

BTPK-based learning: An Interpretable Method for Named Entity Recognition

Yulin Chen¹, Zelai Yao¹, Haixiao Chi¹, Dov Gabbay², Bo Yuan¹, Bruno Bentzen¹ and Beishui Liao^{1*}

¹Zhejiang University

²King’s College London

{sylvia_cyl, byuan.186}@qq.com, zelai_yao@163.com, {haixiaoichi, b.bentzen,baiseliao}@zju.edu.cn, dov.gabbay@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

Named entity recognition (NER) is an essential task in natural language processing, but the internal mechanism of most NER models is a black box for users. In some high-stake decision-making areas, improving the interpretability of an NER method is crucial but challenging. In this paper, based on the existing Deterministic Talmudic Public announcement logic (TPK) model, we propose a novel binary tree model (called BTPK) and apply it to two widely used Bi-RNNs to obtain BTPK-based interpretable ones. Then, we design a counterfactual verification module to verify the BTPK-based learning method. Experimental results on three public datasets show that the BTPK-based learning outperform two classical Bi-RNNs with self-attention, especially on small, simple data and relatively large, complex data. Moreover, the counterfactual verification demonstrates that the explanations provided by the BTPK-based learning method are reasonable and accurate in NER tasks. Besides, the logical reasoning based on BTPK shows how Bi-RNNs handle NER tasks, with different distance of public announcements on long and complex sequences.

1 Introduction

Named Entity Recognition (NER) is an information extraction task aimed at classifying words in unstructured text. Most works focus on improving the model performance and the recognition accuracy [Fu *et al.*, 2020; Lin *et al.*, 2020]. Several methods based on Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) [Žukov-Gregorič *et al.*, 2018; Katiyar and Cardie, 2018; Li *et al.*, 2020; Eligüz el *et al.*, 2021] have been proposed due to their ability to establish dependencies in neighboring words [Li *et al.*, 2022]. However, their inherent black box nature make them unable to explain decision results, especially those involving ambiguous or polysemous words. In application areas where NER technology provides extensive underlying support such as health-care or autonomous driv-

ing, interpretable algorithms and a transparent internal decision system is critical for the system reliability and user trust.

It is worth noting that many explanation works have been carried out for RNN [Hou and Zhou, 2020; Wisdom *et al.*, 2016; Krakovna and Doshi-Velez, 2016]. However, there are few research efforts on explainability for NER, although models with explainability are crucial [Agarwal *et al.*, 2021]. In this paper, we use the Talmudic public announcement logic (TPK) model [Abraham *et al.*, 2013] as a tool to explain the process of NER and bring transparency to the RNN-based models, since the reversible and modifiable recognition process in NER is very much in line the problem that TPK is trying to deal with. We propose a new binary TPK model (called BTPK) based on the original TPK model, which can deal with actions depending on future determination by public announcements [Abraham *et al.*, 2013]. Through modifying the accessibility relation in a temporal tree structure, the public announcement at a future state will tell which path should be chosen. In order to map the TPK structure to the internal mechanism of RNN, we need to generate the public announcement in TPK. In semi-supervised learning algorithms, the Pseudo label [Lee and others, 2013] is used to mark the dataset without labels [Wang and Wu, 2020; Wang and Wu, 2020], and this fits the need of inducing public announcement. Moreover, in order to verify the accuracy of a public announcement, we use counterfactual verification [Byrne, 2019].

We summarize our main contributions as follows: (1) We propose a BTPK-based learning method based on the original TPK model and apply it to two widely used Bi-RNNs to obtain BTPK-based interpretable ones. The interpretable BTPK tree shows how Bi-LSTM and Bi-GRU handle NER tasks, and their differences on long and complex sequences. (2) We also design a counterfactual verification module to verify the BTPK-based learning method; the results indicate that explanations from BTPK trees are reasonable and accurate in NER tasks. (3) Experimental results on three public datasets also show that the BTPK-based Bi-RNNs performance is much better than self-attention based Bi-RNNs on small simple data and relatively large and complex data.

2 Problem Statement and Approach

We consider the black box problem for NER tasks, which is formulated by means of the following two aspects:

*Corresponding Author

Semantic ambiguity. In real life, there are many ambiguous name entities, such as product and company names (e.g. “Apple”). Since the context dependency of sentences is essential to resolve ambiguities, thus, it’s necessary to explore how the context affect entity recognition process. To solve this, it will be helpful to understand the internal mechanism of NER models.

