

CS388: Natural Language Processing

Lecture 15: HMMs, POS

Greg Durrett



TEXAS

The University of Texas at Austin



Administrivia

- ▶ Project 3 due Thursday
- ▶ No class Thursday, Greg's office hours canceled Thursday (on for Wednesday)



Where are we in the course?

- ▶ So far, we have studied Transformer language models, which form representations of text *latently* via embeddings (using self attention + feedforward layers)
- ▶ So far, we have studied Transformer language models, which form representations of text *latently* via embeddings (using self attention + feedforward layers)



Language is Ambiguous!

From the start of the semester: “Teacher Strikes Idle Kids”



You

What would be some possible consequences of the events in an article with the following headline: "Teacher Strikes Idle Kids"?




ChatGPT

An article with the headline "Teacher Strikes Idle Kids" suggests a situation where teacher strikes have led to school closures, leaving students without formal education and supervision. Such events can have multiple consequences, affecting various stakeholders. Here are some possible consequences:

1. **Educational Setbacks:** Students may face delays in learning, potentially impacting their academic progress. Extended strikes can lead to gaps in knowledge, difficulties in catching up, and disruptions in the academic calendar.
2. **Social and Emotional Impact:** School provides a structured environment for


What is GPT-4 doing here?

example credit: Dan Klein



Where are we in the course?

- ▶ So far, we have studied Transformer language models, which form representations of text *latently* via embeddings (using self attention + feedforward layers)
- ▶ Many discrete decisions about the structure of language are made in Transformer models
- ▶ How can we have a symbolic system (+ models) for representing what those decisions look like?



Where are we in the course?

- ▶ Next three lectures: structured prediction. Produce representations of language as sequences and trees
- ▶ Language has hierarchical structure:



- ▶ Understanding syntax fundamentally requires trees — the sentences have the same shallow analysis. But the first step we'll take towards understanding this is understanding **parts of speech**

NN NNS VBZ NNS
Teacher strikes idle kids

VBP
I **record** the video

NN
I listen to the **record**



This Lecture

- ▶ Part-of-speech tagging
- ▶ Hidden Markov Models, parameter estimation
- ▶ Viterbi algorithm
- ▶ POS taggers
- ▶ NER, CRFs, state-of-the-art in sequence modeling

POS Tagging



POS Tagging

Open class (lexical) words

Nouns

Proper

IBM

Italy

Common

cat / cats

snow

Verbs

Main

see

registered

Adjectives

yellow

Adverbs

slowly

Numbers

122,312

one

... more

Closed class (functional)

Determiners

the some

Conjunctions

and or

Pronouns

he its

Auxiliary

can

had


Prepositions

to with

Particles

off up

... more



POS Tagging

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

I hereby
increase interest
rates 0.5%



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

I'm 0.5% interested
in the Fed's raises!




- ▶ Other paths are also plausible but even more semantically weird...
- ▶ What governs the correct choice? Word + context
 - ▶ Word identity: most words have ≤ 2 tags, many have one (*percent, the*)
 - ▶ Context: nouns start sentences, nouns follow verbs, etc.

Hidden Markov Models



Hidden Markov Models

- ▶ Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$
- ▶ Model the sequence of tags \mathbf{y} over words \mathbf{x} as a Markov process
- ▶ Markov property: future is conditionally independent of the past given the present




- ▶ If \mathbf{y} are tags, this roughly corresponds to assuming that the next tag only depends on the current tag, not anything before



Hidden Markov Models


- ▶ Input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ Output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ $y \in T$ = set of possible tags (including STOP);



- $x \in V$ = vocab of words


$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = P(y_1) \underbrace{\prod_{i=2}^n P(y_i | y_{i-1})}_{\text{Initial distribution}} \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i | y_i)}_{\text{Transition probabilities}} \underbrace{\quad}_{\text{Emission probabilities}}$$

- ▶ Observation (x) depends only on current state (y)




HMMs: Parameters

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



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

- ▶ Initial distribution: $|T| \times 1$ vector (distribution over initial states)
- ▶ Emission distribution: $|T| \times |V|$ matrix (distribution over words per tag)
- ▶ Transition distribution: $|T| \times |T|$ matrix (distribution over next tags per tag)



HMMs Example

Tags = {N , V, STOP}

Vocabulary = {they, can, fish}

| Initial | | Transition | | | Emission | | | |
|---------|------|------------|-----------|------|----------|-----|------|--|
| | | y_i | | | x_i | | | |
| | | N | V | STOP | they | can | fish | |
| y_1 | N | 1.0 | y_{i-1} | N | 1/5 | 3/5 | 1/5 | |
| | V | 0 | | V | 1/5 | 1/5 | 3/5 | |
| | STOP | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | y_i | | | N | 1 | 0 | |
| | | | | | V | 0 | 1/2 | |
| | | | | | STOP | 1 | 1/2 | |



