

Character Identification on Multiparty Dialogue based on End-to-End Neural Coreference Resolution

Pu-Chin Chen {puchinchen@ucla.edu}
Aoxuan Li {douglasli@cs.ucla.edu}
Yutian Zhang {yutianzh0527@gmail.com}
Xin Liu {xinliu627@ucla.edu}

Abstract

This document contains the instructions for preparing a camera-ready manuscript for the proceedings of ACL-2016. The document itself conforms to its own specifications, and is therefore an example of what your manuscript should look like. These instructions should be used for both papers submitted for review and for final versions of accepted papers. Authors are asked to conform to all the directions reported in this document.

1 Introduction

Our main goal is to accomplish a shared task in SemEval 2018 - Task 4: Character Identification on Multiparty Dialogues. This task requires us to build a system which can identify different mentions in multiparty dialogues as corresponding characters in the show. This task is rather challenging, for cross-document entity resolution is imperative for identifying such mentions as real characters.

Literally, the character identification problem is tackled as a coreference resolution task with a further step on entity linking. In terms of this task, the baseline model generates mentions from a coreference system, and then each coreference chain is linked to a specific character identity. Both parts are implemented with agglomerative convolutional neural network in previous system (Chen et al., 2017; Chen and Choi, 2016). Alternatively, we intend to use Bidirectional-LSTM with attention mechanism to address the same problem, which proves to have a satisfying performance in many NLP tasks. In our project, we apply the end-to-end neural coreference resolution model introduced by Lee and He, etc. (Lee et al., 2017). After obtaining the predicted clusters of mentions by

the end-to-end coreference system, we choose the same algorithm of entity-linking as the one Chen proposed in his paper.

2 Previous Work

2.1 Coreference resolution

Machine learning methods have a long history in coreference resolution. However, the learning problem is challenging and, until very recently, hand-engineered systems built on top of automatically produced parse trees (Raghunathan et al., 2010) outperformed all learning approaches. Durrett and Klein (2013) showed that highly lexical learning approaches reverse this trend, and more recent neural models (Wiseman et al., 2016; Clark and Manning, 2016b,a) have achieved significant performance gains. However, all of these models still use parsers for head features and include highly engineered mention proposal algorithms. Such pipelined systems suffer from two major drawbacks: (1) parsing mistakes can introduce cascading errors and (2) many of the hand-engineered rules do not generalize to new languages or domains.

The end-to-end coreference resolution model we used in this task significantly outperforms all previous work without using a syntactic parser or hand-engineered mention detector.

2.2 Entity Linking

Entity linking has traditionally relied heavily on knowledge databases, most notably, Wikipedia, for entities (Mihalcea and Csomai, 2007b; Ratnikov et al., 2011b; Gattani et al., 2013; Francis-Landau et al., 2016). Although we do not make use of knowledge bases, our task is closely aligned to entity linking. Recent advances in entity linking are also applicable to our task since we see Francis-Landau et al. (2016) use convolutional

nets to capture semantic similarity between a mention and an entity by comparing context of the mention with the description of the entity. This work validates our usage of deep learning for character identification.

Dialogue tracking has been an expanding task as shown by the Dialogue State Tracking Challenges hosted by Microsoft (Kim et al., 2015). That an ongoing conversation can be dynamically tracked (Henderson et al., 2013) is exciting and applicable to our task because the state of a conversation may yield significant hints for entity linking and coreference resolution. Speaker identification, a task similar to character identification, has already shown some success with partial dialogue tracking by dynamically identifying speakers at each turn in a dialogue using conditional random field models.

3 End-to-End Coreference Resolution

3.1 Introduction

Recent coreference models usually rely on syntactic parsers. However, the end-to-end coreference resolution directly consider all the spans up to a maximum length in the document as potential mentions, compute the probability of possible ancestors (previous span) for each span, and directly optimizes the marginal likelihood of antecedent spans from gold coreference clusters.

Since the number of potential mentions is very large, it is impractical to score all span pairs. So this model uses unary mention scores to prune the space of pairs of spans(spans and antecedents), which significantly reduce the pairwise computations.

3.2 Model

IMAGES HERE

First step: computes embedding representations of spans for scoring potential entity mentions. A bidirectional LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) to encode the lexical information of both the inside and outside of each span. The model also includes an head-finding attention mechanism over words in each span to model head words. Low-scoring spans are pruned, so that only a manageable number of spans is considered for coreference decisions.

IMAGES HERE

Second step: compute antecedent scores from pairs of span representations. And then sum the

mention scores of both spans and their pairwise antecedent score as the final coreference score of this pair of spans. The antecedent scoring function includes explicit element-wise similarity of each span pair and a learned 20-dimensional feature vector which encoding all features like speaker genre, span distance, mention width.

Learning We optimize the marginal log-likelihood of all correct antecedents implied by the gold clustering:

IMAGES HERE

where $GOLD(i)$ is the set of spans in the gold cluster containing span i . If span i does not belong to a gold cluster or all gold antecedents have been pruned, $GOLD(i) = \{\}$.

3.3 Ablations

To show whether each component in our model is actually important, we ablate various parts of the architecture and report the average F1 on these experiments. We conducted one complete experiment and two ablation experiments, no heads and no features.

4 Character Identification

4.1 Introduction

Once the coreference resolution system is built and trained, we can predict co-references represented by clusters for each scene document. The next step should be making predictions from clusters to TV show character id. We model this process as an entity linking task. This section describes our entity linking model that takes the mention embeddings and the mention-pair embeddings generated ACNN and classifies each mention to one of the character labels.

