Lecture 5: Sequence Models II

Alan Ritter

(many slides from Greg Durrett, Dan Klein, Vivek Srikumar, Chris Manning, Yoav Artzi)

Recall: HMMs

- Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)$

Recall: HMMs

- Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)$



Recall: HMMs

- Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)$



$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=2}^{n} P(y_i | y_{i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | y_i)$$

Recall: HMMs

- Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)$



$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=2}^{n} P(y_i | y_{i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | y_i)$$

- Training: maximum likelihood estimation (with smoothing)

Recall: HMMs

- Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)$



$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=2}^{n} P(y_i | y_{i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | y_i)$$

- Training: maximum likelihood estimation (with smoothing)
- Inference problem: $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} \frac{P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})}{\cancel{P(\mathbf{x})}}$

Recall: HMMs

- Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_n)$



$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=2}^{n} P(y_i|y_{i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i|y_i)$$

- Training: maximum likelihood estimation (with smoothing)
- Inference problem: $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} \frac{P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})}{\cancel{P(\mathbf{x})}}$
- Viterbi: $\text{score}_i(s) = \max_{y_{i-1}} P(s|y_{i-1}) P(x_i|s) \text{score}_{i-1}(y_{i-1})$

This Lecture

- CRFs: model (+features for NER), inference, learning
- Named entity recognition (NER)
- (if time) Beam search

Named Entity Recognition

Named Entity Recognition

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Named Entity Recognition

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

PERSON LOC ORG

Named Entity Recognition

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*
PERSON					LOC				ORG		

- BIO tagset: begin, inside, outside

Named Entity Recognition

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*
PERSON					LOC				ORG		

- BIO tagset: begin, inside, outside
- Sequence of tags — should we use an HMM?
- Why might an HMM not do so well here?

Named Entity Recognition

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*
PERSON					LOC				ORG		

- BIO tagset: begin, inside, outside
- Sequence of tags — should we use an HMM?
- Why might an HMM not do so well here?
  - Lots of O's, so tags aren't as informative about context

Named Entity Recognition

B-PER I-PER O O O B-LOC O O O B-ORG O O

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

PERSON LOC ORG

- BIO tagset: begin, inside, outside
- Sequence of tags — should we use an HMM?
- Why might an HMM not do so well here?
  - Lots of O's, so tags aren't as informative about context
  - Insufficient features/capacity with multinomials (especially for unks)

CRFs

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs are expressible as Bayes nets (factor graphs)



Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs are expressible as Bayes nets (factor graphs)



- This reflects the following decomposition:

$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$$

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs are expressible as Bayes nets (factor graphs)



- This reflects the following decomposition:

$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$$

- Locally normalized model: each factor is a probability distribution that normalizes

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$
- CRFs: discriminative models with the following globally-normalized form:

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\dots$
- CRFs: discriminative models with the following globally-normalized form:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$
- CRFs: discriminative models with the following globally-normalized form:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

normalizer

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$
- CRFs: discriminative models with the following globally-normalized form:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

normalizer

any real-valued scoring function of its arguments

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$

- CRFs: discriminative models with the following globally-normalized form:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

normalizer

any real-valued scoring function of its arguments

- Naive Bayes : logistic regression :: HMMs : CRFs

  local vs. global normalization <-> generative vs. discriminative

Conditional Random Fields

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$

- CRFs: discriminative models with the following globally-normalized form:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

normalizer

any real-valued scoring function of its arguments

- Naive Bayes : logistic regression :: HMMs : CRFs
  local vs. global normalization <-> generative vs. discriminative

- Locally normalized discriminative models do exist (MEMMs)

Sequential CRFs

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$



- CRFs:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

Sequential CRFs

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$



- CRFs:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))$$

Sequential CRFs

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$



- CRFs:



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))$$

Sequential CRFs

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$





- CRFs:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1},y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i,y_i))$$

Sequential CRFs

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$





- CRFs:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))$$

Sequential CRFs

- HMMs: $P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\ldots$



- CRFs:



