

# Extracting Biological Processes with Global Constraints

## Author 1

XYZ Company  
111 Anywhere Street  
Mytown, NY 10000, USA  
author1@xyz.org

## Author 2

ABC University  
900 Main Street  
Ourcity, PQ, Canada A1A 1T2  
author2@abc.ca

## Abstract

Biological processes are complex phenomena involving a series of events that are related to one another through multiple dependencies. Teaching computers to read, understand and reason over text describing biological processes could dramatically improve performance of semantic applications such as question answering (QA). In this paper, we present the task of *process extraction*, in which process events and their relations are automatically extracted from text. We represent processes by graphs whose edges describe a large set of temporal, causal and co-reference event-event relations, and characterize the structural properties of that graph (e.g., the graph is *connected*). Then, we present a method for extracting relations between processes, which exploits these structural properties by performing joint inference over the set of possible extracted relations. On a novel data set (released with this paper), containing 148 descriptions of biological processes we show significant improvement comparing to baselines that ignore process structure.

## 1 Introduction

A series of inter-related events that involve multiple entities and lead to an end result is called a *process*. Product manufacturing, economical developments, and various phenomena in life and social sciences can all be viewed as types of processes. Processes are complicated objects; consider for example the biological process of ATP synthesis described in Figure 1. This process involves 12 entities and 8 events. On top of that, it describes the

role of each entity in each event, and the relationship between events (e.g., the second occurrence of the ‘*enter*’ event *causes* the ‘*changing*’ event).

Automatically extracting the structure of processes from text is crucial for applications that require reasoning such as non-factoid QA. For instance, answering a question on ATP synthesis such as “*How do H<sup>+</sup> ions contribute to the production of ATP?*” is only possible given a structure that links *H<sup>+</sup> ions* (Figure 1, sentence 1) to *ATP* (Figure 1, sentence 4) through a sequence of intermediate events. Such “how” questions are common in FAQ websites (Surdeanu et al., 2011), which further supports the importance of process extraction.

Process extraction is related to two recent lines of work in Information Extraction – event extraction and timeline construction. Traditional event extraction focuses on identifying specific events from a closed set in a single sentence. For example, the BioNLP 2009 and 2011 shared tasks (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2011) consider nine event types that are relevant for proteins. Process extraction, on the other hand, is centered around discovering *relations* between events that span *multiple* sentences. The set of possible event types in process extraction is also much larger. Timeline construction involves identifying temporal relations between events (Chambers and Jurafsky, 2008; Yoshikawa et al., 2009; Denis and Muller, 2011; Do et al., 2012; McClosky and Manning, 2012), and is thus related to process extraction as both focus on event-event relations that span multiple sentences. However, events in processes are tightly coupled in ways that go beyond simple temporal ordering, and these inter-



extract event-event relations between pairs of event mentions. In this paper, we focus on the second task, where given a set of triggers  $\mathcal{T}$ , we find all event-event relations, where a trigger is a representative for the entire event. For completeness, we now describe the semantic roles  $\mathcal{L}$  used in our data set, and then present the set of event-event relations  $\mathcal{R}$ .

The set  $\mathcal{L}$  contains standard semantic roles such as AGENT, THEME, ORIGIN, DESTINATION and LOCATION. Two additional semantic roles were employed that are relevant for biological text: RESULT corresponds to an entity that is the result of an event, and RAW-MATERIAL describes an entity that is used or consumed during an event. For example, in the last event in Figure 1 ATP is the RESULT of the event, while ADP is the RAW-MATERIAL.

The relation set  $\mathcal{R}$  contains the following relations (assuming an edge  $(u, v, r)$ ):

