

COMS 4705: NLP HW1 Observations

Zhuangyu Ren(zr2209)

February 13, 2019

Question 4

Found 14043 NEs. Expected 5931 NEs; Correct: 3117.			
	precision	recall	F1-Score
Total:	0.221961	0.525544	0.312106
PER:	0.435451	0.231230	0.302061
ORG:	0.475936	0.399103	0.434146
LOC:	0.147750	0.870229	0.252612
MISC:	0.491689	0.610206	0.544574

As we count all the words whose frequency less than 5 as '_RARE_', we assume all these words are of the same type. Actually, they are not in the same type. So this way of dealing with low-frequency words is not accurate, and the percision rate is very low.

Question 5

Found 4704 NEs. Expected 5931 NEs; Correct: 3648.			
	precision	recall	F1-Score
Total:	0.775510	0.615073	0.686037
PER:	0.763231	0.596300	0.669517
ORG:	0.611855	0.478326	0.536913
LOC:	0.876458	0.696292	0.776056
MISC:	0.830065	0.689468	0.753262

Using the Viterbi algorithm and counting into the context, we can see a big improvement in the accuracy.

Question 6

I still choose the words according to their frequency.

If the word's frequency is less than 5, and it is a capitalized word, then I give it a new name "_PROPER_NAME_".

If the word's frequency is less than 5, and it contains only capital letters and dots, then I give them a new name "_FIRST_NAME_".

If the word's frequency is less than 5, and it consists only of numerals, then I give them a new name "_NUMBER_".

Found 5818 NEs. Expected 5931 NEs; Correct: 4333.			
	precision	recall	F1-Score
Total:	0.744758	0.730568	0.737595
PER:	0.809875	0.776387	0.792778
ORG:	0.541717	0.669656	0.598930
LOC:	0.841337	0.754635	0.795631
MISC:	0.826948	0.679696	0.746126

Now the accuracy has improved by about 5