

Regular-pattern-sensitive CRFs for Distant Label Interactions

Sean Papay¹, Roman Klinger¹, and Sebastian Padó²

¹ Fundamentals of Natural Language Processing, University of Bamberg, Germany
(sean.papay|roman.klinger)@uni-bamberg.de

² Institute for Natural Language Processing, University of Stuttgart, Germany
sebastian.pado@ims.uni-stuttgart.de

Abstract. Linear-chain conditional random fields (CRFs) are a common model component for sequence labeling tasks when modeling the interactions between different labels is important. However, the Markov assumption limits linear-chain CRFs to only directly modeling interactions between adjacent labels. Weighted finite-state transducers (FSTs) are a related approach which can be made to model distant label-label interactions, but exact label inference is intractable for these models in the general case, and the task of selecting an appropriate automaton structure for the desired interaction types poses a practical challenge. In this work, we present regular-pattern-sensitive CRFs (RPCRFs), a method of enriching standard linear-chain CRFs with the ability to learn long-distance label interactions which occur in user-specified patterns. This approach allows users to write regular-expression label patterns concisely specifying which types of interactions the model should take into account, allowing the model to learn from data whether and in which contexts these patterns occur. The result can be interpreted alternatively as a CRF augmented with additional, non-local potentials, or as a finite-state transducer whose structure is defined by a set of easily-interpretable patterns. Critically, unlike the general case for FSTs (and for non-chain CRFs), exact training and inference are tractable for many pattern sets. In this work, we detail how a RPCRF can be automatically constructed from a set of user-specified patterns, and demonstrate the model’s effectiveness on synthetic data, showing how different types of patterns can capture different nonlocal dependency structures in label sequences.

Keywords: Probabilistic graphical models · transducers · sequence labeling · exact inference

1 Introduction

Sequence labeling is a common paradigm which subsumes many tasks in machine learning. In natural language processing (NLP), where text input is naturally interpreted as a sequence of tokens, common examples of sequence labeling tasks include part-of-speech (POS) tagging [3, 23], named entity recognition [12, 17],

and semantic role labeling [7, 18]. Outside of NLP, sequence labeling arises naturally in contexts where the input takes on a linear, sequential structure, such as in protein structure prediction [15, 26] and weather pattern prediction [19].

Sequence labeling is fundamentally a structured prediction task – individual labels are not in general independent from one another, but should form a coherent label sequence. For example, in POS tagging, where an individual word like “duck” may have ambiguous POS in isolation, models should strive to tag all words such that the predicted POS sequence is globally grammatical. In weather pattern prediction, while the weather at a specific time point may be uncertain, it should nonetheless be highly correlated with the weather at nearby points in time.

Different approaches to sequence labeling make use of different strategies for modeling these interdependencies in the label sequence. One conceptually simple approach is to represent the entire input sequence in a joint latent space using an *encoder*, and to make independent predictions for each token conditioned on this joint latent representation.³ With a sufficiently powerful encoder, models can try to sidestep the issue of modeling interactions between output labels by instead modeling the interactions at the level of the input sequence.

However, often an encoder on its own cannot be certain about a prediction. This may be due to underlying ambiguity (e.g. no model could be certain about the POS tagging of a lexically ambiguous sentence like “I saw her duck.”), limits imposed by data availability or model complexity, or simply the fundamental difficulty of the underlying task. In such cases, models stand to benefit from explicitly modeling interactions between labels, such that they can exclude unlikely label sequences. For instance, while an ambiguous sentence may force a POS labeling model to guess, a model that can exclude label sequences that lack a verb has better odds of guessing correctly. Unfortunately, modeling interactions between labels raises mathematical and computational challenges not present when modeling interactions between inputs, and so approaches must make compromises.

The most well established approach to modeling label–label interactions in sequence labeling involves the use of a linear-chain conditional random field (CRF) [11]. Within this framework, interactions between adjacent labels are directly modeled, but distant labels are assumed to only interact by proxy of their intervening labels. This conditional independence assumption, termed the Markov assumption, makes CRFs well-suited for modeling local interactions between labels, but leads to difficulties when long-distance interactions are important, such as in quotation detection [22] and the extraction of opinion expressions from text [27]. Nonetheless, CRFs are well-behaved and efficient, with a convex loss function and exact inference quadratic in the number of labels, making them a popular choice across many sequence labeling tasks.

