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Today 2/19 $\qquad$ 2-

- Review HMMs for POS tagging
- Entropy intuition
- Statistical Sequence classifiers
$\qquad$
- HMMs
- MaxEnt
- MEMMs


## Statistical Sequence

## Classification

- Given an input sequence, assign a label (or tag) to each element of the tape $\qquad$
- Or... Given an input tape, write a tag out to an output tape for each cell on the input tape
- Can be viewed as a classification task if we view
- The individual cells on the input tape as things to be classified
- The tags written on the output tape as the class labels
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## POS Tagging as Sequence

 Classification- We are given a sentence (an "observation" or "sequence of observations")
- Secretariat is expected to race tomorrow
- What is the best sequence of tags which corresponds to this sequence of observations?
- Probabilistic view:
- Consider all possible sequences of tags
- Out of this universe of sequences, choose the tag sequence which is most probable given the observation sequence of $n$ words $w 1 \ldots w n$.
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## Statistical Sequence

 Classification

- We want, out of all sequences of $n$ tags $t_{1} \ldots t_{n}$ the single tag sequence such that $P\left(t_{1} \ldots t_{n} \mid w_{1} \ldots w_{n}\right)$ is highest.

$$
\hat{t}_{1}^{n}=\underset{t_{1}^{n}}{\operatorname{argmax}} P\left(t_{1}^{n} \mid w_{1}^{n}\right)
$$

- Hat ${ }^{\wedge}$ means "our estimate of the best one"
- $\operatorname{Argmax}_{x} f(x)$ means "the $x$ such that $f(x)$ is maximized"
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## Road to HMMs

- This equation is guaranteed to give us the best tag sequence

$$
\hat{t}_{1}^{n}=\underset{t_{1}^{n}}{\operatorname{argmax}} P\left(t_{1}^{n} \mid w_{1}^{n}\right)
$$

- But how to make it operational? How to compute this value?
- Intuition of Bayesian classification:
- Use Bayes rule to transform into a set of other probabilities that are easier to compute
$2128 / 108$

| Using Bayes Rule |
| :---: |
| $P(x \mid y)=\frac{P(y \mid x) P(x)}{P(y)}$ |
| $\hat{t}_{1}^{n}=\underset{t_{1}^{n}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{P\left(w_{1}^{n} \mid t_{1}^{n}\right) P\left(t_{1}^{n}\right)}{P\left(w_{1}^{n}\right)}$ |
| $\hat{t}_{1}^{n}=\underset{t_{1}^{n}}{\operatorname{argmax}} P\left(w_{1}^{n} \mid t_{1}^{n}\right) P\left(t_{1}^{n}\right)$ |
| 28088 |
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## Likelihood and Prior



## Transition Probabilities

- Tag transition probabilities $\mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}} \mid \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)$
- Determiners likely to precede adjs and nouns
- That/DT flight/NN
- The/DT yellow/JJ hat/NN
- So we expect $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{NN} \mid \mathrm{DT})$ and $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{JJ\mid DT})$ to be high
- Compute $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{NN} \mid \mathrm{DT})$ by counting in a labeled corpus:

$$
P\left(t_{i} \mid t_{i-1}\right)=\frac{C\left(t_{i-1}, t_{i}\right)}{C\left(t_{i-1}\right)}
$$

$P(N N \mid D T)=\frac{C(D T, N N)}{C(D T)}=\frac{56,509}{116,454}=.49$
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## Observation Probabilities

- Word likelihood probabilities $p\left(w_{i} \mid t_{i}\right)$
- VBZ (3sg Pres verb) likely to be "is"
- Compute P (is $\mid$ VBZ $)$ bv countina in a labeled corpus: $\quad P\left(w_{i} \mid t_{i}\right)=\frac{C\left(t_{i}, w_{i}\right)}{C\left(t_{i}\right)}$
$P(i s \mid V B Z)=\frac{C(V B Z, i s)}{C(V B Z)}=\frac{10,073}{21,627}=.47$
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## An Example: the verb "race"

- Secretariat/NNP is/VBZ expected/VBN to/TO race/VB tomorrow/NR
- People/NNS continue/VB to/TO inquire/VB the/DT reason/NN for/IN the/DT race/NN for/IN outer/JJ space/NN
- How do we pick the right tag? $\qquad$
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## Example

- $\mathrm{P}($ NN|TO $)=.00047$
- $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{VB} \mid \mathrm{TO})=.83$
- $\mathrm{P}($ race $\mid \mathrm{NN})=.00057$
- $\mathrm{P}($ race $\mid \mathrm{VB})=.00012$
- $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{NR} \mid \mathrm{VB})=.0027$
- $P(N R \mid N N)=.0012$
- $P(V B \mid T O) P(N R \mid V B) P($ race|VB $)=.00000027$
- $P(N N \mid T O) P(N R \mid N N) P($ race $\mid N N)=.00000000032$
- So we (correctly) choose the verb reading,
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## Markov chain = "First-order

