

A Subword Guided Neural Word Segmentation Model for Sindhi

Wazir Ali¹, Jay Kumar¹, Zenglin Xu^{1,2}, Congjian Luo^{1,2}, Junyu Lu¹, Junming Shao¹, Rajesh Kumar¹, and Yazhou Ren¹

¹ School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China

² School of Computer Science and Technology, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, University Town of Shenzhen, Nanshan, 510085 Shenzhen, China

Abstract. Deep neural networks employ multiple processing layers for learning text representations to alleviate the burden of manual feature engineering in Natural Language Processing (NLP). Such text representations are widely used to extract features from unlabeled data. The word segmentation is a fundamental and inevitable prerequisite for many languages. Sindhi is an under-resourced language, whose segmentation is challenging as it exhibits space omission, space insertion issues, and lacks the labeled corpus for segmentation. In this paper, we investigate supervised Sindhi Word Segmentation (SWS) using unlabeled data with a Subword Guided Neural Word Segmenter (SGNWS) for Sindhi. In order to learn text representations, we incorporate subword representations to recurrent neural architecture to capture word information at morphemic-level, which takes advantage of Bidirectional Long-Short Term Memory (BiLSTM), self-attention mechanism, and Conditional Random Field (CRF). Our proposed SGNWS model achieves an F1 value of 98.51% without relying on feature engineering. The empirical results demonstrate the benefits of the proposed model over the existing Sindhi word segmenters.

Keywords: Recurrent neural networks · sequence tagging · Sindhi word segmentation · subword representation learning.

1 Introduction

Word segmentation is a fundamental and challenging task in text classification and other NLP applications [6]. Word segmenter determines the boundaries of words in the shape of beginning and ending [11]. It has been largely investigated in many space-delimited languages including English [7], Arabic [4], Urdu [46] and non-space delimited languages including Chinese [45], Japanese [17], and Burmese [43]. However, the word segmentation in low-resource Sindhi language has not been studied well [16], mainly due to the lack of language resources.

Sindhi word segmentation exhibits the space omission and space insertion [6,24] problems. Although, the white spaces between words are a good sign for

predicting word boundaries, the space omission and space insertion between words bring ambiguity in the segmentation process. Therefore, the SWS task is a challenging problem because of resource scarcity, lack of standard segmentation benchmark corpus, and rich morphological features [6,25] in Sindhi language. Previously, little work has been proposed to address the SWS problem by employing dictionary-based [6] and rule-based [25,24,29,12] approaches. Thus, the existing approaches lack the applicability towards open-source implementation due to following reasons, (i) inability to deal with out-of-vocabulary words, (ii) less robust on the large datasets, and (iii) lower segmentation accuracy. Our proposed novel deep SGNWS model has the capability of dealing with such issues for SWS with the Subword Representation Learning (SRL) approach.

Recently, deep neural architectures have largely gained popularity in NLP community [42] by greatly simplifying the learning and decoding in a number of NLP applications [10,23,39,40] including word segmentation [4,35] with neural word embedding [8,21] and powerful recurrent neural architectures [14,34]. More recently, self-attention [37] has also become a popular approach to boost the performance of neural models. Therefore, we tackle the SWS problem by taking advantage of BiLSTM, self-attention, SRL, and CRF without relying on external feature engineering.

In this paper, we propose a language-independent neural word segmentation model for Sindhi. The proposed model efficiently captures the character-level information with subword representation learning. We convert segmentation into a sequence tagging problem using B, I, E, S, X tagging scheme. Where B denotes [Beginning], I [Inside], E [Ending] of a word in the given corpus, S [Single] is used for the tagging of a single or special character in the unlabeled text, and X tag is used for [hard-space] between words. We train task-oriented [21] Sindhi word representations with character-level subword approach [18]. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to tackle SWS as a sequence labeling task. We provide the open-source implementation for further investigation³. Our novel contributions are listed as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to propose a sequence modeling based language-independent neural model to tackle the SWS problem.
- The proposed model eliminates the constraint of external feature engineering by adopting subword representation learning.
- We treat SWS as a sequence tagging problem by assigning the B, I, E, S, X tags to unlabelled corpus for the word boundary detection.
- Extensive experiments prove the dominant performance of our proposed model compared with the baselines approaches.

