

# Natural Language Processing

## MEMMs and CRFs

Felipe Bravo-Marquez

June 17, 2021

# MEMMs

## Maximum-Entropy Markov Models

- The goal of sequence labeling is to assign tags to words, or more generally, to assign discrete labels to discrete elements in a sequence [Eisenstein, 2018].
- Well known examples of this problem are: part-of-speech tagging (POS) and Named Entity Recognition (NER).
- Maximum-entropy Markov models (MEMMs) make use of log-linear multi-class models for sequence labeling tasks [McCallum et al., 2000].
- In the early NLP literature, logistic regression was often called maximum entropy classification [Eisenstein, 2018].
- Hence, MEMMs will look very similar to the multi-class softmax models seen in the lecture about linear models.
- In contrast to HMMs, here we rely on parameterized functions.

## Hidden Markov Models

# MEMMs

- The goal of MEMMs is model the following conditional distribution:

$$P(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m | x_1, \dots, x_m)$$

- Where each  $x_j$  for  $j = 1 \dots m$  is the  $j$ -th input symbol (for example the  $j$ -th word in a sentence), and each  $s_j$  for  $j = 1 \dots m$  is the  $j$ -th tag.<sup>1</sup>
- We would expect  $P(\text{DET}, \text{NOUN}, \text{VERB} | \text{the}, \text{dog}, \text{barks})$  to be higher than  $P(\text{VERB}, \text{VERB}, \text{VERB} | \text{the}, \text{dog}, \text{barks})$  in a model trained from a POS-tagging training dataset.

---

<sup>1</sup>These slides are based on lecture notes of Michael Collins

<http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~mcollins/crf.pdf>. The notation and terminology has been adapted to be consistent with the rest of the course.

# MEMMs

- We use  $S$  to denote the set of possible tags.
- We assume that  $S$  is a finite set.
- For example, in part-of-speech tagging of English,  $S$  would be the set of all possible parts of speech in English (noun, verb, determiner, preposition, etc.).
- Given a sequence of words  $x_1, \dots, x_m$ , there are  $k^m$  possible part-of-speech sequences  $s_1, \dots, s_m$ , where  $k = |S|$  is the number of possible parts of speech.
- We want to estimate a distribution over these  $k^m$  possible sequences.

# MEMMs

- In a first step, MEMMs use the following decomposition ( $s_0$  has always a special tag \*):

$$\begin{aligned} P(s_1, s_2 \dots, s_m | x_1, \dots, x_m) &= \prod_{i=1}^m P(s_i | s_1 \dots, s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m P(s_i | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

- The first equality is exact (it follows by the chain rule of conditional probabilities).
- The second equality follows from an independence assumption, namely that for all  $i$ ,

$$P(s_i | s_1 \dots, s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) = P(s_i | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m)$$

# MEMMs

- Hence we are making a first order Markov assumption similar to the Markov assumption made in HMMs<sup>2</sup>.
- The tag in the  $i$ -th position depends only on the tag in the  $(i - 1)$ -th position.
- Having made these independence assumptions, we then **model each term using a multiclass log-linear (softmax) model**:

$$P(s_i | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i))}{\sum_{s' \in S} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s'))} \quad (2)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>We actually made a second order Markov assumption in HMMs. MEMMs can also be extended to second order assumptions.

# MEMMs

Here  $\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)$  is a feature vector where:

- $x_1, \dots, x_m$  is the entire sentence being tagged.
- $i$  is the position to be tagged (can take any value from 1 to  $m$ ).
- $s_{i-1}$  is the previous tag value (can take any value in  $S$ ).
- $s_i$  is the new tag value (can take any value in  $S$ ).

The scope of the feature vector is **restricted** to the whole input sequence  $x_1, x_m$ , and only the previous and current tag values. This **restriction allows efficient training** of both **MEMMs and CRFs**.

# Example of Features used in Part-of-Speech Tagging

1.  $\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)_{[1]} = 1$  if  $s_i = \text{ADVERB}$  and word  $x_i$  ends in “-ly”; 0 otherwise.

