

A Multi-task Learning Approach for Named Entity Recognition using Local Detection

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

Named entity recognition (NER) systems that perform well require task-related and manually annotated datasets. However, they are expensive to develop, and are thus limited in size. As there already exists a large number of such datasets that share a certain degree of relationship but differ in content, it is important to explore the question of whether such datasets can be combined as a simple method for improving NER performance. To explore this, we developed a novel non-sequence labelling multi-task feedforward neural network (FFNN) model which relies on the recent fixed-size ordinally forgetting encoding (FOFE). We applied this method to several well-known NER tasks and compared the results of our model to baseline models as well as other published results. As a result, we observed competitive performance in nearly all of the tasks.

1 Introduction

The task of named entity recognition aims to solve the problem of detecting proper nouns in a text and categorizing them into different types of entities. Such information is useful for higher-level NLP applications such as summarization and question answering (Aramaki et al., 2009; Ravichandran and Hovy, 2002). NER systems have been originally built by applying hand-crafted features and other external resources to achieve good results (Ratinov and Roth, 2009). In the recent years, researchers have turned to neural network architectures. Collobert et al. (2011) introduced a neural network model that learns important features from word embeddings, thus requiring little feature engineering. However, in his use of FFNNs, the con-

text used around a word is restricted to a fixed-size window. This bears the risk of losing potentially relevant information between words that are far apart. Recently, Xu et al. (2017) proposed a local detection approach for NER by making use of the FOFE encoding. This technique can encode any variable-length sequence of words into a fixed-size representation and thus has the ability to capture immediate dependencies within the sentence.

Meanwhile, learning many associated tasks concurrently has been shown to improve performance compared to learning each task separately (Bakker and Heskes, 2003; Caruana, 1997). One of the more popular MTL approaches is hard-parameter sharing, which has the advantage of reducing the chance of over-fitting (Maurer et al., 2016) while also being simple to implement.

Our main contribution lies in combining these two proposed models for the NER task. In this paper, we propose a novel multi-task FOFE-based FFNN model with the aim of generalizing the underlying distributions of the named entities in the data. We report our experimental results on several popular NER tasks. Our method has yielded competitive results and improved performance in comparison to the baselines in all tasks.

2 Model

Our neural network model is inspired by the work of Xu et al. (2017), where we use a local detection approach relying on the FOFE method to fully encode each sentence fragment and its contexts. While Xu et al. (2017) uses a single-task model, we propose to incorporate joint learning of related auxiliary tasks, with the intention of improving a main task. We propose to share the hidden layers between all tasks, while keeping several task-specific hidden and output layers (Caruana, 1997).




Figure 1: Illustration of an example network structure for our MTL model using FOFE codes. The window currently examines the fragment *Louvre Museum*.

2.1 Fixed-Size Ordinally Forgetting Encoding (FOFE)

In this section, we describe the FOFE method. Consider a vocabulary V , where each word can be represented by a 1-of- $|V|$ one-hot vector. Let $S = w_1 \cdots w_N$ denote a sequence of N words from V , and denote e_n to be the one-hot vector of the n -th word in S , where $1 \leq n \leq N$. Assuming $z_0 = 0$, the FOFE code z_n of the sequence from word w_1 to w_n is as follows:

$$z_n = \alpha \cdot z_{n-1} + e_n$$

where α is a constant forgetting factor. Hence, z_n can be viewed as a fixed-size representation of the subsequence $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$. Following the theoretical properties presented by Zhang et al. (2015) in Appendix A, we see that FOFE can uniquely encode any sequence of variable length into a fixed-size representation.

2.2 Extracting Features using FOFE

Word-level FOFE Features We extract the bag-of-words (BoW) of the fragment of interest as well as the FOFE of its left and right contexts including/excluding the fragment of interest. All the word features are computed in both cased and uncased forms. The FOFE codes are then projected to lower-dimensional dense vectors using projection matrices for both forms. Those matrices are initialized using word embeddings pre-trained with word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013), and are tuned during training.

Character-level FOFE Features Based on a pre-defined set of all possible characters, we view the fragment as a cased character sequence and apply FOFE to it from left to right, as well as reversed (right-to-left). We then project the character encodings using a trainable character embedding matrix.