2 Related Work

Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) variants has been widely adopted in a number of learning tasks [41,30,20,38] including sequence tagging problems [15,23,42]

³ <https://github.com/AliWazir/Neural-Sindhi-word-segmenter>

since the inception of well-known LSTM network [14]. However, LSTM suffers from a limitation to encode the given sequence in unidirectional way. This limitation has been handled by stacking two LSTM networks as a bidirectional encoder, known as BiLSTM [34] by the integration of the simultaneous training strategy in forward and backward directions. It is an ideal solution to learn the sequences in a language because, unlike unidirectional, the bidirectional network is beneficial to access both the contexts of right and left directions. The bidirectional RNN variants have been largely employed for word segmentation [39,40,22] in Chinese [9,36], Japanese [17] and Arabic [4] by achieving excellent performance without relying on any external feature engineering strategies.

On the one hand, state-of-the-art sequence tagging systems rely on large amounts of task-specific knowledge [23] in the form of hand-engineered features and data pre-processing. On the other hand, the performance of neural models can be enhanced by incorporating unsupervised neural embeddings including classical [26], character-level [8], deep contextualized [2] and task-oriented [21]. Moreover, the success of deep neural architectures also relies on the optimal hyper-parameters selection [33]. More recently, an attention mechanism [37] in neural models has also yielded new state-of-the-art results in multiple NLP tasks. Furthermore, the last layer of neural models has a significant impact on performance. The CRF [19] is broadly used in the sequence classification tasks [17,23,15,9] for decoding in neural models. Taking advantage of language-independent neural models for SWS, we propose a model that efficiently captures the character-level information with subword representation learning by converting the segmentation into a sequence tagging problem.

Presently, Sindhi language is being written in two famous writing system of Persion-Arabic and Devanagari [27]. However, Persian-Arabic is standard script [24] as well as frequently used in online communication, literary work, and journalism. Sindhi contains rich morphology due to the frequent usage of prefixes and suffixes to express inflections and derivations, which makes it a complex morphological language. Initially, the SWS was coined [25] by introducing the first word segmentation model using several rule-based algorithms. The proposed model was evaluated on a small dataset consists of 16,601 lexicon with cumulative segmentation error rate (SER) of 9.54%. Later, [24] proposed a rule-based word tokenizer with 91.76% segmentation accuracy. The segmentation is performed in three steps; the first step consists of input and segmentation with white space. The second step is used for the segmentation of simple and compound words, while the third step deals with the segmentation of complex words. In this way, different word types are separately segmented in their proposed model. Moreover, [6] proposed a word segmenter by evaluating the dataset of 1,57,509 words obtained from news corpus and dictionary lexicon. Their proposed model achieves good performance dictionary lexicon, but poorly performed in dealing with news and books corpus. Recently, [12] proposed two algorithms for stemming and lemmatization process with an opensource⁴ implementation. The SWS is a challenging task because it exhibits space omission

⁴ <https://sindhinlp.com/stemlema.php>

and space insertion problems. This is partly because of the Arabic script, which, although cursive in nature, consists of characters that have inherent joining and non-joining attributes regardless of a word boundary. Apart from the discussed problems, there is no gold-standard benchmark corpus for Sindhi to evaluate the segmentation task. In summary, the SWS task is difficult, important, and not-studied as a sequence modeling problem. The previous approaches mainly rely on the rule-based and dictionary-based methods, which have certain limitations such as inability to deal with out of vocabulary words, less robustness for other languages, and the algorithms’ inefficiency to deal with a large amount of noisy or raw text.

3 Sindhi Morphology

The Persian-Arabic is a standard writing script for Sindhi, which is cursive and written from right to left direction [28,32]. It contains rich morphology [24] due to the frequent usage of prefixes and suffixes to express inflections and derivations, which makes it a complex morphological language. The alphabet of Sindhi Persian-Arabic consists of 52 basic letters, 29 derived from Arabic language, 03 from the Persian language, and 20 modified letters [16]. It also uses 03 secondary letters, 07 honorific symbols and diacritic marks [28,32]. Interestingly, the shape of some letters in Sindhi change the form according to their position in a word [6], such letters are referred as *joiners*. Thus, a *joiner* have at most four shapes; i) initial ii) middle iii) final and iv) isolated, as Table 1 depicts an example of some letters. Whereas the position-independent letters having final or isolated form are referred as *non-joiners*. Specifically, white spaces are used to detect word boundaries in Sindhi. However, writers omit a hard space between two words. Therefore, a phrase or a sentence that ends with non-joiner letters becomes one token. In the first case, the words are joined with their preceding and succeeding words in the absence of white space, which leads to misspellings. In the second case, the shape of characters remains identical even in the absence of white space. Due to position-independent and space-independent letters, the SWS exhibits both challenges of space insertion and space omission [25,32].