Uncertain Bi-RNN workflow. RNNs are very effective for data with sequence characteristics. The output of the current state in a bidirectional RNN model is not only related to its previous states, but also to its subsequent ones. However, it is unknown which state plays a decisive role in the output of the current state, because each Bi-RNN model is a black box model, and the output of the model is only the final labels. Therefore, exploring the influence of the future hidden state on the current state in Bi-RNN models is of great significance to understand how the model works. Therefore, we introduce TPK to show how it works on NER tasks.

2.1 Overview of our method

The overall framework is shown in Figure 1. We firstly train a pseudo learner on training data and get the pseudo labels of the test data. Any classifier can be used as a pseudo learner. Secondly, we calculate the public announcements of the sequences by an attention mechanism. The definition of public announcement in binary TPRK tree model (BTPK) is given by Section 2.2. Then we learn BTPK-based Bi-RNNs by training. Finally we measure the explanations of BTPK-based Bi-RNNs by counterfactual verification. In the third step of training BTPK-based Bi-RNNs, we generate the path of BTPK by the hidden states of a Bi-RNN to explore the Bi-RNN property.

In the following, we elaborate the learning steps of the BTPK-based Bi-RNN model and counterfactual verification.

2.2 BTPK-based learning

Task definition. We regard NER as a sequence labeling problem, whose input includes a set of sequences and labels. For any sequence $W = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$, the corresponding labels are $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, where w_i denotes an entity in the sequence, and y_i comes from BIO tagging schema for labeling elements from the sentence.

The original TPK model. The original TPK model is a deterministic Talmudic \mathbf{K} frame based on a time-action tree structure. The time-action model shown in Figure 2 (a) is a tree structure with a set of states $S = \{s_0, s_1, s_2, s'_2, \dots\}$ (s_0 is the root), and a set of actions $A = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3, \dots\}$. The elements of A are actions moving the agent from any state to a new one. This corresponds to a successor function R_1 (denoted by \rightarrow), and can be written in the form $s_0 R_1 s_1$. A time-action sequence has the form of $s_0 \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2 \dots \mathbf{a}_n$. In Figure 2, action \mathbf{a}_2 is ambiguous and the next state is undetermined: either from s_1 to s_2 , or from s_1 to s'_2 . So, here, we introduce the idea of public announcement, which would make a clarification to the previous undetermined path, and point out the correct successor of the branch point. It can be written in the form $s'_3 \rho s_3$ (denoted by \Rightarrow). This means that the successor of s_1 should be clarified to be s_2 .

Then, a deterministic TPK model [Abraham *et al.*, 2013] can be defined as a 6-tuple $(S, R_1, R, \rho, s_0, \pi)$ where (S, R_1, s_0) is a tree with root s_0 and successor relation R_1 , R is the transitive closure of R_1 , ρ is the public announcement function and π is an assignment for each atom q , such that $s \models q$ iff $s \in \pi(q)$. D is the distance from the root, and if $s'_3 \rho s_3$ then $D(s_3) = D(s'_3) + 1$. The semantics for Deterministic TPK Model is as follows: As for the relation R_1 : $t \models \Box A$ iff $\forall s : t R_1 s \rightarrow s \models A$; $t \models Y A$ iff $\forall s : s R_1 t \rightarrow s \models A$. As for the relation ρ : $t \models \Box A$ iff $\forall s : t \rho s \rightarrow s \models A$; $t \models \forall A$ iff $\forall s : s \rho t \rightarrow s \models A$. D_n is a time constant: $t \models D_n$ iff the distance of t from s_0 is n .

BTPK tree. We view the final output of one RNN as the final option, so there are at most two options for each entity in the Bi-RNN. According to the original TPK model, we propose a binary TPK logic tree (BTPK) model, which is defined as a tree $T = \langle V, E \rangle$ with public announcements P and height $|H|$, where $|V|$ is the order and $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, $|E|$ is the size and E is represented by the successor relation R_1 .