Transitions in POS Tagging

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
| VBD | VB | | | | |
| VBN | VBZ | VBP | VBZ | | |
| NNP | NNS | NN | NNS | CD | NN |

Fed raises interest rates 0.5 percent


- ▶ $P(y_1 = \text{NNP})$ likely because start of sentence
- ▶ $P(y_2 = \text{VBZ}|y_1 = \text{NNP})$ likely because verb often follows noun
- ▶ $P(y_3 = \text{NN}|y_2 = \text{VBZ})$: direct object can follow verb
- ▶ How are these probabilities learned?



Training HMMs


- ▶ Transitions
 - ▶ Count up all pairs (y_i, y_{i+1}) in the training data
 - ▶ Count up occurrences of what tag T can transition to
 - ▶ Normalize to get a distribution for $P(\text{next tag} \mid T)$
 - ▶ Need to *smooth* this distribution, won't discuss here
- ▶ Emissions: similar count + normalize scheme, but trickier smoothing!
- ▶ You can write down the log likelihood and it is exactly optimized by this count + normalize scheme, so no need for SGD!

Inference: Viterbi Algorithm



Inference in HMMs

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





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


- ▶ Inference problem: $\text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} \frac{P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})}{P(\mathbf{x})}$
- ▶ Exponentially many possible \mathbf{y} here!
- ▶ Solution: dynamic programming (possible because of **Markov structure!**)



$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$




slide credit: Vivek Srikumar



$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \end{aligned}$$

The only terms that depend on y_1



slide credit: Vivek Srikumar




$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$


$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1) \end{aligned}$$

Abstract away the score for all decisions till here into **score**

- ▶ Best (partial) score for a sequence ending in state s


$$\text{score}_1(s) = P(s)P(x_1|s)$$






$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3) \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1) \end{aligned}$$



Only terms that depend on y_2







$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3) \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3) \text{score}_2(y_2) \end{aligned}$$


$$\text{score}_i(s) = \max_{y_{i-1}} P(s|y_{i-1})P(x_i|s)\text{score}_{i-1}(y_{i-1})$$



Abstract away the score for all decisions till here into **score**



Viterbi Algorithm



- ▶ “Think about” all possible immediate prior state values. Everything before that has already been accounted for by earlier stages.



$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$

$$\max_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)$$


$$= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1)$$

$$= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1)$$

$$= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3) \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2) \text{score}_1(y_1)$$

$$= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3) \text{score}_2(y_2)$$

:



Abstract away the score for all decisions till here into **score**

slide credit: Vivek Srikumar



$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) = P(y_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} P(y_{i+1}|y_i) \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i|y_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)P(y_1)P(x_1|y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_2, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\text{score}_1(y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3) \max_{y_1} P(y_2|y_1)P(x_2|y_2)\text{score}_1(y_1) \\ &= \max_{y_3, \dots, y_n} P(y_n|y_{n-1})P(x_n|y_n) \cdots \max_{y_2} P(y_3|y_2)P(x_3|y_3)\text{score}_2(y_2) \\ &\vdots \\ &= \max_{y_n} \text{score}_n(y_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{score}_1(s) = P(s)P(x_1|s)$$

$$\text{score}_i(s) = \max_{y_{i-1}} P(s|y_{i-1})P(x_i|s)\text{score}_{i-1}(y_{i-1})$$

1. **Initial:** For each state s , calculate

$$\text{score}_1(s) = P(s)P(x_1|s) = \pi_s B_{x_1,s}$$

2. **Recurrence:** For $i = 2$ to n , for every state s , calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\text{score}_i(s) &= \max_{y_{i-1}} P(s|y_{i-1})P(x_i|s)\text{score}_{i-1}(y_{i-1}) \\ &= \max_{y_{i-1}} A_{y_{i-1},s}B_{s,x_i}\text{score}_{i-1}(y_{i-1})\end{aligned}$$

3. **Final state:** calculate

$$\max_{\mathbf{y}} P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}|\pi, A, B) = \max_s \text{score}_n(s)$$

π : Initial probabilities

A : Transitions

B : Emissions

This only calculates the max. To get final answer (*argmax*),


- keep track of which state corresponds to the max at each step
- build the answer using these back pointers

