

EDIN: An End-to-end Benchmark and Pipeline for Unknown Entity Discovery and Indexing

Nora Kassner^{1,2}, Fabio Petroni¹, Mikhail Plekhanov¹, Sebastian Riedel¹, Nicola Cancedda¹

¹Meta AI

²Center for Information and Language Processing, LMU Munich
kassner@cis.lmu.de

Abstract

Existing work on Entity Linking mostly assumes that the reference knowledge base is complete, and therefore all mentions can be linked. In practice this is hardly ever the case, as knowledge bases are incomplete and because novel concepts arise constantly. This paper created the *Unknown Entity Discovery and Indexing* (EDIN) benchmark where unknown entities, that is entities without a description in the knowledge base and labeled mentions, have to be integrated into an existing entity linking system. By contrasting EDIN with zero-shot entity linking, we provide insight on the additional challenges it poses. Building on dense-retrieval based entity linking, we introduce the end-to-end EDIN pipeline that detects, clusters, and indexes mentions of unknown entities in context. Experiments show that indexing a single embedding per entity unifying the information of multiple mentions works better than indexing mentions independently.

1 Introduction

Entity linking (EL), the task of detecting mentions of entities in context and disambiguating them to a reference knowledge base (KB), is an essential task for text understanding. Existing works on EL mostly assume that the reference KB is complete, and therefore all mentions can be linked. In practice this is hardly ever the case, as knowledge bases are incomplete and because novel concepts arise constantly. For example, English Wikipedia, which is often used as the reference KB for large scale linking, is growing by more than 17k entities every month.¹

We created the EDIN benchmark and pipeline²

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Size_of_Wikipedia (09.05.2022)

²Model and benchmark are currently not publicly available.

where *unknown entities*, that is entities with no available canonical names, descriptions and labeled mentions, have to be integrated into an existing EL model in an end-to-end fashion.

The benchmark is based on Wikipedia and a subset of news pages of the common-crawl dataset OSCAR (Abadji et al., 2021), split into two parts, one preceding time t_1 and one between t_1 and t_2 . With current approaches, an EL system created at t_1 is unable to successfully link unknown entities that were added to Wikipedia between t_1 and a subsequent time t_2 , as it lacks the ability to represent them as part of the entity index. This sets this task apart from zero-shot entity linking (Logeswaran et al., 2019). In the zero-shot (zs) setting, a textual description of the zs entities is assumed available at the time of training. This allows the creation of entity embeddings for them, their insertion in a dense entity index, and their use during training as negative examples. In contrast, no such textual description is initially available for unknown entities.

To adapt the model trained at t_1 , the model can only make use of an *adaptation dataset* and unsupervised techniques. There are two parts to this task: i) Discovery: The entity linking system needs to detect mentions of unknown entities part of the adaptation dataset and classify them as unknown and ii) Indexing: co-referring mentions of unknown entities need to be mapped to a single embedding compatible with the entity index. The EDIN-pipeline developed for this task is the first to adapt a dense-retrieval based EL system created at t_1 such that it incorporates unknown entities in an end-to-end fashion.

We show that distinguishing known from unknown entities, arguably a key feature of an intelligent system, poses a major challenge to dense-retrieval based EL systems. To successfully do so, a model has to strike the right balance between relying on mention vs. context. On one hand, the

model needs to distinguish unknown entities carrying the same name as known entities and co-refer different mentions of the same unknown entities. In both cases, context reliance is necessary. E.g., the model needs to distinguish the 2019 novel ‘Underland’ from multiple other novels and fictional references carrying the same name. On the other hand, the model needs to distinguish unknown entities with new names but semantic similarity. Here, mention reliance is important. E.g., the model needs to distinguish BioNTech from other biotechnology companies with similar names and contexts.

Another challenge in discovery is class imbalance between known and unknown entities. With Wikipedia-size KBs, there tend to be many fewer mentions of unknown entities than of known entities and an adaptation dataset of finite size limits recall. In this work, we optimize for recall on the cost of precision.

On the side of indexing, inserting unknown entities into a space of known entities poses problems of interference with known entities in their close proximity. Again, consider the BioNTech example from above. Semantically, we want to place BioNTech in proximity of other biotech companies but in a way that dense-retrieval linking can still differentiate between them. We find that re-training the model after indexing, and therefore giving it the chance to learn from hard negatives in the style of zs entity linking, is crucial to overcome this challenge.

We experiment with different indexing methods. In particular, we contrast single mention-level indexing [FitzGerald et al. \(2021\)](#) with indexing clusters of mentions. We find that unifying the information of multiple mentions into a single embedding is beneficial.

By introducing a clear-cut temporal segmentation this benchmark targets unknown entities which are truly novel/unseen to all parts of an EL system, specifically including the pre-trained language model (PLM). Therefore, the EL system cannot rely on implicit knowledge captured by the PLM. This is, to the best of our knowledge, a setting that has not been explored before in the context of dense-retrieval based EL.

Temporal segmentation also lets us study the effect of entity encoder and PLM degradation. We note that EL precision drops for known entities in novel contexts which points to a large problem of PLM staleness also discussed by [\(Dhingra](#)

[et al., 2022; Lazaridou et al., 2021\)](#). Novel entities appearing in the context around known entities also complicate discovery, making it likely that the known entities will be mistakenly classified as unknown.

We summarize our contributions as follows: i) We created the EDIN-benchmark, a large scale end-to-end entity linking benchmark dataset where unknown entities need to be discovered and integrated into an existing entity index. ii) We contrast this task with zero-shot entity linking, and provide insight on the additional challenges it poses. iii) We propose the EDIN-pipeline in the form of an extension of existing dense-retrieval architectures. vi) We experiment with different indexing methods, specifically indexing single mentions vs. clusters of mentions.