3.1 Space Omission

The space omission is a common phenomenon in Sindhi words that end with the non-joiner letters. However, the absence of white space exhibit the correct shape of words such as Table 3 shows an example of a Sindhi sentence with and without the use of white space. But computationally, that sentence consists of one token without the use of white spaces between words. Whereas the sentence consists of eight tokens with the use of white space between words. Therefore, the omission of white space between words ending with non-joiner letters raises a computational issue.

Table 4: Sindhi word types with an example of space insertion, along with English translation. (i) represent the words with white space (‘-’ symbol represents space), and (ii) without space. The Roman transliteration is given for ease of reading.

Word Type	i.	ii.	Roman	English Translation
Affix	بي-حساب	بيحساب	Be-hisaab	Uncountable
Reduplicate	ههڙي-ههڙي	ههڙيههڙي	haidai hodai	Here and there
Compound	صاحب-قدرت	صاحبقدرت	saahib-e-Qudrat	Powerful
Borrowed	موبائيل-فون	موبائيلفون	Mobile phone	Mobile Phone
Abbreviation	اين سي ايچ ڊي	اينسي ايچ ڊي	Ain Cee Aich Dee	NCHD

4 Methodology

In this section, the proposed methodology is described in detail. Firstly, we convert the segmentation as a classification problem by introducing the proposed B, I, E, S, X tagging scheme. The labels are assigned to each Sindhi character, including punctuation marks and numbers in the dataset. Afterwards, we describe the baseline as well as the proposed SGNWS models. Later, we present the experimental details and the variants of neural models, including word representations, character-level SRL to predict subwords boundaries.

4.1 Tagging Scheme

We modeled the word segmentation as character-level sequence labelling [9]. Theoretically, word boundary can be predicted with binary classification in word segmentation, but in practice, fine-grained tag sets [44] produce high segmentation accuracy. Following the work [36], we employ four tags [B, I, E, S] to indicate the position of letters at the Beginning [B], Inside [I], Ending [E] of a word, or a Single-character/symbol [S], respectively. Additionally, [X] is used to represent the white space to delimit word boundaries. A sentence, as an example of the proposed tagging scheme is depicted in Table 5 by assigning the proposed tags to a sentence.

4.2 Recurrent Neural Architectures

Long-Short-Term-Memory Unit: The LSTM network [14] is an extension of RNN proposed to solve vanishing and exploding gradient problems. For a given input x_t of a sentence $S = [x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots x_n]$, each word is represented into N -dimensional vector (word representation). As we mentioned earlier that Sindhi is being written from the right-to-left direction. Thus, an LSTM network computes each representation \overleftarrow{h}_t of the right context of the given input at each time-step t . The memory unit c allows the network to learn when to forget the

Table 5: An example of employed character-level sequence tagging scheme for SWS task. The [X] label represents the white spaces. The given Sindhi sentence can be read from right to left, and the Roman transliteration of each Sindhi token can be read from left to right.

Roman Transliteration	.	ahai	boli	qadeemi	Sindhi
Sindhi Persian-Arabic	.	آهي	ٻولي	قديمي	سنڌي
Character Sequence	.	ا ه ي آ	ب و ل ي	ق د ي م ي	س ن ڌ ي
Tagging scheme	S	E I B X	E I I B X	E I I I B X	E I I B

previous information and when to update memory cells given new information. The core LSTM architecture contains forget f , input i , and output o gates, which regulate the information to flow-in and flow-out at current state t . The mathematical representation of the gates, cell update, and output in LSTM is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 i^t &= \sigma(W_i h_{t-1} + U_i x_t + b_i) \\
 f^t &= \sigma(W_f h_{t-1} + U_f x_t + b_f) \\
 \tilde{c}^t &= \tanh(W_c h_t + U_c x_t + b_c) \\
 c^t &= f^t \odot c^t + i^t \odot \tilde{c}^t \\
 o^t &= \sigma(W_o h_{t-1} + U_o x_t + b_o) \\
 h^t &= o^t \odot \tanh(c^t)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where σ and \odot are the element-wises sigmoid function and element-wise product, U, W, b denote the input x_t weight matrix, hidden h_t weight matrix, and bias vector for each LSTM gate, respectively. The core model is a memory cell c which encodes long-term temporal dependencies of observed inputs at every time-step t .

