

Using Surface Syntactic Parser & Deviation from Randomness

Jean-Pierre Chevallet IPAL I2R Gilles Sérasset CLIPS IMAG

Outline

- Monolingual track
 - French, Russian, Finnish
 - Deviation from randomness
- Bilingual track
 - Bilingual Association Thesaurus for disambiguating Query Translation

Goal of Monolingual experiment

- Compare Deviation from randomness Weighting model, against some other – nnn, bnn, lnc, ntc, ltc, atn, dtn, Okapi
- Learn the best parameters
- Use surface syntactic parsing
 - For all documents and queries
 - Ensure correct linguistic stemming
 - Correct split of glued words
- A test for the XIOTA, XML IR systeem

Global Schema of treatment



Deviation from Randomness

- Probabilistic model
- Compute the deviation of statistical repartition of term from a random distribution
- Formula take into account, corpus size and document size
- Only one constant c : weight normalization for the document length compared to the average length

Influence of C Value in DFR



Influence of c in DFR







Comment on results

- Deviation from Randomness is very stable under query weighing, and is the best weighting on French and Finnish : we use it for 2004
- Good values of c between 0.6 and 1.0
- When using syntactic parsing
 - No need to a stop list : using grammatical categories
 - Stemming is done, with word splitting
- But these curves use classical stemming and stop list ...(data from Savoy for Finnish)

Results for 2004 Mono Lingual

Russian: 35%



Results for 2004 Mono Lingual

French : 44 %



Results for 2004 Mono Lingual

Finnish : 53%



Comments on results

- Use of parsing for all 3 languages
- Best absolute results on Finnish
 - Results are better than our training in 2003
 - This is an agglutinative language, in our training we have not used the syntactic parsing
- Results in French are lower than our training
 - we have used both parsing and stemming + stop list to recover possible parsing errors
- There is still a lot on query under 10% of precision
 - We should examine closely why we cannot solve these queries : we probably need additional data like good thesaurus or dedicated knowledge base

Topic Translation

- Translation of query vectors
- Building bilingual dictionaries available at CLIPS and online
- French and English as topic language
- Russian and Finnish use Logos web site but only for terms in the topic
- All bilingual dictionary in the same XML file type

Multilingual Experiments

• Construction of the dictionaries

Dictionary	nb entries	avg nb trans	max nb trans
fr - en	21417	1.92417	22
fr - fi	791	1.06574	4
fr - ru	604	1.06126	3
en - fr	24542	1.67916	25
en - fi	867	1.11649	5
en - ru	15331	2.09901	30

Size of Bilingual Dictionaries



Translation per Entry



Topic Translation

- Substitute each terms by all available translation
- Divide the weight of each translation by the number of translation
- Selection of some better translation by filtering using an association thesaurus

Multilingual Experiments

• First experiment: simple translation

```
<vector id="C201" size="17">
<c id="at_least_one" w="1"/>
<c id="be" w="1"/>
<c id="cause" w="2"/>
<c id="document" w="1"/>
<c id="domestic" w="1"/>
<c id="fire" w="3"/>
<c id="general" w="1"/>
<c id="home" w="1"/>
<c id="house" w="1"/>
<c id="instance" w="1"/>
<c id="main" w="1"/>
<c id="mention" w="1"/>
<c id="private" w="1"/>
<c id="probable" w="1"/>
<c id="reference" w="1"/>
<c id="relevant" w="1"/>
<c id="specific" w="1"/>
</vector>
```

```
<vector id="C201" size="74">
<!-- Translation of id="fire" w="3" -->
<c id="allumer" w="3"/>
<c id="tir" w="3"/>
<c id="embraser" w="3"/>
<c id="feu" w="3"/>
<c id="tirer" w="3"/>
<c id="incendie" w="3"/>
<c id="limoger" w="3"/>
<!-- Translation of id="cause" w="2" -->
<c id="occasionner" w="2"/>
<c id="provoquer" w="2"/>
<c id="causer" w="2"/>
<c id="sujet" w="2"/>
<c id="procès " w="2"/>
<c id="cause" w="2"/>
<c id="donner" w="2"/>
. . .
</vector>
```

Association Rules : meaning

- Support(X<=>Y) : the probability X and Y appears together in a transaction.
 - Used to eliminate rare or too frequent occurrences.
 - All supports get lower when nb of transaction raises : in practice we use absolute value in place of ratio
- Confidence(X=>Y) : the probability that Y appears knowing that X is in the transaction.
 - A probabilistic dependency from X to Y
 - Less dependent from the number of transactions
 - High values are preferred

Association Thesaurus

- Hypothesis : a document is a transaction, set of words forms a consistent set of information
- Production of a graph of terms
 - Link related to "some" semantic, no types
- Using syntactic parsing helps reduction of noise, meaningless relations
- For CLEF : confidence between 20% and 90%
- Possible Use of AT: 2003 Monolingual Query expansion : add related terms 2004 Bilingual Query precision : alignment of two thesaurus, choose the best translation

Multilingual Experiments

- Second experiment: weighted translation
 - Each translation is weighted
 - Using an association thesaurus
 - Idea: w -> t1, ... tn
 - Give a bonus to ti if it has a finite distance with other translations in an association thesaurus.
 - Hypothesis: if 2 words are close in context, their translations are close in context

Association Thesaurus & disambiguation

- Build one Association Thesaurus for each language using all documents
- Hypothesis :
 - the context of a term expresses its semantics
 - each arc of the thesaurus bears one of the meanings of the associated terms
- Thesaurus alignment
 - Associate each couple of term (A,B), in relation in the source thesaurus by a set of couples (X,Y) in the target thesaurus
 - Select (X,Y) with a minimal distance in target thesaurus
 - Meaning : when A is used with B, the X is the best translation of A and Y, of B

Multilingual Experiments

- Example:
 - Find some information about Tamil Tiger suicide bomb attacks or kamikaze actions in Sri Lanka.

<!-- Translation of id="action" w="1" --> <c id="procès" w="0.16666666666666667"/> <c id="acte" w="0.16666666666666667"/> <c id="empire" w="0.1666666666666667"/> <c id="plainte" w="0.1666666666666667"/> <c id="influence" w="0.166666666666666667"/>

Multilingual Experiments

- But:
 - Results got worse !
- Because:
 - Quality of the dictionaries
 - Quality/Size of the thesaurii
 - Too few entries in the thesaurus (~4000 to ~9000)
 - Most of the time, selected transations are the most frequent translations but selection does not really depend on the context...
- However
 - Trowing out the thesaurii to directly take into account the context of translations may still be a good idea.

Results

- Drop mono-> bilingual
 - (Eng) Russian : $35\% \rightarrow 11\%$, 4% with thesaurus ...
 - (Fr) Russian : $35\% \rightarrow 6\%$, 5% with thesaurus
- Possible explanation
 - Division by the number of translation reduce importance of possible tool words
 - Raising weight of correct translation works on terms with many translation hence give more importance to words not really topic related

Conclusion

- Correct results on monolingual track
 - Effectiveness of syntactic parsing + DFR
- Bad results on bilingual track
 - Manual checking are good ...
 - Not due to weighting (cf. monolingual)
 - Possible wrong re-weighting method
 - Not enough linguistic resources ?
 - Possible experimentation error
 - Wrong hypothesis on only one sense in corpus

What next?

- Redo the experiment of parallel bilingual thesaurus
 - Understand what is wrong
 - Have better linguistic resources (but how ?)
- Better use of the output of the parser
 - Using noun phrase to enhance precision