2 Task definition

We formally define end-to-end EL as follows: Given a paragraph p and a set of known entities $E_K = \{e_i\}$ from Wikipedia, each with canonical name, the title, $t(e_i)$ and textual description $d(e_i)$, our goal is to output a list of tuples, $(e, [i, j])$, where $e \in E_K$ is the entity corresponding to the mention $m_{i,j}$ spanning from the i^{th} to j^{th} token in p . We call a system that solves this task based on $d(e_i)$ a *Description-based* entity linking system L .

For EDIN-benchmark, after training a model L_{t1} at time step t_1 , a set of unknown entities $E_U = \{e_i\}$ with $E_U \cap E_K = \emptyset$ and no available canonical name, description and labeled mentions is introduced between t_1 and t_2 , with $t_2 > t_1$. The task is to adapt L_{t1} such that it can successfully link mentions of the union of $E_U \cup E_K$.

We use three dataset splits: the training set D_{train} to train L_{t1} , the adaptation dataset D_{adapt} used to adapt L_{t1} and the testset D_{test} to evaluate. Both D_{adapt} and D_{test} include mentions between t_1 and t_2 but are disjoint, e.g., $D_{adapt} \cap D_{test} = \emptyset$.

3 Model

Our UEDI-pipeline is built on top of [\(Anonymous, 2022\)](#), an end-to-end extension of the dense-retrieval based model BLINK [\(Ledell Wu, 2020\)](#). It is composed of a Mention Detection (MD), Entity Disambiguation (ED) and Rejection (R) head. MD detects entity mention spans $[i, j]$ in context relying on BERT [\(Devlin et al., 2019\)](#). ED links these mentions to $e \in E_K$. It relies on bi-encoder architecture running a k-nearest-neighbor (kNN)




Figure 1: **EDIN-pipeline:** In the adaptation phase, detected mentions in D_{adapt} are mapped into a joint dense space with E_K representations. A clustering algorithm groups mentions and entities based on kNN-similarity. Clusters of mentions without entity encoding are classified as E_U . To integrate these into the index of E_K , mentions in single sentence contexts are concatenated and mapped to a single embedding using the entity encoder. After adaptation, the updated entity index is used for standard EL.

search between *mention encoding* and candidate *entity encodings* (the entity index). Mention encodings are pooled from BERT-encoded paragraph tokens $p_{1..n}$:

$$\mathbf{m}_{i,j} = FFL(BERT([CLS]p_1 \dots p_n[SEP]))_{i..j}$$

Entities are represented using BLINK’s *frozen* entity encoder:

$$\mathbf{e} = BERT_{[CLS]}([CLS]t(e)[SEP]d(e)[SEP])$$

Mention-entity candidates are passed to R that controls precision-recall trade-off by thresholding a learned candidate score.

More information about architecture and training are detailed in Appendix A.

4 Unknown Entity Discovery and Indexing

For E_U without descriptions, canonical names and labeled mentions, L_{t1} is unable to successfully link mentions of the union of entities $E_U \cup E_K$.

To this end, we introduce an end-to-end pipeline to encode E_U into L_{t1} ’s entity index. The pipeline is depicted in Figure 1. This pipeline is fully unsupervised and only relies on the adaptation dataset D_{adapt} . It follows a two-step process: i) Discovery: The entity linking system needs to detect mentions of unknown entities and classify them as unknown and ii) Indexing: co-referring mentions of unknown entities need to be mapped to a single embedding compatible with the entity index.

4.1 Unknown Entity Discovery

First, L_{t1} detects and encodes mentions part of D_{adapt} . The MD head is trained to detect mentions leveraging the context around them, and can therefore detect mentions of both E_K and E_U . Encoded mentions $\mathbf{M} = \{\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{|M|}\}$ are then input to a clustering algorithm that partitions M into disjoint clusters $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_{|C|}\}$. We use Logan IV et al. (2021)’s greedy NN clustering algorithm where $\mathbf{m}_i$ is clustered with all $\mathbf{m}_j \in \mathbf{M}$ such that $\text{sim}(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{m}_j) > \delta$.

Next, entity encodings of $e \in E_K$ are assigned to these clusters if $\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{m}_j) > \tau$ and $\mathbf{e}_i$ is the nearest entity of any $m_i \in c_i$. As we find this approach to result in low precision, we add another condition, namely that $\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{m}_j) > \tau$ must hold for at least 70% of all $\mathbf{m}_j \in c_i$. δ, τ are tuned on D_{adapt} -dev. For more details see Appendix C. Following Agarwal et al. (2021), all clusters not containing any entity representation are deemed to refer to entities in E_U . We refer to this subset of automatically identified unknown entities as E'_U .

4.2 Unknown Entity Indexing

Next, clusters identified as E'_U are integrated into the EL index of L_{t1} . We explore two different methods of entity indexing:

- *Cluster-based indexing:* We concatenate all mentions part of the same cluster, each with the sentence they occur in, and use the entity encoder to map to a single entity representa-

	Wikipedia	OSCAR
Train	100k (908k)	100k (1.7M)
Adapt	17k (183k)	17k (360k)
Dev Train	8k (78k)	8k (142k)
Dev Adapt	-	9k (183k)
Test	198k (1.8M)	569k (11M)

Table 1: **Dataset Statistics:** Number of samples (number of mentions) for training, adaptation and testing.

tion. We pool over all $m_i \in c_i$ and select the most occurring mention as $t(e)$.

- *Mention-based indexing:* Mentions in single sentence contexts are indexed individually using the entity encoder. Individual mentions are used as $t(e)$.

5 Evaluation

For *Discovery*, we report precision and recall of E_U classification and clustering metrics.

To compute standard EL metrics, e.g., precision and recall, canonical names of indexed clusters need to be consistent with the set of test labels. Our method of assigning canonical names to clusters based on mentions is not. To resolve this mismatch we pool on mention labels instead of the mentions itself.

Unsupervised clustering of mentions in D_{adapt} naturally comes with error: i) Clusters can be incomplete, e.g., mentions of a single entity can be split into multiple clusters which can lead to indexing the same entity multiple times and ii) Clusters can be impure, e.g., mentions of different entities end in the same cluster which leads to conflation of multiple entities into one representation.

