

# 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  $z_0 = \mathbf{0}$ , 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  $\alpha$  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. For a fair comparison, we also use character CNNs to generate additional character-level features (Kim et al., 2015).

## 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 ReLUs (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 ENG<sup>1</sup>, CoNLL-2002 SPA<sup>2</sup>, OntoNotes 5.0 ENG and ZH<sup>3</sup>, the KBP 2016<sup>4</sup> 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 employ our in-house data as such with a 90:10 split. We also utilize 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

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

have cased and uncased word embeddings of size 256 trained using the English<sup>5</sup>, Spanish<sup>6</sup> and Chinese<sup>7</sup> 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 implementation<sup>8</sup> 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.

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

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

| LANG | Single-task model |       |              | Multi-task model |       |              | Single-task 5-fold |       |              |
|------|-------------------|-------|--------------|------------------|-------|--------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|
|      | Xu et al. (2017)  |       |              | This work        |       |              | 2016 Best          |       |              |
|      | P                 | R     | F1           | P                | R     | F1           | P                  | R     | F1           |
| ENG  | 0.836             | 0.680 | <b>0.750</b> | 0.800            | 0.742 | <b>0.770</b> | 0.846              | 0.710 | <b>0.772</b> |
| CMN  | 0.789             | 0.625 | 0.698        | 0.766            | 0.673 | <b>0.717</b> | 0.789              | 0.737 | 0.762        |
| SPA  | 0.835             | 0.602 | 0.700        | 0.869            | 0.618 | <b>0.722</b> | 0.839              | 0.656 | 0.736        |
| ALL  | 0.819             | 0.639 | 0.718        | 0.806            | 0.676 | <b>0.738</b> | 0.802              | 0.704 | <b>0.756</b> |

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 ( $\pm 0.18$ )        |
| Yang et al. (2016)      | <b>90.94</b>                |
| Luo et al. (2015)       | 91.2                        |
| Lample et al. (2016)    | 90.94                       |
| Chiu and Nichols (2016) | <b>91.62</b> ( $\pm 0.33$ ) |
| Xu et al. (2017)        | 90.71                       |
| Our MTL model           | <b>90.91</b>                |

Table 2: A comparison with baseline and top published results on CoNLL-2003 ENG eval. 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)   | <b>86.84</b> ( $\pm 0.19$ ) |
| Chiu and Nichols (2016)  | <b>86.28</b> ( $\pm 0.26$ ) |
| Durrett and Klein (2014) | 84.04                       |
| Xu et al. (2017)         | 85.88                       |
| Our MTL model            | <b>86.06</b>                |

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

| Model               | F1 (%)       |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Che et al. (2013)   | 69.82        |
| Pappu et al. (2017) | 67.2         |
| Xu et al. (2017)    | 71.83        |
| Our MTL model       | <b>72.12</b> |

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

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

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

| Main task training data | MTL model    | Xu et al. (2017) |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| KBP 2015                | <b>0.739</b> | <b>0.697</b>     |
| 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.

## 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 Kuska. 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)*.
- Yoon Kim, Yacine Jernite, David Sontag, and Alexander M. Rush. 2015. [Character-aware neural language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/1508.06615.
- 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.