A related class of models are (neural) weighted finite-state transducers (FSTs) [5, 13, 20]. As with CRFs, weighted FSTs define a distribution over label se-

³ Concretely, this would correspond to e.g. feeding the input into BERT [4], and using a position-wise softmax output layer.




Fig. 1: A linear-chain CRF can only model probabilities of labels occurring at particular positions (ϕ^{\nearrow}), and probabilities for labels being adjacent to one another (ϕ^{\leftrightarrow}). In particular, linear-chain CRFs cannot encourage or discourage the presence of nonlocal patterns in the label sequence, e.g. the regular expression patterns **A.*B** and **C.*D**. With a RPCRF, a set of such patterns can be specified, and the model can learn the probability of each of those patterns occurring at different positions of the label sequence (ϕ^{α}).

quences conditioned on an input sequence, but they do so by modeling transitions through latent *states*. FSTs also obey a Markov assumption, but in their case, this is a conditional independence assumption on states, not on labels. While the state at a given time step depends directly only on the states of neighboring time steps, the output label at that time step may not be conditionally independent from distant output labels, depending on the structure and weights of the underlying automaton, and which paths through that automaton might explain those labels.

While this ability to model distant interactions makes weighted FSTs more powerful than CRFs, they are also computationally more demanding. In cases where the underlying automaton is nondeterministic, inferring the most probable label sequence is NP-hard [1]. Furthermore, in this setting, while the automaton structure is a critical model hyperparameter in specifying which types of dependencies can be modeled, it is not always obvious how to choose this structure in order to be sensitive to specific types of label-label interactions.

In this paper, we propose regular-pattern-sensitive CRFs (RPCRFs), a model architecture combining the strengths of CRFs and FSTs for sequence labeling. A RPCRF can be seen as a linear-chain CRF equipped with the ability to be sensitive to specific types of long-distance interactions between labels. When instantiating a model, a user specifies a set of regular-expression label patterns, such that the resulting model will be able to punish or reward occurrences of those patterns at specific positions in the label sequence. In this way, particular types of long-distance interactions can be chosen in a task-specific manner, while the model is still free to learn how and when those interactions are important for sequence labeling. Figure 1 illustrates how a RPCRF can model long-distance interactions through sensitivity to patterns.

From an alternative, but equivalent, perspective, RPCRFs are a framework for specifying automaton structures for FSTs in an easily interpretable manner, such that the resulting FST will be sensitive to exactly and only those long-distance interactions the user would like to model. Unlike in the general-case for weighted FSTs, a RPCRF will always define a deterministic automaton, allowing for efficient exact inference just as with CRFs.

We first characterize RPCRFs formally, and discuss how one can be implemented as a linear-chain CRF defined over an alternative label sequence. From this perspective, we discuss the time-complexity of parameter estimation and inference. We then perform a number of experiments on synthetic wherein we compare a RPCRF against a linear-chain, demonstrating different types of non-local label structures a RPCRF can be made sensitive to through appropriate choice of patterns.

2 Model architecture and construction

2.1 Formal description

For a label set Σ , a standard linear-chain CRF, parameterized by θ , defines a distribution over label sequences $\mathbf{y} \in \Sigma^*$ conditioned on input sequences \mathbf{x} in terms of a *transition potential function* $\phi_{\theta}^{\leftrightarrow}$ and a *emission potential function* $\phi_{\theta}^{\rightarrow}$:

$$P_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_i (\phi_{\theta}^{\leftrightarrow}(y_i, y_{i+1}) \cdot \phi_{\theta}^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}, y_i, i)) \quad (1)$$

The transition potential function is applied pairwise to each pair of adjacent labels, and is responsible for modeling label-label interactions, while the emission potential function models the interaction between the input sequence and individual labels.