In our evaluation we make use of the gold labels for computing standard EL metrics by associating possibly more than one cluster to each unknown test entity, and considering a prediction correct if a test mention is linked to any of the clusters associated with the correct entity. Since, in a practical setting, gold labels are not available though, EL metrics could fail to capture shortcomings in establishing co-references between mentions. Therefore, we report clustering metrics alongside EL metrics. We follow Agarwal et al. (2021) and report normalized mutual information (NMI).

6 Datasets

To construct the reference entity index, we download Wikipedia dumps from t_1 and t_2 and extract

Bin	Support	E_K R@1	Support	E_U R@1
[0)	68,241	21.1	7,095	17.5
[1)	59,227	29.1	3,923	25.9
[1, 10)	313,232	45.6	9,939	40.7
[10, 100)	901,857	65.7	7,765	57.3
[100, 1k)	2,860,880	76.9	7,399	64.4
[1k, +)	5,981,028	84.4	6,717	86.7

Table 2: **Frequency effects:** End-to-end EL performance of upper baseline model L_{t2} per frequency bins.




Figure 2: **Dataset splits:** A schema illustrating the composition of D_{t1} and D_{t2} . Note, that contrary to what this plot suggests, the number of samples per datasplit is equal for D_{t1} and D_{t2} .

entity titles and descriptions. Setting t_1 to September 2019 (the date when BLINK was trained) the reference KB consists of 5.9M entities, setting t_2 to March 2022 an additional set of 0.7M entities is introduced.

Wikipedia and Oscar datasets are constructed as follows.

Wikipedia: Since usually only the first mention of an entity inside a Wikipedia article is hyper-linked, we annotate a subset of Wikipedia. We use a version of L that was trained at t_2 on a labelled non-public dataset. While noisy, these predictions are significantly better than what our best discovery and indexing methods can achieve, therefore we adopt them as pseudo-labels for the purpose of comparing approaches. As discovery and indexing methods improve, manual labelling of the evaluation data will afford more accurate measures. Wikipedia provides time stamps which enables us to separate two time splits.

OSCAR news: This dataset is based on the common-crawl dataset OSCAR (Abadji et al., 2021). We select a subset of English language news pages which we label automatically as described above. The dataset consists of 797k samples, which we split based on their publication date.

For both types of datasets we created two time splits: D_1 , containing samples preceding t_1 , which is used to train model L_{t1} and D_2 , with samples preceding t_2 , which is used to train an upper bound model L_{t2} . To adapt L_{t1} , we hold out a subset of data from between t_1 and t_2 to construct D_{adapt} ($D_{adapt} \cap D_2 = \emptyset$). Remaining samples are randomly split into train, dev, test. Figure 2 illustrates the different data splits. Overall dataset statistics are listed in Table 1.

To construct D_{adapt} , we follow Agarwal et al. (2021), and set a ratio of mentions of type E_U to E_K of 0.1.³ As D_{t2} -test covers both known and unknown entities, we use this dataset for EDIN-pipeline evaluation. In Oscar D_{t2} -test, the average number of mentions per E_U is 5.6 and is ten times lower than for E_K . COVID-19 is the most occurring unknown entity with 12k mentions. 638k of E_U are not mentioned at all and only 733 have a count larger 10. The distribution of number of E_U is more skewed than the one of E_K (skewness 529 vs. 106).

7 Results and Discussion

In the following sections, we report results for OSCAR data. Results on Wikipedia data are consistently lower than OSCAR results and shown in Appendix F. Our main findings are summarized in Table 3 (left) where we report end-to-end performance on OSCAR D_{t2} -test. As mentions of type E_U are significantly less frequent than mentions of type E_K , we report results on these two types separately.

We first discuss upper (L_{t2} a model trained on D_{t2}) and lower (L_{t1} a model trained at D_{t1}) performance bounds. Next, we follow our two-step pipeline in adapting L_{t1} such that it can successfully link mentions of E_U . Recall, that this pipeline involves two steps: discovery and indexing. Running L_{t1} on D_{adapt} , we first discover mentions of E_U s by clustering. These clusters of mentions of E_U s are then indexed. We first present results on these components separately and then assemble the full end-to-end pipeline.

³Naturally this ratio would lie at 0.02. We made this artificial adjustment to reduce the strong class imbalance and obtain more interpretable and statistically stable results. Such adjustment could be lifted once considerably more precise unknown entity discovery components become available.

7.1 Lower and upper bound

Our starting point, and an obvious lower performance bound, is given by model L_{t1} . This model lacks representations of E_U s and its training data does not contain any corresponding mentions. Therefore, performance on the subset of E_U s is 0 for all metrics.

For an upper performance bound we take model L_{t2} . The entities in E_U were introduced to Wikipedia past t_1 but before t_2 , meaning that to L_{t2} these entities are actually *known*: labeled mentions of E_U are part of the training data and entity representations are part of the index.

L_{t2} reaches similar performance as L_{t1} for E_K . We suspect performance differences can be attributed to the difference in training data.

Performance of L_{t2} on mentions of E_U is lower than on mentions of E_K . The performance discrepancy between E_U and E_K is largely due to frequency differences, see Table 2 where we report results per frequency band. We suspect that the remaining difference can be attributed to the degradation of the pre-trained LM and the entity encoder. Note that while labelled mentions of E_U were seen during the training phase of L, BLINK’s entity encoder was not retrained. To investigate this hypothesis further, we test L_{t1} on mentions of E_K that meet two conditions: i) time stamps of these samples are posterior to t_1 and ii) two or more mentions of E_U occur in their context. Thus, we target mentions of E_K in novel contexts to which neither BLINK nor the PLM have been exposed. We find that recall drops only slightly from 80.1 to 79.9 but precision drops from 82.0 to 75.9. This result points to the conclusion that E_U are also a source of noise when trying to link mentions of E_K .