1. PREV denotes that  $u$  is an event immediately before  $v$ . Thus, the edges  $(u, v, \text{PREV})$  and  $(v, w, \text{PREV})$ , preclude the edge  $(u, w, \text{PREV})$ . For example, in “When a photon *strikes* ... energy is *passed* ... until it *reaches* ...”, there is no edge  $(\textit{strikes}, \textit{reaches}, \text{PREV})$  due to the intervening event ‘*passed*’.
2. COTEMP denotes that events  $u$  and  $v$  overlap (e.g., the first two event mentions in Figure 1).
3. SUPER denotes that event  $v$  is included in event  $u$ . For instance, in “During *DNA replication*, DNA polymerases *proofread* each nucleotide...” there is an edge  $(\textit{DNA replication}, \textit{proofread}, \text{SUPER})$ .
4. CAUSES denotes that event  $u$  causes event  $v$  (e.g., the relation between *changing* and *spins* in sentence 2 of Figure 1).
5. ENABLES denotes that event  $u$  creates preconditions that allow event  $v$  to take place. For example, the description “... cause cancer cells to *lose* attachments to neighboring cells..., allowing them to *spread* into nearby tissues” has the edge  $(\textit{lose}, \textit{spread}, \text{ENABLES})$ .
6. SAME denotes that  $u$  and  $v$  co-refer to the same event (see Figure 1).

Our relation set contains the relations CAUSES and ENABLES, which are important for modeling processes and go beyond temporal ordering only.

	Avg	Min	Max
# of sentences	3.80	1	15
# of tokens	89.98	19	319
# of events	6.20	2	15
# of relations	5.64	1	24

Table 1: Process statistics over 148 process descriptions

We defined that these two relations take precedence over their corresponding temporal relation (which is almost invariably PREV). The SUPER relation appears in temporal annotations such as the Timebank corpus (Pustejovsky et al., 2003) and in work on temporal logic (Allen, 1983), but in practice it is not considered by many temporal ordering systems (Chambers and Jurafsky, 2008; Yoshikawa et al., 2009; Do et al., 2012).

We also added event coreference (SAME) to  $\mathcal{R}$ . Do et al. (2012) used event coreference information in a temporal ordering task to modify probabilities provided by pairwise classifiers prior to joint inference. In this paper, we simply treat SAME as another event-event relation, which allows us to easily perform joint inference and employ structural constraints that combine both coreference and temporal relations simultaneously. For example, if  $u$  and  $v$  are the same event, then it can not be for any  $w$  that  $u$  is before  $w$ , but  $v$  is after  $w$  (see Section 3.3)

We have annotated 148 process descriptions based on the aforementioned definitions and provide further details on annotation and data set statistics in Section 4.4 and Table 1.

**Structural properties of processes** Naturally, coherent processes exhibit many structural properties. For example, two argument mentions related to the same event can not overlap – a constraint that has been used in the past in SRL (Toutanova et al., 2008). In this paper we focus on three main structural properties of the graph  $\mathcal{P}$ . First, in a coherent process all events mentioned are related to one another, and hence the graph  $\mathcal{P}$  must be connected. Second, processes tend to have a “chain-like” structure where one event follows another, and thus, we expect node degree to generally be  $\leq 2$ . Indeed, 90% of event mentions have degree  $\leq 2$ , as is demonstrated by the first column in Table 2. Last, if we consider all possible relation triangles, clearly some triangles are impossible, while other

Deg.	Gold	Local	Global
0	0	44	0
1	219	290	224
2	369	306	408
3	46	16	17
$\geq 4$	22	0	7

Table 2: Node degree distribution for event mentions on the training set. Predictions for the *Local* and *Global* models were obtained using 10-fold cross validation

are common, which is illustrated in Figure ?? . In Section 3.3, we will show how by modeling these properties we can improve process extraction using a joint inference framework.

### 3 Joint Model for Process Extraction

Given a paragraph  $x$  and a trigger set  $\mathcal{T}$  we wish to extract all event-event relations  $E$ . Similar to Do et al. (2012) our model consists of a local pairwise classifier and global constraints. We first introduce a classifier that is based on features from previous work (Section 3.1). Next, we describe novel features specific for process extraction (Section 3.2). Last, we incorporate global constraints into our model in an ILP formulation (Section 3.3).

#### 3.1 Local pairwise classifier

The pairwise classifier predicts relations between all event mention pairs (represented by their triggers). Since some of the relations in  $\mathcal{R}$  are directed, we must predict also the direction of these relations. We do this by expanding  $\mathcal{R}$  to include the reverse of four directed relations: PREV-NEXT, SUPER-SUB, CAUSES-CAUSED, ENABLES-ENABLED. After adding NONE to indicate no relation,  $\mathcal{R}$  contains 11 relations. Our classifier is a function  $f : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ . Let  $n$  be the number of triggers in a process description, and  $t_i$  be the  $i$ 'th trigger appearing in the description, since  $f(t_i, t_j)$  completely determines  $f(t_j, t_i)$  it suffices to consider only pairs such that  $i < j$ . Note that in this new definition of  $\mathcal{R}$  the process graph  $\mathcal{P} = (V, E)$  is undirected.