POS Taggers



HMM POS Tagging

- ▶ Penn Treebank English POS tagging: 44 tags
- ▶ Baseline: assign each word its most frequent tag: ~90% accuracy
- ▶ Trigram HMM (states are *pairs* of tags): ~95% accuracy / 55% on words not seen in train
- ▶ TnT tagger (Brants 1998, tuned HMM): 96.2% acc / 86.0% on unks
- ▶ CRF tagger (Toutanova + Manning 2000): 96.9% / 87.0%
- ▶ State-of-the-art (BiLSTM-CRFs, BERT): 97.5% / 89%+



Errors


| | JJ | NN | NNP | NNPS | RB | RP | IN | VB | VBD | VBN | VBP | Total |
|-------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-------|
| JJ | 0 | 177 | 56 | 0 | 61 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 108 | 0 | 488 |
| NN | 244 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 5 | 6 | 19 | 525 |
| NNP | 107 | 106 | 0 | 132 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 427 |
| NNPS | 1 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 |
| RB | 72 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 138 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 295 |
| RP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| IN | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 169 | 103 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 323 |
| VB | 17 | 64 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 85 | 189 |
| VBD | 10 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 143 | 2 | 166 |
| VBN | 101 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 108 | 0 | 1 | 221 |
| VBP | 5 | 34 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 49 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 104 |
| Total | 626 | 536 | 348 | 144 | 317 | 122 | 279 | 102 | 140 | 269 | 108 | 3651 |

JJ/**NN** NN
official knowledge

VBD RP/**IN** DT NN
made up the story

RB VBD/**VBN** NNS
recently sold shares

(NN NN: tax cut, art gallery, ...)



Remaining Errors

- ▶ Lexicon gap (word not seen with that tag in training) 4.5%
- ▶ Unknown word: 4.5%
- ▶ Could get right: 16% (many of these involve parsing!)
- ▶ Difficult linguistics: 20%

VBD / VBP? (past or present?)

They set up absurd situations, detached from reality

- ▶ Underspecified / unclear, gold standard inconsistent / wrong: 58%

adjective or verbal participle? JJ / VBN?

a \$ 10 million fourth-quarter charge against discontinued operations



Other Languages

| Language | CRF+ | CRF | BTS | BTS* |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Bulgarian | 97.97 | 97.00 | 97.84 | 97.02 |
| Czech | 98.38 | 98.00 | 98.50 | 98.44 |
| Danish | 95.93 | 95.06 | 95.52 | 92.45 |
| German | 93.08 | 91.99 | 92.87 | 92.34 |
| Greek | 97.72 | 97.21 | 97.39 | 96.64 |
| English | 95.11 | 94.51 | 93.87 | 94.00 |
| Spanish | 96.08 | 95.03 | 95.80 | 95.26 |
| Farsi | 96.59 | 96.25 | 96.82 | 96.76 |
| Finnish | 94.34 | 92.82 | 95.48 | 96.05 |
| French | 96.00 | 95.93 | 95.75 | 95.17 |
| Indonesian | 92.84 | 92.71 | 92.85 | 91.03 |
| Italian | 97.70 | 97.61 | 97.56 | 97.40 |
| Swedish | 96.81 | 96.15 | 95.57 | 93.17 |
| AVERAGE | 96.04 | 95.41 | 95.85 | 95.06 |


Óscar Romero was born in El Salvador.

SEGMENT



SPANS


[S0, L13, PER] [S26, L11, LOC]



Gillick et al. 2016

- Universal POS tagset (~12 tags), cross-lingual model works as well as tuned CRF using external resources

NER



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
 - ▶ Insufficient features/capacity with multinomials (especially for unks)



HMMs Pros and Cons

- ▶ Big advantage: transitions, scoring pairs of adjacent y's



- ▶ Big downside: not able to incorporate useful word context information
- ▶ Solution: switch from generative to discriminative model (conditional random fields) so we can condition on the *entire input*.
- ▶ Conditional random fields: logistic regression + features on pairs of y's

Conditional Random Fields




Conditional Random Fields

- ▶ Flexible discriminative model for tagging tasks that can use arbitrary features of the input. Similar to logistic regression, but *structured*

B-PER I-PER

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



Curr_word=Barack & Label=B-PER


Next_word=Obama & Label=B-PER

Curr_word_starts_with_capital=True & Label=B-PER

Posn_in_sentence=1st & Label=B-PER

Label=B-PER & Next-Label = I-PER

...




Tagging with Logistic Regression

- ▶ Logistic regression over each tag individually: “different features” approach to

$$P(y_i = y | \mathbf{x}, i) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}(y, i, \mathbf{x}))}{\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}(y', i, \mathbf{x}))}$$

↑ features for a single tag

Probability of the i th word getting assigned tag y (B-PER, etc.)