7.2 Discovery

The first condition for effective discovery is the ability to reliably detect mentions of both known and unknown entities. Recall of L_{t1} on D_{adapt} for Mention Detection task is 90% for E_K s and 86% for E_U s entities. As expected, recall of mentions of E_K is higher as no mentions of E_U were seen during training. As a reference, running L_{t2} on D_{adapt} , we find that for both E_K and E_U 91% of mentions are recalled. Note again, that for L_{t2} , E_U are *known*. This indicates that mention detection is not affected by frequency differences and PLM degradation.

Next, the clustering step to classify between men-

Model	Known Entities			Unknown Entities			Unknown Entities filtered		
	R@1	P@1	NMI	R@1	P@1	NMI	R@1	P@1	NMI
L_{t1}	80.1	82.0	93.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
L_{t2}	78.7	79.7	93.1	49.2	31.8	93.8	63.1	26.0	93.4
L_{t1} -Descp	80.2	82.6	93.5	46.5	32.4	93.8	58.3	26.2	90.5
L_{t1} -Mention-Gold	80.6	81.5	93.3	24.0	46.6	87.0	40.7	46.6	87.0
L_{t1} -Mention	80.3	81.9	93.4	20.5	43.7	87.6	34.5	43.5	88.7
L_{t1} -Cluster-Gold	80.3	82.0	94.2	30.5	51.8	85.9	51.8	51.8	85.9
EDIN (L_{t1} -Cluster)	80.3	81.9	93.4	20.8	43.1	85.9	35.4	43.1	85.3

Table 3: **EL performance** on OSCAR D_{t2} -test for unknown entities E_U and known entities E_K . **Left** shows end-to-end performance and **Right** shows filtered performance where mentions of E_U which are not part of the oracle Cluster-based entity index are dropped from test. **Upper/Lower limit:** L_{t1} uses Description-based entity representations, was trained at t1 and constitutes the lower performance bound. It lacks representations of E_U . L_{t2} uses Description-based entity representations, was trained at t2 and constitutes the upper performance bound. E_U are part of the entity index and labeled-mentions of E_U were part of training. **Adaptation:** For L_{t1} -Descp Description-based entity representations are added to L_{t1} ’s entity index. For L_{t1} -Mention Mention-based representations of i) oracle E_U and ii) discovered E_U' part of D_{adapt} are added to L_{t1} ’s entity index. For L_{t1} -Cluster Cluster-based representations of i) oracle E_U and discovered E_U' part of D_{adapt} are added to L_{t1} ’s entity index.

tions of E_U and E_K follows. We report clustering quality of 93.1% NMI. When assigning entities to clusters as described in Section 7.2, we find that our first attempt results in 35% recall and 5% precision on D_{adapt} -dev. This setting is close in spirit to Agarwal et al. (2021) where a single entity-mention link is decisive for discovery.

A qualitative error analysis reveals that low recall is rooted in the problem that mention embeddings of E_U (e.g. BioNTech) can have high similarity with entity representations of E_K (e.g. of other biotechnology companies). If no mentions of these E_K are part of D_{adapt} , we wrongly assign the high similarity entity to the cluster of mentions of E_U . We suspect that this problem is particularly pronounced in our setting as EDIN-benchmark is a large scale EL benchmark (up to 6 times more entities in the reference KB and up to 36 times more mentions in clustering set compared to Agarwal et al. (2021)) with many long-tail entities (Agarwal et al. (2021) entities were randomly selected).

We find that low precision is rooted in the issue that E_K are indexed as false positive when occurring in novel contexts, e.g., “blood tests” or “vaccine” in the context of COVID form their own distinct clusters.

With the modified cluster-entity assignment method, described in 7.2, discovery still results in low but higher precision (8%) and high recall (80%) of E_U . 1196 of 1368 E_U part of D_{adapt} with

more than three mentions are indexed.

7.3 Indexing

After discovery, we need to integrate clusters of mentions of E_U into the existing entity index. In the following, we i) quantify the impact of re-training the model after indexing, ii) compare Description-based with Cluster-based indexing and iii) compare Cluster-based with Mention-based indexing.

7.3.1 Effect of re-training

In the zero-shot EL problem, all entities are part of the index at training time. In the setting of EDIN-benchmark, discovery and indexing of E_U happen after training. We run the following experiments to study the effect of this difference:

- **Descp-post-train:** Description-based entity representations are added to the index *after* training L on t1.
- **Descp-pre-train:** Description-based entity representations are added to the index *before* training L on t1.

Recall and precision of E_U in the setting where entity representations are added before the training is 47% and 32% respectively, see Table 4. Recall and precision in the setting where entity representations are added post training is 26% and 17% points lower respectively.

We note that entities in E_U can potentially be placed in close proximity to E_K in embedding space. When these entity encodings were present during training, they can be picked up as hard negatives and the mention encoder can learn to circumvent them. This hypothesis is supported by experiments showing that the mean similarity between mentions and correct known entity embeddings increases significantly when the mention encoder is re-trained after adding the new entities. For details see Appendix D.

The take-away for the EDIN-pipeline is that, after adding new entity representations to the index, another round of training is needed to adapt the mention encoder to the updated index. We adopt this approach for the following experiments. Besides adapting the mention encoder, retraining BLINK could have a similar effect: in such case learning from hard negative can affect the spacing of entity encodings. As re-training BLINK is expensive, we did not explore this option in this work.

	Unknown Entities			Known Entities		
	R@1	P@1	NMI	R@1	P@1	NMI
Not re-trained	20.6	15.5	95.2	80.1	82.3	93.5
Re-trained	46.5	32.4	93.8	80.2	82.6	93.5

Table 4: **Effect of re-training:** End-to-end EL performance on OSCAR D_{t2} -test when adding Description-based representation of unknown entities E_U to the entity index before and after training of L_{t1} .

