# **A1\_17**

## **Evaluation**

## Part 1: top 5 bigrams with or without smoothing

### Without Sentence starting token

```
Top 5 bigrams without smoothing:
  ('href', 'http'): 1.000
  ('tychelle', 'to'): 1.000
  ('hang', 'out'): 1.000
  ('nonexistent', 'social'): 1.000
   ('alex', 'and'): 1.000
Top 5 bigrams with laplace smoothing:
  ('i', 'feel'): 0.110
  ('feel', 'like'): 0.035
  ('i', 'am'): 0.032
  ('that', 'i'): 0.027
  ('and', 'i'): 0.023
Top 5 bigrams with kneser-ney smoothing:
  ('don', 't'): 0.970
  ('href', 'http'): 0.970
  ('didn', 't'): 0.958
  ('sort', 'of'): 0.957
  ('supposed', 'to'): 0.918
```

### With Sentence starting token as @

```
Top 5 bigrams without smoothing:
    ('href', 'http'): 1.000
    ('tychelle', 'to'): 1.000
    ('hang', 'out'): 1.000
    ('nonexistent', 'social'): 1.000
    ('alex', 'and'): 1.000
```

```
Top 5 bigrams with laplace smoothing:
    ('@', 'i'): 0.269
    ('i', 'feel'): 0.110
    ('feel', 'like'): 0.035
    ('i', 'am'): 0.032
    ('@', 'im'): 0.027
```

```
Top 5 bigrams with kneser-ney smoothing:
    ('don', 't'): 0.970
    ('href', 'http'): 0.970
    ('didn', 't'): 0.958
    ('sort', 'of'): 0.957
    ('supposed', 'to'): 0.918
```

## Part 2: Reasoning for emotion component

For our bigram final probability we have two components:

- Probability score based on the total bigram occurrences
- Emotion scores generated using the <a href="motion\_score">emotion\_score</a> API provided.

We are taking weighted mean of these components i.e.

```
count_prob = count(w_i, w_i_minus_1) / count(w_i_minus_1)
emotion_score = emotion_scores(wi, w_i_minus_1)[emotion][score]
```

A1\_17 2

```
final_probability = w1*count_prob + w2*emotion_score {where w1
```

The weights which are w1 and w2 depends upon the emotion\_score . We have set up the thresholds for the emotion\_score which indicate that "use these weights given this score". The basic intuition is that if the emotion\_score for a bigram is not very high then reduce the emotion component and increase the count component (which loosely translates to if this bigram have more probability of not being part of the given emotion than being part of it then does not rely too much on this probability and consider the occurrences of this bigram). If bigram is a part of this emotion with high probability then increase the emotion component and reduce the occurrence component.

$$eta=rac{w2}{w1}\{where:w1+w2=1\}$$

The thresholds are as follows:

```
if emotion_score > 0.9 then w1 = 0.1 and w2 = 0.9
if emotion_score < 0.5 then w1 = 0.9 and w2 = 0.1
if emotion_score < 0.7 then w1 = 0.6 and w2 = 0.4
else w1 = 0.3 and w2 = 0.7
```

### Part 3

2 generated samples for each emotion, for a total of 12 generated samples

### **Sadness**

- i forgot my despair in vain today i find my disappointment that side of dumb when non make is ungrateful hellip and suffer the ugly
- ill do an awful feeling pain of losing at am devastated when they missed yoga because that unwell it dirty src rte emoticons smile tha

### Joy

- i did feel and heals them integrated with loreal max factor and delighted in retrospect if ahead of peacefulness her nicely
- id enjoy the beauty plus the support the jasmine green tea next year are likely to educating writers go of pleasantness is steady hands careess

### **Surprise**

- i can never done a surprised us media policy and curiosity is amazing tools met again last five or stunned by being impressed that shocked
- im shocked my funny cuz its only amazing when were people harrass me shocked over so funny to teach me shocked looking it would sing

### **Fear**

- i caught in another intrusion to use headphones sick but seriously feel frightened or uncomfortable etc pp
- i accidentally feel nervous and shaking for fear because arun has such and sensitive nature and indecisive because thats when reading beware here be proved