Formally, BTPK model is a 2-option full binary TPK tree, generated by induction on height $|H| = 1$, as Figure 2 (b) shows. A tree of height $|H| = 1$ is a single node s_0 . The root of BTPK (the same as s_0 in TPK) is an empty state representing the start of hidden state. We begin to add elements after that, and we write $x < y$ to mean that x is the predecessor of y . The inductive steps are as follows: Assume there is a 2-option full binary tree of height $|H| = n$, with junction nodes of each height $k < n$, and top nodes x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m . As Figure 2 shows, we have two options to add new nodes above the top nodes of the tree: 1) to split: add two nodes above each previous top nodes, then y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{2m} become the top nodes of the tree of height $|H| = n + 1$. 2) not to split: add one node above each top node, then y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m become the top nodes. If the junction node is a split junction, it is annotated by a word of possible several labels, then we can construct a tree which represents all options in Bi-RNN to recognize a sequence.

Learning a BTPK from Bi-RNNs. For any sequence $W = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$ and the corresponding labels $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, we can map the bi-directional hidden states to the path in a BTPK tree $T' = \langle V, E \rangle$, where the hidden states of Bi-RNN constitute the vertices of BTPK. We present the mapping from a Bi-RNN network to a BTPK tree of height $|H| = n + 1$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \{h_1^f, h_2^f, \dots, h_n^f\} \\ V_2 &= \{h_1^b, h_2^b, \dots, h_n^b\} \\ H &= \{w_0, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\} \\ n &\leq |E| < |V| * (|V| - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where h_i^f means the hidden state (feature vector) of the i^{th} element w_i in forward RNN, and h_i^b means the feature vector of the i^{th} element w_i in backward RNN, w_0 denotes the start. V is the vertices of graph, which is composed of V_1 and V_2 , where V_1 and V_2 denote the vertices of forward RNN and backward RNN, respectively. H is denoted by the elements in the sequence. As mentioned above, for all $x, y \in V$, $xy \in E$




Figure 1: The illustration of the framework of BTPK-based learning. h_i^f in the white circles represents the a hidden state in forward RNN and h_i^b in the white circles represents a hidden state in backward RNN, where i is the element order. l_i in blue box denotes the output of the pseudo learner, and s_i in blue box denotes the system announcement in BTPK model. Overall, the framework consists of four main steps, namely, training a pseudo learner, training the public announcement, outputting the BTPK-based Bi-RNN, and finally verifying the BTPK-based method by counterfactual reasoning.




Figure 2: (a) original TPK model and (b) BTPK model

iff xR_1y or yR_1x , written as $x < y$ or $y < x$. Unlike standard binary trees, the size $|E|$ is greater than or equal to n because there may be loops in a BTPK tree, since there exist public announcements in the tree.

The public announcements $P = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\}$ in BTPK is trained by an attention module, including two attention networks [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017]. Any public announcement α can also represent the relation between words and pseudo labels of the sequences. We get pseudo labels λ of the test data from a Bi-RNN Pseudo learner in Figure 1. There are no restrictions on model types and training methods. Both neural networks and other machine learning models can be pseudo learners. Suppose that for the input sequence $W = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$, the corresponding pseudo labels are $\Lambda = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n\}$, then the attention matrix of the input sequence and the pseudo labels are calculated by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} score(l_i, j) &= l_i * \tanh(z_1 l_i + z_2 j) \\ att_w(i, j) &= \text{Softmax}(score(l_i, j)) \\ &= \frac{\exp(score(l_i, j))}{\sum_{j=1}^N score(l_i, j)} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Similarly, the attention matrix of pseudo labels Λ can be calculated by:

$$att_p(l_i, l_j) = \text{softmax}(score_p(l_i, l_j)) \quad (3)$$

Then, the public announcement is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{i,j} &= att_w(i, j) + att_p(l_i, l_j) \\ D_u &= |d(i) - d(j)| \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where l_i means the label of word i , z_1 and z_2 are the trained parameters. $att_w(i, j)$ denotes the attention weight of word j and the label of word i ; $att_p(i, j)$ denotes the attention weight of the label of i and j . The possible accessibility relation between words i and j can be denoted as $s_{i,j}$, where the weight value s ranges from 0 to 1. Higher weight means greater impact. What's more, D_u denotes the distance of the public announcement from word i to j , $D_u = 0$ when there is no public announcement. The details of learning a BTPK tree from a Bi-RNN are shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 BTPK-based learning.