Table 3 describes features from previous work (Chambers and Jurafsky, 2008; Do et al., 2012) extracted for a trigger pair  $(t_i, t_j)$ . Some features were omitted since they did not yield improvement in performance on a development

Feature	Description
POS	Pair of POS tags
Lemma	Pair of lemmas
Prep*	Preposition lexeme, if in a prepositional phrase
Words between	For adjacent triggers, content words between triggers
Temp. between	For adjacent triggers, temporal connectives (from a small list) between triggers
Adjacency	Whether two triggers are adjacent
# Sent.	Quantized number of sentences between triggers
# Word.	Quantized number of words between triggers
LCA	Least common ancestor on constituency tree, if exists
Dominates*	Whether one trigger dominates other
Share	Whether triggers share a child on dependency tree

Table 3: Features extracted for a trigger pair  $(t_i, t_j)$ . Asteriks (\*) indicate features that are duplicated, once for each trigger.

set, or they require gold annotations provided in TimeBank, which we do not have. To reduce sparseness, we convert nominalizations into their verbal forms when computing word lemmas, using WordNet's (Fellbaum, 1998) derivation links.

#### 3.2 Classifier extensions

A central source of information for extracting event-event relations from text are *connectives* such as *after*, *during*, etc. However, there is variability in the occurrence of these connectives. Consider the following two sentences (connectives in bold, triggers in italics):

1. **Because** alleles are *exchanged* during *gene flow*, genetic differences are *reduced*.
2. During *gene flow*, alleles are *exchanged*, and **so** genetic differences are *reduced*.

Both sentences express the relation (*exchanged*, *reduced*, CAUSES), but the connective used is different, its linear position with respect to the triggers is different, and in sentence 1 the trigger *gene flow* intervenes between *exchanged* and *reduced*. Since our data set is very small, we would like to identify the triggers related to each connective, and share features between such sentences. We do this using the dependency structure and a clustering of connectives.

[Details on clustering and syntactic feature implementation probably using example above, maybe explain using "marker", then say something that we do something similar for things that are under PP but do not describe for simplicity, and say that for advmod we only use the clustering]

We further extend our features to handle the rich relation set necessary for process extraction. Processes often begin with a trigger for an event that includes subsequent triggers, e.g., "The *Calvin cycle* begins by *incorporating...*". Thus, we add a feature for  $t_i$  indicating whether  $i = 1$  and  $t_i$  is a noun. We also add two features targeted at the relation SAME: one indicating whether the lemmas of  $t_i$  and  $t_j$  are equal, and another specifying the determiner of  $t_j$ , if it exists. Intuition is that certain determiners indicate that the event triggered had already been mentioned, e.g., the determiner *this* hints a SAME relation in "The next steps *decompose* citrate back to oxaloacetate. This *regeneration* makes...". Last, we add as a feature the dependency path between  $t_i$  and  $t_j$ , if it exists, e.g., the feature  $\xrightarrow{dobj} \xrightarrow{rmod}$  between *produces* and *divide* will fire in "meiosis produces cells that divide...".

For our pairwise classifier, we train a maximum entropy classifier that provides a probability  $p_{ijr}$  for every trigger pair  $(t_i, t_j)$  and relation  $r$ . Hence,  $f(t_i, t_j) = \arg \max_r p_{ijr}$ .

### 3.3 Global Constraints

Naturally, a pairwise classifier can result in a process structure that violates global properties (see Section 2). Figure ?? shows in black edges the predictions of our local classifier, which result in the trigger [HERE WILL BE AN EXAMPLE FOR BAD LOCAL DECISIONS]. In this section we incorporate into our model constraints that result in a coherent global process structure.

