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Dependency-based Parsing Systems

- Parsing systems
  - Parser
  - Comprehensive grammar of English

- Link Grammar and Conexor are dependency-based parsing systems
  - The output is a dependency structure

Dependency Structures

- Link Grammar

- Conexor
Semantic Interpretation

- The Problem
  - Given a dependency structure, how to build the logical form?
    - Building the logical form while parsing is not an option
- Two approaches:
  - Top-down
  - Bottom-up
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Answer Extraction

- The Goal of Answer Extraction (AE) is ...
  - ...to locate exact passages within text documents ...
  - ...that answer a question worded in natural language.
- Answer Extraction is not Information Retrieval (IR)
  - We want answers, not pointers to documents/passage
- Answer Extraction is not Question Answering (QA)
  - AE is less ambitious than QA
  - The first editions of TREC-QA are about AE

ExtrAns

- ExtrAns is an AE system that operates over UNIX manual pages
- WebExtrAns operates over Airbus maintenance manuals
  - (SG | X)ML formatting
- Syntax
  - Tokeniser
  - Pruner
  - Disambiguator
  - Semantic Interpreter
  - Knowledge Base
  - Display

NL Query

Information flow
Resources
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ExtrAns’ Logical Forms

- Goals of ExtrAns’ Logical Forms
  - **Expressivity**: Be able to express (part of) the meaning of any sentence
  - Incrementally add more semantic contents if necessary
  - **Robustness**: Be able to get something out from ungrammatical/unexpected sentences
  - **Computability**: Be easy to build and to work with
    - Specially for Answer Extraction

ExtrAns’ Answer Extraction

A “bag of predicates” approach

- \( cp \) will quickly copy files
  1. holds(e4)
  2. object(cp,o1,[x1])
  3. object(command,o2,[x1])
  4. evt(copy,e4,[x1,x6])
  5. object(file,o3,[x6])
  6. prop(quickly,p3,[e4])

- which command copies files?
  1. object(command,o1,[X1]),
  2. evt(copy,E4,[X1,X2]),
  3. object(file,o2,[X2]).
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Semantic Interpretation

- Input:

```
main <- sub
det <- mod
the man that come eats bananas and apples with a fork.
```

- Output:

```
holds(v_e5), object('man',v_o2,[v_x2]),
evt('come',v_e4,[v_x2]),
evt('eat',v_e5,[v_x2,v_x7]), (v_x6<$v_x7), (v_x8<$v_x7),
object('banana',v_o6,[v_x6]), object('apple',v_o8,[v_x8]),
prop('with',v_p9,[v_X9,v_x11]), object('fork',v_o11,[v_x11])
```
Semantic Interpretation: Top-Down

- Starting from the anchor symbol ("///"), follow the dependencies in reversed direction
- The dependency label indicates the type of dependent
- The far end of the dependency points to the head of the dependent

1. Find the head of the main sentence
   - follow the link "main" to find eats
2. Find the head of the subject
   - follow the link "subj" to find man
3. Build the logical form of the subject
   - follow the link "mod" to find the relative clause
   - find the logical form of the clause (recursive call)
     - but this time the subject is found by following "mod"

Semantic Interpretation: Top-Down

4. Build the logical forms of the other verb arguments
   - follow the link "obj" to find the head of the direct object
   - build the logical form of the direct object
5. Build the logical forms of other complements and adjuncts
   - follow the link "ins" to find the prepositional phrase
6. Add the logical form of the main event and the h.o.l.c.s predicate

Semantic Interpretation

- Input:

- Output:
  holds(v_e5), object('man',v_o2,[v_x2]), evt('come',v_e4,[v_x2]),
  evt('eat',v_e5,[v_x2,v_x7]), (v_x5<$v_x7), (v_x8<$v_x7),
  object('banana',v_o6,[v_x6]), object('apple',v_o8,[v_x8]),
  prop('with',v_p9,[v_X9,v_x11]), object('fork',v_o11,[v_x11])
Top-Down and Robustness

- If a dependency structure is incomplete or contains an unexpected dependency, complete sentence constituents will be ignored.
  - Some special syntactic structures are handled by the parsing system but are not recognised by the semantic interpreter.
- Solution:
  1. Collect the words that have not been covered by the top-down algorithm.
  2. Follow the dependencies bottom-up until the heads are found.
  3. Use variants of the top-down algorithm starting from the heads.
  4. Repeat the procedure until no additional predicates are produced.