7.3.2 Description vs. Cluster-based indexing

We compared Description-based entity representations and Cluster-based indexing. To isolate discovery and indexing performance, we first evaluate performance using oracle clusters, where we replace the discovery method run on D_{adapt} with an oracle where mentions of E_U are discovered with perfect precision and recall and perfectly clustered.

In this setting, Cluster-based indexing results in 19% higher precision but 16% lower recall, compared to Description-based indexing, see Table 3 (left) L_{t1} -Cluster-Gold. The drop in recall for Cluster-based indexing can partially be attributed to the fact that a subset of E_U part of D_{t2} -test are not mentioned in D_{adapt} , and therefore no representation can be built for them. When filtering mentions of E_U not part of D_{adapt} out of the test set, the gap in recall decreases to 7%, see Table 3 (right).

The take-away is that Cluster-based indexing relying on concatenated mentions in context instead of manually crafted descriptions has high precision potential but recall is challenging as a randomly selected adaptation set is unlikely to cover long-tail entities.

7.3.3 Mention vs. Cluster-based indexing

In this section, we compare Mention-based and Cluster-based indexing. Again, to isolate discovery and indexing we first report results using oracle clusters of E_U . When indexing mentions of these clusters individually, recall drops by 6% points and precision by 5%, see Table 3 (left), L_{t1} -Mention-Gold. When reducing the testset to mentions of entities that were actually discoverable, the difference in recall becomes even more pronounced: 40.7% R@1 for Mention-based vs. 51.8 for Cluster-based indexing, see Table 3 (right).

Interestingly, this means that the ability to attend over multiple mentions in context and unify their information into a single embedding leads to superior representations. Note that here the entity encoder was neither trained to deal with the style of individual mentions in context nor with clusters of mentions in context. For future work, it would be interesting to see if Cluster-based indexing can be generally beneficial to EL, outside of the context of EDIN-pipeline. This would require training the entity encoder to specifically adapt to the new input style.

7.4 End-to-end model

The prior section presented results of the two components individually. Now, we assemble the full end-to-end pipeline. We replace the oracle clusters of E_U by discovered clusters of E'_U . Errors in discovery that affect indexing are: i) Clusters of mentions of E_K classified false positively as unknown and clusters of mentions of E_U false negatively classified as known and ii) incomplete and impure clusters. We find that performance of Mention-based and Cluster-based indexing in terms of R@1 and P@1 converges and is significantly lower than their oracle counterparts. Mention-based indexing has better clustering performance.

When reducing the testset to mentions of entities that were actually discoverable, thus part of D_{adapt} , Cluster-based indexing is 1% point better in terms of recall and 0.4 % worse in precision, Table 3 (right). When reducing the testset further to mentions of entities that were in fact discovered, recall

of Cluster-based indexing is with 58.4% better than that of Mention-based indexing (55.5%).

Besides end-to-end performance, we also report entity disambiguation performance with oracle mention detection in Table 6 in Appendix E. Here, we find that Mention-based indexing is performing worse than Cluster-based indexing across all metrics: 1% point difference in terms of recall, 3% point difference in terms of precision and 0.7% points difference in terms of NMI.

Overall, these results show that EDIN-benchmark is challenging. In the end-to-end setting, errors easily propagate. Most notably, we see this manifest when i) comparing Table 6 and 3 (right) results where the recall problem of E_U becomes apparent and ii) comparing performance of oracle and automatic clusters where precision drops by 10% points. Overall, we find that Cluster-based indexing, with the advantage of attending to and unifying the information of multiple mentions, performs better than Mention-based indexing. We call this version the EDIN-pipeline. Besides yielding an index that scales in memory with the number of entities rather than the number of mentions – a significant advantage when the number of entities is already large and in view of a streaming extension – it generates fixed-size entity embeddings as a by-product that can have applications of their own and can be used to enhance PLMs (e.g., Peters et al. (2019)).

In future work, we want to explore a setting where E_U are discovered in a streaming fashion, thus scaling up D_{adapt} and dropping the crafted 90%-10% ration of E_K vs. E_U . This would pose challenges in terms of scale and precision in discovery. In terms of precision, a human in the loop approach, as proposed by Hoffart et al. (2016) in the context of keeping KBs fresh, to introduce a component of supervision into our end-to-end pipeline might be needed.

8 Related work

Entity linking is an extensively studied task. Prior to the introduction of PLMs, EL systems used frequency and typing information, alias tables, TF-IDF-based methods and neural networks to model context, mention and entity (Cucerzan, 2007; Bunescu and Paşca, 2006; Milne and Witten, 2008; He et al., 2013; Sun et al., 2015a; Lazic et al., 2015; Raiman and Raiman, 2018; Kolitsas et al., 2018; Gupta et al., 2017; Ganea and Hofmann, 2017;

Khalife and Vazirgiannis, 2018; Onoe and Durrett, 2019).

Gillick et al. (2019) present a PLM-based dual encoder architecture that encodes mentions and entities in the same dense vector space and performs EL via kNN search. Logeswaran et al. (2019) proposed the zero-shot EL task and show that domain adaptive training can address the domain shift problem. Subsequently, Wu et al. (2020) showed that pre-trained zero-shot architectures are both highly accurate and computationally efficient at scale. None of these works tackle the problem of unknown entities.

Recently, FitzGerald et al. (2021) model EL entirely as mappings between mentions, where inference involves a NN search against all known mentions of all entities in the training set. In this setting mentions need to be labeled. They do not explore their approach in the setting of unknown entities.