Let  $\theta_{ijr}$  be a score for the relation  $r$  and the triggers  $(t_i, t_j)$  (e.g.,  $\theta_{ijr} = \log p_{ijr}$ ), and  $y_{ijr}$  be the corresponding indicator. Our goal is to find an assignment for the indicators  $\mathbf{y} = \{y_{ijr} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . With no global constraints this can be formulated as the following ILP:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max_{\mathbf{y}} \sum_{ijr} \theta_{ijr} y_{ijr} \\ \text{s.t. } \forall_{i,j} \sum_r y_{ijr} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the constraint ensures each trigger pair is assigned exactly one relation. We now describe constraints that result in a process that is connected, "chain-like", and has reasonable relation triangles.

**Connectivity** Our formulation for enforcing connectivity is a minor variation on the one suggested by Martins et al. (2009) for dependency parsing. In our setup, we want  $\mathcal{P}$  to be a connected undirected graph, and not a directed tree. However, an undirected graph is connected iff there is a directed tree embedded in it, and thus the resulting formulation is almost identical. This formulation is based on flow constraints that ensure that there is a path from a designated root in the graph to all other nodes.

Let  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  be the set  $\mathcal{R} \setminus \text{NONE}$ . An edge  $(t_i, t_j)$  is in  $E$  if  $y_{ij} = \sum_{r \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}} y_{ijr} = 1$ . For each variable  $y_{ij}$  we define two auxiliary binary variables  $z_{ij}$  and  $z_{ji}$  that correspond to the directed edges in the embedded tree. We tie each auxiliary variable to its corresponding ILP variable by ensuring  $z_{ij}$  and  $z_{ji}$  are active only if  $y_{ij}$  is active:

$$\forall_{i < j} z_{ij} < y_{ij}, z_{ji} < y_{ij} \quad (2)$$

Next, we add constraints that enforce that the graph structure induced by the auxiliary variables results in a tree rooted in node 1. For that we need for every  $i \neq j$  a flow variable  $\phi_{ij}$  which specifies the amount of flow on the directed edge  $z_{ij}$ .

$$\sum_i z_{i1} = 0, \forall_{j \neq 1} \sum_i z_{ij} = 1 \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_i \phi_{1i} = n - 1 \quad (4)$$

$$\forall_j \sum_i \phi_{ij} - \sum_k \phi_{jk} = 1 \quad (5)$$

$$\forall_{i \neq j} \phi_{ij} \leq n \cdot z_{ij} \quad (6)$$

Equation 3 says that all nodes in the graph have exactly one parent, except for the root that has no

parents. Equation 4 ensures that the outgoing flow from the root is  $n - 1$ , and Equation 5 states that each of the other  $n - 1$  nodes consumes exactly one flow unit. Last, Equation 6 ties the auxiliary variables to the flow variables, making sure that flow occurs only on edges. The combination of these constraints guarantees that the graph induced by the variables  $z_{ij}$  is a directed tree and consequently the graph induced by our variables  $\mathbf{y}$  is connected.

**Chain structure** A connected graph where the degree of all nodes is  $\leq 2$  is a chain. Table 2 presents nodes’ degree and demonstrates that indeed process graphs are close to being chains. The following constraint bounds nodes’ degree by 2:

$$\forall_j \sum_{i < j} y_{ij} + \sum_{j < k} y_{jk} \leq 2 \quad (7)$$

Since graph structures are not always chains we add this as a soft constraint, that is, we penalize the objective for each node with degree  $> 2$ . Thus, our modified objective function is  $\sum_{i,j,r} \theta_{ijr} y_{ijr} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_k C_k$ , where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the set of soft constraints,  $\alpha_k$  is the penalty, and  $C_k$  indicates whether a constraint is violated. We tune the parameters  $\alpha_k$  on a development set, as explained in Section 4.4.

**Relation triangles** A triangle is a 3-tuple of relations  $(f(t_i, t_j), f(t_j, t_k), f(t_i, t_k))$ . Clearly, some triangles are impossible while others are quite common. In order to look for triangles that could potentially improve process extraction we counted how many time each possible triangle occurs in both the training data and the output of our pairwise classifier, and focused on those for which the classifier and the gold standard disagree. We are interested in triangles that never occur in the training data but are predicted by the classifier, and triangles that are frequent in the gold standard but do not appear in the classifier output. Figure ?? illustrates the triangles found and Equations X-Y provide their ILP formulation. Soft constraints are incorporated by defining a penalty/reward  $\alpha_k$  for each triangle structure and expanding the set  $\mathcal{K}$  accordingly.