2.3 A MTL approach for NER using FOFE

To fully characterize our model, we must first present the MTL hard-parameter sharing approach introduced by Caruana (1997). Consider k learning tasks $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^k$, where each task T_i is associated with an input-output pair of sequences $(x_{1:n}, y_{1:n}^i)$, where $x_j \in W$ and $y_j^i \in Y_i$. The input set W is shared by all tasks, whereas the output sets Y_i are reserved to a single corresponding task. For our model, we consider a dataset with distinct labels to be a separate task. The model is illustrated in Figure 1. The character and word features are concatenated to form the input to the model. The model has many outputs, corresponding to the number of tasks trained for the specific instance. Assuming that we would like to train k tasks - mainly 1 main task and $(k - 1)$ auxiliary tasks - we would have k output layers. The k outputs are connected to a stack of hidden layers that they share. Additionally, some main and auxiliary tasks (Task T_2 in Figure 1) may contain an additional private layer. Since the k outputs share common hidden layers, the internal representations that arise in the hidden layers for the auxiliary tasks may be used by the main task. The private layers for the main task can be useful for personalizing the learning of the task, since some of information contained in the training signals distinct to the task may be swamped in the shared layers by the auxiliary tasks' training signals. As for private layers for an auxiliary task, it would serve as an enablement for the shared layers to focus on representing information pertinent to the other tasks, while keeping its distinct signals in its private layer. This is especially useful if the auxiliary task has a large data size compared to the main task.

Training At each training step, we randomly choose a task T_i and training sample $(x_{1:n}, y_{1:n}^i) \in T_i$. After the forward pass, we backpropagate the loss of the current instance through the shared (and private, if exists) layers and update the model parameters. We use categorical cross entropy as our

objective function. Training is executed by using mini-batch SGD with momentum of 0.9 (Bottou, 2010) and learning rates are exponentially decayed by a factor of 1/16 if dev-performance drops compared to the last run. We apply dropout (Srivastava et al., 2014) to all layers with a value of 0.5. We set all the forgetting factors for words to $\alpha_w = 0.5$, and to $\alpha_c = 0.8$ for characters. The layers are initialized based on a uniform distribution following Glorot et al. (2011). All of the layers consist of ReLU (Nair and Hinton, 2010), and the probability of an output class is modelled by a softmax function. We follow the same post-processing and decoding steps for named entities as the ones outlined in Xu et al. (2017). We performed grid search and selected the hyper-parameters over the main task’s development set, with early stopping. For detailed hyper-parameter settings, please go to Appendix A.

3 Experimental setup

We use the following multi-lingual benchmark tasks: CoNLL-2003 ENG¹, CoNLL-2002 SPA², OntoNotes 5.0 ENG and ZH³, the KBP 2016⁴ trilingual task and DEFT Light ERE. For each main task, we consider the following systems: (i) Baseline model, trained without any auxiliary task. (ii) A system involving a combination of auxiliary tasks along with the main task.

Main and Auxiliary Tasks We group the tasks used together by language: (i) ENG models: The CoNLL-2003, OntoNotes 5.0 and KBP 2016 ENG. (ii) SPA models: CoNLL-2002, KBP 2016 SPA and Light ERE. (iii) ZH models: OntoNotes 5.0, KBP 2016 ZH and Light ERE. Each task within the group is used as a main task in a separate experiment, and the rest of the tasks in the group are used as auxiliary tasks. The only exception is Light ERE, which is only auxiliary in all experiments. Additionally, we make use an in-house dataset which consists of 10k ENG and ZH documents labelled manually following the KBP 2016 format. Since KBP 2016 does not contain any train and development data, we use our in-house data as such with a 90:10 split. We also use the KBP 2015 dataset as additional data for training. For the CoNLL-2003 task, we use cased and uncased word embeddings of size 256 trained on the Reuters RCV1 corpus. The remaining tasks use

¹ (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003) ² (Tjong Kim Sang, 2002) ³ (Pradhan et al., 2013) ⁴ (Ji and Nothman, 2016)

cased and uncased word embeddings of size 256 trained using the English⁵, Spanish⁶ and Chinese⁷ Gigaword for the corresponding models evaluated in that language. Detailed info about the tasks can be found in Appendix A.