If the weight  $\vec{w}_{[1]}$  associated with this feature is large and positive, then this feature is essentially saying that we prefer labelings where words ending in -ly get labeled as ADVERB.

2.  $\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)_{[2]} = 1$  if  $i = 1$ ,  $s_i = \text{VERB}$ , and  $x_m = ?$ ; 0 otherwise.

If the weight  $\vec{w}_{[2]}$  associated with this feature is large and positive, then labelings that assign VERB to the first word in a question (e.g., “Is this a sentence beginning with a verb?”) are preferred.

3.  $\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)_{[3]} = 1$  if  $s_{i-1} = \text{ADJECTIVE}$  and  $s_i = \text{NOUN}$ ; 0 otherwise. Again, a positive weight for this feature means that adjectives tend to be followed by nouns.

4.  $\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)_{[4]} = 1$  if  $s_{i-1} = \text{PREPOSITION}$  and  $s_i = \text{PREPOSITION}$ . A negative weight  $\vec{w}_{[4]}$  for this function would mean that prepositions don't tend to follow prepositions.

<sup>3</sup>Source: <https://blog.echen.me/2012/01/03/introduction-to-conditional-random-fields/>



# Feature Templates

It is possible to define more general feature templates covering unigrams, bigrams, n-grams of words as well as tag values of  $s_{i-1}$  and  $s_i$ .

1. A word unigram and tag unigram feature template:

$$\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)_{[index(j,z)]} = 1 \text{ if } s_i = \text{TAG}_{[j]} \text{ and } x_i = \text{WORD}_{[z]}; 0 \text{ otherwise } \forall j, z.$$

Notice that  $j$  is an index spanning all possible tags in  $S$  and  $z$  is another index spanning the words in the vocabulary  $V$ .

2. A word bigram and tag bigram feature template:

$$\vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i)_{[index(j,z,u,v)]} = 1 \text{ if } s_{i-1} = \text{TAG}_{[j]} \text{ and } s_i = \text{TAG}_{[z]} \text{ and } x_{i-1} = \text{WORD}_{[u]} \text{ and } x_i = \text{WORD}_{[v]}; 0 \text{ otherwise } \forall j, z, u, v.$$

The function  $index(j, k, \dots)$  will map each different feature to a unique index in the feature vector.

Notice that the resulting vector will be very high-dimensional and sparse.

## Example

$$P(s_i | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i))}{\sum_{s' \in S} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s'))}$$

Example:

1	2	3	4
The	dog	barks	loudly
DT	NN	VB	ADV

Let's check that  $P(s_4 = \text{ADV} | s_3 = \text{VB, the,dog,barks,loudly}) > P(s_4 = \text{VB} | s_3 = \text{VB, the,dog,barks,loudly})$

$$P(s_4 = \text{ADV} | s_3 = \text{VB, the,dog,barks,loudly}) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, ADV}))}{\sum_{s' \in S} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, } s'))}$$

$$P(s_4 = \text{VB} | s_3 = \text{VB, the,dog,barks,loudly}) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, VB}))}{\sum_{s' \in S} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, } s'))}$$

# Example

This is the same as checking if:

$$\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, ADV}) > \vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, VB})$$

$\vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, ADV})$

$$\downarrow$$

1
1
0
0
0
0
0
1

←  $s_i = \text{ADV}$  and  $x_i$  ends in “-ly” →

←  $s_i = \text{ADV}$  and  $s_{i-1} = \text{VB}$  →

←  $s_i = \text{VB}$  and  $s_{i-1} = \text{VB}$  →

←  $s_i = \text{NN}$  and  $s_{i-1} = \text{VB}$  →

←  $s_i = \text{VB}$  and  $x_i = \text{loudly}$  →

←  $s_i = \text{NN}$  and  $x_i = \text{loudly}$  →

←  $s_i = \text{DET}$  and  $x_i = \text{loudly}$  →

←  $s_i = \text{ADV}$  and  $x_i = \text{loudly}$  →

$\vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, VB})$

$$\downarrow$$

0
0
1
0
1
0
0
0

→

→

→

→

→

→

→

→

$\vec{w}$

$$\downarrow$$

3
2
-2
-2
-4
-5
-5
3

frequent events get  
positive weights  
after training  
while infrequent  
events get  
negative (or close to zero)  
weights.

