

Homework 2: Simple Entity Resolution Approaches Applied to the El Salvadoran Conflict

Rebecca C. Steorts, STA 490/690

General instructions for homeworks: Please follow the uploading file instructions according to the syllabus. Your code must be completely reproducible and must compile.

Advice: Start early on the homeworks and it is advised that you not wait until the day of as these homeworks are meant to be longer and treated as case studies.

Commenting code Code should be commented. See the Google style guide for questions regarding commenting or how to write code <https://google.github.io/styleguide/Rguide.xml>. No late homework's will be accepted.

R Markdown Test

0. Open a new R Markdown file; set the output to HTML mode and “Knit”. This should produce a web page with the knitting procedure executing your code blocks. You can edit this new file to produce your homework submission.

Working with data

Total points on assignment: 5 (reproducibility) + 10 points for the assignment.

El Salvador Civil War

Recall that between 1980 and 1991, the Republic of El Salvador witnessed a civil war between the central government, the left-wing guerrilla Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN), and right-wing paramilitary death squads. After the peace agreement in 1992, the United Nations created a Commission on the Truth (UNTC) for El Salvador, which invited members of Salvadoran society to report war-related human rights violations, which mainly focused on killings and disappearances. In order to collect such information the UNTC invited individuals through newspapers, radio, and television advertisements to come forward and testify. The UNTC opened offices through El Salvador where witnesses could provide their testimonials, and this resulted in a list of potential victims with names, date of death, and reported location.

In this assignment, you will explore the UNTC data set to get a better understanding of how to work with real data versus toy data. Let's read in the data.

```
library(knitr)
library(RecordLinkage)
```

```
# read in data
df <- read.csv("../sv-mauricio/sv-mauricio.csv")
head(df)
```

##	X	ID	lastname	firstname	day	month	year	geocode	HandID	dept	muni
## 1	26	32	ASENSIO ERNANDES	ALBERTO	NA	2	1981	150000	NA	15	NA
## 2	84	95	PALASIOS AYALA	OBIDIO	NA	10	1985	150000	NA	15	NA
## 3	100	117	PALMA	SEBASTIAN	13	5	1980	40000	NA	4	NA
## 4	143	173	PERES	ARCADIO	NA	8	1984	40000	NA	4	NA

```
## 5 170 205      MAYA QUESADA  ANTONIO 22      9 1984      0      NA      0      NA
## 6 189 227      MEJIA    ALFONSO 13      5 1980    40000    NA      4      NA
```

```
dim(df)
```

```
## [1] 5395  11
```

Next, let's filter out any records that do not have ground truth information.

```
ent_id <- df$HandID
# Filter out records with ground truth, leaving dept 1 and 7
df <- df[!is.na(ent_id),]
ent_id <- ent_id[!is.na(ent_id)]
head(df)
```

```
##      X   ID      lastname firstname day month year geocode HandID dept muni
## 26  543  654  ALEMAN SOLIS  ALFREDO  2    5 1984   70000   136    7   NA
## 64 1406 1687      CRUS    CARMEN  21   10 1981   10000   639    1   NA
## 66 1470 1772    MONTOYA  CARMEN   NA    3 1982   70000   201    7   NA
## 70 1486 1792 PAS SINGUENSA JUAN JOSE 22   10 1980   70000   202    7   NA
## 112 2461 2942    GUIYEN  TEODORO  NA   NA 1983   70000   310    7   NA
## 144 3140 3750    MANOQUIN  JULIA   NA    3 1982   70000    6    7   NA
```

```
tail(df)
```

```
##      X   ID lastname      firstname day month year geocode HandID dept
## 4737 4150 4972 PICHINTE    FELIX JESUS 22    3 1980   71608   490    7
## 4738 4151 4973 PICHINTE FRANCISCO JERONIMO 22    3 1980   71608   491    7
## 4739 4599 5524  RIBERA      FRANCISCO 22    7 1984   71600   533    7
## 4740 4679 5623  RIBERA      TOMAS    22    7 1984   71600   536    7
## 4741 5123 6161 SIGUENSA    OSCAR ANTONIO NA    4 1981   71609   580    7
## 4742 5301 6372  BAYES      JOSE OLIBERIO 19    9 1982   71601   595    7
##      muni
## 4737  716
## 4738  716
## 4739  716
## 4740  716
## 4741  716
## 4742  716
```

```
dim(df)
```

```
## [1] 735  11
```

Observe that we are only considering two municipalities in El Salvador now, which is what was considered in Sadinle (2014).

Task 1: Similarity of Hispanic Names

Consider the similarity of first name and last name. Consider looking at the Edit distance and comment on how this works. Below we explain a recently proposed hybrid metric for Hispanic names. Consider this using the code provided. Explain your findings.

