Transition-based Dependency Tree to AMR Parser

Chuan Wang, Yuchen Zhang, Nianwen Xue Brandeis University August.01.2014

Outline

- Motivation
- System pipeline
- Preprocessing
 - o Alignment
 - Gold graph generation
- Dependency tree to Graph transition system
- Preliminary Results

Motivation

The boy wants to visit New York City.





Dependency Tree

AMR Graph







Gold graph generation

Alignment + AMR graph = Gold graph "Our learning target"

1. each node in gold graph represents one of the spans in the sentence.

2. each node also contains its entity tag in the AMR graph.





Dependency Tree to Graph Transition Parsing

Parsing actions:

- → if β is not empty:
 - delete edge
 - swap
 - replace head
 - merge
 - next

- → if β is empty:
 - add child k
 - finish
 - delete node









TESTING

Deterministic Parsing

If we assume alignment is correct, which means we always get the gold graph (alignment + AMR graph), we can design an oracle to generate unique sequence of parsing actions for each sentence in corpus and use perceptron learner to approximate oracle.





Experiment results

Currently we don't have edge label and concept label, we can measure the performance by measuring only the unlabeled score.

$$Precision = \frac{N_{correct}}{N_{parsed}}$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{N_{correct}}{N_{gold}}$$

 $N_{correct}$ is the number of correct attachments predicted N_{parsed} is the number of predicted attachments N_{gold} is the number of gold attachments

Experiment results

- "The little price": 1562 sentences with English AMRs in total; 312 held out as development set; the rest 1250 as training set.
- Similarity of attachment between dependency tree and gold graph? -- baseline measured on the development set.
- CAMR: using only word form, POS tag and named entity tag as features -our system trained 19 iterations on the training set and measured on the development set.

	unlabeled precision	unlabeled recall	unlabeled f1
baseline	0.30	0.48	0.37
CAMR	0.45	0.53	0.48