

THK's Natural Logic-based Compositional Textual Entailment Model at NTCIR-10 RITE-2

Yotaro Watanabe, Junta Mizuno and Kentaro Inui {yotaro-w,junta-m,inui}@ecei.tohoku.ac.jp

Overview

- Our system learns plausible transformations of pairs of *Text* t_1 and *Hypothesis* t_2 only from semantic labels of the pairs using a discriminative probabilistic model combined with the framework of *Natural Logic*
- ◆ We achieved the highest contradiction detection performance in MC subtask (28.57 of F1)

Natural Logic (NL) for RTE

- Originally proposed by [MacCartney and Manning 2008]
- Assumption: the entailments of a compound expression are a function of the entailments of its parts (*compositionality*)
- A transformation from T to H represents a decomposition of its parts and is represented by a set of alignment edits (insertion, deletion and substitution)
- Sentence-level semantic relations are inferred from semantic relations of alignment edits



Seven types of Relations in NL

Equivalence (couch \equiv sofa) **Forward-ent.** (crow \subset bird) **Backward-ent.** (bird \supset crow) **Negation** (human ^ non-human) **Alternation** (dog | cat) **Cover** (animal \cup non-human) **Independence** (hungry # hippo)

TRAIN

TRAIN

INITIAL

INITIAL

Factors

Alignment factor Ψ_A

provides plausibility of

Alignment Semantic

Projection Factor Ψ_P

Composition Factor

 $\Psi_{\mathsf{c}}\,$ encodes the set of composition rules of

[MacCartney 2009]

are left to initial values

36.32

semantic relations defined in

TRAIN: parameters in the factors

INITIAL: parameters in the factors

* : unofficial results

are learned from training data

provides an appropriate projection from r_e to r_e^{P} by considering the context of e

<u>Relation</u> Factor Ψ_s

each (unlabeled) alignment edits

provides plausibility of semantic

relation r_e of each alignment edit e

Model



- The model provides a conditional joint distribution of alignment edits, their semantic relations, their projected relations and the final semantic relation between *T* and *H*
- Two sentences are aligned using an extended MANLI algorithm [Watanabe+ 12]
- Training the model: maximization of marginal likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda} = \sum_{n} \log p(r_T^C = l^n | \boldsymbol{x}^n; \boldsymbol{\lambda})$

Results

THK-01

30.98

- THK-01: the model was trained with the corresponding development data of each subtask.
- THK-02: the model was trained with the MC-dev data

49.09 21.95 75.00

BC	Macro F1	Acc.	Y-F1	Y-Prec	Y-Rec	N-F1	N-Prec	N-Rec		UnitTest	Macro F1	Acc.	Y-F1	Y-Prec	Y-Rec	N-F1	N-Prec	N-Rec	
THK-02 (*)	58.34	58.69	62.16	50.49	80.86	54.51	75.50	42.66		THK-02 (*)	56.59	73.86	83.93	91.16	77.83	29.21	21.67	44.83	
THK-01	52.40	53.28	45.92	44.65	47.27	58.87	60.18	57.63		THK-01	53.26	71.37	82.35	89.94	75.94	24.18	17.74	37.93	
ExamBC	Macro F1	Acc.	Y-F1	Y-Prec	Y-Rec	N-F1	N-Prec	N-Rec		 Fine-grained semantic labels provided effective information for estimating better parameters in alignment The model failed to assign the relation to delete or insert 									
THK-02 (*)	46.59	46.65	48.38	38.62	64.74	44.80	61.39	35.27											
THK-01	43.77	62.28	11.52	61.11	6.36	76.03	62.33	97.45		 meaning-less expressions (e.g. 主に (mainly)) 									
MC M	acro F1 A	cc. B·	-F1 B-	Prec. B	-Rec.	F-F1 F	-Prec. I	-Rec.	C-F1	C-Prec.	C-Rec. I-F	1 I-Pr	ec I-l	Rec.					

12.86 60.75 47.77 83.41 28.57 52.17 19.67 43.63 54.61