$$\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, ADV}) = 1 * 3 + 1 * 2 + 1 * 3 = 6$$

$$> \vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(\text{the,dog,barks,loudly, 4, VB, VB}) = 1 * -2 + 1 * -4 = -6$$

# MEMMs and Multi-class Softmax

Back-propagation: Error obtenido al final, distribuido en las neuronas anteriores que contribuyeron al error

ver la contribucion de cada peso

- Notice that the log-linear model from above is very similar to the multi-class softmax model presented in the lecture about linear models.
- A general log-linear model has the following form:

$$P(y|x; \vec{w}) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x, y))}{\sum_{y' \in Y} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x, y'))}$$

- A multi-class softmax model has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y} &= \text{softmax}(\vec{x} \cdot W + \vec{b}) \\ \hat{y}_{[i]} &= \frac{e^{(\vec{x} \cdot W + \vec{b})_{[i]}}}{\sum_j e^{(\vec{x} \cdot W + \vec{b})_{[j]}}}\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

# MEMMs and Multi-class Softmax

- **Difference 1:** in the log-linear model we have a fixed parameter vector  $\vec{w}$  instead of having multiple vectors (one column of  $W$  for each class value).
- **Difference 2:** the feature vector of the log-linear model  $\vec{\phi}(x, y)$  includes information of the label  $y$ , whereas the input vector  $\vec{x}$  of the softmax model is independent of  $y$ .
- **Log-linear models allow using features that consider the interaction between  $x$  and  $y$  (e.g.,  $x$  ends in “ly” and  $y$  is an ADVERB).**

# Training MEMMs

- Once we've defined the feature vectors  $\vec{\phi}$ , we can train the parameters  $\vec{w}$  of the model in the usual way linear models are trained.
- We set the negative log-likelihood as the loss function and optimize parameters using gradient descent from the training examples.
- This is equivalent as using the cross-entropy loss.
- "Any loss consisting of a negative log-likelihood is a cross-entropy between the empirical distribution defined by the training set and the probability distribution defined by model" [Goodfellow et al., 2016].

# Decoding with MEMMs

- The decoding problem is as follows.
- We are given a new test sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_m$ .
- Our goal is to compute the most likely state sequence for this test sequence,

$$\arg \max_{s_1, \dots, s_m} P(s_1, \dots, s_m | x_1, \dots, x_m). \quad (4)$$

- There are  $k^m$  possible state sequences, so for any reasonably large sentence length  $m$  brute-force search through all the possibilities will not be possible.
- We can use the Viterbi algorithm in a similar way as used for HMMs.

# Decoding with MEMMs

- The basic data structure in the algorithm will be a dynamic programming table  $\pi$  with entries  $\pi[j, s]$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , and  $s \in S$ .
- $\pi[j, s]$  will store the maximum probability for any state sequence ending in state  $s$  at position  $j$ .
- More formally, our algorithm will compute

$$\pi[j, s] = \max_{s_1, \dots, s_{j-1}} \left( P(s|s_{j-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} P(s_k|s_{k-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) \right)$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , and for all  $s \in S$ .



# Decoding with MEMMs

The algorithm is as follows:

- Initialization: for  $s \in S$

$$\pi[1, s] = P(s|s_0, x_1, \dots, x_m)$$

where  $s_0$  is a special “initial” state.

- For  $j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ ,  $s \in \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$\pi[j, s] = \max_{s' \in S} [\pi[j-1, s'] \times P(s|s', x_1, \dots, x_m)]$$

# Decoding with MEMMs

- Finally, having filled in the  $\pi[j, s]$  values for all  $j, s$ , we can calculate

$$\max_{s_1, \dots, s_m} = \max_s \pi[m, s].$$

- The algorithm runs in  $O(mk^2)$  time (i.e., linear in the sequence length  $m$ , and quadratic in the number of tags  $k$ ).
- As in the Viterbi algorithm for HMMs, we can compute the highest-scoring sequence using backpointers in the dynamic programming algorithm.