Baselines Our baseline models are from Xu et al. (2017). We use the author’s findings for CoNLL-2003 and KBP 2016, and apply the implementation⁸ released by the author to train the model with OntoNotes 5.0 and CoNLL-2002 tasks.

4 Results and Discussion

Overall, the MTL models yield better performance over baselines for all of the tasks. The task that has most benefited from MTL is the KBP 2016 trilingual task, whose results are summarized in Table 1. Xu et al. (2017) and the best KBP 2016 system are single-task models and the latter used 5-fold cross-validation. All the KBP 2016 results have been generated using the official evaluator. Table 6 summarizes the results obtained with MTL for the KBP 2016 ENG task. The first MTL model is trained by only using KBP 2015 data for the main task, which results in an F_1 score of 0.739, compared to only 0.697 in Xu et al. (2017). We see that the gains experienced by MTL are more significant when the main task’s training data is smaller. In Table 2, we compare our best MTL model for CoNLL-2003 with baseline and state-of-the-art results. Our model makes use of the task’s training data only additionally to the auxiliary task training data. Compared to the models that are trained without the dev-set, our proposed model only comes second to Yang et al. (2016). The OntoNotes 5.0 English and Chinese results are presented in Tables 3 and 4, and the CoNLL-2002 SPA results in Table 5. For ENG OntoNotes, we observe substantial gains over the baseline models, and are competitive with the top results. We should mention that we do not use any hand-crafted features. For the Chinese OntoNotes task, we found two non-neural method results and have exceeded them with both our baseline and MTL models. We have been unable to find prior published neural-based results, and thus cannot say with certainty whether we achieved state-of-the-art results.

⁵ (Parker et al., 2011) ⁶ (Mendonca et al., 2009) ⁷ (Graff and Chen, 2005)

⁸ <https://github.com/xmb-cipher/fofe-ner>

LANG	Xu et al. (2017)			This work			2016 Best		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
ENG	0.836	0.680	0.750	0.800	0.742	0.770	0.846	0.710	0.772
CMN	0.789	0.625	0.698	0.766	0.673	0.717	0.789	0.737	0.762
SPA	0.835	0.602	0.700	0.869	0.618	0.722	0.839	0.656	0.736
ALL	0.819	0.639	0.718	0.806	0.676	0.738	0.802	0.704	0.756

Table 1: Comparison of the MTL models to Xu et al. (2017) and the best system for KBP 2016 task.

Model	F1 (%)
Collobert et al. (2011)	89.59
Huang et al. (2015)	90.10
Strubell et al. (2017)	90.54 (± 0.18)
Yang et al. (2016)	90.94
Luo et al. (2015)	91.2
Lample et al. (2016)	90.94
Chiu and Nichols (2016)	91.62 (± 0.33)
Xu et al. (2017)	90.71
Our MTL model	90.91

Table 2: A comparison with baseline and top published results on CoNLL-2003 ENG. The three sections, in order, are models: trained with training set only, trained with both training and dev set, our baseline and model.

Model	F1 (%)
Strubell et al. (2017)	86.84 (± 0.19)
Chiu and Nichols (2016)	86.28 (± 0.26)
Durrett and Klein (2014)	84.04
Xu et al. (2017)	85.88
Our MTL model	86.06

Table 3: A comparison with baseline and state-of-the-art results on OntoNotes ENG NER.

Model	F1 (%)
Che et al. (2013)	69.82
Pappu et al. (2017)	67.2
Xu et al. (2017)	71.83
Our MTL model	72.12

Table 4: A comparison with the baseline and other published results on OntoNotes Chinese NER.

Model	F1 (%)
dos Santos and Guimarães (2015)	82.21
Gillick et al. (2016)	82.95
Lample et al. (2016)	85.75
Yang et al. (2016)	85.77
Xu et al. (2017)	83.22
Our MTL model	84.14

Table 5: Results and comparison with the baseline and state-of-the-art results on CoNLL-2002 SPA NER.