Input:

- The Pseudo labels for the dataset Λ ;
- Current dataset N ;

Output:

- The labels of the dataset T_N ;
- 1: Embedding the input dataset;
- 2: Embedding the Pseudo labels Λ .
- 3: Extracting the hidden states H_T of a bidirectional RNN on step 1., including forward hidden states and backward hidden states;
- 4: Generating the different paths in BTPK model by H_T according to Equation (1);
- 5: Extracting the hidden states H_P of an RNN on step 2.;
- 6: Calculating the similarity degree of H_T and H_P by attention module to get a public announcement, S according to Equation (4);
- 7: $H_N = H_T \cup S$;
- 8: Calculating the labels of H_N in Softmax layer, denoted as T_N ;
- 9: **return** T_N ;




Figure 3: Counterfactual verification. (a) shows the causal diagram for the label of word x_3 . (b) shows the counterfactual reasoning process, we observe that the label of x_3 is “B-video” and ask what would have happened if word x_6 was deleted.

2.3 Counterfactual verification

In NER tasks, labels are decided by the information of former and future words. It's crucial to know whether the explanation for NER models is accurate and reasonable, i.e., the inner mechanism of NER models or the semantic relations contained in sentences should be right. Counterfactual verification can provide an in-depth view of the essence of this problem. Through its introduction we verify the rationality and accuracy of the explanation of our method.

Figure 3 (a) shows a diagram representing how the label of element x_3 is decided in the sentence s , where

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\} \\ x_i &= \text{True/False} ((0 \leq i \leq 6, i \neq 3)) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Each x_i is a variable ranging over values *True* or *False* of i^{th} word encoded by the data dictionary. If the value of the variable is reset to 0, it's deleted and False. For example, $x_6 = \text{True}$ means that x_6 exists in the current sentence and its position is the same as that of the original sentence s . On the other hand, $x_6 = \text{False}$ means that the value of x_6 reset to 0, because it's deleted.

Figure 3 (b) shows counterfactual verification about the label of x_3 in s . Suppose that x_6 does not occur in s , would

the label of x_3 not be “B-video”? This question requires us to compare the real world with a fictitious and conditional world (called counterfactual world) where x_6 was deleted. In the counterfactual world, the value of x_6 is reset to 0. If x_6 is a public announcement of x_3 in s , the explanation of the proposed model is considered to be rational and accurate when the label of x_3 isn’t “B-video” in the counterfactual world. The counterfactual verification module of the BTPK-based learning model is presented in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 The counterfactual verification of the BTPK-based learning

Input:
 Dataset N ;
 The output O_1 of Bi-RNN models;
 The public announcement matrix S ;
 A trained Bi-RNN model M ;
 The value of k ;

Output:
 The Boolean value of the counterfactual verification, *True* or *False*;

- 1: Extract the k elements in the matrix S that have the greatest impact on the entity labels;
- 2: Reset the encoding of the k elements to 0 to get a counterfactual dataset N' ;
- 3: Calculate the label $T_{N'}$ of N' ;
- 4: Compare the $T_{N'}$ with O_1 ;
- 5: If the label of entities in $T_{N'}$ is different with that in O_1 , then the output O' is *True*. Otherwise, O' is *False*;
- 6: **return** O' ;

3 Experiments

In this section, we mainly evaluate our method across three NER datasets, including two MIT datasets in English, and one Chinese NER dataset.

3.1 Datasets

CBVM CBVM is a Chinese public NER dataset on Github, including 7 label categories. We extract 7814 available sequences from it, including 8791 train samples and 977 test samples.

MIT-V The MIT-V is a well-defined and fine-grained dataset for NER and we use its trivial10k13 corpus. We extract 9769 available sequences from it, including 7816 train samples and 1953 test samples.

MIT-R The MIT-R is another MIT dataset related to restaurants including 17 categories. We extract 9081 available sequences from it, including 7660 train samples and 1921 test samples.

To explore how Bi-RNNs work on ambiguous entities, we divide entities into simple entities and variable entities. Simple entities refer to all entities marked with “O” (means Others), and variable entities refer to those labeled with various labels (excluding “O”), such as “B-book” or “B-video” or “B-music”.

3.2 Setup

In our experiments, we evaluate our method in two settings: self-attention based models and BTPK-based models. We also set up five groups of experiments for two English datasets. In each group, we only select N (100, 200, 300, 400, 500) sentences from the train set to