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_k \exp(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))$$

Sequential CRFs



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))$$

Sequential CRFs



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))$$

- We condition on **x**, so every factor can depend on all of **x** (including transitions, but we won't do this)

Sequential CRFs



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \cancel{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))}$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

- We condition on **x**, so every factor can depend on all of **x** (including transitions, but we won't do this)

Sequential CRFs



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \cancel{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))}$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

token index — lets us look at current word

- We condition on **x**, so every factor can depend on all of **x** (including transitions, but we won't do this)

Sequential CRFs



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \cancel{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))}$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

token index — lets us look at current word

- We condition on **x**, so every factor can depend on all of **x** (including transitions, but we won't do this)

Sequential CRFs



$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\phi_o(y_1)) \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \cancel{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(x_i, y_i))}$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

token index — lets us look at current word

- We condition on **x**, so every factor can depend on all of **x** (including transitions, but we won't do this)
- **y** can't depend arbitrarily on **x** in a generative model

Sequential CRFs



Sequential CRFs



- Notation: omit **x** from the factor graph entirely (implicit)

Sequential CRFs



- Notation: omit **x** from the factor graph entirely (implicit)

Sequential CRFs



- Notation: omit **x** from the factor graph entirely (implicit)
- Don't include initial distribution, can bake into other factors

Sequential CRFs



- Notation: omit **x** from the factor graph entirely (implicit)
- Don't include initial distribution, can bake into other factors

Sequential CRFs:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

Feature Functions

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



Feature Functions

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Phis can be almost anything! Here we use linear functions of sparse features

Feature Functions

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Phis can be almost anything! Here we use linear functions of sparse features

$$\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) = w^\top f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})$$

Feature Functions

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Phis can be almost anything! Here we use linear functions of sparse features

$$\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) = w^\top f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \quad \phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) = w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)$$

Feature Functions

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1},y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x}))$$



- Phis can be almost anything! Here we use linear functions of sparse features

$$\phi_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x}) = w^\top f_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x}) \qquad \phi_t(y_{i-1},y_i) = w^\top f_t(y_{i-1},y_i)$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1},y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x})\right]$$

Feature Functions

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Phis can be almost anything! Here we use linear functions of sparse features

$$\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) = w^\top f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \qquad \phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) = w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Looks like our single weight vector multiclass logistic regression model

Basic Features for NER

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Basic Features for NER

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

O B-LOC

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Basic Features for NER

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

O B-LOC

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Transitions: $f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) = \mathrm{Ind}[y_{i-1} \ \& \ y_i]$ = Ind[O — B-LOC]

Basic Features for NER

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

O B-LOC

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Transitions: $f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) = \text{Ind}[y_{i-1} \;\&\; y_i]$ = Ind[O — B-LOC]

Emissions: $f_e(y_6, 6, \mathbf{x}) =$

Basic Features for NER

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

O B-LOC

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Transitions: $f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) = \mathrm{Ind}[y_{i-1} \ \& \ y_i]$ = Ind[O — B-LOC]

Emissions: $f_e(y_6, 6, \mathbf{x}) =$ Ind[B-LOC & Current word = *Hangzhou*]

Basic Features for NER

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

O B-LOC

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Transitions: $f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) = \mathrm{Ind}[y_{i-1} \ \& \ y_i]$ = Ind[O — B-LOC]

Emissions: $f_e(y_6, 6, \mathbf{x}) =$ Ind[B-LOC & Current word = *Hangzhou*]

Ind[B-LOC & Prev word = *to*]

Features for NER

$$\boxed{\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})}$$

LOC

Leicestershire is a nice place to visit…

PER

Leonardo DiCaprio won an award…

LOC

I took a vacation to Boston

ORG

Apple released a new version…

LOC PER

Texas governor Greg Abbott said

ORG

According to the New York Times…

Features for NER

- Word features (can use in HMM)
  - Capitalization
  - Word shape
  - Prefixes/suffixes
  - Lexical indicators
- Context features (can't use in HMM!)
  - Words before/after
  - Tags before/after
- Word clusters
- Gazetteers

