JAIST Repository
https://dspace.jaist.ac.jp/

Title	Semantic Parsing: transforming sentences to logical forms using machine learning models
Author(s)	Nguyen, Minh Le
Citation	
Issue Date	2007-03-07
Type	Presentation
Text version	publisher
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10119/8297
Rights	
Description	4th VERITE : JAIST/TRUST-AIST/CVS joint workshop on VERIfication TEchnologyでの発表資料，開催：2007年3月6日～3月7日，開催場所：北陸先端科学技術大学院大学・知識講義棟２階中講義室

JAIST
JAPAN ADVANCED INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology

Semantic Parsing: transforming sentences to logical forms using machine learning models

Minh Le Nguyen
School of Information Science
Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology

Syntactic and Semantic Natural Language Learning

- Most computational research in natural-language learning has addressed "low-level" syntactic processing.
  - Morphology (e.g. past-tense generation)
  - Part-of-speech tagging
  - Chunking
  - Syntactic parsing
- Learning for semantic analysis has been restricted to relatively "shallow" meaning representations.
  - Word sense disambiguation (e.g. SENSEVAL)
  - Semantic role assignment (determining agent, patient, instrument, etc., e.g. FrameNet, PropBank)
  - Information extraction

Semantic Parsing

- Semantic parsing is the process of mapping a natural-language sentence to a complete, detailed semantic representation: ***logical form*** or ***meaning representation*** (***MR***).
- For many applications, the desired output is immediately executable by another program.
- Application domains:
  - CLang: RoboCup Coach Language
  - GeoQuery: A Database Query Application
  - Legal domain

CLang: RoboCup **C**oach **Lang**uage

- In RoboCup Coach competition teams compete to coach simulated players
- The coaching instructions are given in a formal language called CLang



GeoQuery: A Database Query Application

- Query application for U.S. geography database containing about 800 facts [Zelle & Mooney, 1996]



Approach

- Applying ML to the transforming problem
- Motivations
  - Robustness, reduction of development rules
  - Treating ambiguity
  - Handling with the difficulty of consistent rules
- Current work
  - ML for query database language / robocup controlled language
  - ML for legal domain

Machine Learning Framework



Semantic Tagging

Pos Tagging: Using our FlexCRF toolkit



Semantic Tagging



Semantic parsing



Example: Generate LF from a semantic tree



Current Work

- English Data (CLANG)
  - **Structured SVM** (Robocup)
    - Precision: 85%
    - Recall: 74%
  - Maximum entropy model (DB query)
    - Precision 89%
    - Recall 51%
- Japanese Data
  - Splitting long sentences into a set of short sentences
  - Mapping NL Japanese sentence to logical form

$$precision = \frac{\#correct-representation}{\#completed-representation}$$
$$recall = \frac{\#correct-representation}{\#sentences}$$

Legal domain



$$\forall x_1, x_2, \exists e_1, e_2, e_3$$
$$P(w_6'(e_1) \wedge agt(e_1, a) \wedge obj(e_1, e_2)$$
$$\wedge ((w_3'(e_2) \wedge obj(e_2, x_1) \wedge w_2'(x1))$$
$$\wedge (w_3'(e_2) \wedge obj(e_2, x_2) \wedge w_4'(x_2)))$$

Dependency Parsing



Japanese unlabeled accuracy 93.9%

Japanese unlabeled accuracy 91.6%

very good results in shared task CONLL-2006 including Japanese data

State of the art result in English data (Penn III)

English unlabeled accuracy 91.6%

English unlabeled accuracy 90.7%

Plan to participate CONLL-2007 task

Patterns learning

- Input: set of dependency trees and their logical forms
- Output: the correspondences of each node in DT with a predicate in LF
- Method: Using statistical machine translation to align a node in DT to a predicate a LF

Example: W1 W2 W3 W4 W5 W6 W7 W8 W9



Splitting clauses in legal domain

- Using machine learning for splitting clauses



zenjou ni gaitou suru mono ga aru toki ha, kuchou ha, kore o kokuhatsu suru mono to suru

前条に該当する者があるときは、区長は、これを告発するものとする。

前条に該当する者があるときは、区長は これを告発するものとする。

- Collected 108 sentences and their logical form
  - 9/10 for training and 1/10 for testing data
  - The accuracy of the model is 93.10%!

Online-SCFG Methods

- Preprocessing
  - Generate a sequence of word tokens
  - Transform a logical form representation into a sequence of atomic logical form.
- Using GIZA++ to generate alignment between each word in NL to each token in LF
- Using synchronous grammar to estimate the model for generating logical form
- Using online structured prediction learning to estimate the SCFG grammar
- Some issues for Japanese data
  - Require a formal grammar representation for LF
  - In the case there is no formal grammar it becomes phrase based SMT models

Context-Free Semantic Grammar

QUERY → **What is** CITY

CITY → **the capital** CITY

CITY → **of** STATE

STATE → **Ohio**



Synchronous Context-Free Grammars (SCFG)

- Developed by Aho & Ullman (1972) as a theory of compilers that combines *syntax analysis* and *code generation* in a single phase
- Generates a pair of strings in a single derivation

Synchronous Context-Free Grammars

Developed by Aho & Ullman (1972) as a theory of compilers that combines *syntax analysis* and *code generation* in a single phase

Generates a pair of strings in a single derivation

pattern *template*

QUERY → **What is** CITY / answer(CITY)

Synchronous Context-Free Grammars



What is the capital of Ohio → answer(capital(loc_2(stateid('ohio'))))

Probabilistic Parsing Model



Parsing Model

- **N** (non-terminals) = {QUERY, CITY, STATE, …}
- *S* (start symbol) = QUERY
- $\mathbf{T}_m$ (MRL terminals) = {answer, capital, loc_2, (,), …}
- $\mathbf{T}_n$ (NL words) = {**What**, **is**, **the**, **capital**, **of**, **Ohio**, …}
- **L** (lexicon) =
  - QUERY → **What is** CITY / answer(CITY)
  - CITY → **the capital** CITY / capital(CITY)
  - CITY → **of** STATE / loc_2(STATE)
  - STATE → **Ohio** / stateid('ohio')
- λ (parameters of probabilistic model) = **?**

Online structured prediction learning

Online structured prediction learning

- Extend the traditional Perceptron learning

Perceptron → Extend → Online structured Learning

Two class labels learning problem Many class labels, tree structure

Results

- English data (CLANG)
  - It is applicable for Robocup language
    - Precision 89.5 (best precision)
    - Recall 61.2
  - The result is good because we do not need fully semantic tree annotation
- Japanese data (110 sentences)
  - Because of spare data problem so the alignment of each word in NL sentence and each token in LF is not good.
  - It is need to verify this problem in detail for improving the accuracy of our model
    - Enlarge the training data ?

Conclusions

- Learning is applicable for transforming NL to logical form
- The number of training data should be enlarged to make sure the accuracy of the models
- The splitting result for legal Japanese data is attractive

We should integrate this model with the rule-based model

Future work

- Experiment on a larger corpus of Japanese data
- Integrate with the rule-based models
- Transforming a logical form representation to a NL sentence
- Semi-supervised learning models for semantic parsing