A RPCRF can be understood as standard linear-chain augmented with additional potential functions defined by the set of specified patterns. A RPCRF is additionally hyperparameterized by a set \mathbb{L} of regular-language patterns, and includes a *pattern potential function*, $\phi_{\theta}^{\mathbb{L}}$, to model the likelihood of different label-sequence patterns ending at different positions in the sequence:

$$P_{\theta}^{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \propto P_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \cdot \prod_{L \in \mathbb{L}} \prod_i \phi_{\theta}^{\mathbb{L}}(L, i)^{\mathbb{1}(L \text{ matches } \mathbf{x} \text{ ending at position } i)} \quad (2)$$

In principle, since deciding if an arbitrary regular-language pattern matches ending on a given label index requires looking at all preceding labels, this defines a CRF without linear-chain structure wherein all labels are adjacent to one another. However, as we will show in the next subsection, the RPCRF distribution can be represented as the distribution over an auxiliary CRF which *does* have a linear-chain structure, allowing for tractable training and exact inference for these models.

2.2 Construction from patterns

This subsection describes how training and inference can be done with RPCRFs. As described, these models are highly cyclic CRFs, for which exact training and inference are infeasible in general. However, we will present a method for defining an auxiliary, linear-chain CRF whose distribution happens to equal the RPCRF distribution. As this auxiliary CRF has a linear-chain structure, parameter estimation and inference can be done with the forward and Viterbi algorithms respectively.

We begin by defining a deterministic finite-state automaton (DFA) Π whose state space captures information about all patterns in \mathbb{L} . Specifically, we would like to define Π such that, as Π processes the label sequence \mathbf{y} , the current state of Π at time step i can tell us which set of patterns in \mathbb{L} match \mathbf{y} ending at position i . We achieve this as follows: for each $L \in \mathbb{L}$, we construct a DFA for the language $L' = \Sigma^* \oplus L$, i.e., the language of label sequences with a suffix matching L . We can then construct Π as a product of the automata for these L' , whose states are $|\mathbb{L}|$ -tuples of the states the constituent automata. While accepting \mathbf{y} through Π , we can examine the state-tuple at each time-step, and determine which set of patterns match \mathbf{y} ending at that time step by checking which states in that tuple are accepting states in their original automata. We can interpret Π as a state-labeled DFA, where each state is labeled with the set of patterns which match \mathbf{y} ending at that time-step when that state is reached. In particular, for each state q in Π , we will notate the set of patterns which label that state as $\mathbb{L}_{[q]} \subseteq \mathbb{L}$.

Once we have constructed Π , we will define an auxiliary linear-chain CRF whose label set is the set A of arcs (labeled arrows) of Π . As Π is deterministic, each possible label sequence $\mathbf{y} \in \Sigma^*$ corresponds to exactly one path through Π – as a path through Π can be represented as a sequence of arcs $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in A^*$, that path can be used directly as a label sequence for our auxiliary CRF. We specifically construct our auxiliary CRF such that the probability assigned to each arc sequence $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is equal to the RPCRF probability for the corresponding label sequence \mathbf{y} :

$$P'_\theta(\boldsymbol{\pi} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_i (\phi_\theta^{\leftrightarrow}(\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) \cdot \phi_\theta^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}, \pi_i, i)) = P_\theta^{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

We achieve this through the definitions of our auxiliary CRF's transition function $\phi_\theta^{\leftrightarrow}$ and emission function $\phi_\theta^{\rightarrow}$:

$$\phi_\theta^{\leftrightarrow}(\langle q \xrightarrow{a} r \rangle, \langle s \xrightarrow{b} t \rangle) = \begin{cases} \phi_\theta^{\leftrightarrow}(a, b) & \text{if } r = s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$$\phi_\theta^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}, \langle q \xrightarrow{a} r \rangle, i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } q \text{ is not} \\ & \text{the initial state of } \Pi \\ \phi_\theta^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}, a, i) \cdot \prod_{L \in \mathbb{L}_{[r]}} \phi_\theta^{\mathbf{a}}(L, i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

These definitions ensure that our auxiliary CRF will only assign nonzero probability to proper paths through Π (those which start at the initial state and contain only valid transitions), and, for those paths, will assign a probability to path π equal to the RPCRF distribution’s probability for the corresponding label sequence \mathbf{y} . Figure 2 shows a worked example of this construction, illustrating the state-labeled automaton obtained from a set of patterns and the auxiliary CRF computing a probability for a path through that automaton.

As the time- and space-complexity of our learning and inference algorithms will depend on the size of Π , we would like to make Π as small as possible. This can be achieved by minimizing all automata for our L' languages before constructing Π , and pruning unreachable states in Π .