Tagging with Logistic Regression

- ▶ Logistic regression over each tag individually: “different features” approach to

$$P(y_i = y | \mathbf{x}, i) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}(y, i, \mathbf{x}))}{\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}(y', i, \mathbf{x}))}$$

↑ features for a single tag

- ▶ Over all tags:

$$P(\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}} | \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(y_i = \tilde{y}_i | \mathbf{x}, i) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}(\tilde{y}_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right)$$

- ▶ Score of a prediction: sum of weights dot features over each individual predicted tag (this is a simple CRF but not the general form)
- ▶ Set Z equal to the product of denominators
- ▶ Conditional model: \mathbf{x} is observed, unlike in HMMs



Example: “Emission Features” f_e

B-PER I-PER O O

Barack Obama will travel


$$\text{feats} = f_e(\text{B-PER}, i=1, x) + f_e(\text{I-PER}, i=2, x) + f_e(\text{O}, i=3, x) + f_e(\text{O}, i=4, x)$$

[CurrWord=*Obama* & label=I-PER, PrevWord=*Barack* & label=I-PER,
CurrWordIsCapitalized & label=I-PER, ...]

B-PER B-PER O O

Barack Obama will travel

$$\text{feats} = f_e(\text{B-PER}, i=1, x) + \color{blue}{f_e(\text{B-PER}, i=2, x)} + f_e(\text{O}, i=3, x) + f_e(\text{O}, i=4, x)$$



Adding Structure

$$P(\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}(\tilde{y}_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right)$$

- ▶ We want to be able to learn that some tags don't follow other tags — want to have features on tag *pairs*

$$P(\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}_e(\tilde{y}_i, i, \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}_t(\tilde{y}_{i-1}, \tilde{y}_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right)$$

- ▶ Score: sum of weights dot \mathbf{f}_e features over each predicted tag (“emissions”) plus sum of weights dot \mathbf{f}_t features over tag pairs (“transitions”)
- ▶ This is a sequential CRF



Example

B-PER I-PER O O

Barack Obama will travel

$$\begin{aligned} \text{feats} = & f_e(\text{B-PER}, i=1, x) + f_e(\text{I-PER}, i=2, x) + f_e(\text{O}, i=3, x) + f_e(\text{O}, i=4, x) \\ & + f_t(\text{B-PER}, \text{I-PER}, i=1, x) + f_t(\text{I-PER}, \text{O}, i=2, x) + f_t(\text{O}, \text{O}, i=3, x) \end{aligned}$$

B-PER B-PER O O

Barack Obama will travel

$$\begin{aligned} \text{feats} = & f_e(\text{B-PER}, i=1, x) + \color{blue}{f_e(\text{B-PER}, i=2, x)} + f_e(\text{O}, i=3, x) + f_e(\text{O}, i=4, x) \\ & + \color{red}{f_t(\text{B-PER}, \text{B-PER}, i=1, x)} + f_t(\text{B-PER}, \text{O}, i=2, x) + f_t(\text{O}, \text{O}, i=3, x) \end{aligned}$$


- ▶ *Obama* can start a new named entity (**emission feats** look okay), but we're not likely to have two PER entities in a row (**transition feats**)



Sequential CRFs

$$P(\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}_e(\tilde{y}_i, i, \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{f}_t(\tilde{y}_{i-1}, \tilde{y}_i, i, \mathbf{x}) \right)$$

- ▶ **Critical property:** this structure allows us to use dynamic programming (Viterbi) to sum or max over all sequences
- ▶ **Inference:** use Viterbi, just replace probabilities with exponentiated weights * features
- ▶ **Learning:** need another dynamic program (forward-backward) to compute gradients



CRFs Today

- ▶ Can generalize CRFs to work with neural networks (including BERT): “neural CRFs” for tagging (Lample et al., 2016), parsing (Durrett and Klein, 2015; Dozat and Manning, 2016)
- ▶ Why aren’t CRFs used more today?
 - ▶ We don’t often need to **score** transitions: If you have hard constraints (e.g., cannot follow B-PER with I-ORG), you can simply integrate these into inference. Train BERT to predict each label individually, then use Viterbi to get a coherent sequence.
 - ▶ ChatGPT and other such systems are decent at learning structural constraints — so bigger models also learn most of the constraints you really want



Takeaways

- ▶ POS and NER are two ways of capturing sequential structures
 - ▶ POS: syntax, each word has a tag
 - ▶ NER: spans, but we can turn them into tags with BIO
- ▶ Can handle these with generative or discriminative models, but CRFs are most typically used (although these days you can also just ask ChatGPT...)
- ▶ Next time: move from sequences to trees