

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

Anonymous ACL submission

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

Hyper-parameters

- **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

- David Graff and Ke Chen. 2005. Chinese gigaword. *LDC Catalog No.: LDC2003T09*, ISBN, 1:58563-58230.
- Angelo Mendonca, David Andrew Graff, and Denise DiPersio. 2009. *Spanish gigaword second edition*. Linguistic Data Consortium.
- 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 Bjrkkelund, 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.
- 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.
- 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.