Leicestershire

Boston

Apple released a new version…

According to the New York Times…

CRFs Outline

- Model: $P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1},y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x}))$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1},y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Inference

- Learning

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\mathrm{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

$$= \max_{y_2,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \max_{y_1} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\mathrm{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

$$= \max_{y_2,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \boxed{\max_{y_1}} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

$$= \max_{y_2,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \boxed{\max_{y_1}} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \underbrace{e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}}$$

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

$$= \max_{y_2,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \boxed{\max_{y_1}} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \underbrace{e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}}$$

$$= \max_{y_3,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots \max_{y_2} e^{\phi_t(y_2,y_3)} e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \max_{y_1} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \text{score}_1(y_1)$$

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

$$= \max_{y_2,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \boxed{\max_{y_1}} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \underbrace{e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}}$$

$$= \max_{y_3,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots \max_{y_2} e^{\phi_t(y_2,y_3)} \underbrace{e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \max_{y_1} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \text{score}_1(y_1)}$$

Computing (arg)maxes

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$: can use Viterbi exactly as in HMM case

$$\max_{y_1,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}$$

$$= \max_{y_2,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \boxed{\max_{y_1}} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \underbrace{e^{\phi_e(y_1,1,\mathbf{x})}}$$

$$= \max_{y_3,\ldots,y_n} e^{\phi_t(y_{n-1},y_n)} e^{\phi_e(y_n,n,\mathbf{x})} \ldots \max_{y_2} e^{\phi_t(y_2,y_3)} \underbrace{e^{\phi_e(y_2,2,\mathbf{x})} \max_{y_1} e^{\phi_t(y_1,y_2)} \text{score}_1(y_1)}$$

- $\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))$ and $\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$ play the role of the Ps now, same dynamic program

Inference in General CRFs



Inference in General CRFs

- Can do inference in any tree-structured CRF



Inference in General CRFs

- Can do inference in any tree-structured CRF



- Max-product algorithm: generalization of Viterbi to arbitrary tree-structured graphs (sum-product is generalization of forward-backward)

CRFs Outline

- Model: $$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Inference: argmax P(**y**|**x**) from Viterbi

- Learning

Training CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

Training CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Logistic regression: $P(y|x) \propto \exp w^\top f(x, y)$

Training CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Logistic regression: $P(y|x) \propto \exp w^\top f(x, y)$
- Maximize $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \log P(\mathbf{y}^*|\mathbf{x})$

Training CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Logistic regression: $P(y|x) \propto \exp w^\top f(x, y)$
- Maximize $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \log P(\mathbf{y}^*|\mathbf{x})$
- Gradient is completely analogous to logistic regression:

Training CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

- Logistic regression: $P(y|x) \propto \exp w^\top f(x, y)$
- Maximize $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \log P(\mathbf{y}^*|\mathbf{x})$
- Gradient is completely analogous to logistic regression:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}} \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right]$$

Training CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Logistic regression: $P(y|x) \propto \exp w^\top f(x, y)$
- Maximize $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \log P(\mathbf{y}^*|\mathbf{x})$
- Gradient is completely analogous to logistic regression:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y^*_{i-1}, y^*_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y^*_i, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}} \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

intractable!