Weighted average on MIT-V												
N	Bi-LSTM						Bi-GRU					
	self-attention based			BTPK-based			self-attention based			BTPK-based		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
100	81.13	87.63	84.18	84.46	88.96	86.32 (+2.14)	78.33	85.08	80.63	85.82	89.32	86.89 (+5.76)
200	83.00	87.76	85.06	84.68	88.70	86.07 (+1.01)	81.44	86.21	83.05	87.64	90.30	88.72 (+5.67)
300	87.27	89.86	88.29	88.00	90.02	88.68 (+0.39)	87.40	89.22	88.13	88.42	89.92	88.91 (+0.78)
400	87.66	89.81	88.58	88.55	90.12	89.08 (+0.50)	88.95	89.81	88.98	90.18	90.71	90.16 (+1.18)
500	89.65	91.33	90.37	89.90	91.41	90.53 (+0.16)	90.44	90.72	90.38	91.02	91.23	90.92 (+0.54)
Macro average on MIT-V												
N	Bi-LSTM						Bi-GRU					
	self-attention based			BTPK-based			self-attention based			BTPK-based		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
100	6.20	6.21	6.18	12.10	8.49	9.37 (+3.19)	6.77	5.12	5.30	2.41	9.40	10.53 (+5.23)
200	8.48	7.19	7.27	16.50	8.47	9.33 (+2.06)	9.18	6.44	6.89	23.72	14.72	16.93 (+10.04)
300	10.71	10.53	9.64	19.86	12.87	13.25 (+3.61)	17.55	14.47	15.30	26.01	17.79	20.03 (+4.73)
400	12.72	12.18	12.22	24.83	17.65	19.64 (+7.42)	30.01	19.66	20.72	35.11	23.56	26.81 (+6.09)
500	20.89	17.88	17.83	24.55	19.32	20.34 (+2.51)	35.03	26.33	28.16	37.62	28.11	31.04 (+2.88)

Table 1: Results of self-attention based Bi-RNNs and BTPK-based Bi-RNNs on MIT-V

train models for evaluating performance under limited observational instances. In addition, we select sentences (10%, 15%, 18%, 20%, 22%, 30% of training data) from a more complex Chinese dataset to show how BTPK-based learning method performance. We always keep test datasets unchanged in all experiments.

3.3 Evaluation of the experiment

We mainly consider the performance at the entity level, especially the variable entities with ambiguities. Generally, when the categories of labels are extremely unbalanced, macro average can pay more attention to the kind of labels with a small number than micro average. However, it cannot reflect the accuracy of entities’ boundaries. Weighted average considers the proportion of the number of labels in each category in total labels. To explore the recognition of ambiguous entities, macro average and weighted average are both used to measure the performance of models.

4 Results and Discussion

In this section, we will firstly analyze our experimental results on three public datasets. Secondly, we will give the explanation of real instances in the form of BTPK trees, and show how to extend the BTPK-based learning method to an Bi-RNN-CRF. Thirdly, we try to explore the workflow of two gate Bi-RNNs, and reason on ambiguous entities through TPK logic. Finally we verify our method against the real and counterfactual world.

4.1 Main results

Pseudo test

The essence of BTPK-based learning method is to understand how Bi-RNNs work on ambiguous entities, so we mainly focus on variable entities. The key part of BTPK-based learning is to learn public announcements, which are trained from sequences and pseudo labels. As Figure 4 shows, pseudo labels have a great impact on the performance of the model, which is proportional on the whole. In other words, the more accurate the pseudo labels are, the more likely the BTPK-based learning method is to achieve better prediction results. In addition, pseudo labels have a greater influence on BTPK-based Bi-GRU than BTPK-based Bi-LSTM.




Figure 4: Results of pseudo labels. The BTPK-based Bi-LSTM and BTPK-based Bi-GRU are two trained models with $N = 1000$




Figure 5: (a) shows the results of counterfactual verification; (b) shows the experimental results on CBVM

Comparison with self-attention based Bi-RNNs

In order to investigate how BTPK-based learning method influences the performance of Bi-RNNs, we carry out two experiments with BTPK-based Bi-LSTM and BTPK-based Bi-GRU. To ensure the fairness of the experiment, we control the consistency of pseudo labels using the pseudo learner by self-attention based Bi-RNNs. That means the accuracy of the pseudo labels is the same as self-attention based Bi-RNNs. Table 1 and Table 2 show the comparisons between self-attention based Bi-RNNs and BTPK-based Bi-RNNs on MIT-V and MIT-R, respectively. The results show that our method achieves an improvement of weighted average and macro average in all settings. Even though it’s hard for the pseudo learner to learn high-quality pseudo labels from small datasets, the BTPK-based learning method can still achieve better performance on variable entities and simple entities. This indicates that BTPK-based learning is a potential effective method to recognize the variable entities from limited data. As Table 1 shows, for MIT-V, the best results of our method yield a boost of 5.76% on weighted average and 10.04% on macro average. As Table 2 shows, for MIT-R, the best results of our method yields a boost of 5.82% on weighted average and 9.26% on macro average. What’s more, we observe that BTRK-based Bi-GRU outperforms BTRK-based Bi-LSTM in general on small and simple datasets.