In the worst case, all states in Π will be reachable, and the size of Π equals the product of the minimal number of states for all languages in \mathbb{L} , i.e. it is exponential in $|\mathbb{L}|$. However, we observe that in many cases where different patterns “share information,” we can do significantly better than this upper bound. For instance, when one pattern is a strict prefix of another, we can include the prefix pattern “for free”, without necessitating any additional states, as the product construction has the effect of simply labeling which states in the larger automaton match the prefix. Unfortunately, a full characterization of such synergies falls outside the scope of the current work.

3 Experiments

To concretely demonstrate the differences between RPCRFs and linear-chain CRFs, we perform three experiments with synthetic data, each demonstrating a particular class of problem where a RPCRF can model interactions not capturable by a linear-chain CRF. Each experiment will feature a synthetic dataset exhibiting a certain type of label structure, and a pattern set designed to be sensitive to that label structure. As all labels are trivially independent under certainty (i.e. when all label probabilities are either zero or one), all synthetic data tasks are fundamentally underspecified, such that models will always need to “guess” the right answer from some space of possibilities. Thus, for each experiment, in addition to reporting model performance, we will report the highest level of performance possible by a hypothetical model employing an optimal strategy.

For all synthetic data experiments, we will use digits as input symbols, and letters and underscores as output labels, with the specific meanings of these symbols varying by experiment. For all experiments, the emission and pattern potential functions are represented with a biLSTM neural network [8], and the transition function is represented as a parameter matrix. All parameters are jointly optimized until convergence using the Adam optimizer [9].


We evaluate all tasks via exact-match accuracy. That means that we count a model as correct only when it predicts the label sequence exactly correct, and we don’t assign partial credit. This turns out to be quite important, as many less-strict evaluation methods are explicitly insensitive to the global structures



(a) A DFA for for Π . The path through this automaton for the string **BAXAA** is marked.

$$A = \{ \langle q_1 \xrightarrow{X} q_1 \rangle, \langle q_1 \xrightarrow{A} q_2 \rangle, \langle q_1 \xrightarrow{B} q_4 \rangle, \langle q_2 \xrightarrow{X} q_2 \rangle, \langle q_2 \xrightarrow{A} q_3 \rangle, \langle q_2 \xrightarrow{B} q_4 \rangle, \langle q_3 \xrightarrow{X} q_2 \rangle, \langle q_3 \xrightarrow{A} q_3 \rangle, \langle q_3 \xrightarrow{B} q_4 \rangle, \langle q_4 \xrightarrow{A} q_2 \rangle, \langle q_4 \xrightarrow{X} q_4 \rangle, \langle q_4 \xrightarrow{B} q_5 \rangle, \langle q_4 \xrightarrow{A} q_2 \rangle, \langle q_4 \xrightarrow{X} q_3 \rangle, \langle q_4 \xrightarrow{B} q_4 \rangle \}$$

(b) A , the set of arcs in Π , which will be used as the label set for the auxiliary CRF.



(c) The auxiliary CRF calculating the probability for the arc sequence corresponding to \mathbf{y} 's path through Π . Since q_3 corresponds to an accepting state for L_1 , the emission function incorporates the pattern potential for L_1 at time steps which end on q_3 . The resulting probability equals the RPCRF probability for the string \mathbf{y} .

Fig. 2: A worked example for the label string $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{BAXAA}$ of a RPCRF with two patterns: $L_1 = \mathbf{AX^*A}$ and $L_2 = \mathbf{BX^*B}$. (a) shows Π , the state-labeled automaton we obtain from these two languages, (b) shows the set of arcs in Π , which will be tags for our auxiliary CRF, and (c) demonstrates how we use our auxiliary CRF to calculate a probability for \mathbf{y} .

Table 1: Example for Experiment 1 (cardinality patterns). The first token of each input specifies the number of As in the output.

\mathbf{x}	3000000000	9000000000	1000000000
\mathbf{y}	--A_AA----	_AAAAAAAA	-----A----

we are trying to capture. For instance, when evaluating by token-wise accuracy, models are not rewarded for producing globally plausible label sequences, only for ensuring that each individual label is likely in isolation, something that linear-chain CRFs are already capable of.