Training CRFs

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y^*_{i-1}, y^*_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y^*_i, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

Training CRFs

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Let's focus on emission feature expectation

Training CRFs

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$
$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Let's focus on emission feature expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

Training CRFs

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$
$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Let's focus on emission feature expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right] = \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{Y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

Training CRFs

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Let's focus on emission feature expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right] = \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{Y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{Y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})$$

Training CRFs

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Let's focus on emission feature expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right] = \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{Y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{Y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s} P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) f_e(s, i, \mathbf{x})$$

Computing Marginals

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



Computing Marginals

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1},y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x}))$$



- Normalizing constant $Z = \sum_{\mathbf{y}}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1},y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i,i,\mathbf{x}))$

Computing Marginals

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Normalizing constant $Z = \sum_{\mathbf{y}}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$
- Analogous to P(**x**) for HMMs

Computing Marginals

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Normalizing constant $Z = \sum_{\mathbf{y}}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$
- Analogous to P(**x**) for HMMs
- For both HMMs and CRFs:

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'}\text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

Computing Marginals

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$



- Normalizing constant $Z = \sum_{\mathbf{y}} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i)) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$
- Analogous to P(**x**) for HMMs
- For both HMMs and CRFs:

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

Z for CRFs, P(**x**) for HMMs

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

	$P(x_i|y_i), P(y_i|y_{i-1})$
HMM	Model parameter (usually multinomial distribution)

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

	$P(x_i|y_i), P(y_i|y_{i-1})$	$P(y_i|\mathbf{x}), P(y_{i-1}, y_i|\mathbf{x})$
HMM	Model parameter (usually multinomial distribution)	

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

	$P(x_i\|y_i), P(y_i\|y_{i-1})$	$P(y_i\|\mathbf{x}), P(y_{i-1}, y_i\|\mathbf{x})$
HMM	Model parameter (usually multinomial distribution)	Inferred quantity from forward-backward

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

	$P(x_i \mid y_i), P(y_i \mid y_{i-1})$	$P(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}), P(y_{i-1}, y_i \mid \mathbf{x})$
HMM	Model parameter (usually multinomial distribution)	Inferred quantity from forward-backward
CRF		

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

	$P(x_i \mid y_i), P(y_i \mid y_{i-1})$	$P(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}), P(y_{i-1}, y_i \mid \mathbf{x})$
HMM	Model parameter (usually multinomial distribution)	Inferred quantity from forward-backward
CRF	Undefined (model is by definition conditioned on **x**)	

Posteriors vs. Probabilities

$$P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\text{forward}_i(s)\text{backward}_i(s)}{\sum_{s'} \text{forward}_i(s')\text{backward}_i(s')}$$

- Posterior is *derived* from the parameters and the data (conditioned on **x**!)

	$P(x_i|y_i), P(y_i|y_{i-1})$	$P(y_i|\mathbf{x}), P(y_{i-1}, y_i|\mathbf{x})$
HMM	Model parameter (usually multinomial distribution)	Inferred quantity from forward-backward
CRF	Undefined (model is by definition conditioned on **x**)	Inferred quantity from forward-backward

Training CRFs

- For emission features:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s} P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) f_e(s, i, \mathbf{x})$$

Training CRFs

- For emission features:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s} P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) f_e(s, i, \mathbf{x})$$

gold features — expected features under model

Training CRFs

- For emission features:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s} P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) f_e(s, i, \mathbf{x})$$

gold features — expected features under model

- Transition features: need to compute $P(y_i = s_1, y_{i+1} = s_2|\mathbf{x})$ using forward-backward as well

CRFs Outline

- Model: $$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z}\prod_{i=2}^{n}\exp(\phi_t(y_{i-1}, y_i))\prod_{i=1}^{n}\exp(\phi_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x}))$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp w^\top \left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

- Inference: argmax P(**y**|**x**) from Viterbi

- Learning: run forward-backward to compute posterior probabilities; then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s} P(y_i = s|\mathbf{x}) f_e(s, i, \mathbf{x})$$

Pseudocode

```
for each epoch
    for each example
```

Pseudocode

```
for each epoch
    for each example
        extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)
```

Pseudocode

```
for each epoch
    for each example
        extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)
        compute potentials phi based on features + weights
```

Pseudocode

```
for each epoch
    for each example
        extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)
        compute potentials phi based on features + weights
        compute marginal probabilities with forward-backward
```