Prior to dense retrieval-based EL, unknown entity discovery work includes: Ratinov et al. (2011) train a classifier to determine whether the top ranked EL candidate is unknown relying on local context, global Wikipedia coherence, and additional linker features. Mentions of known entities that are incorrectly linked are among the training examples for unknown entity discovery thus decreasing quality.; Nakashole et al. (2013) introduce a model for unknown entity discovery and typing leveraging incompatibilities and correlations among entity types. This method ignores context. Therefore, mentions not registered in the reference KB are regarded unknown; Hoffart et al. (2014); Wu et al. (2016) study a variety of features for unknown entity discovery: Hoffart et al. (2014) use perturbation-based confidence measures and keyphrase representations and Wu et al. (2016) explore different feature spaces, e.g., topical and search engine features. These features are not readily available and incorporating them into PLM-based approaches is not straightforward and outside the scope of this work.; Ji et al. (2015); Derczynski et al. (2017) introduce shared tasks for discovery. These tasks do not target end-to-end dense-retrieval based EL and are outdated, e.g., treat iPhone as an unknown entity.; Akasaki et al. (2019) introduces a time sensitive method of discovering emerging entities. This method relies on training data in form of labeled emerging contexts. This data is collected by searching only exact mentions of unknown enti-

ties and therefore neglecting the issue of ambiguity and mention variety.

None of these works consider unknown entities in an end-to-end setting including mention detection, unknown entity discovery and indexing. Also, we cannot use their datasets to evaluate as these entities were part of training the PLM.

Closely related to EL is the task of cross document entity co-reference (CDC), where no reference KB is present (Bagga and Baldwin, 1998; Gooi and Allan, 2004; Singh et al., 2011; Dutta and Weikum, 2015b; Barhom et al., 2019; Cattan et al., 2021a; Caciularu et al., 2021; Cattan et al., 2021b). Most recently, Logan IV et al. (2021) benchmark methods for streaming CDC, where mentions are disambiguated in a scalable manner via incremental clustering. Our work can be seen as bridging between the world of CDC and EL. We harvest CDC to discover and cluster unknown entities but then integrate them into a curated list of entities. Dutta and Weikum (2015a) also combine clustering-based CDC decisions and linking but as this work is using sparse bag-of-word representations, it is not well suited for the embedding-based representations used in this work.

Most recently, Angell et al. (2021) introduce a new EL method using document-level supervised graph-based clustering. Agarwal et al. (2021) extend this work to cross-document EL and entity discovery. In this work, we adopt a more standard bi-encoder architecture (i.e. BLINK), with better EL scalability potential (memory linear in the number of entities and not in the number of mentions) and an existing end-to-end extension. We use a modified version of their discovery method.

Besides dense-retrieval based EL, De Cao et al. (2021) proposed generative EL. We plan to study the problem of integrating unknown entities into generative models in future work.

9 Conclusion

This work created EDIN benchmark and pipeline. EDIN-benchmark is a large-scale, end-to-end entity linking benchmark with a clear cut temporal segmentation for *Unknown Entity Discovery and Indexing*. EDIN-pipeline detects and clusters mentions of unknown entities in context. These clusters of unknown mentions are then collapsed into single embeddings and integrated into the entity index of the original entity linking system.

References

- Julien Abadji, Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Laurent Romary, and Benoît Sagot. 2021. [Ungoliant: An optimized pipeline for the generation of a very large-scale multilingual web corpus](#). Proceedings of the Workshop on Challenges in the Management of Large Corpora (CMLC-9) 2021. Limerick, 12 July 2021 (Online-Event), pages 1 – 9, Mannheim. Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- Dhruv Agarwal, Rico Angell, Nicholas Monath, and Andrew McCallum. 2021. [Entity linking and discovery via arborescence-based supervised clustering](#).
- Satoshi Akasaki, Naoki Yoshinaga, and Masashi Toyoda. 2019. [Early discovery of emerging entities in microblogs](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 4882–4889. ijcai.org.
- Rico Angell, Nicholas Monath, Sunil Mohan, Nishant Yadav, and Andrew McCallum. 2021. [Clustering-based inference for biomedical entity linking](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2598–2608, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anonymous. 2022. End to end entity linking in 100 languages.
- Amit Bagga and Breck Baldwin. 1998. [Entity-based cross-document coreferencing using the vector space model](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics - Volume 1, ACL '98/COLING '98*, page 79–85, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shany Barhom, Vered Shwartz, Alon Eirew, Michael Bugert, Nils Reimers, and Ido Dagan. 2019. [Revisiting joint modeling of cross-document entity and event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4179–4189, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Razvan Bunescu and Marius Paşca. 2006. [Using encyclopedic knowledge for named entity disambiguation](#). In *11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 9–16, Trento, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Avi Caciularu, Arman Cohan, Iz Beltagy, Matthew Peters, Arie Cattan, and Ido Dagan. 2021. [CDLM: Cross-document language modeling](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2648–2662, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Yixin Cao, Lei Hou, Juan-Zi Li, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2018. Neural collective entity linking. In *COLING*.
- Arie Cattan, Alon Eirew, Gabriel Stanovsky, Mandar Joshi, and Ido Dagan. 2021a. [Realistic evaluation principles for cross-document coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of *SEM 2021: The Tenth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 143–151, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arie Cattan, Sophie Johnson, Daniel S. Weld, Ido Dagan, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Tom Hope. 2021b. [Scico: Hierarchical cross-document coreference for scientific concepts](#). In *3rd Conference on Automated Knowledge Base Construction*.
- Silviu Cucerzan. 2007. [Large-scale named entity disambiguation based on Wikipedia data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pages 708–716, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicola De Cao, Gautier Izacard, Sebastian Riedel, and Fabio Petroni. 2021. [Autoregressive entity retrieval](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Leon Derczynski, Eric Nichols, Marieke van Erp, and Nut Limsopatham. 2017. [Results of the WNUT2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 140–147, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Jeremy Cole, Julian Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William Cohen. 2022. [Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10(0):257–273.
- Sourav Dutta and Gerhard Weikum. 2015a. [C3EL: A joint model for cross-document co-reference resolution and entity linking](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 846–856, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sourav Dutta and Gerhard Weikum. 2015b. [Cross-document co-reference resolution using sample-based clustering with knowledge enrichment](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:15–28.
- Nicholas FitzGerald, Dan Bikel, Jan Botha, Daniel Gillick, Tom Kwiatkowski, and Andrew McCallum. 2021. [MOLEMAN: Mention-only linking of entities with a mention annotation network](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 278–285, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Octavian-Eugen Ganea and Thomas Hofmann. 2017. [Deep joint entity disambiguation with local neural attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2619–2629, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Gillick, Sayali Kulkarni, Larry Lansing, Alessandro Presta, Jason Baldridge, Eugene Ie, and Diego Garcia-Olano. 2019. [Learning dense representations for entity retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 528–537, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chung Heong Gooi and James Allan. 2004. [Cross-document coreference on a large scale corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: HLT-NAACL 2004*, pages 9–16, Boston, Massachusetts, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nitish Gupta, Sameer Singh, and Dan Roth. 2017. [Entity linking via joint encoding of types, descriptions, and context](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2681–2690, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhengyan He, Shujie Liu, Mu Li, Ming Zhou, Longkai Zhang, and Houfeng Wang. 2013. [Learning entity representation for entity disambiguation](#). In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 30–34, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Johannes Hoffart, Yasemin Altun, and Gerhard Weikum. 2014. [Discovering emerging entities with ambiguous names](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '14*, page 385–396, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Johannes Hoffart, Dragan Milchevski, Gerhard Weikum, Avishek Anand, and Jaspreet Singh. 2016. The knowledge awakens: Keeping knowledge bases fresh with emerging entities. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web*.
- Heng Ji, Joel Nothman, Ben Hachey, and Radu Florian. 2015. [Overview of TAC-KBP2015 tri-lingual](#)

