

to infer $|a||c|$ from $|b||c|$...

$\{a\}^{L_2} \{b\}^{L_1} \{c\} \rightarrow$ intervals

$\hookrightarrow L\emptyset = \{ |a||b||c|, |a|b||c|, |a|a,b||c|, |a|a,b|a||c|, |a|a,b|b||c|, |a,b||c|, |a,b|a||c|, |a,b|b||c|, |b|a,b||c|, |b|a,b|a||c|, |b|a,b|b||c|, |b||a||c|, |b|a||c| \}$

$s \in L\emptyset = |a||b||c|, \text{voc}(s) = \{a, b, c\}$

\vdots
 $v \in \text{voc}(s) = \{a, b\}$

$\pi_v(s) = |a||b| = p$

$\text{resid}(p, L_1, L_2) \rightarrow$

$p \& L_1 = \{ |a||b||c| \} \Rightarrow H$

$m \in L_2 = |a||c|, \text{voc}(m) = \{a, c\} = \text{voc}_m$

$\pi_{\text{voc}_m}(H) = m$

$$\pi_m(H) = m$$

$$|a||b| = |a|/|b| \quad \checkmark$$

if $|a||b|$ is a residual,

Collect all

$gap(L, L') \rightarrow L = \text{premises}, L' = \text{conclusions}$

$$L \& L' = \{s'' \mid s \in L, s' \in L', s \& s' = s''\}$$

$$p(L, L') = \alpha = \{\pi_v(s'') \mid \forall s'' \in L \& L', \forall V \subseteq \text{vocabulary}(s'')\}$$

$$\beta = \alpha \& L$$

$$\gamma = \{a \mid a \in \alpha, \forall s' \in L', \pi_{\text{voc}(s')}(a) \equiv s'\}$$

$$\{\pi_v(s'') \mid \forall s'' \in L \& L', \forall V \subseteq \text{voc}(s'') (\forall s \in L)$$

$$(\forall r \in \pi_v(s'') \& s) (\forall s' \in L') \pi_{\text{voc}(s')}(r) \equiv s'\}$$

$$\min \hat{L} = \{r \mid r \in \hat{L}, \forall V \subseteq \text{voc}(r), \pi_v(r) \notin L'\}$$

$$gap(\boxed{b|c}, \boxed{a|c}) =$$

$$\boxed{a,b} + \boxed{a|a,b} + \boxed{b|a,b} + \boxed{a|c}$$

Note: Tim's gap.pdf has the premises + conclusion the other way around.

$$A = \{a, b, c\}$$

$$L_A = \boxed{a} \& \boxed{b} \& \boxed{c} + \boxed{a} \& \boxed{b} + \boxed{a} \& \boxed{c} + \boxed{b} \& \boxed{c} \\ + \boxed{a} + \boxed{b} + \boxed{c} + \epsilon \dots \#L_A = 1+1+1+3+3+3+13 = 26$$

$$s' = \boxed{b|c}, s = \boxed{a|c}$$

$$\llbracket s \rrbracket_A = \{ \boxed{a|c}, \boxed{b|a|c}, \boxed{a,b|c}, \\ \boxed{a|b,c}, \boxed{a|b|c}, \boxed{a|c|b} \} = \llbracket L \rrbracket_A$$

$$\llbracket s' \rrbracket_A = \{ \boxed{b|c}, \boxed{a,b|c}, \boxed{b|a|c}, \\ \boxed{b|a,c}, \boxed{b|c|a}, \boxed{a|b|c} \} = \llbracket L' \rrbracket_A$$

$$G = \{ \boxed{a,b}, \boxed{a|b}, \boxed{a|c} \} = \text{gap}(L, L')$$

$$\llbracket G \rrbracket_A = \{ \boxed{c|a,b}, \boxed{a,b|c}, \boxed{a,b|c}, \boxed{a,b} \} \cup \\ \{ \boxed{a|b}, \boxed{c|a|b}, \boxed{a|b|c}, \boxed{a|c|b}, \boxed{a,c|b}, \boxed{a|b,c} \} \cup \\ \{ \boxed{a|c}, \boxed{b|a|c}, \boxed{a|b|c}, \boxed{a|c|b}, \boxed{a,b|c}, \boxed{a|b,c} \}$$

↳ = above, non-highlighted...

$$\llbracket L' \rrbracket_A \cap \llbracket G \rrbracket_A = \{ \boxed{a,b|c}, \boxed{b|a|c}, \boxed{a|b|c} \} \subseteq \llbracket L \rrbracket_A$$

$$\llbracket L' \rrbracket_A \cap \llbracket L \rrbracket_A = \{ \boxed{a,b|c}, \boxed{b|a|c}, \boxed{a|b|c} \} \subseteq \llbracket G \rrbracket_A$$

$$\text{res}_A(L, L') =$$

Annotation part / semantics part
extra guidelines

1 ^{summary} conference papers / TimeML
applying SP

2 Inference problems / DRT
+ residuals + Fracas "test suite"

• Evaluation is important to ADAPT
but tricky for us → Fracas is all we've got

• Differing granularities: challenges

• Formal evaluation? i.e. formal semantics

- Intro

↪ - TimeML / TLINKS

- Literature Review

- DRT → existing

→ input DRT becomes output strings

→ Need to evaluate correctness of output

↳ WRT PMB examples ← adding value

↳ Manual evaluation

- objective decision on correctness of output
 - can my manipulations produce something incorrect? No
 - can I construe a proof of this
 - Fracas
 - if access to productive boxer
 - Do we get what Fracas says we should? This is also evaluation of a sort
-

Doesn't have to be a corpus evaluation

TEA?

- Manual evaluation?
 - manually convert to strings and show the inferences held
 - demonstrates the aspectuality
-

Zebra/scheduling?

- Primer on finite state temporality ch. like lit. review
- showing operations in action as

much as possible + reminders
to help the examiners as often
as possible

Make T.O.C.

Applications → code in appendix
↳ Linked w/ formal definitions
↳ show implementation
↳ evaluate correctness of code
demonstrably → maybe not formal
correctness proofs
→ test suites? would be good.