Pseudocode

```
for each epoch
    for each example
        extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)
        compute potentials phi based on features + weights
        compute marginal probabilities with forward-backward
        accumulate gradient over all emissions and transitions
```

How to “Cheat” with Automatic Differentiation

for each epoch

    for each example

        extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)

        compute potentials phi based on features + weights

        compute marginal probabilities with forward-backward

        accumulate gradient over all emissions and transitions

How to “Cheat” with Automatic Differentiation

for each epoch

  for each example

    extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)

    compute potentials phi based on features + weights

    ~~compute marginal probabilities with forward-backward~~

    accumulate gradient over all emissions and transitions

How to “Cheat” with Automatic Differentiation

for each epoch

for each example

extract features on each emission and transition (look up in cache)

compute potentials phi based on features + weights

~~compute marginal probabilities with forward-backward~~

accumulate gradient over all emissions and transitions

- Compute P(Y|X), using the forward algorithm to get Z(X)
- Use auto-diff through the computation graph of the dynamic program, to compute gradients.

Structured SVM / Structured Perceptron

Structured Perceptron

- Structured Perceptron Update:

$$\hat{y} = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} w^\top f(x, y)$$

$$w = w + f(x, y^*) - f(x, \hat{y})$$

Structured Perceptron

- Structured Perceptron Update:

$$\hat{y} = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} w^\top f(x, y)$$

Viterbi Algorithm

$$w = w + f(x, y^*) - f(x, \hat{y})$$

Structured Perceptron

- Structured Perceptron Update:

$$\hat{y} = \ \text{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} w^\top f(x, y) \longleftarrow \text{Viterbi Algorithm}$$

$$w = w + f(x, y^*) - f(x, \hat{y})$$

- Compare to gradient of CRF:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y^*_{i-1}, y^*_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y^*_i, i, \mathbf{x})$$
$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

Structured Perceptron

- Structured Perceptron Update:

$$\hat{y} = \ \mathrm{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} w^\top f(x, y)$$

Viterbi Algorithm

$$w = w + f(x, y^*) - f(x, \hat{y})$$

- Compare to gradient of CRF:

Replaces Expectation
With argmax

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}^*, y_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i^*, i, \mathbf{x})$$
$$-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_e(y_i, i, \mathbf{x})\right]$$

Structured SVM

Structured SVM

- CRF: $\log P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$

Structured SVM

- CRF: $\log P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$
- We can formulate an SVM using the same features

Structured SVM

- CRF: $\log P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$
- We can formulate an SVM using the same features

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Structured SVM

- CRF: $\log P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$
- We can formulate an SVM using the same features

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Minimize $\lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j$

Structured SVM

- CRF: $\log P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$
- We can formulate an SVM using the same features

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Minimize $\lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j$

s.t. $\forall j \quad \xi_j \geq 0$

$\forall j \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \quad w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j^*) \geq w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}) + \ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}_j^*) - \xi_j$

Structured SVM

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Minimize $\lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j$

s.t. $\forall j \quad \xi_j \geq 0$

$\forall j \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \quad w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j^*) \geq w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}) + \ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}_j^*) - \xi_j$

Structured SVM

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Minimize $\lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j$

s.t. $\forall j \quad \xi_j \geq 0$

$\forall j \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \quad w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j^*) \geq w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}) + \ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}_j^*) - \xi_j$

- Exponentially large state space! Use Viterbi for loss-augmented decode

Structured SVM

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Minimize $\lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j$

s.t. $\forall j \quad \xi_j \geq 0$

$\forall j \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \quad w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j^*) \geq w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}) + \ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}_j^*) - \xi_j$

- Exponentially large state space! Use Viterbi for loss-augmented decode
- Same as normal Viterbi but boost wrong labels’ scores by 1 (if using Hamming loss)

Structured SVM

$$w^\top f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} w^\top f_t(y_{i-1}, y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w^\top f_e(x_i, y_i)$$