- entity discovery and linking. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Text Analysis Conference, TAC 2015, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA, November 16-17, 2015*, 2015. NIST.
- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2017. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08734*.
- Sammy Khalife and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2018. Scalable graph-based individual named entity identification. *CoRR*, abs/1811.10547.
- Nikolaos Kolitsas, Octavian-Eugen Ganea, and Thomas Hofmann. 2018. End-to-end neural entity linking. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 519–529, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angeliki Lazaridou, Adhi Kuncoro, Elena Gribovskaya, Devang Agrawal, Adam Liska, Tayfun Terzi, Mai Gimenez, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Tomas Kocisky, Sebastian Ruder, Dani Yogatama, Kris Cao, Susannah Young, and Phil Blunsom. 2021. Mind the gap: Assessing temporal generalization in neural language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 29348–29363. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Nevena Lazic, Amarnag Subramanya, Michael Ringgaard, and Fernando Pereira. 2015. Plato: A selective context model for entity resolution. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:503–515.
- Martin Josifoski Sebastian Riedel Luke Zettlemoyer Ledell Wu, Fabio Petroni. 2020. Zero-shot entity linking with dense entity retrieval. In *EMNLP*.
- Belinda Z. Li, Sewon Min, Srinivasan Iyer, Yashar Mehdad, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Efficient one-pass end-to-end entity linking for questions. In *EMNLP*.
- Robert L Logan IV, Andrew McCallum, Sameer Singh, and Dan Bikel. 2021. Benchmarking scalable methods for streaming cross document entity coreference. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4717–4731, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lajanugen Logeswaran, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Jacob Devlin, and Honglak Lee. 2019. Zero-shot entity linking by reading entity descriptions. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3449–3460, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David N. Milne and Ian H. Witten. 2008. Learning to link with wikipedia. In *CIKM ’08*.
- Ndapandula Nakashole, Tomasz Tylenda, and Gerhard Weikum. 2013. Fine-grained semantic typing of emerging entities. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1488–1497, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yasumasa Onoe and Greg Durrett. 2019. Fine-grained entity typing for domain independent entity linking. *CoRR*, abs/1909.05780.
- Yasumasa Onoe and Greg Durrett. 2020. Fine-grained entity typing for domain independent entity linking. In *AAAI*.
- Matthew E Peters, Mark Neumann, Robert Logan, Roy Schwartz, Vidur Joshi, Sameer Singh, and Noah A Smith. 2019. Knowledge enhanced contextual word representations. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*.
- Jonathan Raiman and Olivier Raiman. 2018. Deep-type: Multilingual entity linking by neural type system evolution. In *AAAI*.
- Lev Ratnikov, Dan Roth, Doug Downey, and Mike Anderson. 2011. Local and global algorithms for disambiguation to Wikipedia. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1375–1384, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sameer Singh, Amarnag Subramanya, Fernando Pereira, and Andrew McCallum. 2011. Large-scale cross-document coreference using distributed inference and hierarchical models. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 793–803, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yaming Sun, Lei Lin, Duyu Tang, Nan Yang, Zhenzhou Ji, and Xiaolong Wang. 2015a. Modeling mention, context and entity with neural networks for entity disambiguation. In *IJCAI*.
- Yaming Sun, Lei Lin, Duyu Tang, Nan Yang, Zhenzhou Ji, and Xiaolong Wang. 2015b. Modeling mention, context and entity with neural networks for entity disambiguation. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’15*, page 1333–1339. AAAI Press.
- Ledell Yu Wu, Fabio Petroni, Martin Josifoski, Sebastian Riedel, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Scalable zero-shot entity linking with dense entity retrieval. In *EMNLP*.
- Zhaohui Wu, Yang Song, and C. Lee Giles. 2016. Exploring multiple feature spaces for novel entity discovery. In *AAAI*.

A Model

In the following sections, we explain (Anonymous, 2022)’s architecture in detail.

A.1 Mention Detection

For every span $[i, j]$, the MD head calculates the probability of $[i, j]$ being the mention of an entity by scoring whether i is the start of the mention, j is the end of the mention, and the tokens between i and j are the insides:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{start(i)} &= \mathbf{w}_{start}^T \mathbf{p}_i \\ s_{end(j)} &= \mathbf{w}_{end}^T \mathbf{p}_j \\ s_{mention(t)} &= \mathbf{w}_{mention}^T \mathbf{p}_t \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{w}_{start}$, $\mathbf{w}_{end}$, $\mathbf{w}_{mention}$ are learnable vectors and $\mathbf{p}_i$ paragraph token representations based on BERT:

$$[\mathbf{p}_1 \dots \mathbf{p}_n] = BERT([CLS]p_1 \dots p_n[SEP])$$

Overall mention probabilities are computed as:

$$p([i, j]) = \sigma(s_{start(i)} + s_{end(j)} + \sum_{t=i}^j (s_{mention(t)}))$$

Top candidates are selected as mention candidates and propagate to the next step.