Semantic Interpretation: Bottom-Up

- The error recovery from the top-down method has a bottom-up component.
- Why not do everything bottom-up?
- Three stages in the bottom-up approach:
  - Introspection
    - For each word, build the corresponding predicate.
    - Some information in the resulting predicates may be missing.
  - Extrospection
    - For each word, examine its head and fill the missing information.
    - Reinterpretation
    - Do some final adjustments to the logical form.

Bottom-Up — Example

```
main

subj cats do not run

v_ch

neg

Introspect(cats): object(cat,o2,[x2])
Introspect(not): object(cat,o2,[x2]), log_op(not,l4,[?])
Introspect(run): object(cat,o2,[x2]), log_op(not,l4,[?]), evt(run,e5,[?])
Extrospect(cats): object(cat,o2,[x2]), log_op(not,l4,[?]), evt(run,e5,[x2])
Extrospect(not): object(cat,o2,[x2]), log_op(not,l4,[e5]), evt(run,e5,[x2])
Extrospect(run): object(cat,o2,[x2]), log_op(not,l4,[e5]), evt(run,e5,[x2]), holds(e5)
Re-interpretation: object(cat,o2,[x2]), log_op(not,l4,[e5]), evt(run,e5,[x2]), holds([4])
```

Bottom-up and Robustness

- The logical form contains all the basic predicates.
  - The introspection stage explores all words in the sentence.
- Missing/unexpected dependencies translated into unconnected variables.
  - The extrospection stage may fail to follow the dependencies.

The bottom-up approach is robust by nature.
Logical Forms and Semantic Interpretation

- “Bag of predicates” nature of ExtrAns’ flat logical forms
  - Introspection stage: Introduce the bag of predicates
  - Extrospection stage: Add dependency information
- Bottom-up approach:
  - Suitable to ExtrAns’ format of logical forms
  - Robust by nature

These conclusions are independent from the dependency-based parsing system

ExtrAns’ Answer Extraction

- The text retrieved is not always a logical answer to the question
- The question …
  - which command copies files?
- … retrieves the following “answers”:
  - cp will quickly copy the files
  - if the user types y, then cp copies the files
  - cp refuses to copy a file onto itself
  - rm does not copy files

Semantic Interpretation: Top-Down

1. Find the head of the main sentence
   - follow the links $wa$ and $se$ to find $eats$
2. Find the head of the subject
   - follow the link $se$ to find $man$
3. Build the logical form of the subject
   - follow the link $re$ to find the relative clause
   - find the logical form of the clause (recursive call)
     - but this time the subject is found by following $se$s
4. Build the logical forms of the other verb arguments
   - follow the link $o^v$ to find the head of the direct object
   - build the logical form of the direct object
5. Create an entity for the main eventuality
   - the entity created is named, say, e2
6. Build the logical forms of other complements and adjuncts
   - follow the link $nvp$ to find the prepositional phrase
7. Add the logical form of the main event and the holds predicate
Answer Extraction over Limited Domains

- Current IR and QA techniques are based on large volumes of data
  - Bag of words approaches
  - Question classification and named-entity extraction
  - Use of patterns
- Small and technical domains have different requirements
  - Little data redundancy: high recall is important!
  - A more comprehensive linguistic analysis is possible and required
    - Full parse
    - Use of logical forms

ExtrAns’ Logical Forms

- Use a conjunction of predicates
  - No nested expressions
- Only express what is necessary: use underspecification
- Use reflication as a means to represent nested expressions
  - objects
  - events, states (“eventualities”)
  - properties
- By default, all variables are existentially quantified
  - Some of the entities may be asserted to exist (“hold”) in the world of Unix manual pages