Bidirectional Long-Short-Term-Memory (BiLSTM): The BiLSTM model encodes the text sequences from both left and right directions into two separate forward \vec{h} and backward \overleftarrow{h} hidden states to capture the right and left context information. Afterwards, both hidden states \vec{h} , \overleftarrow{h} are concatenated for the final output. However, the LSTM hidden state h_t can only encode context of one direction, such as the left direction, knowing nothing about the right direction. The BiLSTM first computes the forward \vec{h} and then backward \overleftarrow{h} hidden states of a given input x_t . Afterwards, both \vec{h} and \overleftarrow{h} are combined to generate output y_t . This process can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{h}_t &= H \left(W_{x\vec{h}} x_t + \left(W_{\vec{h}} \vec{h}_{t-1} + b_{\vec{h}} \right) \right) \\
\overleftarrow{h}_t &= H \left(W_{x\overleftarrow{h}} x_t + \left(W_{\overleftarrow{h}} \overleftarrow{h}_{t+1} + b_{\overleftarrow{h}} \right) \right) \\
y_t &= W_{\vec{h}y} \vec{h}_t + W_{\overleftarrow{h}y} \overleftarrow{h}_t + b_t
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where, H is a concatenation of the corresponding hidden outputs of both forward \vec{h}_y , and backward \overleftarrow{h}_y LSTM cells.

4.3 Tag Inference

The CRF is an effective approach for sequence tagging problems [19] because it learns the scoring function from tag pairs, such as B, I, E, S at the training stage. Thus, it is beneficial for sequence tagging tasks by considering the correlation between the corresponding neighbour tags [23] as well as efficiently decodes the best chain of tags of a given input sequence. The probability of a possible tag sequences in CRF can be formulated as:

$$P(Y|X) = \frac{\prod_{i=2}^n \exp(s(X, i)_{y_i} + b_{y_{i-1}y_i})}{\sum_{y'} \prod_{i=2}^n \exp(s(X, i)'_{y_i} + b'_{y_{i-1}y_i})} \tag{3}$$

where $y \in \{B, I, E, S\}$ tags, scoring function $s(X, i)_{y_i}$ is an output of the hidden layer at i_{th} word, and $b_{y_{i-1}y_i}$ are the trainable parameters. While decoding is the search for tag sequences y with highest conditional probability. Thus, by solving the Eq. (4), we obtain optimal tag sequence:

$$Y^* = \operatorname{argmax} P(Y|X) \tag{4}$$

4.4 Subword Representation Learning

We use BiLSTM network [14] for SRL by representing each word w from a fixed vocabulary V of unlabeled Sindhi text in a sequence of forward and backward character representations. Such as, character representations $E^c = [c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_i]$, bigrams $E^B = [c_i, c_{i+1}]$, and trigrams $E^T = [c_i, c_{i+1}, c_{i+2}]$ of a given word are learned to capture the structure of words at morphemic level. Afterwards, we utilize both forward and backward representations by concatenating them:

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{h}_t &= \text{LSTM} \left(E^{C_i} : E^{B_i} : E^{T_i}, \vec{h}_{t-1} \right), \\
\overleftarrow{h}_t &= \text{LSTM} \left(E^{C_i} : E^{B_i} : E^{T_i}, \overleftarrow{h}_{t+1} \right), \\
\text{BiLSTM}(Emb_s) &= \vec{h}_{|w|} : \overleftarrow{h}_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where Emb_s is the concatenated output of Bidirectional $\vec{h}_{|w|}$, \overleftarrow{h}_1 representations of LSTM layers over the sequence of character n-grams.

