

An application of Spectral Clustering on Named Entity Recognition

Ali Josue Limon; Michele Cerú
ajl649@nyu.edu ; mc3784@nyu.edu

December 7, 2016

Abstract

This study explores the performance of spectral clustering in a Spanish Named Entity Recognition (NER) task. Our approach comprises two main steps. Firstly, we represent each Entity in two different ways: 1) by the embedding vector formed from the entity and 2) by the embedding vector formed from the context and the entity. Then, we use spectral clustering over the words embeddings to analyze whether the words cluster according to their labels or not. In order to train the word embedding, we use Word2Vec algorithm over a huge Spanish Corpus with the skip-gram and CBOW models. Our results suggest that this approach performs better than the standard k-means cluster. However, the clustering accuracy is still very low and this suggests that spectral clustering applied on word embedding is not by itself enough to solve the NER task.

1 Introduction

Named Entity Recognition (NER) is one of the important parts of NLP. It aims to find and classify expressions of special meaning in texts written in natural language. These expressions can belong to different predefined classes such as Person, Organization and Location.

The main algorithms that are currently used for NER in English involve Neural Networks that are trained in a supervised way using large corpora of labeled data. However, in most languages and domains, there is only a very small amount of supervised training data available, and consequently these supervised algorithms are hard to train. Specifically for Spanish, NER is a challenging problem because of the lack of resources and labeled data.

In this paper we investigate whether spectral clustering techniques can be successfully applied to NER in Spanish. In order to do so, we transform the original input, defined by the word2Vector embeddings of entities and context, into a set of orthogonal eigenvectors. Then, We work in the space defined by the first few eigenvectors, using standard clustering techniques in the reduced space.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a explanation of the data used to accomplish the study. Section 3 describes the architecture to create the word embeddings. Section 4 presents our framework for NER and Section 5 explains the metric used to evaluate results. In Section 6 the experiments and results are discussed. Finally, Section 7 presents the conclusions.

2 Data

The experimentation of this work will be carried on a corpora that consist of sentences extracted from news articles. The corpora corresponds to the *CoNLL 2002* Shared Task Spanish data [1], the original source being the *EFE Spanish Newswire Agency*. The data consists of two columns separated by a single space. The first item on each line is a word and the second the named entity tag. In this dataset, there are four types of entities: person names (PER), organizations (ORG), locations (LOC) and miscellaneous names (MISC) and other (O). This dataset contains 11,752 sentences, 369,171 words and 26,706 Name Entities.

In order to create the word embedding, we added to the *CoNLL 2002* dataset an unannotated corpus of the Spanish Billion Words Corpus [2] with a total of 1,420,665,810 raw words, 46,925,295 sentences and 3,817,833 unique tokens. Both Corporuses are preprocessed by replacing all non-alphanumeric characters with whitespaces, all numbers with the token "DIGITO" and all the multiple whitespaces with only one whitespace.

3 Word2Vector Embedding

Word2vec is a two-layer neural net that processes text. Its input is a text corpus and its output is a set of vectors: feature vectors for words in that corpus.

The purpose and usefulness of Word2vec is to group the vectors of similar words together in vectorspace. That is, it detects similarities mathematically. Word2vec creates vectors that are distributed numerical representations of word features, features such as the context of individual words. It does so without human intervention.

Word2Vec works in two ways, either using context to predict a target word (a method known as continuous bag of words, or CBOW), or using a word to predict a target context, which is called skip-gram. For both approaches a neural network is trained with a single hidden layer to perform a certain task depending of the approach. Figure 1 shows the network architecture of CBOW and Skip-gram

4 Problem Formulation

Our first goal is to estimate a vector for each entity that captures a large number of precise syntactic and semantic word relationships. For this purpose, we create an embedding matrix, which will transform the entity's words into a dense word





Figure 1: Word2Vector Algorithm

embedding. To do so, we make use of a simple one-hot vector that represent every word as an $\mathbb{R}^{|V|}$ vector with all 0s and one 1 at the index of that word in the $|V|$ vocabulary created by the embedding Figure 2.


Figure 2: Dense Word Embedding



In this work, each entity can be represented in two different ways. The first one takes into account the embedding of the entity and the second, in addition to the entity, incorporates the embedding of the surrounded words (context). As each entity can be composed by one or more words, we use the average of the embeddings for each word to create the final entity embedding. Figures 3 shows the two approaches used to compute the final entity embedding.