3.1 Experiment 1: Cardinality patterns

A common source of label interdependencies in sequence labeling is given by global constraints on how often a particular label occurs. Under such constraints, each label can directly depend on each other label. For example, if we know that a particular label must occur exactly once in a sequence, assigning that label to any particular position affects the marginal distribution of every other position. These constraints may be soft, though – for example, in the classification of daily activities from a smartwatch data sequence, users typically go running once a day, but might run twice, or not at all [10].

In order to investigate a RPCRF’s ability to model such cardinality constraints, we construct a synthetic dataset of (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) pairs. For each pair, \mathbf{x} consists of a single non-zero digit k , followed by nine zeros. The first label of \mathbf{y} is always $_$, and, of the remaining nine labels, exactly k are **A**, with all others being $_$. We chose the value of k uniformly randomly, and then uniformly randomly select which k positions should be labeled as **A**. Table 1 gives examples of some datapoints for this experiment.

As patterns, we use a set of nine regular languages $\mathbb{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_9\}$:

$$L_k = \wedge (- * \mathbf{a})^k - * \$ \tag{6}$$

Each L_k matches label sequences with exactly k occurrences of **A**. As pattern can match only a complete label sequence, and as the languages are disjoint, only one pattern can match any given label sequence. A RPCRF should be able to learn from the first token of the input sequence which pattern should apply to the label sequence, and assign only that pattern a high weight with its pattern potential function, resulting in the model always predicting the correct number of As. Conversely, while a CRF can learn that the **A** label should be more or less likely depending on the value of k , it has no mechanism for enforcing a specific number of **A** labels (except in the case for $k = 9$, wherein the output is deterministic).

Table 2 summarizes the performance of RPCRF and linear-chain CRFs on this task. We see that a RPCRF is able to achieve near-optimal accuracy. On the

Table 2: Results for Experiment 1: While the CRF-based model cannot predict the correct cardinality well, the RPCRF achieves near-optimal performance.

Model	Exact-match Accuracy (%)	% Optimal strategy
Optimal strategy	14.64	–
LSTM+CRF	11.27	76.98
LSTM+RPCRF	14.61	99.80

Table 3: Example for Experiment 2 (agreement patterns): model must learn which pairs of non-zero output labels correspond (A/B, C/D, E/F).

\mathbf{x}	0010000100	0011000000	0001000001
\mathbf{y}	__A____B__	__DC_____	___F_____E

other hand, the linear-chain CRF, lacking an ability to directly enforce cardinality constraints, can only achieve approximately 77% of the optimal strategy’s accuracy.

3.2 Experiment 2: Agreement patterns

Commonly for sequence labeling tasks, the presence of one type of label in a sequence might be highly informative about the presence or absence of other labels at distant positions in the sequence. For instance, when using sequence labeling to label named entities in text, an entity of type EVENT may be likely to occur in the same document as an entity of type DATE, while there may be no such affinity between entities of types LAW and WORK_OF_ART. In the extreme case, certain labels might be guaranteed to co-occur in a document, or alternatively may be forbidden from doing so.

To investigate a RPCRF’s ability to learn such interactions, we construct a synthetic sequence-labeling dataset which exhibits strong agreement interactions between distant labels. In each (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) pair, \mathbf{x} is a length-ten sequence containing eight zeros and exactly two ones, which represent entities to be labeled. The corresponding \mathbf{y} assigns a _ label to all zeros, and a letter from A to F to the two ones. Importantly, these letter labels are selected such that A must co-occur with a B, C with a D, and E with an F. Table 3 provides some example (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) -pairs for this experiment.

We assume a setting where model users know that *some* co-occurrence constraints exist, but do not know the particular letters which can or cannot co-occur. Thus, as patterns, we use a set of $\binom{6}{2} = 15$ languages, with each language matching a label sequence containing two distinct labels exactly once:

$$\mathbb{L} = \left\{ \hat{_}^* (\alpha_*\beta \mid \beta_*\alpha) _*\$: \{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{F}\}, \alpha \neq \beta \right\} \quad (7)$$

Our model is thus responsible for learning which label pairs agree with one another, and which disagree.

Table 4: Results for Experiment 2 (agreement patterns): While the CRF-based model cannot consistently match up output labels, the RPCRF achieves near-optimal performance.