Table 6: An example of Sindhi subword decomposition for subword representation learning

Representation	Decomposition
Word	سنڌوندي
Characters	س+ن+ڌ+و+ن+د+ي
Bigrams	سن+نڌ+ڌو+ون+ند+دي
Trigrams	سنڌ+نڌو+ڌون+ونند+ندي
4-grams	سنڌو+نڌون+ڌونند+ونندي

4.5 Proposed Model

The proposed SGNWS architecture consists of five layers. We explain sequential processing of each layer as follows:

- **Input layer:** The model takes character-level input $x_t = c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_i$ of character unigrams c_i , character bigrams c_i, c_{i+1} , character trigrams c_i, c_{i+1}, c_{i+2} , and 4-grams of each word w_n for SRL, as depicted in Table 6.
- **Embedding layer:** After the character-level input, we learn bidirectional unigram E_c , bigram E_c^B , trigram E_c^T , and 4-gram representations of the given input words w_n , other numerical features and then concatenate them into subword embeddings as formulated in Eq.(5). In the next step, embeddings are used as an input to the proposed model after passing through a non-linear bidirectional layer.
- **LSTM layers:** we utilize forward \vec{h} and backward hidden \overleftarrow{h} layers of BiLSTM to obtain high-level features from embedding layer. The n-gram based subword representations are passed through the \vec{h} and \overleftarrow{h} layers.
- **Hidden layer:** The Bidirectional output of the forward and backward hidden layers is concatenated with a hidden layer before the input to the CRF layer.
- **Self-attention layer:** We add a self-attention layer before the CRF classifier, which has the ability to decide how much information to use from token-level components dynamically.
- **Output layer:** Finally, the CRF layer is placed on the last hidden layer of proposed model to incorporate transition information between succeeding tag sequences to obtain optimal tag sequences over the entire sentence. In this way, CRF decodes the best chain of tags Y^* of given input sequences as represented in Eq. (4).

5 Experimental Setup

This section provides details about the experimental setting of baseline models as well as proposed SGNWS architecture. We use tensorflow [1] deep learning framework for the implementation of all neural models on GTX 1080-TITAN GPU to conduct all the experiments.

Table 7: Statistics of the proposed unlabelled dataset used in the experiments. We concatenate all the datasets and represent it as SDSEG in general experiments.

Domain	Sentences	Tokens	Unique words	Average word length
Kawish news paper	24,212	601,910	10,721	3.687
Awami-Awaz news paper	19,736	521,257	14,690	3.660
Wikipedia-dumps	14,557	669,623	11,820	3.738
Twitter	10,752	159,130	17,379	3.820
Books	22,496	430,923	16,127	3.684
Total	91,753	2,382,843	70,737	3.717

5.1 Dataset

We utilize the recently proposed unlabeled Sindhi text corpus [3] in the experimental setting. We convert segmentation into a sequence tagging problem using B, I, E, S, X tagging scheme and split the dataset into 80% for training and 20% for development and test sets. The complete statistics of the dataset is given in Table 7. We split each sentence with punctuation marks of period, comma, question mark, colon, semicolon, exclamation mark, dash for consistency in the dataset and do not consider sentences having tokens less than 5. Moreover, we split the large sentences with white-space if the length exceeds more than 300 tokens. The regular hard-space is tagged as [X] in the dataset. However, multi-word tokens such as numerical expressions 689.0967, date 25-06-2020, money 4736\$, etc., are assigned continuous tags. For example, date 25-06-2020 is assigned continuous tags of BIIIIIIIE, respectively.

5.2 Baseline Models

To analyze and compare the performance of proposed model, we conduct several baseline experiments by training by training the LSTM, BiLSTM, and B-LSTM-CRF. We train task-specific [21] character-level word representations in baseline experiments. The brief description of each approach is defined as follows:

1. **LSTM**: Our first baseline is the LSTM network exploited with character-level word representations using task-oriented strategy [21]. We use a softmax classifier in the last layer of the network for the decoding of tag sequences.
2. **BiLSTM**: The BiLSTM has the advantage of encoding forward and backward sequences to efficiently capture the word information at the morphemic level. Similar to the LSTM network, we also use softmax in the last layer of the network for decoding.

3. **BiLSTM-CRF**: The third baseline model is based on a BiLSTM-CRF network with a similar hyper-parameter setting as LSTM and BiLSTM networks. We use CRF inference in the last layer of the network for decoding purpose.