Minimize $\lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j$

s.t. $\forall j \quad \xi_j \geq 0$

$\forall j \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \quad w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j^*) \geq w^\top f(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}) + \ell(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}_j^*) - \xi_j$

- Exponentially large state space! Use Viterbi for loss-augmented decode
- Same as normal Viterbi but boost wrong labels' scores by 1 (if using Hamming loss)
- Only need Viterbi, not forward-backward…hmm…

NER

NER

NER

- CRF with lexical features can get around 85 F1 on this problem

NER

- CRF with lexical features can get around 85 F1 on this problem
- Other pieces of information that many systems capture

NER

- CRF with lexical features can get around 85 F1 on this problem
- Other pieces of information that many systems capture
- World knowledge:

NER

- CRF with lexical features can get around 85 F1 on this problem
- Other pieces of information that many systems capture
- World knowledge:

  The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

NER

- CRF with lexical features can get around 85 F1 on this problem
- Other pieces of information that many systems capture
- World knowledge:

The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

Tanjug

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Tanjug (/ˈtʌnjʊɡ/) (Serbian Cyrillic: Танјуг) is a Serbian state news agency based in Belgrade.[2]

Nonlocal Features

The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

Finkel and Manning (2008), Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Nonlocal Features

ORG?
PER?

The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

Finkel and Manning (2008), Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Nonlocal Features

The news agency Tanjug reported on the outcome of the meeting.

ORG?

PER?

The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

Finkel and Manning (2008), Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Nonlocal Features

The news agency Tanjug reported on the outcome of the meeting.

ORG?

PER?

The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

Finkel and Manning (2008), Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Nonlocal Features

The news agency Tanjug reported on the outcome of the meeting.

ORG?

PER?

The delegation met the president at the airport, Tanjug said.

- More complex factor graph structures can let you capture this, or just decode sentences in order and use features on previous sentences

Finkel and Manning (2008), Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Semi-Markov Models

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

Sarawagi and Cohen (2004)

Semi-Markov Models

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

- Chunk-level prediction rather than token-level BIO

Sarawagi and Cohen (2004)

Semi-Markov Models

$\underbrace{\textit{Barack Obama}}_{\text{PER}}\ \underbrace{\textit{will travel to}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\textit{Hangzhou}}_{\text{LOC}}\ \underbrace{\textit{today for the}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\textit{G20}}_{\text{ORG}}\ \underbrace{\textit{meeting .}}_{\text{O}}$

- Chunk-level prediction rather than token-level BIO

Sarawagi and Cohen (2004)

Semi-Markov Models

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

$\underbrace{\text{Barack Obama}}_{\text{PER}}\ \underbrace{\text{will travel to}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\text{Hangzhou}}_{\text{LOC}}\ \underbrace{\text{today for the}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\text{G20}}_{\text{ORG}}\ \underbrace{\text{meeting .}}_{\text{O}}$

- Chunk-level prediction rather than token-level BIO
- ***y*** is a set of touching spans of the sentence

Sarawagi and Cohen (2004)

Semi-Markov Models

$\underbrace{\textit{Barack Obama}}_{\text{PER}}\ \underbrace{\textit{will travel to}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\textit{Hangzhou}}_{\text{LOC}}\ \underbrace{\textit{today for the}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\textit{G20}}_{\text{ORG}}\ \underbrace{\textit{meeting .}}_{\text{O}}$

- Chunk-level prediction rather than token-level BIO
- ***y*** is a set of touching spans of the sentence
- Pros: features can look at whole span at once

Sarawagi and Cohen (2004)

Semi-Markov Models

$\underbrace{\textit{Barack Obama}}_{\text{PER}}\ \underbrace{\textit{will travel to}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\textit{Hangzhou}}_{\text{LOC}}\ \underbrace{\textit{today for the}}_{\text{O}}\ \underbrace{\textit{G20}}_{\text{ORG}}\ \underbrace{\textit{meeting .}}_{\text{O}}$

- Chunk-level prediction rather than token-level BIO
- ***y*** is a set of touching spans of the sentence
- Pros: features can look at whole span at once
- Cons: there's an extra factor of *n* in the dynamic programs

Sarawagi and Cohen (2004)

Evaluating NER

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*
PERSON					LOC				ORG		

Evaluating NER

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*

PERSON LOC ORG

- Prediction of all Os still gets 66% accuracy on this example!

