

# Natural Language Processing

## Home Assignment 1

### Problem 1:

Compute the edit distance (using insertion cost = 1, deletion cost = 1, substitution cost = 1) of "leda" to "deal". Show your work (using the edit distance grid) We derive the edit distance between words "leda" and "deal", according to the next algorithm [1]:

```
function MIN-EDIT-DISTANCE(source, target) returns min-distance

  n ← LENGTH(source)
  m ← LENGTH(target)
  Create a distance matrix distance[n+1,m+1]

  # Initialization: the zeroth row and column is the distance from the empty string
  D[0,0] = 0
  for each row i from 1 to n do
    D[i,0] ← D[i-1,0] + del-cost(source[i])
  for each column j from 1 to m do
    D[0,j] ← D[0,j-1] + ins-cost(target[j])

  # Recurrence relation:
  for each row i from 1 to n do
    for each column j from 1 to m do
      D[i,j] ← MIN( D[i-1,j] + del-cost(source[i]),
                     D[i-1,j-1] + sub-cost(source[i],target[j]),
                     D[i,j-1] + ins-cost(target[j]))

  # Termination
  return D[n,m]
```

Figure 1: The minimum edit distance algorithm (Dynamic Programming). The divergent costs can be applied (i.e.,  $\forall x, ins - cost(x) = 2$ ). Assume that there is no cost for the substitution of the letter by itself or  $sub - cost(x, x) = 0$ ) [1].

Table 1 illustrates the obtained edit distance grid for "leda" and "deal".

Table 1: Edit distance grid for "leda" and "deal"

Src	#	l	e	d	a
#	0	1	2	3	4
d	1	1	2	3	3
e	2	2	1	2	3
a	3	2	2	2	3
l	4	3	3	2	3

Hence, the Levenshtein distance between "leda" and "deal" is 3:

l	e	d	a	
d	e		a	l

## Problem 2:

Figure out whether "drive" is closer to "brief" or to "divers" and what the edit distance is to each. You may use any version of distance that you like.

To begin with, we determine the edit distance (using insertion cost = 1, deletion cost = 1, substitution cost = 1) among *drive* and *brief* (Table 2).

Table 2: Edit distance grid for "drive" and "brief"

Src	#	b	r	i	e	f
#	0	1	2	3	4	5
d	1	1	2	3	4	5
r	2	2	1	2	3	4
i	3	3	2	1	2	3
v	4	4	3	2	2	3
e	5	5	4	3	2	3

Next, we derive edit distance between "drive" and "divers" (Table 3).

Table 3: Edit distance grid for "drive" and "divers"

Src	#	d	i	v	e	r	s
#	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
d	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
r	2	1	1	2	3	3	4
i	3	2	1	2	3	4	4
v	4	3	2	1	2	3	4
e	5	4	3	2	1	2	3

The Levenshtein distance between "drive" and "brief" is 3:

d	r	i	v	e	
b	r	i		e	f

The Levenshtein distance between "drive" and "divers" is 3:

d	r	i	v	e		
d		i	v	e	r	s

Thus, the edit distance between "*drive*" and "*belief*" is the same as "drive" and "*divers*".

### Problem 3:

Now implement a minimum edit distance algorithm and use your hand-computed results to check your code.

**Figure 2** demonstrates the code for implementing minimum edit distance algorithm.

```
def levenshteinDistance(temp, temp2):
    if len(temp) > len(temp2):
        temp = temp2
        temp2 = temp

    dist = range(len(temp) + 1)

    for ind, ind2 in enumerate(temp2):
        temp_dist = [ind+1]
        for iind, iind2 in enumerate(temp):
            if iind2 != ind2:
                temp_dist.append(1 + min((dist[iind], \
                                           dist[iind + 1], temp_dist[-1])))
            else:
                temp_dist.append(dist[iind])

        dist = temp_dist

    return dist[-1]
```

Figure 2: The minimum edit distance algorithm (Dynamic Programming) (using insertion cost = 1, deletion cost = 1, substitution cost = 1)

**Figure 3** displays the results of the experiments with *drive*, *divers*, *brief*, *belief*, *leda* and *deal*. The same results were obtained manually.

```
In [61]: levenshteinDistance("leda", "divers")
Out[61]: 5

In [62]: levenshteinDistance("drive", "brief")
Out[62]: 3

In [63]: levenshteinDistance("drive", "divers")
Out[63]: 3

In [64]: levenshteinDistance("leda", "deal")
Out[64]: 3

In [65]: levenshteinDistance("drive", "belief")
Out[65]: 5
```

Figure 3: Experimenting with the implemented minimum edit distance algorithm

## References

- [1] Jurafsky D., Martin J., Speech and Language Processing, An Introduction to Natural Language Processing, Computational Linguistics, and Speech Recognition, Stanford University, University of Colorado at Boulder, 2017, p. 28-30