Model	Exact-match Accuracy (%)	% Optimal strategy
Optimal strategy	16.67	–
LSTM+CRF	6.97	41.81
LSTM+RPCRF	16.60	99.58

Table 4 shows the results on this experiment for a RPCRF and for a linear-chain CRF baseline. As before, our RPCRF-based model achieves nearly optimal performance, while the linear-chain CRF, unable to learn the relationships between distant labels, lags significantly behind.

3.3 Experiment 3: Battleship

While this paper has thus far focused largely on CRFs with a linear-chain structure, CRFs are also commonly used for 2-dimensional data in tasks such as image segmentation [2]. In such a setting, instead of labeling elements of a sequence, individual pixels or grid cells are labeled. Crucially, such a setting usually envisions each pixel as directly adjacent to all four of its orthogonal neighbors, leading to a highly cyclic graph structure not amenable to tractable exact inference [16].

With appropriate encoding and patterns, RPCRFs can also be used for labeling such 2-dimensional data. Any 2-dimensional grid can be serialized row-by-row into a linear sequence. Cells which neighbored horizontally in the original grid are still neighbors in the sequence, while vertical neighbors are now separated by from one another by a constant distance equal to the grid width. By writing patterns that are specifically sensitive to labels separated by exactly this distance, we can enable a RPCRF to model interactions between vertically adjacent cells in our original grid.

We demonstrate this concretely with a synthetic task on a 5×5 grid. Somewhere on this grid, a 4×1 battleship is hiding, positioned and oriented randomly. The input sequence \mathbf{x} comprises all zeros, except for a single one, at some randomly-chosen cell of the battleship. In the label sequence \mathbf{y} , each cell occupied by the battleship is labeled **A**, while all other cells are labeled **_**. The model’s task is thus to guess the position and orientation of the battleship, given only a single “hit.” Table 5 illustrates some input-output pairs.

We utilize a single pattern, sensitive to two **As** separated by four **_s** (i.e. vertically adjacent in the grid):

$$\mathbb{L} = \{\mathbf{A__A}\} \tag{8}$$

This allows our RPCRF to be sensitive to vertically adjacent pairs of **As** in the label sequence (at least when all intervening labels in the sequence are instances of **_**).

Table 5: Example for Experiment 3 (battleship). Each input marks a single cell of the battleship, while the output marks all cells. For clarity, inputs and outputs are displayed as 5×5 grids here but are treated as length-25 sequences by models.

	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
x	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-
y	-	-	-	A	-	A	A	A	A	-	A	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-

Table 6: Results for Experiment 3 (Battleship): The RPCRF substantially outperforms the CRF-based model in recovering the right shape.

Model	Exact-match Accuracy (%)	% Optimal strategy
Optimal strategy	31.25	-
LSTM+CRF	2.50	8.00
LSTM+RPCRF	12.49	39.98

Table 6 reports the performance of our two models for this task. In this case, the RPCRF-based model does not achieve the performance of the optimal strategy here. This is due to a limitation in the pattern used: while the model can use its pattern to ensure the predicted **A**s are adjacent, it has no mechanism for ensuring that it predicts the correct *number* of **A**s. Nonetheless, even though the provided pattern set cannot capture all structural properties of the label sequences, we still see significant improvements over a linear-chain CRF.

4 Related Work

Our proposed approach is one of many ways for extending a linear-chain CRF in a manner that selectively circumvents the Markov assumption of default CRFs. Here we will briefly discuss some alternate formalisms for defining and working with such 'higher-order' CRFs.

4.1 Pattern-based CRFs

A conceptually similar approach to our current proposal are pattern-based CRFs [25, 28]. As with our regular-pattern-sensitive CRFs, pattern-based CRFs allow

practitioners to specify a set of label patterns, allowing the CRF to learn long-distance dependencies by either encouraging or discouraging the presence of these patterns at particular locations of the label sequence. However, the patterns in pattern-based CRFs are limited to exact string matches, while our RPCRFs allow for arbitrary regular-expression patterns. Critically, a pattern-based CRF can only model dependencies as distant as its longest search pattern, while RPCRFs can easily be designed to learn dependencies over arbitrary distances, as our Experiment 1 demonstrated.