Evaluating NER

B-PER I-PER O O O B-LOC O O O B-ORG O O

Barack Obama will travel to Hangzhou today for the G20 meeting .

PERSON LOC ORG

- Prediction of all Os still gets 66% accuracy on this example!
- What we really want to know: how many named entity *chunk* predictions did we get right?

Evaluating NER

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*
PERSON					LOC				ORG		

- Prediction of all Os still gets 66% accuracy on this example!
- What we really want to know: how many named entity *chunk* predictions did we get right?
  - Precision: of the ones we predicted, how many are right?

Evaluating NER

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*

PERSON LOC ORG

- Prediction of all Os still gets 66% accuracy on this example!
- What we really want to know: how many named entity *chunk* predictions did we get right?
  - Precision: of the ones we predicted, how many are right?
  - Recall: of the gold named entities, how many did we find?

Evaluating NER

B-PER	I-PER	O	O	O	B-LOC	O	O	O	B-ORG	O	O
Barack	*Obama*	*will*	*travel*	*to*	*Hangzhou*	*today*	*for*	*the*	*G20*	*meeting*	*.*
PERSON					LOC				ORG		

- Prediction of all Os still gets 66% accuracy on this example!
- What we really want to know: how many named entity *chunk* predictions did we get right?
  - Precision: of the ones we predicted, how many are right?
  - Recall: of the gold named entities, how many did we find?
  - F-measure: harmonic mean of these two

How well do NER systems do?

	System	Resources Used	F_1
+	LBJ-NER	Wikipedia, Nonlocal Features, Word-class Model	90.80
-	(Suzuki and Isozaki, 2008)	Semi-supervised on 1G-word unlabeled data	89.92
-	(Ando and Zhang, 2005)	Semi-supervised on 27M-word unlabeled data	89.31
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007a)	Wikipedia	88.02
-	(Krishnan and Manning, 2006)	Non-local Features	87.24
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007b)	Non-local Features	87.17
+	(Finkel et al., 2005)	Non-local Features	86.86

Ratinov and Roth (2009)

How well do NER systems do?

	System	Resources Used	F_1
+	LBJ-NER	Wikipedia, Nonlocal Features, Word-class Model	90.80
-	(Suzuki and Isozaki, 2008)	Semi-supervised on 1G-word unlabeled data	89.92
-	(Ando and Zhang, 2005)	Semi-supervised on 27M-word unlabeled data	89.31
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007a)	Wikipedia	88.02
-	(Krishnan and Manning, 2006)	Non-local Features	87.24
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007b)	Non-local Features	87.17
+	(Finkel et al., 2005)	Non-local Features	86.86

Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Lample et al. (2016)

LSTM-CRF (no char)	90.20
LSTM-CRF	**90.94**
S-LSTM (no char)	87.96
S-LSTM	90.33

How well do NER systems do?

	System	Resources Used	F_1
+	LBJ-NER	Wikipedia, Nonlocal Features, Word-class Model	90.80
-	(Suzuki and Isozaki, 2008)	Semi-supervised on 1G-word unlabeled data	89.92
-	(Ando and Zhang, 2005)	Semi-supervised on 27M-word unlabeled data	89.31
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007a)	Wikipedia	88.02
-	(Krishnan and Manning, 2006)	Non-local Features	87.24
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007b)	Non-local Features	87.17
+	(Finkel et al., 2005)	Non-local Features	86.86

Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Lample et al. (2016)

LSTM-CRF (no char)	90.20
LSTM-CRF	**90.94**
S-LSTM (no char)	87.96
S-LSTM	90.33

BiLSTM-CRF + ELMo
Peters et al. (2018) **92.2**

How well do NER systems do?

