

Event extraction using iterative optimization

Aju Thalappillil Scaria
ajuts@stanford.edu

Rishita Anubhai
rishita@stanford.edu

Rose Marie Philip
rosep@stanford.edu

Abstract

Abstract goes here

1 Introduction

This is the introduction section.

2 Previous Work

Most of the work in the area of event and entity extraction can be categorized using different criteria:

- **Coverage and domain** Most of the previous work dealt only with a subset of the four tasks listed as the project goals and dealt with very specific domains. For instance, Chambers 2008 talks about event identification and temporal ordering using narrative event chains. Toutanova deals with argument extraction and semantic role labeling assuming that the trigger words are provided. While Bjorne solves the problem of event and argument extraction almost completely, their event categories and arguments are closely tied to the BIONLP task and hence, would not generalize to event extraction from domain-independent text. Chambers 2009 addresses the areas of all event identification, argument extraction and semantic role labeling using an unsupervised approach.
- **Parsing scheme: Constituency vs Dependency parse** Some of the previous work relied on the constituency parse structure of sentences, while others used the dependency parse structure. For instance Toutanova approaches semantic role labeling as a joint task of argument identification and labeling on the parse tree of the sentence. Bjorne and McClosky focus more on the dependency parse structure of the sentence.

- **Modeling: Graph vs Tree** The work of Bjorne and McClosky are based on graphs and deal with edge prediction, while Toutanova uses tree structure with classification of nodes as an entity or not.

3 Data

In this project, the dataset was prepared by annotating 125 paragraphs from different chapters of the text book *Biology (Eighth Edition)* by Neil A. Campbell and Jane B. Reece. Each paragraph is a text file and has an associated annotation file that indicates the different events and entities (by their character offsets in the original paragraph) and the event-entity and event-event relationships. The annotations were done by experts in the field (employees of the company Vulcan). Since there is not much data at our disposal, we split the data by a proportion of 70-30% for training and testing. We randomly permute the order of files to avoid similarities in adjacent files and then use 10 fold cross validation on the training set. For event prediction, we use F1 score based on the trigger predictions made. In entity prediction, the F1 score is based on whether an entity was predicted correctly along with its association with the corresponding event.

4 Model

This file is for model overview.
This file is for model triggers.
This file is for argument prediction model.
This file is for iterative optimization.
This file is for model on SRL.

5 Results

This section talks about results

6 Analysis

This section is for analysis of models

7 Conclusion

This section is for conclusion

Acknowledgments

Do not number the acknowledgment section. Do not include this section when submitting your paper for review.

References

- Alfred V. Aho and Jeffrey D. Ullman. 1972. *The Theory of Parsing, Translation and Compiling*, volume 1. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- American Psychological Association. 1983. *Publications Manual*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Association for Computing Machinery. 1983. *Computing Reviews*, 24(11):503–512.
- Ashok K. Chandra, Dexter C. Kozen, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. 1981. Alternation. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 28(1):114–133.
- Dan Gusfield. 1997. *Algorithms on Strings, Trees and Sequences*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.