# Comparison between MEMMs and HMMs

- So what is the motivation for using MEMMs instead of HMMs?
- Note that the Viterbi decoding algorithms for the two models are very similar.
- In MEMMs, the probability associated with each state transition  $s_{i-1}$  to  $s_i$  is

$$P(s_i | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s_i))}{\sum_{s' \in S} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_1, \dots, x_m, i, s_{i-1}, s'))}$$

- In HMMs, the probability associated with each transition is:

$$P(s_i | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_m) = P(s_1 | s_{i-1})P(x_i | s_i)$$

# Comparison between MEMMs and HMMs

- The key advantage of MEMMs is that the use of feature vectors  $\vec{\phi}$  allows much richer representations than those used in HMMs.
- For example, the transition probability can be sensitive to any word in the input sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_m$ .
- In addition, it is very easy to introduce features that are sensitive to spelling features (e.g., prefixes or suffixes) of the current word  $x_i$ , or of the surrounding words.
- These features are useful in many NLP applications, and are difficult to incorporate within HMMs in a clean way.

# Conditional Random Fields (CRFs)

- We now turn to Conditional Random Fields (CRFs) [Lafferty et al., 2001].
- Notation: for convenience, we'll use  $x_{1:m}$  to refer to an input sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_m$ , and  $s_{1:m}$  to refer to a sequence of tags  $s_1, \dots, s_m$ .
- The set of all possible tags is again  $S$ .
- The set of all possible tag sequences is  $S^m$ .
- In conditional random fields we'll again build a model of

$$P(s_1, \dots, s_m | x_1, \dots, x_m) = P(s_{1:m} | x_{1:m})$$

# Conditional Random Fields (CRFs)

- A first key idea in CRFs will be to define a feature vector that maps an entire input sequence  $x_{1:m}$  paired with an entire tag sequence  $s_{1:m}$  to some  $d$ -dimensional feature vector:

$$\vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m}) \in \mathcal{R}^d$$

- We'll soon give a concrete definition for  $\vec{\Phi}$ .
- For now just assume that some definition exists.
- We will often refer to  $\vec{\Phi}$  as being a “global” feature vector.
- It is global in the sense that it takes the entire state sequence into account.

# Conditional Random Fields (CRFs)

- In CRFs we build a **giant log-linear model**:

$$P(s_{1:m}|x_{1:m}; \vec{w}) = \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m}))}{\sum_{s'_{1:m} \in S^m} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s'_{1:m}))}$$

- This is “just” another log-linear model, but it is “giant”.
- The space of possible values for  $s_{1:m}$  is huge  $S^m$ .
- The normalization constant (denominator in the above expression) involves a sum over all possible tag sequences  $S^m$ .
- These issues might seem to cause severe computational problems.
- Under appropriate assumptions we can train and decode efficiently with this type of model.

# Conditional Random Fields (CRFs)

- We define the **global feature vector**  $\vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m})$  as follows:

$$\vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j)$$

where  $\vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j)$  are the same as the feature vectors used in MEMMs.

- **Example:**  
 $\vec{\Phi}([\text{the,dog,barks}], \text{DET}, \text{NOUN}, \text{VERB}) = \vec{\phi}([\text{the,dog,barks}], 1, *, \text{DET}) + \vec{\phi}([\text{the,dog,barks}], 2, \text{DET}, \text{NOUN}) + \vec{\phi}([\text{the,dog,barks}], 3, \text{NOUN}, \text{VERB})$
- Essentially, we are adding up many sparse vectors.



