



Tutorial on Universal Dependencies

CoNLL shared task on UD parsing

Joakim Nivre¹ Daniel Zeman² Filip Ginter³ Francis M. Tyers⁴⁵

¹Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Sweden

²Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics, Charles University, Prague, Czechia

³Department of Information Technology, University of Turku, Finland

⁴Giela ja kultuvrra instituhtta, UiT Norgga árktalaš universitehta, Tromsø, Norway

⁵Arvutiteaduse instituut, Tartu Ülikool, Estonia

Dependency Parsing Shared Tasks

CoNLL 2006 (13 langs: ar, cs, bg, da, de, es, ja, nl, pt, sl, sv, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2007 (10 langs: ar, ca, cs, el, en, eu, hu, it, tr, zh)



Dependency Parsing Shared Tasks

CoNLL 2006 (13 langs: ar, cs, bg, da, de, es, ja, nl, pt, sl, sv, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2007 (10 langs: ar, ca, cs, el, en, eu, hu, it, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2008: + semantic dependencies (English)

CoNLL 2009: + semantic dependencies (ca, cs, de, en, es, ja, zh)



Dependency Parsing Shared Tasks

CoNLL 2006 (13 langs: ar, cs, bg, da, de, es, ja, nl, pt, sl, sv, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2007 (10 langs: ar, ca, cs, el, en, eu, hu, it, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2008: + semantic dependencies (English)

CoNLL 2009: + semantic dependencies (ca, cs, de, en, es, ja, zh)

ICON 2009 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

ICON 2010 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)



Dependency Parsing Shared Tasks

CoNLL 2006 (13 langs: ar, cs, bg, da, de, es, ja, nl, pt, sl, sv, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2007 (10 langs: ar, ca, cs, el, en, eu, hu, it, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2008: + semantic dependencies (English)

CoNLL 2009: + semantic dependencies (ca, cs, de, en, es, ja, zh)

ICON 2009 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

ICON 2010 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

SPMRL 2013 (9 languages: ar, de, eu, fr, he, hu, ko, pl, sv)

SPMRL 2014 (9 languages: ar, de, eu, fr, he, hu, ko, pl, sv)



Dependency Parsing Shared Tasks

CoNLL 2006 (13 langs: ar, cs, bg, da, de, es, ja, nl, pt, sl, sv, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2007 (10 langs: ar, ca, cs, el, en, eu, hu, it, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2008: + semantic dependencies (English)

CoNLL 2009: + semantic dependencies (ca, cs, de, en, es, ja, zh)

ICON 2009 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

ICON 2010 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

SPMRL 2013 (9 languages: ar, de, eu, fr, he, hu, ko, pl, sv)

SPMRL 2014 (9 languages: ar, de, eu, fr, he, hu, ko, pl, sv)

VarDial 2017 (cross-lingual: cs-sk, sl-hr, da/sv-no)



Dependency Parsing Shared Tasks

CoNLL 2006 (13 langs: ar, cs, bg, da, de, es, ja, nl, pt, sl, sv, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2007 (10 langs: ar, ca, cs, el, en, eu, hu, it, tr, zh)

CoNLL 2008: + semantic dependencies (English)

CoNLL 2009: + semantic dependencies (ca, cs, de, en, es, ja, zh)

ICON 2009 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

ICON 2010 (Hindi, Bangla, Telugu)

SPMRL 2013 (9 languages: ar, de, eu, fr, he, hu, ko, pl, sv)

SPMRL 2014 (9 languages: ar, de, eu, fr, he, hu, ko, pl, sv)

VarDial 2017 (cross-lingual: cs-sk, sl-hr, da/sv-no)

CoNLL 2017 (45 languages + surprise + end-to-end parsing)



Languages and Treebanks

All UD 2.0 treebanks except:

- Too small
- Non-free



Languages and Treebanks

All UD 2.0 treebanks except:

- Too small
- Non-free

Arabic NYUAD: not available free of charge



Languages and Treebanks

All UD 2.0 treebanks except:

- Too small
- Non-free

Arabic NYUAD: not available free of charge

At least 10K test words ⇒

Exclude: Belarusian, Coptic, Lithuanian, Sanskrit, Tamil

Include but small training: French ParTUT, Galician TreeGal,
Irish, Kazakh, Latin, Slovenian SST, Ukrainian, Uyghur



Languages and Treebanks

All UD 2.0 treebanks except:

- Too small
- Non-free

Arabic NYUAD: not available free of charge

At least 10K test words ⇒

Exclude: Belarusian, Coptic, Lithuanian, Sanskrit, Tamil

Include but small training: French ParTUT, Galician TreeGal,
Irish, Kazakh, Latin, Slovenian SST, Ukrainian, Uyghur

Expected about 4 surprise languages



Languages and Treebanks

All UD 2.0 treebanks except:

- Too small
- Non-free

Arabic NYUAD: not available free of charge

At least 10K test words ⇒

Exclude: Belarusian, Coptic, Lithuanian, Sanskrit, Tamil

Include but small training: French ParTUT, Galician TreeGal,
Irish, Kazakh, Latin, Slovenian SST, Ukrainian, Uyghur

Expected about 4 surprise languages

New parallel test set (DFKI, Google and others):

15–20 languages



Additional Data

Just one “closed” track

Registered participants were asked for suggestions

CommonCrawl + word embeddings

Word Atlas of Language Structures (WALS)

Wikipedia Dumps

 Wikipedia word vectors (90 languages) by Facebook

Opus Parallel Corpora

WMT 2016 Parallel + Monolingual Data

Apertium + Giellatekno Morphological Analyzers

French Treebank UD v2 conversion



Multi-Language and Multi-Domain

English language

UD English (Web Treebank): blog, social, reviews

205K train, 25K dev, 25K test

UD English LinES: fiction, nonfiction (sw localization),
spoken

50K train, 17K dev, 16K test

UD English ParTUT: legal, news, wiki

26K train, 12K dev, 12K test

UD English DGPT: nonfiction/legal (EuroParl), news, wiki
roughly 20K **test only!**

You can train one model for all if you want

But they are different domains!

Main system score:

macro-average LAS across all test sets (not languages)



End-to-End Parsing

A real-world scenario

No gold-standard processing available in the test data



End-to-End Parsing

A real-world scenario

No gold-standard processing available in the test data

Sentence segmentation



End-to-End Parsing

A real-world scenario

No gold-standard processing available in the test data

Sentence segmentation

Tokenization

Word segmentation (multi-word tokens)



End-to-End Parsing

A real-world scenario

No gold-standard processing available in the test data

Sentence segmentation

Tokenization

Word segmentation (multi-word tokens)

Morphological analysis

If your parser needs it

Exception: predicted morphology available for surprise languages



End-to-End Parsing

A real-world scenario

No gold-standard processing available in the test data

Sentence segmentation

Tokenization

Word segmentation (multi-word tokens)

Morphological analysis

If your parser needs it

Exception: predicted morphology available for surprise languages

Parsing



Baseline Models

UDPipe (ÚFAL): trained segmenter, tagger+lemmatizer, parser

Pre-processed test data (except syntax) directly available

Just use that if you don't have anything better

SyntaxNet / ParseySaurus (Google)

No interest in surprise languages?

Use simple delexicalized parser.



Evaluation Metrics

Align system-output tokens to gold tokens

Al-Zaman : American forces killed Shaikh Abdullah al-Ani, the preacher at the mosque in the town of Qaim, near the Syrian border.

GOLD: Al - Zaman : American forces killed Shaikh
OFFSET: 0-1 2 3-7 9 11-18 20-25 27-32 34-39

All characters except for whitespace match => easy align!

SYSTEM: **Al-Zaman** : American forces killed Shaikh
OFFSET: 0-7 9 11-18 20-25 27-32 34-39



Evaluation Metrics

Align system-output tokens to gold tokens

Die Kosten sind definitiv auch im Rahmen.

GOLD: Die Kosten sind definitiv auch **im** Rahmen .

SPLIT: Die Kosten sind definitiv auch **in dem** Rahmen .