Background on the Monge Elkan Distance Metric It will be useful (for this case study) to utilize a hybrid distance measure for comparing textual strings containing multiple words (tokens). A hybrid distance measure accounts for differences between tokens, while allowing for fuzzy matching between tokens. The measure we describe here resembles a hybrid similarity measure proposed by Monge (1996) for attribute

matching. As shown in Marchant et. al. (2020) this metric attempts to match the tokens in each string while incorporating penalties for “missing” tokens.

We describe the measure with reference to the following example. Suppose we have two strings to compare: y = “University of California, San Diego” and x = “Univ. Calif., Sna Diego”.

The two strings clearly refer to the same entity, however the latter string is abbreviated and has a typographical error. We begin by splitting each string into tokens:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{y} &= [\text{“University”, “of”, “California,”}, \text{“San”, “Diego”}], \\ \vec{x} &= [\text{“Univ.”}, \text{“Calif.”}, \text{“Sna”, “Diego”}].\end{aligned}$$

As explained in Marchant et al. (2020), to compute the distance between \vec{y} and \vec{x} , one must proceed in three steps:

1. If \vec{y} and \vec{x} do not contain the same number of tokens, we append special NA tokens to the shorter token vector to make $|\vec{y}| = |\vec{x}|$. For the above example, we append an NA token to \vec{x} .
2. Next we view \vec{y} and \vec{x} as two independent parts of a bipartite graph. We solve the minimum weight matching problem for the bipartite graph, where the weights between nodes (tokens) are defined by an *inner* distance measure $\text{dist}_{\text{inner}}(y_i, x_j)$ for $y_i \in \vec{y}$ and $x_j \in \vec{x}$. Note that $\text{dist}_{\text{inner}}(y_i, x_j)$ must return valid distances when either y_i or x_j is an NA token. We represent the solution of the minimum weight bipartite matching problem as an edge set $M = \{(y_i \leftrightarrow x_j) : i \in 1, \dots, |\vec{y}|\}$. For the above example, we obtain $M = \{(\text{“University”} \leftrightarrow \text{“Univ.”}), (\text{“of”} \leftrightarrow \text{NA}), (\text{“California,”} \leftrightarrow \text{“Calif.”}), (\text{“San”} \leftrightarrow \text{“Sna”}), (\text{“Diego”} \leftrightarrow \text{“Diego”})\}$ using the inner distance measure defined below.
3. Finally we define the hybrid distance between y and x as an average over the minimum matching weights:

$$\text{dist}(y, x) = \frac{1}{|M|} \sum_{(y_i \leftrightarrow x_j) \in M} \text{dist}_{\text{inner}}(y_i, x_j).$$

For the above example, we obtain $\text{dist}(y, x) = 0.62^1$ which is an good result given that y and x have the same semantic meaning. In comparison, the Levenshtein (edit) distance $\text{dist}_{\text{Ed}}(y, x) = 12$ does not reflect the semantic closeness of y and x .

The inner distance measure dist_{in} plays a crucial role in the performance of the hybrid distance. The authors utilize a modified Levenshtein distance which handles NA tokens and detects abbreviations.

Concretely, they set

$$\text{dist}_{\text{inner}}(y, x) = \begin{cases} d_{\text{miss},l}, & \text{if } y = \text{NA}, \\ d_{\text{miss},r}, & \text{if } x = \text{NA}, \\ d_{\text{abbr},l} \cdot \text{dist}_{\text{Ed}}(y, x), & \text{if } y \text{ abbreviates } x, \\ d_{\text{abbr},r} \cdot \text{dist}_{\text{Ed}}(y, x), & \text{if } x \text{ abbreviates } y, \\ \text{dist}_{\text{Ed}}(y, x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $d_{\text{miss},l}$, $d_{\text{miss},r}$, $d_{\text{abbr},l}$, $d_{\text{abbr},r}$ are positive constants and dist_{Ed} is the Levenshtein distance.

```
# Normalized Levenshtein similarity function used below
unitLevenshteinSimilarity <- function(v1, v2) {
  totalLength <- matrix(nchar(v1), nrow=length(v1), ncol=length(v2))
  totalLength <- sweep(totalLength, 2, nchar(v2), FUN = "+")
  dist <- adist(v1, v2)
  ifelse(totalLength > 0, 1.0 - 2.0 * dist / (totalLength + dist), 1.0)
}
```