### Anger

- no description feel rebellious i ran away i possibly can insist and plastic slippers for months you who am again though the judge passing sentence
- is killing my hair a lot lately and blowing my time but ill desperately trying something so tortured enough away for hating myself not curl

#### Love

 i loved for sharing your beloved nakahara mai would like caring in too cheap so delicate pressure on loved ones name for accepting and compassionate • i feel caring in brave men will contain some sort of hot blanket than fond toward though i wish than fond of caring about supporting

## Part 4: Accuracy and macro F1 scores

### **Accuracy**

- 0.86666666666666
- 0.896666666666666
- 0.866666666666667
- 0.8333333333333334
- 0.8766666666666667
- 0.886666666666667
- 0.90666666666666
- 0.8566666666666667
- 0.893333333333333
- 0.86
- 0.8733333333333333
- 0.886666666666667
- 0.8766666666666667
- 0.89
- 0.86
- 0.87
- 0.90666666666666
- 0.87
- 0.93
- 0.88

These are the accuracies of our model for 20 different iterations. Each iteration generate 50 sentences for each emotion. Average accuracy for our test is as follows:

0.8793333333333333

### **Classification Report**

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
anger	0.94	0.64	0.76	50

fear	0.88	0.92	0.90	50
joy	0.89	0.78	0.83	50
love	0.83	1.00	0.91	50
sadness	0.83	0.96	0.89	50
surprise	0.94	0.98	0.96	50
accuracy			0.88	300
macro avg	0.89	0.88	0.88	300
weighted avg	0.89	0.88	0.88	300

### Part 5: Reasoning behind these sentence generation

#### **Define Models for Each Emotion**

```
models = {
    "sadness": Bigram_LM(),
    "joy": Bigram_LM(),
    "surprise": Bigram_LM(),
    "fear": Bigram_LM(),
    "anger": Bigram_LM(),
    "love": Bigram_LM()
}
```

We have generated 6 models for each emotion which has initially been initialized with the Bigram\_LM class. For each bigram we have called the emotion\_scores() corresponding to each bigram and depending on the beta calculation we have populated the bigram probability.

Refer to Part-2 to better understand how the models are trained.

### **Choosing the First Token**

We have stored the first token in the form of ("@", <first-token>) for each corresponding sentence.

```
starting_word = random.choices(starting_bigrams, starting_bigram
```

Starting word is determined probabilistically with the above formula.

### **Sentence generation process**

Depending on the first token which was appended in the sentence, the next word is determined depending on the last word appended to the sentence.

```
next_word = sample_next_word(model, sentence[-1])
```

A list of candidates word is generated for each last word in the sentence and then the process is continued using the formula given below.

```
next_word_probs = [model.bigram_probs[(previous_token, word)] for
return random.choices(candidate_words_list, next_word_probs)[0]
```

We have set the <code>Max\_length = 25</code> and <code>Min\_length = 10</code> so until a token with no bigram is found the sentence will continue to form if the length is less than <code>Max\_length</code>. If we encounter the last token when sentence is less 10 words then we randomly choose a bigram using the random.choices() function.

### Part 6: contributions

Note: Any part is not actually done by a particular student still we are able to enlist contributions.

### Lakshay Chauhan (2021060):

- Task1: BPE\_Tokenizer.learn()
- Task2: Bigram\_LM.learn()
- Task2: Kneser-Ney.bigram\_probability()
- Task2: Bigram emotion scores generation
- Task2: beta optimization

A1\_17 7

Task1: debugging

Task2: debugging

### Krishna Somani (2021058)

Task2: Laplace.bigram\_probability()

• Task2: generate samples()

• Task2: beta optimization

• Task2: min max length optimization,

· Task1: debugging

Task2: debugging

### **Mayank Gupta (2021058)**

• Task1: BPE Tokenizer.learn()

Task2: Unigram optimization()

Task2: Bigram\_LM.sample\_next\_word()

Task2: beta optimisation

• Task2: Entrinsic evaluation

Task1: debugging

Task2: debugging

### **Arnav Singh (2021019)**

• Task2: Entrinsic evaluation

Task1: debugging

Task2: debugging

• Evaluation part1: top 5 for each smoothing,

• Task2: unigram emotion scores generation