4.2 Semi-Markov CRFs

Another approach commonly used for allowing CRFs to learn non-local label interactions are semi-Markov CRFs [21]. Under this formalism, rather than labeling each individual token, a semi-Markov CRF outputs a segmentation of the input, labeling each segment. While segment labels must follow the Markov assumption (each segment’s label depends directly only on its neighboring segments), the model’s behavior *within* each segment may be non-Markovian. Such models offer an efficient approach to modeling certain types of nonlocal interactions, but these interactions are limited to occurring within the same segment, again in contrast to our model.

4.3 Skip-chain CRFs

A skip-chain CRFs [24] is an otherwise linear-chain CRF augmented with *skip-connections*, a number of connections directly connecting otherwise distant labels in the sequence. The exact structure of these skip connections can be specified according to the task, and may even be specified conditioned on the input sequence. This provides a conceptually straightforward way to enable linear-chain CRFs to model long-distance dependencies. While skip connections can be selected to account for many possible types of long-distance interactions, the resulting graphs are highly cyclic, and often require approximate techniques for parameter estimation and inference. Nonetheless, with certain connection structures, tricks are possible to allow for exact training and inference on skip-chain CRFs [6].

4.4 Regular-constrained CRFs

Regular-constrained CRFs [18] enforce that a model *must* output label sequences that match some user-specified regular expression. While this enables linear-chain CRFs to respect non-local label interactions similar to our own proposal, our proposal allows a CRF to learn the likelihood of regular expressions matching at different positions in the label sequence. Thus, a regular-constraint CRF can be understood as a special case of a RPCRF wherein a single pattern (the complement of the user-specified language) is given a constant potential of zero. While regular-constrained CRFs are limited to enforcing known constraints specified a priori, our regular-pattern-sensitive CRFs can *learn* under which contexts different label patterns are likely or unlikely.

5 Conclusions

In this work, we introduced regular-pattern-sensitive CRFs, a method for enriching linear-chain CRFs with the ability to learn long-distance interactions which occur within user-specified regular-expression patterns. By representing all patterns in a single state-labeled DFA, and using an auxiliary CRF to represent a distribution over paths through this DFA, we can selectively extend features of the original CRF with non-local features while preserving efficient parameter learning and inference.

Regular patterns are often sufficient to model the relevant structures in the domain, as Experiment 2 illustrates. More complex structures can often be rewritten with regular patterns by assuming a maximum input length (cf. [14] and Experiment 1). Even when regular-language patterns cannot fully capture the dependency structure of the labels, and imperfect approximation can still yield a substantial improvement, as we found in Experiment 3.

We believe that the combination of regular patterns with linear-chain CRFs offers a flexible and powerful perspective for incorporating domain knowledge into sequence classification models that combines the knowledge-based and data-driven paradigms in a promising fashion. Model architectures for sequence labeling can easily be made to account for specific tasks’ output structures by simply specifying a set of regular-expression patterns, without the need to explicitly construct an FST or otherwise adapt the model architecture.

Two important directions for future work include (a) a formal characterization of the circumstances under which the DFA resulting from the user-specified regular patterns cannot be effectively minimized; and (b) a downstream evaluation and analysis on real-world tasks such as quotation detection and protein-structure prediction, where label interactions over longer distance scales clearly matter. Work in both of these directions would help to make RPCRFs more practically usable – (a) would help users of RPCRFs select pattern sets that lead to tractable exact inference, while (b) would provide wisdom into which types of patterns are most helpful for improving performance in practice.

Acknowledgments. Scrubbed for double-blind review.

References

1. Casacuberta, F., de la Higuera, C.: Computational complexity of problems on probabilistic grammars and transducers. In: Oliveira, A.L. (ed.) *Grammatical Inference: Algorithms and Applications*. pp. 15–24. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2000)
2. Chen, L.C., Papandreou, G., Kokkinos, I., Murphy, K., Yuille, A.L.: Deeplab: Semantic image segmentation with deep convolutional nets, atrous convolution, and fully connected crfs. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* **40**(4), 834–848 (2017)
3. Chiche, A., Yitagesu, B.: Part of speech tagging: a systematic review of deep learning and machine learning approaches. *Journal of Big Data* **9**(1), 10 (2022)

4. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: 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). pp. 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota (Jun 2019), <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N19-1423>
5. Eisner, J.: Parameter estimation for probabilistic finite-state transducers. In: Isabelle, P., Charniak, E., Lin, D. (eds.) Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 1–8. Association for Computational Linguistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA (Jul 2002). <https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073085>, <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1001>
6. Galley, M.: A skip-chain conditional random field for ranking meeting utterances by importance. In: Jurafsky, D., Gaussier, E. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 364–372. Association for Computational Linguistics, Sydney, Australia (Jul 2006), <https://aclanthology.org/W06-1643>
7. He, L., Lee, K., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L.: Deep semantic role labeling: What works and what’s next. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 473–483. Association for Computational Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada (Jul 2017), <https://aclanthology.org/P17-1044>
8. Hochreiter, S., Schmidhuber, J.: Long short-term memory. *Neural computation* **9**(8), 1735–1780 (1997)
9. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In: Bengio, Y., LeCun, Y. (eds.) Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations. San Diego, CA (2015)
10. Kwon, M.C., Choi, S.: Recognition of daily human activity using an artificial neural network and smartwatch. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing* (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/2618045>
11. Lafferty, J.D., McCallum, A., Pereira, F.C.N.: Conditional Random Fields: Probabilistic Models for Segmenting and Labeling Sequence Data. In: Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 282–289 (2001)
12. Li, J., Sun, A., Han, J., Li, C.: A survey on deep learning for named entity recognition : Extended abstract. In: 2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE). pp. 3817–3818 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE55515.2023.00335>
13. Mohri, M.: Finite-state transducers in language and speech processing. *Computational Linguistics* **23**(2), 269–311 (1997), <https://aclanthology.org/J97-2003>
14. Mohri, M., Nederhof, M.J.: Regular approximation of context-free grammars through transformation. In: Robustness in language and speech technology, pp. 153–163. Springer (2001)
15. Mukanov, Z., Takhanov, R.: Learning the pattern-based CRF for prediction of a protein local structure. *Informatica* **46**(6) (2022)
16. Murphy, K.P., Weiss, Y., Jordan, M.I.: Loopy belief propagation for approximate inference: An empirical study. In: Proceedings of the Fifteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence. p. 467–475. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., Stockholm, Sweden (1999)
17. Nadeau, D., Sekine, S.: A survey of named entity recognition and classification. *Linguisticae Investigationes* **30**(1), 3–26 (2007), <https://doi.org/10.1075/li.30.1.03nad>

18. Papay, S., Klinger, R., Pado, S.: Constraining linear-chain CRFs to regular languages. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (2022), <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jbrgwbv8nD>
19. Raje, D., Mujumdar, P.P.: A conditional random field-based downscaling method for assessment of climate change impact on multisite daily precipitation in the mahanadi basin. *Water Resources Research* **45**(10) (2009), <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008WR007487>
20. Rastogi, P., Cotterell, R., Eisner, J.: Weighting finite-state transductions with neural context. In: Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. pp. 623–633. Association for Computational Linguistics, San Diego, California (Jun 2016). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N16-1076>, <https://aclanthology.org/N16-1076>
21. Sarawagi, S., Cohen, W.W.: Semi-markov conditional random fields for information extraction. In: Saul, L., Weiss, Y., Bottou, L. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. vol. 17. MIT Press (2004)
22. Scheible, C., Klinger, R., Padó, S.: Model architectures for quotation detection. In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 1736–1745. Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin, Germany (Aug 2016). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P16-1164>, <https://aclanthology.org/P16-1164>
23. Schmid, H.: Part-of-speech tagging with neural networks. In: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. Kyoto, Japan (1994), <https://aclanthology.org/C94-1027>
24. Sutton, C., McCallum, A.: An introduction to conditional random fields for relational learning (2007), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.4088>
25. Takhanov, R., Kolmogorov, V.: Inference algorithms for pattern-based crfs on sequence data. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 145–153 (2013)
26. Wang, S., Peng, J., Ma, J., Xu, J.: Protein secondary structure prediction using deep convolutional neural fields. *Scientific reports* **6**(1), 1–11 (2016)
27. Yang, B., Cardie, C.: Extracting opinion expressions with semi-markov conditional random fields. In: Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning. pp. 1335–1345 (2012)
28. Ye, N., Lee, W., Chieu, H., Wu, D.: Conditional random fields with high-order features for sequence labeling. In: Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. Curran Associates, Inc. (2009)