# Example

	will $\phi(x, 1, y_1, y_0)$	to $\phi(x, 2, y_2, y_1)$	fight $\phi(x, 3, y_3, y_2)$	$\Phi(x, \text{NN TO VB})$
$x_i = \text{will} \wedge y_i = \text{NN}$	1	0	0	1
$y_{i-1} = \text{START} \wedge y_i = \text{NN}$	1	0	0	1
$x_i = \text{will} \wedge y_i = \text{MD}$	0	0	0	0
$y_{i-1} = \text{START} \wedge y_i = \text{MD}$	0	0	0	0
...				
$x_i = \text{to} \wedge y_i = \text{TO}$	0	1	0	1
$y_{i-1} = \text{NN} \wedge y_i = \text{TO}$	0	1	0	1
$y_{i-1} = \text{MD} \wedge y_i = \text{TO}$	0	0	0	0
...				
$x_i = \text{fight} \wedge y_i = \text{VB}$	0	0	1	1
$y_{i-1} = \text{TO} \wedge y_i = \text{VB}$	0	0	1	1

<sup>4</sup>source:

[http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~dbamman/nlpF18/slides/12\\_neural\\_sequence\\_labeling.pdf](http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~dbamman/nlpF18/slides/12_neural_sequence_labeling.pdf)

# Conditional Random Fields (CRFs)

- We are assuming that for any dimension of  $\vec{\Phi}_{[k]}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, d$ , the  $k$ 'th global feature is:

$$\vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m})_{[k]} = \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j)_{[k]}$$

- Thus  $\vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m})_{[k]}$  is calculated by summing the “local” feature vector  $\vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j)_{[k]}$  over the  $m$  different tag transitions in  $s_1, \dots, s_m$ .
- We would expect each local vector to encode relevant information about the tag transition by turning on some vector dimensions (setting the value to one).
- We now turn to two critical practical issues in CRFs: first, decoding, and second, parameter estimation (training).

# Decoding with CRFs

- The decoding problem in CRFs is as follows.
- For a given input sequence  $x_{1:m} = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ , we would like to find the most likely underlying state sequence under the model, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} P(s_{1:m} | x_{1:m}; \vec{w}) &= \arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} \frac{\exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m}))}{\sum_{s'_{1:m} \in S^m} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s'_{1:m}))} \\ &= \arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} \exp(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m})) \\ &= \arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} \vec{w} \cdot \vec{\Phi}(x_{1:m}, s_{1:m}) \\ &= \arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} \vec{w} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j) \\ &= \arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

# Decoding with CRFs

- We have shown that finding the most likely sequence under the model is equivalent to finding the sequence that maximizes:

$$\arg \max_{s_{1:m} \in S^m} \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j)$$

- This problem has a clear intuition. Each transition from tag  $s_{j-1}$  to tag  $s_j$  has an associated score:  $\vec{w} \cdot \vec{\phi}(x_{1:m}, j, s_{j-1}, s_j)$
- This score could be positive or negative.
- Intuitively, this score will be relatively high if the state transition is plausible, relatively low if this transition is implausible.
- The decoding problem is to find an entire sequence of states such that the sum of transition scores is maximized.
- We can again solve this problem using a variant of the Viterbi algorithm, in a very similar way to the decoding algorithm for HMMs or MEMMs.

# Parameter Estimation in CRFs (training)

- For parameter estimation, we assume we have a set of  $n$  labeled examples,  $\{(x_{1:m}^i, s_{1:m}^i)\}_{i=1}^n$ . Each  $x_{1:m}^i$  is an input sequence  $x_1^i, \dots, x_m^i$  each  $s_{1:m}^i$  is a tag sequence  $s_1^i, \dots, s_m^i$ .
- We again set the negative log-likelihood (or cross-entropy) as the loss function  $L$  as optimize parameters using gradient descent.
- The main challenge here is that gradient calculations  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \vec{w}_{[k]}}$  involve summing over  $S^m$  (a very large set containing all possible tag sequences).
- This sum can be computed efficiently using the Forward-backward algorithm<sup>5</sup>.
- This is another dynamic programming algorithm that is closely related to the Viterbi algorithm.