We also conduct an experiment on CBVM to explore how BTPK-based learning performance on a more complex and larger dataset. As Figure 5(b) shows, 22% of the data with BTPK-based Bi-LSTM can achieve better results than 30% the data with self-attention based Bi-LSTM. It’s worth noting that even small changes in weighted average may lead to large changes in macro average, because there are far more simple entities than variable entities in all datasets.

4.2 Semantic ambiguity explanation

Based on the experimental results, we can obtain the explanation of ambiguous entities by BTPK-based learning methods. The explanation consists of public announcements and a natural language template.

Weighted average on MIT-R														
N	Bi-LSTM					Bi-GRU								
	self-attention based		BTPK-based			self-attention based		BTPK-based						
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1					
100	76.47	85.70	80.73	81.97	87.01	84.04	(+3.31)	77.69	86.07	81.07	85.82	89.32	86.89	(+5.82)
200	80.01	86.49	82.88	82.16	87.03	83.74	(+0.86)	83.06	87.47	84.40	85.49	88.62	86.06	(+1.66)
300	83.55	87.37	85.08	84.57	87.49	85.27	(+0.19)	86.43	88.75	87.29	86.91	89.13	87.61	(+0.32)
400	85.91	88.38	86.72	86.52	88.77	87.04	(+0.32)	87.56	89.33	88.12	88.07	89.76	88.49	(+0.37)
500	87.91	89.39	88.23	88.06	89.36	88.26	(+0.03)	88.91	89.97	89.04	89.07	90.26	89.22	(+0.18)

Macro average on MIT-R														
N	Bi-LSTM					Bi-GRU								
	self-attention based		BTPK-based			self-attention based		BTPK-based						
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1					
100	7.27	9.60	7.75	21.46	16.36	17.01	(+9.26)	12.19	10.06	9.27	33.49	16.37	18.50	(+9.23)
200	12.65	13.72	12.13	28.02	16.56	18.34	(+6.21)	36.21	19.59	22.00	46.82	25.10	30.07	(+8.07)
300	21.28	20.17	19.31	36.80	22.01	22.95	(+3.64)	45.72	33.75	37.41	49.90	34.32	38.99	(+1.58)
400	28.81	26.10	24.83	38.33	27.27	27.37	(+2.54)	50.03	37.54	41.28	52.07	38.29	42.32	(+1.04)
500	41.49	32.87	33.15	46.09	33.00	34.03	(+0.88)	53.53	40.99	43.77	55.72	40.36	44.19	(+0.42)

Table 2: Results of self-attention based Bi-RNNs and BTPK-based Bi-RNNs on MIT-R




Figure 6: BTPK trees. (a) shows a BTPK tree of Bi-LSTM, (b) shows a BTPK tree of Bi-LSTM-CRF; where ρ denotes a public announcement and ρ' denotes a CRF announcement

Example 1 Consider the sentence task₁₀₃ = “Telling the death is a very good story, downloading free novels can also make money, killing two birds with one stone”.

Question: Why is “Telling the death” recognized as a book name rather than others (the label of simple entities)?

Explanation: Because the “novels” (public announcement) appears in the following words, it is more reasonable to be recognized as “book”.

In this example, the explanation is obtained by a logic reasoning process of a BTPK tree in Figure 6 (a). Let axiom p denotes that the entity is recognized as “I-book”, axiom q denotes that the entity is recognized as “Others”, and axiom p' denotes that the entity is recognized as “B-book”. From semantics of TPK logic, “Telling the death” is correctly recognized iff $(s'_1 \models p') \wedge (s'_1 \models p) \wedge (s'_3 \models p)$, and all the entities is recognized correctly iff $(s'_1 \models p') \wedge (s'_1 \models p) \wedge (s'_3 \models p) \wedge (s'_4 \models \Box q)$, where s_i and s'_i denote the states in height $|H| = i$. When the system gets words from s_1 and goes forward to s_{12} , the path can be represented as $s_1 \models \Box q$. But there is a public announcement $s_{12}\rho s'_{12}$, so the system will go back to s'_1 and then go forward to the end state s'_{23} , generating a new path in red (see Figure 6 (a)), since there’s no other public announcement. The new path can be denoted by $(s'_3 \models \forall p) \wedge (s'_4 \models \Box q)$, the relation between s_{12} and s'_{12} can be represented as $s_{12} \twoheadrightarrow s'_{12}$. Thus, the recognition process of the ambiguous entity can be presented in a logical way by BTPK tree, and the public announcement function illustrates




Figure 7: BTPK trees. (a) and (b) are BTPK trees of $task_{1001}$; (c) is a BTPK tree of $task_{1000}$.

how to go back to a more reasonable state.

