## **Supplemental Material for An Annotated Corpus of Reference Resolution for Interpreting Common Grounding**

## 1 Agreement Statistics for Markable Attributes and Relations

Annotation	% Agreement	# Total
All-Referents	99.970 (57.128)	7
No-Referent	99.961 (95.102)	82
Anaphora	99.944 (82.480)	303
Cataphora	99.997 (24.998)	4

Table 1: Agreement statistics for markable attributes and relations (Fleiss's Multi- $\pi$  in parenthesis). We count the total number each annotation by 3 annotators in 130 dialogues.

We show the agreement statistics for the markable attributes and relations in Table 1. For markable attributes (all-referents and no-referent), agreement is calculated at the token level of whether each token is the end of the markable with the attribute. For markable relations, agreement is calculated for every pair of tokens in the same utterance (whether the pair is in anaphoric or cataphoric relation), without considering identical but differently annotated anaphoric/cataphoric chains. Note that we are only calculating the lower bound of the agreement that can be achieved, since this annotation step was optional and our calculation of agreement is simplified in a strict way.

We can see that the agreements are low or moderate for annotations of *all-referents* and *cataphora*: this is most likely because they were too rare or often ignored by the annotators. Missing these annotations is completely unproblematic, because their referents will simply be annotated in the next referent identification step and this only increases the annotation cost. On the other hand, *no-referent* and *anaphora* were annotated frequently and the agreements are very high, which is an important evidence of reliability.

## 2 Token Level Correlations with the Exact Match Rate

We show the whole list of the correlations between occurrence of *common tokens* (tokens which appeared more than

Copyright © 2020, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

100 times) and the exact match rate of the referents in Table 2. We can confirm the general trend that ambiguous or complex expressions tend to have negative correlations, while simple or less ambiguous expressions tend to have positive correlations.

Token	$\rho$	Count	Token	$\rho$	Count	Token	$\rho$	Count
it	-0.14851	12696	grouping	-0.01297	156	much	0.01472	444
any	-0.10343	546	lonely	-0.01248	1284	colored	0.01567	552
that	-0.10029	12524	vertical	-0.01231	246	blackest	0.01569	174
your	-0.08300	1542	pairs	-0.01190	174	lighter	0.01600	6384
few	-0.08061	108	closest	-0.01088	180	med/grey	0.01607	306
what	-0.08057	366	but	-0.01082	468	grey	0.01609	24132
yours	-0.07435	324	gray	-0.01064	14716	close	0.01656	228
of	-0.06647	6864	identical	-0.01014	210	only	0.01663	642
others	-0.06364	804	almost	-0.00970	966	nose	0.01677	138
line	-0.06179	1722	circles	-0.00953	468	upper	0.01700	516
bunch	-0.06007	204	l	-0.00879	180	5	0.01731	540
mine	-0.05944	1128	greys	-0.00789	108	five	0.01733	144
they	-0.05021	2286	both	-0.00731	450	bigger	0.01744	1410
its	-0.04991	1602	their	-0.00519	108	point	0.01711	108
all	-0.04812	1134	second	-0.00319	150	massive	0.01903	168
triangle	-0.04654	2508	shaded	-0.00436	126	smaller	0.01960	10074
same	-0.04546	2214	bit	-0.00366	102	lone	0.01300	492
same lot	-0.04546	102	circle	-0.00300	1338	<i>з</i>	0.02174	4194
those	-0.04324	2094	color	-0.00337	708	darker	0.02209	6504
	-0.04234	156		-0.00279	3132		0.02391	48586
some			slightly			a 1.:		
them	-0.04139	1320	shade	-0.00132	744 264	biggest	0.02486	524
medium	-0.04062	12530	(	-0.00123		dark	0.02512	22104
other	-0.04006	3914	)	-0.00123	264	1	0.02527	1344
rest	-0.03950	1290	an	-0.00078	540	lowest	0.02567	306
first	-0.03878	342	even	-0.00041	150	largest	0.02648	2166
another	-0.03864	1410	next	-0.00037	120	4	0.02715	1542
's	-0.03844	354	center	0.00157	132	really	0.02730	1026
ones	-0.03841	2400	6	0.00188	102	lower	0.02833	1344
shape	-0.03742	264	single	0.00198	246	two	0.02969	14726
thats	-0.03383	180	2	0.00264	5204	three	0.03125	4194
v	-0.03138	102	smallish	0.00272	156	right	0.03314	2354
and	-0.02882	1718	sized	0.00327	3030	darkest	0.03592	2120
thing	-0.02829	288	pair	0.00345	1038	left	0.03828	3018
dots	-0.02636	25004	higher	0.00447	186	larger	0.03876	7668
med	-0.02583	2748	spot	0.00504	258	lightest	0.03995	1326
most	-0.02380	456	similar	0.00541	444	middle	0.04069	2136
diagonal	-0.02310	312	my	0.00555	2298	big	0.04229	3168
set	-0.02191	264	kinda	0.00646	114	smallest	0.04286	1984
these	-0.02136	138	four	0.00683	792	bottom	0.05583	3660
this	-0.02121	396	tiniest	0.00720	174	very	0.05601	6056
sets	-0.02098	150	mid	0.00797	270	top	0.06074	5202
either	-0.01933	126	group	0.00804	1026	small	0.07167	16932
to	-0.01859	240	third	0.00873	150	light	0.07188	18734
horizontal	-0.01615	174	super	0.00908	114	tiny	0.07550	7842
different	-0.01570	120	,	0.00965	2652	large	0.08430	21692
original	-0.01475	102	huge	0.01023	276	dot	0.11708	61074
each	-0.01409	246	highest	0.01200	138	the	0.12480	55040
cluster	-0.01389	2070	little	0.01332	660	one	0.13587	57058
size	-0.01341	2322	pale	0.01357	174	black	0.14498	26872
5120	0.01511		Pare	0.01337			0.1 1 1/0	20012

Table 2: Token level correlations with the exact match rate (from lowest to highest). Correlation scores are shown in  $\rho$ .