1. SAME transitivity: The transitivity of SAME (co-reference) has been used in past work (Finkel and Manning, 2008) and we incorporate it as a soft constraint (Equation X).

2. COTEMP transitivity: If  $t_i$  is co-temporal with  $t_j$  and  $t_j$  is co-temporal with  $t_k$ , then usually  $t_i$  and  $t_k$  are either co-temporal or denote the same event (soft constraint in Equation X).
3. CAUSE-COTEMP: If  $t_i$  causes both  $t_j$  and  $t_k$ , then often  $t_j$  and  $t_k$  are co-temporal. E.g, in “*genetic drift* has led to a *loss* of genetic variation and an *increase* in the frequency of harmful alleles”, a single event causes two subsequent events that occur simultaneously (soft constraint in Equation X).
4. SAME contradiction: if  $t_i$  is the same event as  $t_j$ , then their temporal ordering with respect to a third trigger  $t_k$  may result in a contradiction, e.g., if  $t_i$  is before  $t_k$ , but  $t_j$  is after  $t_k$ . We define 5 temporal categories that generate  $\binom{5}{2}$  possible contradictions, but for brevity present just one representative hard constraint (Equation X). Note that this constraint depends on co-reference and temporal relations being predicted jointly.
5. PREV: As mentioned (Section 3.3), if  $t_i$  is immediately before  $t_j$ , and  $t_j$  is immediately before  $t_k$ , then it can not be that  $t_i$  is immediately before  $t_k$  (hard constraint in Equation X).

We used the Gurobi optimization package<sup>2</sup> to find an exact solution for our ILP, which contains  $O(n^2 r)$  variables and  $O(n^3)$  constraints. We have also developed an equivalent formulation amenable to dual decomposition (Reichart and Barzilay, 2012), which is a faster approximation method, but practically found that solving the problem exactly with Gurobi is quite fast (average/median time per process: XX/YY).

## 4 Experimental Evaluation

### 4.1 Experimental setup

Our data set consists of 148 process descriptions annotated by a biologist. The annotator was presented with annotation guidelines, annotated 20 descriptions and then annotations were discussed with the authors, after which all process descriptions were annotated. After training a second biologist, we measured inter-annotator agreement on 30 random

<sup>2</sup>[www.gurobi.com](http://www.gurobi.com)

process descriptions, resulting in agreement  $\kappa = 0.69$ .

Process descriptions were parsed with Stanford constituency and dependency parsers (Klein and Manning, 2003; de Marneffe et al., 2006), and 35 process descriptions were set aside as a test set (# of training set trigger pairs: XXX, # of test set trigger pairs: XXX). We performed 10-fold cross validation over the training set for feature selection and tuning of constraint parameters. For each constraint type (connectivity, chain-structure, and five triangle constraints) we introduced a parameter and tuned the seven parameters by coordinate-wise ascent, where for hard constraints a binary parameter controls whether the constraint is used, and for soft constraints it controls reward/penalty ( $\alpha_k$ ).

We test the following systems: (a) *All-Prev*: since the most common process structure is a chain of consecutive events we simply predict NEXTEVENT for every two adjacent triggers. (b) *Local<sub>base</sub>*: A pairwise classifier with features from previous work (Section 3.1) (c) *Local*: A pairwise classifier with all features (Section 3.2) (d) *Global*: Our full model that uses ILP inference.

To evaluate system performance we compare its set of predictions on all trigger pairs to the gold standard annotations and compute micro-averaged precision, recall and  $F_1$ . We perform two types of evaluations: (a) *Full*: evaluation on our full set of 11 relations (b) *Temporal*: Evaluation on temporal relations only, by collapsing PREVIOUS-EVENT, CAUSES, and ENABLES to a single category and similarly for NEXTEVENT, CAUSED, and ENABLED (inter-annotator agreement  $\kappa = 0.75$ ). We computed statistical significance of our results with the paired bootstrap resampling method (Efron and Tibshirani, 1993).