Main task training data	MTL model	Xu et al. (2017)
KBP 2015	0.739	0.697
KBP 2015 + in-house	0.770	0.750

Table 6: Results for KBP 2016 ENG with two different main task training set combinations.

5 Related Work

NER Recently, methods involving deep learning have been very successful in many NLP projects. Due to the limitations of FFNNs, more powerful neural networks, such as recurrent neural networks (RNNs) have been used. Many studies have used bidirectional Long Short-Term memory (B-LSTM) architecture along with CRF (Luo et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2015), and report convincing NER results. As for character-level modelling, studies have turned to convolutional neural networks (CNNs). For instance, dos Santos and Guimarães (2015) have employed CNNs to extract character-level features for Spanish and Portuguese, and obtained successful results.

MTL Much of the work done in MTL has been initiated by Caruana (1997). His techniques have been used and confirmed in many studies (Maurer et al., 2016; Ando and Zhang, 2005). The success of MTL has been associated with label entropy, regularizers, training size and many other aspects (Martínez Alonso and Plank, 2017; Bingel and Søgaard, 2017). For example, Collobert and Weston (2008) use MTL in a unified model to train multiple core NLP tasks: NER, Part-of-Speech, chunking and semantic role labeling with neural networks. They show that MTL improves generality among the shared tasks. Liu et al. (2015) used MTL for information retrieval and semantic classification by training a model for both tasks which has shared and private layers. Their method exceeded performance of strong baselines for tasks such as query classification and web search.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated the benefit of multi-task learning combined with local detection (FOFE) as a possible solution for improving performance on various NER tasks. We applied this method to several well-known NER tasks and observed competitive results, without using any external resources or hand-crafted features.

A Supplemental Material

A.1 FOFE Theorems

With α being the constant forgetting factor, the theoretical properties that show FOFE code uniqueness are as follows:

Theorem 1. *If the forgetting factor α satisfies $0 < \alpha \leq 0.5$, FOFE is unique for any countable vocabulary V and any finite value T .*

Theorem 2. *For $0.5 < \alpha < 1$, given any finite value T and any countable vocabulary V , FOFE is almost unique everywhere, except only a finite set of countable choices of α .*

When $0.5 < \alpha < 1$, uniqueness is not guaranteed. However, the odds of ending up with such scenarios is small. Furthermore, it is rare to have a word reappear many times within a near context. Thus, we can say that FOFE can uniquely encode any sequence of variable length, providing a fixed-size lossless representation for any sequence. The proof for those theorems can be found in [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#).

A.2 Data description

CoNLL-2003: The CoNLL-2003 dataset consists of newswire data originated from the Reuters RCV1 corpus. It is tagged with four entity types: person, location, organization and miscellaneous. We only used the ENG documents in our experiments.

OntoNotes: The OntoNotes dataset consists of text from sources such as broadcast conversation and news, newswire, telephone conversation, magazine and web text. The dataset was assembled by [Pradhan et al. \(2013\)](#) for the CoNLL-2012 shared task, who specifies a standard train, validation, and test split followed in our evaluation. It is tagged with eighteen entity types, some of which are: person, facility, organization, product, data, time, money, quantity and so forth.

KBP 2016: The KBP 2016 trilingual EDL task require the identification of entities (including nested) from a collection of text documents in three languages (ENG, ZH and SPA), and their classification to the following named and nominal entity types: person, geo-political entity, organization, location and facility. The dataset consists of recent news articles and discussion forums (non-parallel across languages). The KBP 2016 EDL task is an extension of the KBP 2015 task, except KBP 2015 does not contain any nominal types. We

treat a named entity mention and its' corresponding nominal mention as a single entity type and detect them together.

CoNLL-2002: The CoNLL 2002 named entity data contains files covering both Spanish and Dutch, where each language has training, validation and evaluation file. Similarly to CoNLL 2003, It is tagged with four entity types: person, location, organization and miscellaneous. We mainly use the Spanish files for our Spanish NER model.

Light ERE: The DEFT Light ERE dataset consists of discussion forum and newswire documents tagged with five types of named entities: person, title, organization, geopolitical entities and location.

In-house dataset: Our in-house dataset consists of 10k ENG and ZH documents that are labelled manually following the KBP 2016 dataset.

