

Context Free Grammars (CFG)

- N a set of **non-terminal symbols** (or **variables**)
- Σ a set of *terminal symbols* (disjoint from *N*)
- *R* a set of *productions* or *rules* of the form A→β, where A is a non-terminal and β is a string of symbols from (Σ∪ N)*
- S, a designated non-terminal called the start symbol

Simple CFG for ATIS English

Grammar

 $\begin{array}{l} S \rightarrow NP \, VP \\ S \rightarrow Aux \, NP \, VP \\ S \rightarrow VP \\ NP \rightarrow Proper-Noun \\ NP \rightarrow Proper-Noun \\ NP \rightarrow Det Nominal \\ Nominal \rightarrow Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal PP \\ VP \rightarrow Verb \\ VP \rightarrow Verb \\ VP \rightarrow VPP \\ PP \rightarrow Prep \, NP \end{array}$

Lexicon

 $\begin{array}{l} Det \rightarrow the \mid a \mid that \mid this \\ Noun \rightarrow book \mid flight \mid meal \mid money \\ Verb \rightarrow book \mid include \mid prefer \\ Pronoun \rightarrow I \mid he \mid she \mid me \\ Proper-Noun \rightarrow Houston \mid NWA \\ Aux \rightarrow does \\ Prep \rightarrow from \mid to \mid on \mid near \mid through \end{array}$

Sentence Generation

 Sentences are generated by recursively rewriting the start symbol using the productions until only terminals symbols remain.



Parsing

- Given a string of non-terminals and a CFG, determine if the string can be generated by the CFG.
 - Also return a parse tree for the string
 - Also return all possible parse trees for the string
- Must search space of derivations for one that derives the given string.
 - **Top-Down Parsing:** Start searching space of derivations for the start symbol.
 - Bottom-up Parsing: Start search space of reverse deivations from the terminal symbols in the string.



























































































Top Down vs. Bottom Up

- Top down never explores options that will not lead to a full parse, but can explore many options that never connect to the actual sentence.
- Bottom up never explores options that do not connect to the actual sentence but can explore options that can never lead to a full parse.
- Relative amounts of wasted search depend on how much the grammar branches in each direction.

Dynamic Programming Parsing

- To avoid extensive repeated work, must cache intermediate results, i.e. completed phrases.
- Caching (memoizing) critical to obtaining a polynomial time parsing (recognition) algorithm for CFGs.
- Dynamic programming algorithms based on both topdown and bottom-up search can achieve O(n³) recognition time where n is the length of the input string.

52

Dynamic Programming Parsing Methods

- CKY (Cocke-Kasami-Younger) algorithm based on bottom-up parsing and requires first normalizing the grammar.
- Earley parser is based on top-down parsing and does not require normalizing grammar but is more complex.
- More generally, chart parsers retain completed phrases in a chart and can combine top-down and bottom-up search.

СКҮ

- First grammar must be converted to Chomsky normal form (CNF) in which productions must have either exactly 2 non-terminal symbols on the RHS or 1 terminal symbol (lexicon rules).
- Parse bottom-up storing phrases formed from all substrings in a triangular table (chart).

54

53

51

ATIS English Grammar Conversion Original Grammar Chomsky Normal Form

 $\begin{array}{l} S \rightarrow NP \; VP \\ S \rightarrow Aux \; NP \; VP \end{array}$

 $S \to VP$

 $\begin{array}{l} NP \rightarrow Pronoun \\ NP \rightarrow Proper-Noun \\ NP \rightarrow Det Nominal \\ Nominal \rightarrow Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal PP \\ VP \rightarrow Verb \\ VP \rightarrow Verb \\ VP \rightarrow Verb \\ PP \rightarrow VPP \\ PP \rightarrow Prep \\ NP \end{array}$

$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Chomsky Normal Form} \\ \textbf{S} \rightarrow NP VP \\ \textbf{S} \rightarrow X1 VP \\ \textbf{X1} \rightarrow Aux NP \\ \textbf{S} \rightarrow book | include | prefer \\ \textbf{S} \rightarrow Verb NP \\ \textbf{S} \rightarrow Verb NP \\ \textbf{S} \rightarrow VPP P \\ \textbf{NP} \rightarrow I | he | she | me \\ \textbf{NP} \rightarrow Houston | NWA \\ \textbf{NP} \rightarrow Det Nominal \\ Nominal \rightarrow book | flight | meal | money \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal Noun \\ Nominal \rightarrow Nominal PP \\ \textbf{VP} \rightarrow book | include | prefer \\ \textbf{VP} \rightarrow Verb NP \\ \textbf{VP} \rightarrow Verp PP \\ \textbf{PP} \rightarrow Prep NP \end{array}$













Book	the	flight	through	Houston	
S, VP, Verb, Nominal, Noun	None	S VP	None		
L	Det	NP	None		
		Nominal, Noun	None		
			Prep	PP	











Book	the	flight	through	Houston	
S, VP, Verb, Nominal, Noun	None	S VP≪	None	- S VP S VP	
	Det	NP	None	NP	
		Nominal, Noun	None	Nominal	
			Prep	PP	





Complexity of CKY (recognition)

- There are (*n*(*n*+1)/2) = O(*n*²) cells
- Filling each cell requires looking at every possible split point between the two non-terminals needed to introduce a new phrase.
- There are O(n) possible split points.
- Total time complexity is O(n³)

Complexity of CKY (all parses)

- Previous analysis assumes the number of phrase labels in each cell is fixed by the size of the grammar.
- If compute all derivations for each non-terminal, the number of cell entries can expand combinatorially.
- Since the number of parses can be exponential, so is the complexity of finding all parse trees.

72

71

Effect of CNF on Parse Trees

73

- Parse trees are for CNF grammar not the original grammar.
- A post-process can repair the parse tree to return a parse tree for the original grammar.

Syntactic Ambiguity

74

- Just produces all possible parse trees.
- Does not address the important issue of ambiguity resolution.

Ambiguity NP VF NP VP Pronoun Verb NF Pronoun VP PP shot Det Nominal Verb NP in my pajamas an PP Nominal shot Det Nominal Noun in my pajamas Noun an elephant elephant Examples taken from Jurafsky and Martin







Evaluating Chunking

• Per token accuracy does not evaluate finding correct full chunks. Instead use:

 $Precision = \frac{Number of correct chunks found}{Total number of chunks found}$ $Recall = \frac{Number of correct chunks found}{Total number of actual chunks}$

• Take harmonic mean to produce a single evaluation metric called F measure.

$$F = \frac{(\beta^2 + 1)PR}{\beta^2 P + R} \qquad F_1 = \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{P} + \frac{1}{R})/2} = \frac{2PR}{P + R}$$

Current Chunking Results Best system for NP chunking: F₁=96% Typical results for finding range of chunk types (CONLL 2000 shared task: NP, VP, PP, ADV, SBAR, ADJP) is F₁=92–94%

80