However, in $task_{103}$, Bi-LSTM still doesn't recognize the boundaries of an entity correctly, since the label of first entity should be "B-book". In this case, we extend the BTPK-based learning to the framework of Bi-RNN-CRF. Notice that there may be more announcements and paths in the BTPK-based Bi-RNN-CRF, so we define it as "CRF announcement". Different from public announcements in Bi-RNNs, CRF announcements are generated by the CRF layer. For $task_{103}$, Figure 6 (b) shows the explanation of Bi-LSTM-CRF based on BTPK-based learning method. Similarly, when there is a CRF announcement and a new path in green, we have that $(u'_1 \models p') \wedge (u_2 \models p) \wedge (u'_3 \models p) \wedge (u'_4 \models \square q)$, where u_i denotes the state in $|H| = i$. Therefore, a "CRF announcement" mainly appears due to the rule of the labels, and the public announcement mainly appears due to semantics of the words.

4.3 Bi-RNNs workflow explanation

Consider a relatively long and difficult Chinese sentence $task_{1001} = \{\text{"The Lord of the Rings is very good, can you recommend similar films"}\}$ and a shorter and simple sentence $task_{1000} = \{\text{"The Lord of the Rings is the movie I like"}\}$. To simplify the task, we use the axiom p to denote the option of "video" (including "B-video" and "I-video") and axiom q to denote the option of "Others".

We can visualize the BTPK tree of $task_{1000}$ in Figure 7 (c). Similarly, "The Lord of the Rings" is recognized correctly iff $(s'_1 \models p) \wedge (s'_1 \models p) \wedge (s'_3 \models p)$, and all the entities is recognized correctly iff $(s'_3 \models \forall p) \wedge (s'_4 \models \square q)$, where s_i and s'_i denote the states in height $|H| = i$. In this task, The BTPK tree of Bi-LSTM and Bi-GRU are the same, there is one public announcement that $s_8 \rightarrow s'_8$, then generate a new path in red (see Figure 7 (c)), which is the right one.

We can also visualize the BTPK tree of $task_{1001}$ in Figure 7 (a) and (b). According to the TPK semantics, "The Lord of the Rings" is recognized correctly iff $(s'_1 \models p) \wedge (s'_1 \models p) \wedge (s'_3 \models p)$, and all the entities are recognized correctly iff $(s'_3 \models \forall p) \wedge (s'_4 \models \square q)$. In the Bi-LSTM model in Figure 7 (a), the old path in blue can be represented as $(s_1 \models \square q) \wedge (s_{20} \models \forall q)$; but there is a public announcement $s_{20} \rightarrow s'_{20}$, so it will return to s_1 and choose the new path in red, which is the right one. For the Bi-GRU model in Figure 7 (b), there is no public announcement, and only one path of the states is chosen, namely, $(s_1 \models \square q) \wedge (s_{20} \models \forall q)$, which is not the right one. Then, we can derive the distance of the public announcement D_u based on this knowledge. D_u in BTPK shows how long the future state influences the former state, which can also indicate how long the information can be transmitted in Bi-RNNs. In $task_{1001}$, D_u in Bi-LSTM is 20, but D_u in Bi-GRU is 0. In $task_{1000}$, D_u in both Bi-

LSTM and Bi-GRU are 8. Thus, even Bi-GRU learns more information of variable entities than Bi-LSTM from a small and simple data, but for a large and complex data, the public announcement distance of Bi-LSTM is longer than Bi-GRU, which indicates that the generalization ability of Bi-LSTM is better than that of Bi-GRU.