	System	Resources Used	F_1
+	LBJ-NER	Wikipedia, Nonlocal Features, Word-class Model	90.80
-	(Suzuki and Isozaki, 2008)	Semi-supervised on 1G-word unlabeled data	89.92
-	(Ando and Zhang, 2005)	Semi-supervised on 27M-word unlabeled data	89.31
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007a)	Wikipedia	88.02
-	(Krishnan and Manning, 2006)	Non-local Features	87.24
-	(Kazama and Torisawa, 2007b)	Non-local Features	87.17
+	(Finkel et al., 2005)	Non-local Features	86.86

Ratinov and Roth (2009)

Lample et al. (2016)

LSTM-CRF (no char)	90.20
LSTM-CRF	**90.94**
S-LSTM (no char)	87.96
S-LSTM	90.33

BiLSTM-CRF + ELMo
Peters et al. (2018) **92.2**

BERT-Large
Devlin et al. (2019) **92.8**

Beam Search

Viterbi Time Complexity

VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN
Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent

Viterbi Time Complexity

VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN
Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent

- n word sentence, s tags to consider — what is the time complexity?

Viterbi Time Complexity

Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent
VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN

Fed raises interest rates 0.5 percent

- n word sentence, s tags to consider — what is the time complexity?



Viterbi Time Complexity

VBD
VBN VBZ VB VBP VBZ
NNP NNS NN NNS CD NN
Fed raises interest rates 0.5 percent

- n word sentence, s tags to consider — what is the time complexity?

sentence

tags



- $O(ns^2)$ — s is ~40 for POS, n is ~20

Viterbi Time Complexity

VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN
Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent

Viterbi Time Complexity

Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent
VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN

Fed raises interest rates 0.5 percent

- Many tags are totally implausible

Viterbi Time Complexity

VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN
Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent

- Many tags are totally implausible
- Can any of these be:
  - Determiners?
  - Prepositions?
  - Adjectives?

Viterbi Time Complexity

Fed	raises	interest	rates	0.5	percent
VBD		VB			
VBN	VBZ	VBP	VBZ		
NNP	NNS	NN	NNS	CD	NN

Fed raises interest rates 0.5 percent

- Many tags are totally implausible
- Can any of these be:
  - Determiners?
  - Prepositions?
  - Adjectives?
- Features quickly eliminate many outcomes from consideration — don't need to consider these going forward

Beam Search

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep

Fed

raises

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Fed

raises

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep

VBD +1.2

NNP +0.9

Fed

raises

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



- Maintain priority queue to efficiently add things

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



- Maintain priority queue to efficiently add things

- Beam size of k, time complexity

Beam Search

- Maintain a beam of *k* plausible states at the current timestep
- Expand all states, only keep *k* top hypotheses at new timestep



- Maintain priority queue to efficiently add things

- Beam size of k, time complexity O(nks log(ks))

How good is beam search?

How good is beam search?

- k=1: greedy search

How good is beam search?

- k=1: greedy search
- Choosing beam size:

How good is beam search?

- k=1: greedy search
- Choosing beam size:
  - 2 is usually better than 1

How good is beam search?

- k=1: greedy search
- Choosing beam size:
  - 2 is usually better than 1
  - Usually don’t use larger than 50

How good is beam search?

- k=1: greedy search
- Choosing beam size:
  - 2 is usually better than 1
  - Usually don’t use larger than 50
  - Depends on problem structure

How good is beam search?

- k=1: greedy search
- Choosing beam size:
  - 2 is usually better than 1
  - Usually don't use larger than 50
  - Depends on problem structure
- If beam search is much faster than computing full sums, can use structured perceptron instead of CRFs
- Very similar to structured SVM