A.3 Training details

Hyperparameters

- *CoNLL-2003 ENG:* The model has two hidden layers in the shared module and contains a private module for the OntoNotes task with one hidden layer. The hidden layers in the shared module contain 700 units, while the one in the private layer has 512 units. Training is done by mini-batch of size 256. The learning rate is set to 0.128. We used case-sensitive and insensitive word embeddings of 256 dimensions trained using Reuters RCV1, and randomly initialized character embeddings of dimension 64. The official training, development and test set partition is used.
- *OntoNotes ENG:* The multi-task model setup for this dataset is the same as the one for CoNLL-2003, except we use a learning rate of 0.064 and mini-batch of size 128. We follow the split dictated by [Pradhan et al. \(2013\)](#). Also, the word embeddings are derived from the English Gigaword instead ([Parker et al., 2011](#)). Baseline: The baseline model is an FFNN with fully-connected ReLU activation layers that lead to a single output layer with softmax activation. It contains two hidden layers of size 512. The learning rate is set to 0.128, and the mini-batch size is 256.
- *KBP 2016:* For each language, we set up three models that are trained and evaluated independently. We use three sets of word

embeddings of 256 dimensions from the English, Spanish (Mendonca et al., 2009) and Chinese (Graff and Chen, 2005) Gigaword. As specified in Xu et al. (2017), Chinese is labelled at character level only. Here is an overview for each of the models:

1. English and Chinese: Similar to CoNLL-2003, however the private module is instead dedicated to the KBP 2016 task. The learning rate is set to 0.064 with a mini-batch size of 128.
 2. Spanish: Contains a shared module only, with two hidden layers of size 612. The learning rate is set to 0.128, with a mini-batch size of 128.
- *OntoNotes ZH*: The multi-task model set up for this dataset is the same as the one for the Chinese KBP model, with instead a private module for the OntoNotes task, two shared hidden layers of size 712 and a private hidden layer of size 512.
 - *CoNLL-2002*: Contains a shared module only, with two hidden layers of size 612. The learning rate is set to 0.256, with a mini-batch size of 128. Baseline: We set up the CoNLL-2002 baseline model in the same way as the OntoNotes baseline model, with hidden layers of size 412.

Effect of auxiliary training data size We ran all of our systems by gradually increasing the size of the auxiliary tasks training data in 20% increments, while keeping the size of the main task constant. We did not observe any significant improvements over the baseline for any combination. We noticed that adding private hidden layers to some of the auxiliary tasks instead brought more benefit to the model performance.

References

Rie Kubota Ando and Tong Zhang. 2005. [A framework for learning predictive structures from multiple tasks and unlabeled data](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 6:1817–1853.

Eiji Aramaki, Yasuhide Miura, Masatsugu Tonoike, Tomoko Ohkuma, Hiroshi Mashiuchi, and Kazuhiko Ohe. 2009. [Text2table: Medical text summarization system based on named entity recognition and modality identification](#). In *Proceedings of the BioNLP 2009 Workshop*, pages 185–192. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Bart Bakker and Tom Heskes. 2003. [Task clustering and gating for bayesian multitask learning](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 4:83–99.

Joachim Bingel and Anders Søgaard. 2017. [Identifying beneficial task relations for multi-task learning in deep neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 164–169. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Léon Bottou. 2010. Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent. In *Proceedings of COMPSTAT'2010*, pages 177–186, Heidelberg. Physica-Verlag HD.

Rich Caruana. 1997. [Multitask learning](#). *Mach. Learn.*, 28(1):41–75.

Wanxiang Che, Mengqiu Wang, Christopher D. Manning, and Ting Liu. 2013. [Named entity recognition with bilingual constraints](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 52–62, Atlanta, Georgia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jason Chiu and Eric Nichols. 2016. [Named entity recognition with bidirectional lstm-cnns](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:357–370.

Ronan Collobert and Jason Weston. 2008. [A unified architecture for natural language processing: Deep neural networks with multitask learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '08*, pages 160–167, New York, NY, USA. ACM.

Ronan Collobert, Jason Weston, Léon Bottou, Michael Karlen, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Pavel Kuksa. 2011. [Natural language processing \(almost\) from scratch](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12:2493–2537.