 Observable Markov Model"- A set of states
- $\mathrm{Q}=\mathrm{q}_{1}, \mathrm{q}_{2} \ldots \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{N}}$ the state at time t is $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{t}}$
- Transition probabilities:
- a set of probabilities $A=a_{01} a_{02} \ldots a_{n 1} \ldots a_{n n}$.
- Each $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ represents the probability of transitioning from state i to state j
- The set of these is the transition probability matrix A
- Current state only depends on previous state
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## Hidden Markov Models

- States $\mathrm{Q}=\mathrm{q}_{1}, \mathrm{q}_{2} \ldots \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{N}}$;
- Observations $\mathrm{O}=\mathrm{o}_{1}, \mathrm{o}_{2} \ldots \mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{N}}$;
- Each observation is a symbol from a vocabulary $\mathrm{V}=$ $\left\{\mathrm{v}_{1}, \mathrm{v}_{2}, \ldots \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{v}}\right\}$
- Transition probabilities
- Transition probability matrix $\mathrm{A}=\left\{\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right\}$

- Observation likelihoods
- Output probability matrix $\mathrm{B}=\left\{\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{k})\right\}$




B observation likelihoods for POS HMM


## The A matrix for the POS HMM

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | VB | TO | NN | PPSS |  |
| $<\mathbf{s}>$ | .019 | .0043 | .041 | .067 |  |
| VB | .0038 | .035 | .047 | .0070 |  |
| TO | .83 | 0 | .00047 | 0 |  |
| NN | .0040 | .016 | .087 | .0045 |  |
| PPSS | .23 | .00079 | .0012 | .00014 |  |

Figure 4.15 Tag transition probabilities (the $a$ array, $p\left(t_{i} \mid t_{i-1}\right)$ computed from the 87-tag Brown corpus without smoothing. The rows are labeled with the conditioning event; thus $P(P P S S \mid V B)$ is .0070 . The symbol $\langle\mathrm{s}\rangle>$ is the start-of-sentence symbol.

## The B matrix for the POS HMM




## The Viterbi Algorithm
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| Information Theory |
| :--- |
|  |
| - Who is going to win the World Series next |
| year? |
| - Well there are 30 teams. Each has a |
| chance, so there's a 1/30 chance for any |
| team...? No. |
| - Rockies? Big surprise, lots of information |
| - Yankees? No surprise, not much information |
| 222808 |
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## Entropy

$\qquad$
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- Let's start with a simple case, the probability of word sequences with a $\qquad$ unigram model
- Example $\qquad$
- $\mathrm{S}=$ "One fish two fish red fish blue fish"
- $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{S})=$ $\mathrm{P}($ One $) \mathrm{P}$ (fish) P (two) P (fish) P (red) P (fish) P (blue) P (fish)
- $\log \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{S})=\log \mathrm{P}($ One $)+\log \mathrm{P}($ fish $)+\ldots \log \mathrm{P}($ fish $)$
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## Entropy cont.

- Now let's divide both sides by N , the length of the sequence: $\qquad$

- That's basically an average of the logprobs
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## Model Evaluation

- Remember the name of the game is to come up with statistical models that capture something useful in some body of text or speech.
- There are precisely a gazzilion ways to do this
- N-grams of various sizes
- Smoothing
- Backoff...

2128108

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Model Evaluation |
| :--- |
| - The more you're surprised at some event |
| that actually happens, the worse your |
| model was. |
| - We want models that minimize your |
| surprise at observed outcomes. |
| - Given two models and some training data |
| and some withheld test data... which is |
| better? |
| 2 22a008 |

## Three HMM Problems



$\qquad$


| Who cares? |
| :--- |
| - Suppose I have two different HMM models |
| extracted from some training data. |
| - And suppose I have a good-sized set of |
| held-out data (not used to produce the |
| above models). |
| - How can I tell which model is the better |
| model? |
| 2 22808 |
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## Generative vs. Discriminative Models

| - For POS tagging we start with the |
| :--- |
| question... P (tags \| words) but we end up |
| via Bayes at |
| - P (words\| tags) P (tags) |
| - That's called a generative model |
| - We're reasoning backwards from the models |
| that could have produced such an output |
|  |
| 22808 |


$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Discriminative Models

- What if we went back to the start to
- Argmax P(tags|words) and didn't use Bayes?
- Can we get a handle on this directly?
- First let's generalize to $P$ (tags|evidence)
- Let's make some independence assumptions and consider the previous state and the current word as the evidence. How does that look as a graphical model?
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