- 500 Andreas Maurer, Massimiliano Pontil, and Bernardino  
501 Romera-Paredes. 2016. [The benefit of multitask](#)  
502 [representation learning](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*,  
503 17(1):2853–2884. 550
- 504 Angelo Mendonca, David Andrew Graff, and Denise  
505 DiPersio. 2009. *Spanish gigaword second edition*.  
506 Linguistic Data Consortium. 551
- 507 Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Cor-  
508 rado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. [Distributed represen-](#)  
509 [tations of words and phrases and their composition-](#)  
510 [ality](#). In *Proceedings of the 26th International Con-*  
511 *ference on Neural Information Processing Systems -*  
512 *Volume 2, NIPS'13*, pages 3111–3119, USA. Curran  
513 Associates Inc. 552
- 514 Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2010. [Rectified](#)  
515 [linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines](#).  
516 In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference*  
517 *on International Conference on Machine Learning*,  
518 ICML'10, pages 807–814, USA. Omnipress. 553
- 519 Aasish Pappu, Roi Blanco, Yashar Mehdad, Amanda  
520 Stent, and Kapil Thadani. 2017. [Lightweight multi-](#)  
521 [lingual entity extraction and linking](#). In *Proceedings*  
522 *of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Web*  
523 *Search and Data Mining, WSDM '17*, pages 365–  
524 374, New York, NY, USA. ACM. 554
- 525 Robert Parker, David Graff, Junbo Kong, Ke Chen, and  
526 Kazuaki Maeda. 2011. English gigaword. *Linguistic*  
527 *Data Consortium*. 555
- 528 Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue,  
529 Hwee Tou Ng, Anders Bjrkkelund, Olga Uryupina,  
530 Yuchen Zhang, and Zhi Zhong. 2013. [Towards ro-](#)  
531 [bust linguistic analysis using ontonotes](#). In *Proceed-*  
532 *ings of the Seventeenth Conference on Computa-*  
533 *tional Natural Language Learning*, pages 143–152,  
534 Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Lin-  
535 guistics. 556
- 536 Lev Ratinov and Dan Roth. 2009. [Design challenges](#)  
537 [and misconceptions in named entity recognition](#). In  
538 *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Com-*  
539 *putational Natural Language Learning, CoNLL '09*,  
540 pages 147–155, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association  
541 for Computational Linguistics. 557
- 542 Deepak Ravichandran and Eduard Hovy. 2002. [Learn-](#)  
543 [ing surface text patterns for a question answering](#)  
544 [system](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting*  
545 *on Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL*  
546 *'02*, pages 41–47, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Associa-  
547 tion for Computational Linguistics. 558
- 548 Cícero Nogueira dos Santos and Victor Guimarães.  
549 2015. [Boosting named entity recognition with neu-](#)  
550 [ral character embeddings](#). *CoRR*, abs/1505.05008. 559
- 551 Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky,  
552 Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014.  
553 [Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks](#)  
554 [from overfitting](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15(1):1929–  
555 1958. 560
- 556 Emma Strubell, Patrick Verga, David Belanger, and  
557 Andrew McCallum. 2017. [Fast and accurate enti-](#)  
558 [ty recognition with iterated dilated convolutions](#).  
559 In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Em-*  
560 *pirical Methods in Natural Language Processing,*  
561 *EMNLP 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September*  
562 *9-11, 2017*, pages 2670–2680. 563
- 563 Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang. 2002. [Introduction to](#)  
564 [the conll-2002 shared task: Language-independent](#)  
565 [named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 6th*  
566 *Conference on Natural Language Learning - Volume*  
567 *20, COLING-02*, pages 1–4, Stroudsburg, PA, USA.  
568 Association for Computational Linguistics. 564
- 569 Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder.  
570 2003. [Introduction to the conll-2003 shared task:](#)  
571 [Language-independent named entity recognition](#). In  
572 *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural*  
573 *Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003 - Volume*  
574 *4, CONLL '03*, pages 142–147, Stroudsburg, PA,  
575 USA. Association for Computational Linguistics. 565
- 576 Mingbin Xu, Hui Jiang, and Sedtawut Watcharawit-  
577 tayakul. 2017. [A local detection approach for named](#)  
578 [entity recognition and mention detection](#). In *Pro-*  
579 *ceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Associa-*  
580 *tion for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long*  
581 *Papers)*, pages 1237–1247, Vancouver, Canada. As-  
582 sociation for Computational Linguistics. 566
- 583 Zhilin Yang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William W.  
584 Cohen. 2016. [Multi-task cross-lingual sequence tag-](#)  
585 [ging from scratch](#). *CoRR*, abs/1603.06270. 567
- 586 Shiliang Zhang, Hui Jiang, Mingbin Xu, Junfeng Hou,  
587 and Li-Rong Dai. 2015. [A fixed-size encoding](#)  
588 [method for variable-length sequences with its appli-](#)  
589 [cation to neural network language models](#). *CoRR*,  
590 abs/1505.01504. 568