## 4.2 Results

Table 4 presents performance of all systems. Our main result is that using global constraints improves performance on all measures in both full and temporal evaluations. Particularly, in the full evaluation recall improves by 12% and overall  $F_1$  improves significantly by 3.5 points against *Local* ( $p < 0.01$ ). Recall improvement suggests that modeling connectivity allowed *Global* to add correct relations in cases where some events were not connected to one

	Temporal			Full		
	P	R	$F_1$	P	R	$F_1$
<i>All-Prev</i>	62.2	58.3	60.2	34.1	32.0	33.0
<i>Local<sub>base</sub></i>	65.6	55.3	60.0	52.1	43.9	47.6
<i>Local</i>	66.2	58.3	62.0	54.7	48.3	51.3
<i>Global</i>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>64.5*</b>	<b>65.5*</b>	<b>55.7</b>	<b>54.0*</b>	<b>54.8*</b>

Table 4: Test set results on all experiments. Asterisk (\*) denotes statistical significance ( $p < 0.01$ ) against all other baselines.

another [double penalization? for now not mentioning it]

The full *Local* classifier substantially outperforms *Local<sub>base</sub>*. This indicates that our novel features (Section 3.2) are important for discriminating between process relations. Specifically, in the full evaluation *Local* improves precision more than in the temporal evaluation, suggesting that designing syntactic and semantic features for connectives is useful for distinguishing NEXT, CAUSES, and ENABLES when the amount of training data is small.

The *All-Prev* baseline performs quite badly in the full evaluation, but in temporal evaluation it performs reasonably well. This shows a strong tendency of process descriptions to proceed linearly from one event to the other, which is a general property of discourse structure (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

Table 2 presents the degree distribution of *Local* and *Global* on the development set comparing to the gold standard. Clearly, degree distribution of *Global* is much more similar to the gold standard than *Local*. In particular, the connectivity constraint ensures that there are no isolated nodes and shifts mass from nodes with degree 0 and 1 to nodes with degree 2.

## 4.3 Analysis and Discussion

Table that shows the setting of the hyper parameters on the dev set - what order and what are the parameter values - this shows what constraint help and what constraints don't. We can interpret that - Connectivity is really important, Chains are not important since local classifier does a good enough job.

An example - a graph from GraphViz showing what was predicted by local and how global fixed it - it should have both connectivity and triad issues.

## 4.4 Full pipeline

If we have this we can briefly explain about our first step system and show some results. This is good to say we do everything and bad if this really sucks.

## 5 Related Work

BioNLP work

Timeline construction work.

Scripts work - Chambers, Poon 2013.

Work that uses global constraints with ILP or dual decomposition or whatever.

Process extraction is related to two recent lines of work in Information Extraction – event extraction and timeline construction. The BioNLP 2009 and 2011 shared tasks (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2011) led to increasing interest in biomedical event extraction (Poon and Vanderwende, 2010; Miwa et al., 2010; Riedel and McCallum, 2011; McClosky et al., 2011; Björne et al., 2011), where given a single sentence annotated with protein mentions, events are identified and relations between events and proteins are extracted. In this shared task participants were asked to consider nine event types that are relevant for proteins (such as *Phosphorylation* and *Transcription*). Processes, on the other hand, are centered around discovering *relations* between events that span *multiple* sentences. In Figure 1 for instance, process extraction involves determining the relations between 8 events (*flowing*, *enter*, etc.) that are necessary for ATP production, which appear across four sentences. Note that the set of possible event types can not be restricted to a small closed set.

Timeline construction involves identifying temporal relations between events (Chambers and Jurafsky, 2008; Yoshikawa et al., 2009; Denis and Muller, 2011; Do et al., 2012; McClosky and Manning, 2012), and is thus related to process extraction as both focus on event-event relations that span multiple sentences. However, fully capturing process structure requires handling a rich set of relations such as CAUSES and SUPEREVENT (see Section 2), which are often not addressed in timeline construction. Moreover, processes exhibit particular properties that do not hold generally in temporal ordering. For example, in processes all events are somehow related to one another, a property that can be exploited for improving extraction.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper we presented the task of process extraction and a method for extracting processes. We focused on extracting relations between event triggers. We also release publicly a data set for the scientific community. We have shown that by taking advantage of the global structure of a process we can improve performance.

