LING571 – Hw4  
Probabilistic Cocke-Kasami-Younger Parsing

# Overview

I worked alone to complete this assignment.

# Challenges

The biggest challenge for this assignment was reading the assignment brief.

In the end, I created the following mapping, which helped me out a lot. (Please feel free to use it for future cohorts.)

+--------------------------------+----------------------+

| treebank\_filename | parses.train |

| output\_PCFG\_file | hw4\_trained.pcfg |

| test\_sentence\_filename | sentences.txt |

| baseline\_parse\_output\_filename | parses\_base.out |

| input\_PCFG\_file | hw4\_trained.pcfg |

| improved\_parse\_output\_filename | parses\_improved.out |

| baseline\_eval | parses\_base.eval |

| improved\_eval | parses\_improved.eval |

+--------------------------------+----------------------+

# Learning Outcomes

Give examples if possible

This was an interesting assignment and a good review of condition probabilities. Having already done Ling 572 and Ling 570, I was pleased that the calculation of conditional probability was intuitive and relatively straightforward.

My base implementation achieved accuracy of 99.04% with a runtime of about 7 seconds. I think that this is pretty good, both in terms of efficiency and accuracy. In part, I believe the high accuracy is because my original CNF implementation relied on a back-trace mechanism that returned *all* possible parses and it was simple to adapt that algorithm to also return the probability of each parse and select the highest *global* parse, as opposed to making a greedy, local assessments along the way.

# Improvements

Make sure to discuss the improvements you implemented and compare your 'improved' results to your baseline results.

The baseline implementation achieved 99.04% accuracy even without handling out-of-vocabulary (OOV) symbols; so certainly, being able to handle OOV would go a long way to improving the accuracy even further.

I decided to make improvements to my parser and did so in the following ways:

* Using log probabilities rather than simple probabilities.

This really didn’t have nearly as much of an effect as I expected. This didn’t appear to affect tagging accuracy at all with both versions reporting 99.04%.

However, a marginal improvement was noticed in Bracketing Recall, Bracketing Precision, and Bracketing FMeasure, which all improved equivalently from 87.74 to 88.05.

Average crossing, however, seemed to degraded from 0.53 to 0.49.

# Closing Comments

# Completeness

I was able to complete the assignment.