OFFSET: 0-2 4-9 11-14 16-24 26-29 **31-32** 34-39 40

Corresponding but not identical spans?

Find longest common subsequence

SYSTEM: Kosten sind definitiv auch **im** Rahmen .

SPLIT: Kosten sind **de finitiv** auch **im** Rahmen .

OFFSET: 4-9 11-14 16-24 26-29 **31-32** 34-39 40



Evaluation Metrics

Align system-output tokens to gold tokens

Die Kosten sind definitiv auch im Rahmen.

GOLD: Die Kosten sind definitiv auch **im** Rahmen .

SPLIT: Die Kosten sind definitiv auch **in dem** Rahmen .

OFFSET: 0-2 4-9 11-14 16-24 26-29 **31-32** 34-39 40

Corresponding but not identical spans?

Find longest common subsequence

SYSTEM: auch **im** Rahmen .

SPLIT: auch **in einem , dem alle zustimmen ,** Rahmen .

OFFSET: 26-29 **31-32** 34-39 40



Evaluation Metrics

Word IDs no longer match between gold and system files!

Instead of comparing gold HEAD to system HEAD

$$\text{head}_{\text{System}}(i) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(i)$$

(Comparing just integers here.)



Evaluation Metrics

Word IDs no longer match between gold and system files!

Instead of comparing gold HEAD to system HEAD

$$\text{head}_{\text{System}}(i) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(i)$$

(Comparing just integers here.)

Compare aligned nodes, if alignment is found

$$\text{node} : \text{Integer} \rightarrow \text{Node}$$

$$\text{align} : \text{SystemNode} \rightarrow \text{GoldNode}$$

$$\text{align}(\text{head}_{\text{System}}(\text{node}_i)) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(\text{align}(\text{node}_i))$$

(Comparing node objects.)



Evaluation Metrics

Word IDs no longer match between gold and system files!

Instead of comparing gold HEAD to system HEAD

$$\text{head}_{\text{System}}(i) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(i)$$

(Comparing just integers here.)

Compare aligned nodes, if alignment is found

$$\text{node} : \text{Integer} \rightarrow \text{Node}$$

$$\text{align} : \text{SystemNode} \rightarrow \text{GoldNode}$$

$$\text{align}(\text{head}_{\text{System}}(\text{node}_i)) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(\text{align}(\text{node}_i))$$

(Comparing node objects.)

Cannot align? No point for attachment!



Evaluation Metrics

Word IDs no longer match between gold and system files!

Instead of comparing gold HEAD to system HEAD

$$\text{head}_{\text{System}}(i) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(i)$$

(Comparing just integers here.)

Compare aligned nodes, if alignment is found

$$\text{node} : \text{Integer} \rightarrow \text{Node}$$

$$\text{align} : \text{SystemNode} \rightarrow \text{GoldNode}$$

$$\text{align}(\text{head}_{\text{System}}(\text{node}_i)) = \text{head}_{\text{Gold}}(\text{align}(\text{node}_i))$$

(Comparing node objects.)

Cannot align? No point for attachment!

Wrong sentence boundary?

⇒ one or more wrong relations



Labeled Attachment Score

Correct relation ... alignment of parent equals to parent of alignment, and the universal prefix of dependency relation types match on both sides

Precision: $P = \frac{\#correctRelations}{\#systemNodes}$

Recall: $R = \frac{\#correctRelations}{\#goldNodes}$

LAF (labeled attachment F_1 -score): $LAF = \frac{2PR}{P+R}$



UD-specific Weighted Metric (Experimental)

Relations between content words are more important cross-linguistically

Attachment of function word = morphology in other languages

Weighted scoring of correct relations:

Weight = 1 for *root, nsubj, obj, iobj, csubj, ccomp, xcomp, obl, vocative, expl, dislocated, advcl, advmod, discourse, nmod, appos, nummod, acl, amod, conj, fixed, flat, compound, list, parataxis, orphan, goeswith, reparandum, dep*

Weight = 0 for *aux, case, cc, clf, cop, det, mark*

Weight = 0 for *punct*



Still time to join!

<http://universaldependencies.org/conll17/>