¹Using $d_{\text{miss},l} = \infty$, $d_{\text{miss},r} = 0$, $d_{\text{abbr},l} = 0.1$, $d_{\text{abbr},r} = 1$.

```

#' Similarity function for Hispanic names based upon the Monge Elkan metric
#'
#' @param x a character vector
#' @param y a character vector
#' @param sep separator for tokens/words (uses white space by default)
#' @param knownTokens a character vector of known tokens (default is NULL)
#' @returns a length(x) × length(y) similarity matrix
unitHispanicSimilarity <- function(x, y, sep = '\\s+', knownTokens = NULL) {
  # Split into tokens (words)
  tokens1 <- strsplit(x, sep)
  tokens2 <- strsplit(y, sep)

  # Preallocate similarity matrix for output
  out <- matrix(0.0, nrow = length(tokens1), ncol = length(tokens2))

  if (!is.null(knownTokens)) {
    # Convert known tokens to environment for faster look-up
    knownList <- setNames(replicate(length(knownTokens), 1, simplify = FALSE), knownTokens)
    knownEnv <- list2env(knownList, hash = TRUE, size = length(knownList))
  }

  # Function to compute the symmetrized Monge-Elkan similarity for a single
  # pair of tokens
  meSim <- function(t1, t2) {
    maxSim1 <- numeric(length=length(t1))
    knownDistinct1 <- logical(length=length(t1))
    maxSim2 <- numeric(length=length(t2))
    knownDistinct2 <- logical(length=length(t2))
    for (i in seq_along(t1)) {
      for (j in seq_along(t2)) {
        sim <- unitLevenshteinSimilarity(t1[i], t2[j])
        bothKnownDistinct <- FALSE
        if (!is.null(knownTokens) && t1[i] != t2[j] &&
            exists(t1[i], envir = knownEnv, inherits = FALSE) &&
            exists(t2[j], envir = knownEnv, inherits = FALSE)) {
          bothKnownDistinct <- TRUE
        }
        if (sim > maxSim1[i]) { maxSim1[i] <- sim; knownDistinct1[i] <- bothKnownDistinct }
        if (sim > maxSim2[j]) { maxSim2[j] <- sim; knownDistinct2[j] <- bothKnownDistinct }
      }
    }
    maxSim1 <- ifelse(knownDistinct1, 0, maxSim1)
    maxSim2 <- ifelse(knownDistinct2, 0, maxSim2)
    # Symmetrize
    return(max(length(t1)/sum(1.0/maxSim1), length(t2)/sum(1.0/maxSim2)))
  }

  # Function to compute an asymmetric similarity for a single pair of tokens
  asymSim <- function(t1, t2) {
    if (length(t1) < length(t2)) {
      # If t2 contains extra tokens, similarity is zero (can't distort
      # true name by adding names)
      return(0)
    }
  }

```

```

    } else {
      # Get symmetrized Monge-Elkan similarity
      me <- meSim(t1, t2)
      # Assign 0.95 weight to Monge-Elkan and 0.05 weight to num. tokens
      # similarity
      #return(1.0/(0.95/me + 0.05*length(t1)/length(t2)))
      return(me)
    }
  }

  # Loop over all combinations in input character vectors
  for (i in seq_len(length(tokens1))) {
    for (j in seq_len(length(tokens2))) {
      out[i, j] <- asymSim(tokens1[[i]], tokens2[[j]])
    }
  }

  return(out)
}

```

Task 2

How does exact matching work on this data set? What about off by one matching? Be sure to provide the precision and recall. Hint: Be sure to work on the modified data set below as I have removed columns that would not be wise for comparing, such as the record label.

```
head(df)
```

##	X	ID	lastname	firstname	day	month	year	geocode	HandID	dept	muni
## 26	543	654	ALEMAN SOLIS	ALFREDO	2	5	1984	70000	136	7	NA
## 64	1406	1687	CRUS	CARMEN	21	10	1981	10000	639	1	NA
## 66	1470	1772	MONTOYA	CARMEN	NA	3	1982	70000	201	7	NA
## 70	1486	1792	PAS SINGUENSA	JUAN JOSE	22	10	1980	70000	202	7	NA
## 112	2461	2942	GUIYEN	TEODORO	NA	NA	1983	70000	310	7	NA
## 144	3140	3750	MANOQUIN	JULIA	NA	3	1982	70000	6	7	NA

```
head(df_new <- df[,3:8,10])
```

##	lastname	firstname	day	month	year	geocode
## 26	ALEMAN SOLIS	ALFREDO	2	5	1984	70000
## 64	CRUS	CARMEN	21	10	1981	10000
## 66	MONTOYA	CARMEN	NA	3	1982	70000
## 70	PAS SINGUENSA	JUAN JOSE	22	10	1980	70000
## 112	GUIYEN	TEODORO	NA	NA	1983	70000
## 144	MANOQUIN	JULIA	NA	3	1982	70000

Task 3

How would you build a decision rule for matches/non-matches based upon scoring rules. What would your scoring rule be? Write this up as an algorithm.

Task 4

Code up your algorithm in Task 3 and provide the precision and recall. Did your method do better or worse than exact matching?

Task 5

Give insights into how you might be able to improve deterministic approaches moving forward if you re-did your analysis. What advice would you give to a new member that is just joining the project after working on this project (assume that they have just joined your team and your job is to bring them up to speed).