Greg Durrett and Dan Klein. 2014. [A joint model for entity analysis: Coreference, typing, and linking](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2:477–490.

Dan Gillick, Cliff Brunk, Oriol Vinyals, and Amarnag Subramanya. 2016. [Multilingual language processing from bytes](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1296–1306, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xavier Glorot, Antoine Bordes, and Yoshua Bengio. 2011. [Deep sparse rectifier neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 15 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 315–323, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA. PMLR.

- David Graff and Ke Chen. 2005. Chinese gigaword. *LDC Catalog No.: LDC2003T09*, ISBN, 1:58563–58230.
- Zhiheng Huang, Wei Xu, and Kai Yu. 2015. Bidirectional LSTM-CRF models for sequence tagging. *CoRR*, abs/1508.01991.
- Heng Ji and Joel Nothman. 2016. Overview of tac-kbp2016 tri-lingual edl and its impact on end-to-end cold-start kbp. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Text Analysis Conference (TAC2016)*.
- Guillaume Lample, Miguel Ballesteros, Sandeep Subramanian, Kazuya Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. 2016. Neural architectures for named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 260–270. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong He, Li Deng, Kevin Duh, and Ye-Yi Wang. 2015. Representation learning using multi-task deep neural networks for semantic classification and information retrieval. In *HLT-NAACL*, pages 912–921. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gang Luo, Xiaojiang Huang, Chin-Yew Lin, and Zaiqing Nie. 2015. Joint entity recognition and disambiguation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 879–888. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Héctor Martínez Alonso and Barbara Plank. 2017. When is multitask learning effective? semantic sequence prediction under varying data conditions. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 44–53, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andreas Maurer, Massimiliano Pontil, and Bernardino Romera-Paredes. 2016. The benefit of multitask representation learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 17(1):2853–2884.
- Angelo Mendonca, David Andrew Graff, and Denise DiPersio. 2009. *Spanish gigaword second edition*. Linguistic Data Consortium.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS'13*, pages 3111–3119, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2010. Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'10*, pages 807–814, USA. Omnipress.
- Aasish Pappu, Roi Blanco, Yashar Mehdad, Amanda Stent, and Kapil Thadani. 2017. Lightweight multi-lingual entity extraction and linking. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM '17*, pages 365–374, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Robert Parker, David Graff, Junbo Kong, Ke Chen, and Kazuaki Maeda. 2011. English gigaword. *Linguistic Data Consortium*.
- Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue, Hwee Tou Ng, Anders Bjrkelund, Olga Uryupina, Yuchen Zhang, and Zhi Zhong. 2013. Towards robust linguistic analysis using ontonotes. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 143–152, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lev Ratinov and Dan Roth. 2009. Design challenges and misconceptions in named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, CoNLL '09*, pages 147–155, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Deepak Ravichandran and Eduard Hovy. 2002. Learning surface text patterns for a question answering system. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL '02*, pages 41–47, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cícero Nogueira dos Santos and Victor Guimarães. 2015. Boosting named entity recognition with neural character embeddings. *CoRR*, abs/1505.05008.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15(1):1929–1958.
- Emma Strubell, Patrick Verga, David Belanger, and Andrew McCallum. 2017. Fast and accurate entity recognition with iterated dilated convolutions. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-11, 2017*, pages 2670–2680.
- Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang. 2002. Introduction to the conll-2002 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Natural Language Learning - Volume 20, COLING-02*, pages 1–4, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. 2003. Introduction to the conll-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003 - Volume 4, CONLL '03*, pages 142–147, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Mingbin Xu, Hui Jiang, and Sedtawut Watcharawit-tayakul. 2017. A local detection approach for named entity recognition and mention detection. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1237–1247, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William W. Cohen. 2016. Multi-task cross-lingual sequence tagging from scratch. *CoRR*, abs/1603.06270.
- Shiliang Zhang, Hui Jiang, Mingbin Xu, Junfeng Hou, and Li-Rong Dai. 2015. A fixed-size encoding method for variable-length sequences with its application to neural network language models. *CoRR*, abs/1505.01504.

750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799