All the hyper-parameters for baseline models and SGNWS are kept similar (see Table 8) for performance difference and fair comparison.

5.3 Evaluation metrics

We report word boundary Precision, Recall and F-Score as illustrated in Eq. (6)-(7)-(8). The Precision evaluates the percentage of correctly predicted tags with respect to the predicted boundaries, and Recall measures the percentage of correctly predicted tags with respect to the true boundaries. While F – Score is the harmonic mean of Precision and Recall, which can be interpreted as their weighted average.

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\#(\text{correctly_predicted_tags})}{\#(\text{predicted_tags})} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\#(\text{correctly_predicted_tags})}{\#(\text{true_tags})} \quad (7)$$

$$F\text{-Score} = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (8)$$

5.4 Parameter setting and training

The training procedure is to regulate all parameters of the network from training data. We train the baselines and proposed model using the log-likelihood function. The log-likelihood has already been optimized to give strong performances in our baseline experiments compared to global learning [5] to maximize F-Score. We distribute the SDSEG dataset into training, development, and test sets. We use variational dropout [13] to both input and output recurrent units. The softmax is used for label classification in baseline LSTM and BiLSTM models, CRF is added in the last layer of the BiLSTM-CRF and SGNWS models. The Gradient normalization is used to improve the performance [31], which re-scales the gradient when the norm goes over a threshold. The range of optimal hyper-parameters for SRL, baselines, and the proposed model is depicted in Table 8.

6 Results and analysis

The Table 9 shows the performance comparison of all the models on SDSEG dataset. Firstly, the LSTM yields a stable baseline F-Score of 95.29% on development and 94.32% on the test set. The BiLSTM model provides better results

Table 8: Optimal hyper-parameters for SRL, baseline neural models, and proposed SGNWS model.

	Hyper-parameter	Range
SRL	E^c dimension	64
	E^B dimension	64
	E^T dimension	64
	Emb_S dimension	64
	Epochs	100
Neural models	Optimizer	Adamax
	Learning rate	0.025
	Gradient normalization	5.0
	h layers	200
	Dropout	0.25
	Epochs	40

Table 9: Results of baselines and proposed SGNWS model for Sindhi word segmentation on the SDSEG development and test sets.

RNN variant	Dev.			Test		
	P	R	F	P	R	F
LSTM (Baseline)	96.38	95.68	95.29	94.81	94.57	94.32
BiLSTM	96.86	96.21	96.19	96.52	94.28	95.87
BiLSTM-CRF	97.25	96.38	96.74	96.11	95.87	96.18
BiLSTM-CRF+Char	97.76	97.81	96.38	96.82	97.26	96.78
BiLSTM-CRF+bigram	96.34	97.89	96.58	96.13	97.23	96.74
BiLSTM-CRF++Trigram	97.14	98.29	96.89	97.32	97.68	96.53
SGNWS	99.77	98.83	98.94	99.08	98.72	98.51

than LSTM in both development and test sets due to the bidirectional learning states. However, the BiLSTM-CRF is superior over both baselines of LSTM and BiLSTM, respectively, which shows that CRF is dominant over softmax classifier. Moreover, the addition of character-level features in the BiLSTM-CRF model surpasses three baselines. However, BiLSTM-CRF with bigram and trigram based word embeddings yield close results to the BiLSTM-CRF+Char model, which shows the superiority of the character-level approach a performance gain. The proposed SGNWS model produced superior results over baselines, as depicted in Table 9 on development and test data. According to the results, SRL is beneficial for the SWS task. The proposed SGNWS model surpasses all the

baselines on the SDSEG dataset as well as on five different datasets (see Figure 1) of Kawish, Awami-Awaz, Wikipedia-dumps, Twitter, and books.




Fig. 1: The performance of proposed SGNWS model on the various datasets. The F-Score is reported on the test set of multiple datasets.

Our proposed SGNWS model surpasses baselines with a high F-Score of 98.94% on development set and 98.51% on the test set using the SDSEG dataset. The observation indicates that SRL is beneficial to capture more semantic information for the word segmentation of Sindhi text.