Future work - adding more constraints - Mengqiu’s idea. This may results in inference problems (it does) and so we can try think of smarter inference. There is the problem of very little data and we can think about using data from other domains and do adaptations. We want to do the full pipeline jointly.

## References

- James F. Allen. 1983. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Commun. ACM*, 26(11):832–843.
- Jari Björne, Juho Heimonen, Filip Ginter, Antti Airola, Tapio Pahikkala, and Tapio Salakoski. 2011. Extracting contextualized complex biological events with rich graph-based feature sets. *Computational Intelligence*, 27(4):541–557.
- Neil Campbell and Jane Reece. 2005. *Biology*. Benjamin Cummings.
- Nathanael Chambers and Daniel Jurafsky. 2008. Jointly combining implicit constraints improves temporal ordering. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Bill MacCartney, and Christopher D. Manning. 2006. Generating typed dependency parses from phrase structure parses. In *Proceedings of LREC*.
- Pascal Denis and Philippe Muller. 2011. Predicting globally-coherent temporal structures from texts via endpoint inference and graph decomposition. In *Proceedings of IJCAI*.
- Quang Do, Wei Lu, and Dan Roth. 2012. Joint inference for event timeline construction. In *Proceedings of EMNLP-CoNLL*.
- Bradley Efron and Robert Tibshirani. 1993. *An introduction to the bootstrap*, volume 57. CRC press.
- Christiane Fellbaum, editor. 1998. MIT Press.
- Jenny Rose Finkel and Christopher D. Manning. 2008. Enforcing transitivity in coreference resolution. In *Proceedings of ACL*.
- Jin-Dong Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Yoshinobu Kano, and Junichi Tsujii. 2009. Overview of bionlp 09 shared task on event extraction. In *Proceedings of BioNLP*.



- Jin-Dong Kim, Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, Robert Bossy, and Junichi Tsujii. 2011. Overview of bionlp shared task 2011. In *Proceedings of BioNLP*.
- Dan Klein and Christopher D. Manning. 2003. Accurate unlexicalized parsing. In *Proceedings of ACL*.
- André L. Martins, Noah A. Smith, and Eric P. Xing. 2009. Concise integer linear programming formulations for dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of ACL/IJCNLP*, pages 342–350.
- David McClosky and Christopher D. Manning. 2012. Learning constraints for consistent timeline extraction. In *Proceedings of EMNLP-CoNLL*, pages 873–882.
- David McClosky, Mihai Surdeanu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2011. Event extraction as dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 1626–1635.
- Makoto Miwa, Rune Sætre, Jin-Dong Kim, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2010. Event extraction with complex event classification using rich features. *J. Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, 8(1).
- Hoifung Poon and Lucy Vanderwende. 2010. Joint inference for knowledge extraction from biomedical literature. In *Proceedings of HLT-NAACL*, pages 813–821.
- James Pustejovsky, José M. Castaño, Robert Ingria, Roser Sauri, Robert J. Gaizauskas, Andrea Setzer, Graham Katz, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2003. Timeml: Robust specification of event and temporal expressions in text. In *New Directions in Question Answering*, pages 28–34.
- Roi Reichart and Regina Barzilay. 2012. Multi-event extraction guided by global constraints. In *Proceedings of HLT-NAACL*.
- Sebastian Riedel and Andrew McCallum. 2011. Fast and robust joint models for biomedical event extraction. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Emanuel A Schegloff and Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4):289–327.
- Mihai Surdeanu, Massimiliano Ciaramita, and Hugo Zaragoza. 2011. Learning to rank answers to non-factoid questions from web collections. *Computational Linguistics*, 37(2).
- Kristina Toutanova, Aria Haghighi, and Christopher D. Manning. 2008. A global joint model for semantic role labeling. *Computational Linguistics*, 34(2):161–191.
- Katsumasa Yoshikawa, Sebastian Riedel, Masayuki Asahara, and Yuji Matsumoto. 2009. Jointly identifying temporal relations with markov logic. In *Proceedings of ACL/IJCNLP*.