4.2 Model

IMAGES HERE

We prepare three embeddings generated by mentions which are predicted by precious coreference system. The first embedding is mention embedding; the second is embedding of the cluster including the mention; the third is generated by mention-pair embedding, which pairs the mention with reaming mention in the same cluster. Here are the formal formula:

IMAGES HERE

In order to fix the input tensor size of both cluster embedding and mention-pair embedding, we perform avg-pooling and max-pooling for both

embeddings. Then each of pooling layers is passed to a convolutional layer. Finally, we concat the mention embedding, cluster CNN embedding and mention-pair CNN embedding.

IMAGES HERE

After concatenation, we feed them into a feed-forward neural network with two hidden layers. Final output is a softmax with the idmention of entity id number in Friends TV show.

4.3 Data Preprocessing

Our training data has 374 documents, which contains totally 13280 gold mentions that have gold entity label. Firstly, we need to get gold clusters and generate three embeddings, i.e. mention, cluster and mention pair embeddings. Since all gold clusters are labeled with entity ids, we can flat clusters to mentions while computing three embeddings. We can easily get mention embeddings from the pretrained coref model.

5 Dataset and Evaluation Metrics

5.1 Data Description

The data comes from the scripts of the first two seasons of TV show Friends, which are already annotated for this task. Specifically, each season consists of episodes, and each episode is comprised of scenes. Furthermore, each scene is segmented into sentences. All datasets follow the CoNLL 2012 Shared Task data format. Each sentence is delimited by a new line and each column indicates the information regarding the word or the punctuation.

5.2 Data Split

Considering the amount of total data is not so sufficient, we simply split them into two datasets for different purposes, training and evaluation sets. The exact ratio of our training set to our evaluation set is 4:1. The evaluation set contains seventy-four scenes in *Friends*.

5.3 Coreference Evaluation Metrics

The coreference results are evaluated with three metrics apropos coreference resolution: MUC, B^3 , and $CEAF_e$. The precision, recall and F1 score of each metric approach are calculate separately and then the averages of them are obtained, which are utilized to compare against each other.

MUC

MUC(Vilain et al.,1995) concerns the number of

Table 1: My caption

	No Features			No Heads	
	F1	RECALL	PRECISION	F1	REC
MUC	79.14%	76.98%	81.42%	80.90%	80.3
B3	60.68%	55.22%	67.34%	64.38%	62.5
CEAF_e	48.47%	48.21%	48.43%	52.89%	50.5
AVG	62.76%	60.14%	65.73%	66.06%	64.4

pairwise links needed to be inserted or removed to map system responses to gold keys. The number of links shared by system and gold are calculated. In addition, minimum numbers of links needed to describe coreference chains of the system and gold are computed as well.

B^3

Rather than evaluating coreference chains merely on their links, B^3 (Bagga and Baldwin, 1998) metric computes precision and recall on a mention level. System performance is evaluated by the average of all mentions scores.

$CEAF_e$

$CEAF_e$ (Luo, 2005) metric further clarifies the downside of B^3 , in which entites can be used more than once during evaluation. Consequently, both multiple coreference chains of the same entity and chains with mentions of multiple entities are not penalized. To mitigate the aforementioned problem, $CEAF_e$ evaluates exclusively on the best one-to-one mapping between the systems and golds entities.

6 Results and Analysis

We conducted one complete experiment and two ablation experiments, no heads and no features. The result of no features is shown in Table 1.

7 Conclusion and Future work

In this work, we proposed an end-to-end character identification system, combining neural coreference system with an agglomerative convolutional neural network entity linking model.

The results should be improved in the future if we can gather GPU resources. Inspired by (Clark and Manning, 2016), the next step will be designing loss function proposed in their work and boost the reliability of our system using reinforcement learning.

300	Acknowledgments	350
301		351
302	The acknowledgments should go immediately be-	352
303	fore the references. Do not number the acknowl-	353
304	edgments section. Do not include this section	354
305	when submitting your paper for review.	355
306		356
307	References	357
308		358
309	A Supplemental Material	359
310	ACL 2016 also encourages the submission of sup-	360
311	plementary material to report preprocessing deci-	361
312	sions, model parameters, and other details nec-	362
313	essary for the replication of the experiments re-	363
314	ported in the paper. Seemingly small preprocess-	364
315	ing decisions can sometimes make a large differ-	365
316	ence in performance, so it is crucial to record such	366
317	decisions to precisely characterize state-of-the-art	367
318	methods.	368
319	Nonetheless, supplementary material should be	369
320	supplementary (rather than central) to the paper.	370
321	It may include explanations or details of proofs or	371
322	deriations that do not fit into the paper, lists of fea-	372
323	tures or feature tempates, sample inputs and out-	373
324	puts for a system, pseudo-code or source code, and	374
325	data. (Source code and data should be separate up-	375
326	loads, rather than part of the paper).	376
327	The paper should not rely on the supplementary	377
328	material: while the paper may refer to and cite the	378
329	supplementary material will be available to the re-	379
330	viewers, they will not be asked to review the sup-	380
331	plementary material.	381
332	Appendices (i.e. supplementary material in the	382
333	form of proofs, tables, or pseudo-code) should	383
334	come after the references, as shown here. Use	384
335	\appendix before any appendix section to	385
336	switch the section numbering over to letters.	386
337	B Multiple Appendices	387
338	... can be gotten by using more than one section.	388
339	We hope you won't need that.	389
340		390
341		391
342		392
343		393
344		394
345		395
346		396
347		397
348		398
349		399