7 Conclusion

The word segmentation is an essential and non-trivial task in Sindhi language. The white spaces between words are a good sign for predicting word boundaries, but the existence of space-omission and space-insertion bring ambiguity in the segmentation process. We proposed the SGNWS model, keeping in view the challenges related to SWS, respectively. The proposed model has the ability to learn and extract subword features automatically by eliminating the constraints such as hand-craft features for segmentation or any other type of prior domain-specific knowledge.

In this paper, we empirically demonstrate that our proposed model yields the best performance in SWS because of its high efficiency and robustness for sequential modeling tasks with great ability to capture the word information at the morphemic level for the prediction of word boundaries. The SGNWS model is an effective and elegant neural solution for SWS, which can also be applied to other sequence tagging problems.

Acknowledgement

This work was funded by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2018YFB1005100 & No. 2018YFB1005104).

References

1. Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Irving, G., Isard, M., et al.: Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In: 12th *USENIX* Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (*OSDI*) 16). pp. 265–283 (2016)
2. Akbik, A., Blythe, D., Vollgraf, R.: Contextual string embeddings for sequence labeling. In: Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. pp. 1638–1649 (2018)
3. Ali, W., Kumar, J., Lu, J., Xu, Z.: Word embedding based new corpus for low-resourced language: Sindhi. arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12579 (2019)
4. Almuhareb, A., Alsanie, W., Al-Thubaity, A.: Arabic word segmentation with long short-term memory neural networks and word embedding. *IEEE Access* **7**, 12879–12887 (2019)
5. Andor, D., Alberti, C., Weiss, D., Severyn, A., Presta, A., Ganchev, K., Petrov, S., Collins, M.: Globally normalized transition-based neural networks. In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 2442–2452 (2016)
6. Bhatti, Z., Ismaili, I.A., Soomro, W.J., Hakro, D.N.: Word segmentation model for Sindhi text. *American Journal of Computing Research Repository* **2**(1), 1–7 (2014)
7. Bird, S.: NLTK: the natural language toolkit. In: Proceedings of the COLING/ACL on Interactive presentation sessions. pp. 69–72 (2006)
8. Bojanowski, P., Grave, E., Joulin, A., Mikolov, T.: Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **5**, 135–146 (2017)
9. Chen, X., Qiu, X., Zhu, C., Liu, P., Huang, X.: Long short-term memory neural networks for Chinese word segmentation. In: Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 1197–1206 (2015)
10. Collobert, R., Weston, J., Bottou, L., Karlen, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., Kuksa, P.: Natural language processing (Almost) from scratch. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12**, 2493–2537 (2011)
11. Ding, C., Thu, Y.K., Utiyama, M., Sumita, E.: Word segmentation for Burmese (Myanmar). *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing* **15**(4), 1–10 (2016)
12. Dootio, M.A., Wagan, A.I.: Automatic stemming and lemmatization process for Sindhi text. *Journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research* **6**(2), 19–28 (2017)
13. Gal, Y., Ghahramani, Z.: A theoretically grounded application of dropout in recurrent neural networks. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 1019–1027 (2016)
14. Hochreiter, S., Schmidhuber, J.: Long short-term memory. *Neural computation* **9**(8), 1735–1780 (1997)