---

<sup>5</sup><http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~mcollins/fb.pdf>

# CRFs and MEMMs

- CRFs and MEMMs are discriminative sequence labeling models: they model the conditional probability directly via a parameterized log-linear multi-class function (softmax).
- HMMs, on the other hand, are generative models.
- In MEMM the normalization (denominator of the softmax) is local: it happens at each tag step (the sum runs over all possible tag values  $S$ ).
- In CRFs the normalization is global: the sum runs over all possible tag sequences  $S^m$ .
- Training a MEMM is quite easy: just train a multi-class log-linear model for for a given word to the label. This classifier is used at each word step to predict the whole sequence.
- Training CRF is more complex. The objective is to maximize the log probability of the most likely sequence.



# CRFs and MEMMs: the label bias problem

- MEMMs end up making up decision at each time step independently.
- This leads to a problem called label bias: in some tag space configurations, MEMMs essentially completely ignore important aspects of the context.
- Example: The right POS labeling of sentence “will to fight” (la voluntad de pelear) is “NN TO VB”.<sup>6</sup>
- Here NN stands for “noun”, TO stands for “infinitive to”, and VB stands for “verb base form”.
- Modals (MD) show up much more frequently at the start of the sentence than nouns do (e.g., questions).
- Hence, tag “MD” will receive a higher score than tag “NN” when  $x_0 = \text{“will”}$  :  $P(s_1 = MD | s_0 = *, x_1 = \text{“will”}, \dots) > P(s_1 = NN | s_{i-1} = *, x_1 = \text{“will”})$ .
- But we know that MD + TO is very rare: “... can to eat”, “... would to eat”.

---

<sup>6</sup>Here we are using the PENN Treebank tagset:

# CRFs and MEMMs: the label bias problem

- The word “to” is relatively deterministic (almost always has tag TO) so it doesn't matter what tag precedes it.
- Because of the local normalization of MEMMs,  $P(s_i = TO | s_{i-1}, x_1, \dots, x_i = \text{“to”}, \dots, x_n)$  will always be 1 when  $x_i = \text{“to”}$  regardless of the value of  $s_{i-1}$  (MD or NN).
- That means our prediction for “to” can't help us disambiguate “will”.
- We lose the information that MD + TO sequences rarely happen.
- As a consequence: a MEMMS would likely label the first word to “MD”.
- CRF overcomes this issue by doing a global normalization: it considers the score of the whole sequence before normalizing to make it a probability distribution.



# Links

- [http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~dbamman/nlpF18/slides/11\\_memm\\_crf.pdf](http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~dbamman/nlpF18/slides/11_memm_crf.pdf)
- [http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~dbamman/nlpF18/slides/12\\_neural\\_sequence\\_labeling.pdf](http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~dbamman/nlpF18/slides/12_neural_sequence_labeling.pdf)
- <https://www.depends-on-the-definition.com/sequence-tagging-lstm-crf/>
- <https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-pros-and-cons-of-these-three-sequence-models-MaxEnt->
- <https://people.cs.umass.edu/~mccallum/papers/crf-tutorial.pdf>
- [http://www.davidsbatista.net/blog/2017/11/13/Conditional\\_Random\\_Fields](http://www.davidsbatista.net/blog/2017/11/13/Conditional_Random_Fields)

Questions?

Thanks for your Attention!

# References I



Eisenstein, J. (2018).  
Natural language processing.  
Technical report, Georgia Tech.



Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., and Courville, A. (2016).  
*Deep learning*.  
MIT press.



Lafferty, J. D., McCallum, A., and Pereira, F. C. N. (2001).  
Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling  
sequence data.  
In Brodley, C. E. and Danyluk, A. P., editors, *Proceedings of the Eighteenth  
International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2001)*, Williams College,  
Williamstown, MA, USA, June 28 - July 1, 2001, pages 282–289. Morgan  
Kaufmann.



McCallum, A., Freitag, D., and Pereira, F. C. (2000).  
Maximum entropy markov models for information extraction and segmentation.  
In *icml*, volume 17, pages 591–598.