4.4 Counterfactual verification

It's vital to know whether the explanation of the NER model is correct. For users it may be easy to identify whether it gets the right logic of sentences semantically, but it's hard to tell whether the explanation can truly reflect the workflow of the model. This work verifies explanations from a causal len. Suppose that the explanation for tasks is accurate and reasonable if labels of entities in a counterfactual world is different from that in a real world. Therefore, when the explanation of a BTPK tree for any sequence s is right, the label of variable entities cannot be recognized accurately in the counterfactual world. In this way, the P , R , and $F1$ of the counterfactual data would be smaller than that of the real data.

We conduct two counterfactual tests on MIT-R to investigate how public announcements effect the model functioning according to Algorithm 2 with $k = 2$. The original and counterfactual datasets indicate a real and a counterfactual world, respectively. The results of the counterfactual test are shown in Figure 5(a), and indicate that the accuracy of a counterfactual world is much lower than that of a real world for all settings. This shows that the public announcements for sequences are accurate, and, moreover, that the BTPK-based learning can reflect the internal mechanism of the Bi-RNN models.

5 Conclusions and future work

We proposed a new BTPK-based learning method for NER tasks, which can effectively and logically capture the semantics in the context and give explanations in form of trees to show the internal mechanism of Bi-RNNs. We implement the BTPK-based learning method to Bi-RNNs and conduct experimental comparisons on three public datasets. The experimental results show that BTPK-based Bi-RNNs outperforms the self-attention based Bi-RNNs. In addition, the proposed counterfactual verification proves that the explanations of our method are accurate and reasonable. For future work, we plan to combine BTPK-based learning (as in this work) with transfer learning for cross-lingual NER tasks.

References

[Abraham *et al.*, 2013] Michael Abraham, Israel Belfer, Dov M Gabbay, and U Schild. Future determination of

- entities in talmudic public announcement logic. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 11(1):63–90, 2013.
- [Agarwal *et al.*, 2021] Oshin Agarwal, Yinfei Yang, Byron C Wallace, and Ani Nenkova. Interpretability analysis for named entity recognition to understand system predictions and how they can improve. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(1):117–140, 2021.
- [Byrne, 2019] Ruth MJ Byrne. Counterfactuals in explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Evidence from human reasoning. In *IJCAI*, pages 6276–6282, 2019.
- [Eligüzel *et al.*, 2021] Nazmiye Eligüzel, Cihan Çetinkaya, and Türkay Dereli. Application of named entity recognition on tweets during earthquake disaster: a deep learning-based approach. *Soft Computing*, pages 1–27, 2021.
- [Fu *et al.*, 2020] Jinlan Fu, Pengfei Liu, and Graham Neubig. Interpretable multi-dataset evaluation for named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06854*, 2020.
- [Hou and Zhou, 2020] Bo-Jian Hou and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Learning with interpretable structure from gated rnn. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(7):2267–2279, 2020.
- [Katiyar and Cardie, 2018] Arzoo Katiyar and Claire Cardie. Nested named entity recognition revisited. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 861–871, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Krakovna and Doshi-Velez, 2016] Viktoriya Krakovna and Finale Doshi-Velez. Increasing the interpretability of recurrent neural networks using hidden markov models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05320*, 2016.
- [Lee and others, 2013] Dong-Hyun Lee et al. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, ICML*, volume 3, page 896, 2013.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020] Jianqiang Li, Shenhe Zhao, Jijiang Yang, Zhisheng Huang, Bo Liu, Shi Chen, Hui Pan, and Qing Wang. Wcp-rnn: a novel rnn-based approach for bio-ner in chinese emrs. *The journal of supercomputing*, 76(3):1450–1467, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2022] Jing Li, Aixin Sun, Jianglei Han, and Chenliang Li. A survey on deep learning for named entity recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 34(1):50–70, 2022.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2020] Bill Yuchen Lin, Dong-Ho Lee, Ming Shen, Ryan Moreno, Xiao Huang, Prashant Shiralkar, and Xiang Ren. Triggerner: Learning with entity triggers as explanations for named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07493*, 2020.
- [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [Wang and Wu, 2020] Guo-Hua Wang and Jianxin Wu. Repetitive reprediction deep decipher for semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 6170–6177, 2020.
- [Wisdom *et al.*, 2016] Scott Wisdom, Thomas Powers, James Pitton, and Les Atlas. Interpretable recurrent neural networks using sequential sparse recovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07252*, 2016.
- [Žukov-Gregorič *et al.*, 2018] Andrej Žukov-Gregorič, Yoram Bachrach, and Sam Coope. Named entity recognition with parallel recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 69–74, Melbourne, Australia, July 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.