15. Huang, Z., Xu, W., Yu, K.: Bidirectional LSTM-CRF models for sequence tagging. arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.01991 (2015)
16. Jamro, W.A.: Sindhi language processing: A survey. In: International Conference on Innovations in Electrical Engineering and Computational Technologies. pp. 1–8 (2017)
17. Kitagawa, Y., Komachi, M.: Long short-term memory for Japanese word segmentation. In: Proceedings of the 32nd Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (2018)
18. Labeau, M., Allauzen, A.: Character and subword-based word representation for neural language modeling prediction. In: Proceedings of the First Workshop on Subword and Character Level Models in NLP. pp. 1–13 (2017)
19. Lafferty, J.D., McCallum, A., Pereira, F.C.: Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In: Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 282–289 (2001)
20. Liu, H., He, L., Bai, H., Dai, B., Bai, K., Xu, Z.: Structured inference for recurrent hidden semi-markov model. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. pp. 2447–2453 (2018)
21. Liu, Q., Huang, H.Y., Gao, Y., Wei, X., Tian, Y., Liu, L.: Task-oriented word embedding for text classification. In: Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. pp. 2023–2032 (2018)
22. Ma, J., Ganchev, K., Weiss, D.: State-of-the-art Chinese word segmentation with bi-lstms. In: Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 4902–4908 (2018)
23. Ma, X., Hovy, E.: End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional LSTM-CNNs-CRF. In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 1064–1074 (2016)
24. Mahar, J., Shaikh, H., Memon, G.: A model for Sindhi text segmentation into word tokens. *Sindh University Research Journal (Science Series)* **44**(1) (2012)
25. Mahar, J.A., Memon, G.Q., Danwar, S.H.: Algorithms for Sindhi word segmentation using lexicon-driven approach. *International journal of academic research* **3**(3) (2011)
26. Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G.S., Dean, J.: Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 3111–3119 (2013)
27. Motlani, R.: Developing language technology tools and resources for a resource-poor language: Sindhi. In: Proceedings of the NAACL Student Research Workshop. pp. 51–58 (2016)
28. Narejo, W.A., Mahar, J.A.: Morphology: Sindhi morphological analysis for natural language processing applications. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computing, Electronic and Electrical Engineering. pp. 27–31 (2016)
29. Narejo, W.A., Mahar, J.A., Mahar, S.A., Surahio, F.A., Jumani, A.K.: Sindhi morphological analysis: An algorithm for Sindhi word segmentation into morphemes. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security* **14**(6), 293 (2016)
30. Pan, Y., Xu, J., Wang, M., Ye, J., Wang, F., Bai, K., Xu, Z.: Compressing recurrent neural networks with tensor ring for action recognition. In: The Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. pp. 4683–4690 (2019)
31. Pascanu, R., Mikolov, T., Bengio, Y.: On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks. In: Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning. vol. 28, pp. III–1310 (2013)

32. Rahman, M.U.: Towards Sindhi corpus construction. In: Proceedings of the Conference on Language and Technology (2010)
33. Reimers, N., Gurevych, I.: Optimal hyperparameters for deep LSTM-networks for sequence labeling tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06799 (2017)
34. Schuster, M., Paliwal, K.K.: Bidirectional recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **45**(11), 2673–2681 (1997)
35. Shao, Y.: Cross-lingual word segmentation and morpheme segmentation as sequence labelling. In: The First Workshop on Multi-Language Processing in a Globalising World. pp. 75–80 (2017)
36. Shao, Y., Hardmeier, C., Tiedemann, J., Nivre, J.: Character-based joint segmentation and POS tagging for Chinese using bidirectional RNN-CRF. In: Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing. pp. 173–183 (2017)
37. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 5998–6008 (2017)
38. Wen, L., Zhang, X., Bai, H., Xu, Z.: Structured pruning of recurrent neural networks through neuron selection. *Neural Networks* **123**, 134–141 (2020)
39. Yang, J., Zhang, Y., Dong, F.: Neural word segmentation with rich pretraining. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 839–849 (2017)
40. Yao, Y., Huang, Z.: Bi-directional lstm recurrent neural network for Chinese word segmentation. In: International Conference on Neural Information Processing. pp. 345–353 (2016)
41. Ye, J., Wang, L., Li, G., Chen, D., Zhe, S., Chu, X., Xu, Z.: Learning compact recurrent neural networks with block-term tensor decomposition. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 9378–9387 (2018)
42. Young, T., Hazarika, D., Poria, S., Cambria, E.: Recent trends in deep learning based natural language processing. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine* **13**(3), 55–75 (2018)
43. Zhang, S., Mao, C., Yu, Z., Wang, H., Li, Z., Zhang, J.: Word segmentation for Burmese based on dual-layer CRFs. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing* **18**(1) (2018)
44. Zhao, H., Huang, C., Li, M., Lu, B.L.: Effective tag set selection in Chinese word segmentation via conditional random field modeling. In: Proceedings of the 20th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation. pp. 87–94 (2006)
45. Zheng, B., Che, W., Guo, J., Liu, T.: Enhancing LSTM-based word segmentation using unlabeled data. In: Chinese Computational Linguistics and Natural Language Processing Based on Naturally Annotated Big Data, pp. 60–70 (2017)
46. Zia, H.B., Raza, A.A., Athar, A.: Urdu word segmentation using conditional random fields (CRFs). In: Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. pp. 2562–2569 (2018)