Finally, the clustering is done using spectral cluster algorithm on the entity

Figure 3: Entity embedding under both approaches



embeddings. Results are compared using skip-gram and CBOW algorithms for the word embeddings and using different kernels for the spectral clustering.

5 Evaluation

To compare the different models we ran, we used the Adjusted Rand index [7], that evaluates the accuracy of the predicted labels of the clustering given the ground truth of the label. This index looks at each pair of sample, and evaluate the consistency of the prediction given the true label. Calling C the ground truth clustering and C' the predicted one, there are four possible set of pairs:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{11} &= \{\text{pairs belonging to the same cluster both in } C \text{ and } C'\} \\
 S_{00} &= \{\text{pairs belonging to different cluster both in } C \text{ and } C'\} \\
 S_{10} &= \{\text{pairs belonging to the same cluster both } C \text{ but to different ones in } C'\} \\
 S_{01} &= \{\text{pairs belonging to the same cluster both } C' \text{ but to different ones in } C\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Calling with n_{11} the number of sample in the first set (and analogously for the other sets), the Rand index is defined as:

$$R = \frac{n_{11} + n_{00}}{n_{11} + n_{10} + n_{01} + n_{00}} = \frac{n_{11} + n_{00}}{\binom{n}{2}}$$

where n is the total number of sample. This index range from 0 (when C and C' don't agree on any pair of points) and 1 (when C and C' agree on every pairs). The Adjusted Rand index is defined by rescaling it considering the value that a random clustering would have, doing so the index value is 0 for random clusters.

6 Experiments and Discussion

After Training the model with different combination of parameters (Figure 4), we found that the best model is the one that uses a CBOW embedding with dimension size $d_E = 100$, average over $n_w = 3$ entity context words, and the

Figure 4: Parameters used to train the model

Parameters of the models		
WordEmbedding	CBOW	Embedding Size Context window = 5 Min Occurrences = 5
	Skip-gram	Negative Sampling (Skip-gram)
Spectral Clustering	Kernel	Cosine Similarity K-nearest neighbor $k(x, y) = \exp(-\gamma x - y _1)$
Entity context		No context 1 word 2 words 3 words

cosine similarity as the kernel for spectral clustering. The spectral clustering has also a comparable Rand index value for small values of γ . In Figure 5 we report the results for this two model compared with the Rand index obtained applying k-means clustering to the embedding vectors.

The following table contains the correspondence between the numeric label used for the clusters and its name entity, if also contain the total number of samples for each clusters:

Cluster Label	Name Entity	Samples
0	Organization	7953
1	Location	4743
2	Person	5314
3	Miscellaneous	2441

The figures with the confusion matrices describe how the three models described here (Kmeans (in Figure 7), Spectral with exponential kernel (in Figure 8), and Spectral with Cosine similarity (in Figure 9)) compare with an ideal perfect clustering (in Figure 6). We notice that the worst cluster in every models is the number 3 that correspond with the named entity "Miscellaneous" that is an ambiguous label and therefore it is reasonable that it is not actually possible to obtain a cluster for it.

7 Conclusions

This paper presents a technique for Named Entity Recognition using spectral clustering and word embeddings. The main conclusion given the results is that our approach does not seem to perform very well creating clusters according to the named entities labels. This could be due to the fact that word embeddings representation encloses many different properties of the language, and named entity it is just one of them, consequently it is not possible to achieve a very good cut of the cluster according just to the named entities labels. Even though with




Figure 5: The blue line show the rand index for the exponential kernel model trained for different value of γ . The red line is the best model (cosine similarity) and the green line is the kmeans clustering, report here as a bench mark




Figure 6: True label distribution




Figure 7: Kmeans Clustering




Figure 8: Spectral(exponential kernel)



more tuning of the parameters we could maybe achieve slightly better results, we do not think that this alone could be the solution of the problem.

References

- [1] <http://www.cnts.ua.ac.be/conll2002/ner/>
- [2] <http://crscardellino.me/SBWCE/>
- [3] <http://www.cims.nyu.edu/~bandeira/TenLecturesFortyTwoProblems.pdf>
- [4] Popescu, M., & Hristea, F. (2011). State of the art versus classical clustering for unsupervised word sense disambiguation. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 35(3), 241?264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10462-010-9193-7>.
- [5] <http://crscardellino.me/SBWCE/>
- [6] Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., & Dean, J. (2013). Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- [7] Rand, William M.: Objective Criteria for the Evaluation of Clustering Methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 66(336):846? 850, 1971.