

# A Comparison between Udpipes Tagger and Perceptron-based Tagger

---

**Ali Aljubailan**

**April 15, 2019**

**L545**

## **Practical 03: Disambiguation**

I tested two tagger on the UD\_Finnish-TDT treebank. The first tagger was udpipe tagger. The second tagger was Perceptron-based tagger. After that I evaluated each tagger's performance targetting the row, UPOS. For this evaluation, I utilized the CoNLL-2017 evaluation script. The results of the Perceptron-based tagger and the Udpipes tagger respectively are shown below:

```

149-160-251-62:UD_Finnish-TDT alialjubailan$ cat data.txt
Metrics | Precision | Recall | F1 Score | AligndAcc
-----+-----+-----+-----+-----
Tokens | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
Sentences | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
Words | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
UPOS | 90.32 | 90.32 | 90.32 | 90.32
XPOS | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
Feats | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
AllTags | 90.32 | 90.32 | 90.32 | 90.32
Lemmas | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
UAS | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
LAS | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
Alis-MacBook-Air:UD_Finnish-TDT alialjubailan$ python3 conll
Metrics | Precision | Recall | F1 Score | AligndAcc
-----+-----+-----+-----+-----
Tokens | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
Sentences | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
Words | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
UPOS | 94.64 | 94.64 | 94.64 | 94.64
XPOS | 95.81 | 95.81 | 95.81 | 95.81
Feats | 90.77 | 90.77 | 90.77 | 90.77
AllTags | 89.75 | 89.75 | 89.75 | 89.75
Lemmas | 84.52 | 84.52 | 84.52 | 84.52
UAS | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
LAS | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00
Alis-MacBook-Air:UD_Finnish-TDT alialjubailan$

```

*The results of evaluating the Perceptron-based taggers (the above table) and the Udpipeline tagger*

As can be seen, udpipeline tagger achieved 94.64/100 points for Precision, Recall, F1 Score, AligndAcc columns for UPOS. On the other hand, Perceptron-based tagger scored 90.32/100 point for the same columns. Probably the difference does not seem to be high, but I think that although it seems so (almost 4 points higher for udpipeline), this trivial difference can make a considerable difference in efficiency.

However, this difference might be explained by that the Perceptron-based tagger is more simply written than the Udpipeline one, which is one of the known models today. If we consider this, I think that somewhat can give a good indication about the efficiency of the Perceptron-based tagger, as it is more simply prepared and treated and in spite of that it can show a fair competition to the Udpipeline tagger.

Furthermore, there might be other certain factors that could play a role in the result between the two tagger. For instance, it can be noticed that the row Lemmas sharply differs from the Udpipes to the Perceptron-based tagger, by above 15%. That is, whereas Udpipes scored in Lemmas 100/100, the Perceptron-based tagger has only scored 84.52/100. Another example is the row Feats, in which Udpipes scored 100/100, by more than 10 point above the score of the Perceptron-based tagger. I think that probably because the achievement of UPOS is likely to be affected by the achievement of other rows such as Lemmas and Feats in particular, this could partially explain the differences of scoring for the both taggers.

In sum, the comparison that was made between the Udpipes tagger and the Perceptron-based tagger on the UD\_Finnish-TDT treebank resulted in observably higher scores for the Udpipes tagger. On the row UPOS in particular and all other rows in general, the Udpipes tagger enjoys a higher score and thus more efficiency rate than the simple Perceptron-based tagger. However, the Perceptron-based tagger seems to be able to achieve a higher score and enhance its performance if it is promoted a little bit more.