

# Waht kinda typoz do poeple mak?

## COMP90049 Project 1 Report

### 1 Introduction

What kind of typos do people make is a wide question. Some existing solutions, like spelling checker or auto spelling corrector, help people make less misspell. On another hand, these solutions need to know how people make misspells, to improve their performance. For spelling correctors, a suitable algorithm could increase the correctness of their recognition and prediction on the words. This report implements a misspelling predictor based on the basic global edit distance algorithm to correct misspelling, and discuss the performance of those particular algorithms on those particular corporuses.

### 2 Data

There two set of corporuses used for this project: the wiki misspell and the birkbeck misspell. The wiki misspell list is from Wikipedia contributors (nd), there are 4453 tokens that have been identified as common errors made by Wikipedia editors. Corresponding with misspell list, wiki correct list is a list of the truly intended spellings. Another set of corporuses is from Roger Mitton (nd), which contains 34683 misspellings words, comprising the "Birkbeck spelling error corpus". It has a big difference with the wiki misspell that this list is a machine-readable transcription of hand written by schoolchildren, university students, and adult literacy student. In addition, the dictionary is from (dwyl, nd) which contains approximately 370K English entries. The implementation used it as a referenced correct words during comparison.

### 3 Methodology

Python is chosen as the language we implemented on, due to the wide range of packages, and there are several available algorithms able to complete the task.

### 3.1 Global Edit Distance

The global edit distance (GED) is the main algorithm in the implementations. Package `editdistance` in Python performs well and fast which is based on the rule of Levenshtein distance. It calculates the "distance" between the misspelling word and the word from the dictionary by the numbers of character edit. In this implementation, these parameters are set to (0, 1, 1, 1) for *match*, *insert*, *delete*, *replace*. The one with the lowest distance will be provided as the correct word. The naive version of GED is that only provides one prediction to the user. The predicted word has lowest distance with the word in dictionary. However it is not considered the situation when several words in dictionary have the same lowest distance with the misspelling word. The naive GED simply outputs the one appear earlier in the dictionary. The naive version of GED get improved that rather than storing the possible word as a single candidate, to store them in a list. The improved GED is able to provide multiple possible options in a row. However, multiple response is hard to get familiar by people. The second algorithm is used to refine the outputs.

### 3.2 N-gram

By testing the usability of the packages on Python, it is found that N-gram has the lowest efficiency. So it is used as a filter to refine the predictions from the GED. Since the less amount of responses from GED led the less amount of input for Ngram, then it could execute in a reasonable time. N-gram splits the tokens to substring with size of  $N$ . The number of substrings from two different tokens indicates the similarity of the two tokens. In this implementation, the parameter  $N$  is set to 2 and the distance between two tokens is calculated as

$$\frac{\text{Number of same substrings}}{\text{Total number of unrepeated substrings}}$$

## 4 Evaluation Metrics

Since the output number from different implementations are slight different. There are different evaluation metrics for them. Throughout the report, accuracy, precision, and recall will be considered separately to evaluate each implementation system.

- *Accuracy*: For only single output system, the fraction of correct output that the system response to.

$$Accuracy = \frac{\text{Number of correct predictions}}{\text{Total number of words}}$$

- *Precision*: For multiple outputs system, the fraction of correct response among attempted responses.

$$Precision = \frac{\text{Number of correct predictions}}{\text{Total number of predictions}}$$

- *Recall*: For multiple outputs system, the fraction of word with a correct response.

$$Recall = \frac{\text{Number of words with correct response}}{\text{Total number of words}}$$

## 5 Result

The result are summarised in Table 1.

Method	Accu / Recl	Prec
Single Output GED	0.549	*
Multi Outputs GED	0.797	0.263
GED + Ngram	0.717	0.600

Table 1: Result for Wiki misspell

## 6 Section

Version one might not suit to all users. A large amount of candidates cannot work for the general users who write or type on daily used words. However for some long jargon, ???generally it has less preselections???

## 7 Conclusions

Concluding text.

## References

dwyl. n.d. English words.  
<https://github.com/dwyl/english-words>.  
Oxford Text Archive Roger Mitton. n.d. birkbecks.  
<https://www.dcs.bbk.ac.uk/ROGER/corpora.html>.

Wikipedia contributors. n.d. Wikipedia:Lists of common misspellings. In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Lists\\_of\\_common\\_misspellings&oldid=813410985](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Lists_of_common_misspellings&oldid=813410985).