A.2 Entity Disambiguation

The ED head receives mention spans in the text and finds the best matching entity in the KB.

Following Wu et al. (2020), ED is based on dense retrieval. Description-based entity representations are computed as follows:

$$\mathbf{e} = BERT_{[CLS]}([CLS]t(e)[SEP]d(e)[SEP])$$

Following Li et al. (2020), mention representations are constructed with one pass of the encoder and without mention boundary tokens by pooling mention tokens from the encoder output:

$$\mathbf{m}_{i,j} = FFL(\mathbf{p}_i \dots \mathbf{p}_j)$$

Similarity score s between the mention candidate and an entity candidate $e \in E$ are computed:

$$s(e, [i, j]) = \mathbf{e} * \mathbf{m}_{i,j}$$

A likelihood distribution over all entities, conditioned on the mention $[i, j]$ is computed:

$$p(e|[i, j]) = \frac{\exp(s(e, [i, j]))}{\sum_{e' \in E} \exp(s(e', [i, j]))}$$

$< [i, j], e^* >$, such that

$$e^* = \operatorname{argmax}_e (p([i, j], e)),$$

are passed as a candidate $< \text{mention span, entity} >$ tuple to the rejection head.

A.3 Rejection head

MD and ED steps over-generate. R looks at an $(e^*, [i, j])$ pair holistically decides whether to accept it. Input features to R are the MD score $p([i, j])$, the ED score $p(e^*|[i, j])$, the mention representation $\mathbf{y}_{i,j}$, top-ranked candidate representation $\mathbf{x}_{e^*}$ as well as their difference and Hadamard product. The concatenation of these features is fed through a feed-forward network to output the final entity linking score $p([i, j], e^*)$. All $p([i, j], e^*) > \gamma$ are accepted where γ is a threshold set to 0.4.

A.4 Training

Following prior work (Sun et al., 2015b; Cao et al., 2018; Gillick et al., 2019; Onoe and Durrett, 2020), training is split into two stages. First, ED only is trained on a Wikipedia dataset. This dataset is constructed by extracting Wikipedia hyperlinks to labeled mention-entity pairs and consists of 17M training samples. Then, ED, MD and R are trained jointly on the downstream dataset (either Oscar or Wikipedia). To train the ED head, frozen entity representations are used. As entity embeddings do not change during training, entity embeddings can be indexed using quantization algorithms for a fast kNN search (using FAISS (Johnson et al., 2017) framework with HNSW index). A likelihood distribution over positive and mined hard negative entities for each mention is computed. Negative Log-Likelihood loss across all gold mentions in the text is used.

To train MD, binary cross-entropy loss between all possible valid spans and gold mentions in the training set is computed.

To train R, binary cross-entropy loss between retrieved mention-entity pairs and gold mention-entity pairs is used.

B OSCAR-based dataset

We select the following six online news pages:

Parameter	Value
d_m	0.8171
s_m	0.5
d_e	110

Table 5: Hyper-parameters adaptation phase

BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/>

CNN: <https://www.cnn.com/>

Deutsche Welle: <https://www.dw.com/en/>

Reuters: <https://www.reuters.com/article/>

Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/>

Associated Press: <https://apnews.com/article/>

C Hyper-parameters Adaptation phase

Using OSCAR D_{adapt} -dev, we optimize mention score threshold s_m , greedy NN distance threshold d_m and mention entity similarity threshold d_e .

We optimize s_m in range 0.0 to 1.0 in steps of 0.1 for E_U discovery recall. We optimize d_m in range 0.5 to 1.0, in steps of 0.0001 for NMI. We optimize d_e for E_U discovery recall in range 50 to 250 in steps of 10. For results, see Table 5.

We report recall of 81% and precision of 6% for clusters referring to unknown entities. Recall of clusters referring to known entities is 88% with precision 96%. Clustering NMI is 0.92.

D Effect of re-training

We show that by re-training L after indexing, L learns to circumvent E_U : We identify known entities part of the training set that are in close proximity of unknown entities (*confusable known entities*). We compare the average similarity between mentions and their respective linked entity when adding unknown entities before training vs. after training. Mean similarity when adding unknown entities before training is 93.28 for confusable known entities and 92.57 for other known entities. A t-test shows that this difference is significant (p-value of 0.0001 with < 0.05). As a reference, mean similarity when adding unknown entities post training is 92.65 irrespective of whether they are confusable or not.

E Disambiguation Results

Besides end-to-end performance, we also report entity disambiguation performance with oracle mention detection in Table 6.

F Wikipedia Results

We report performance on Wikipedia D_{t2} -test in Table 7. Due to a smaller D_{adapt} , end-to-end performance is lower. When filtering Wikipedia D_{t2} -test for mentions of discovered entities, L_{t1} -Cluster-Gold precision is 40.5 and L_{t1} -Cluster recall is 15.3.

Model	OSCAR					
	Unknown Entities			Known Entities		
	R@1	P@1	NMI	R@1	P@1	NMI
L_{Dt1}	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.2	92.2	96.0
L_{Dt2}	63.5	45.3	96.8	90.0	90.2	96.0
L_{t1} -Descp	58.0	33.9	96.3	92.1	92.3	96.1
L_{t1} -Mention	26.2	30.8	92.7	92.2	92.2	96.0
EDIN (L_{t1} -Cluster)	27.9	34.1	93.4	92.2	92.2	96.2

Table 6: **Entity Disambiguation performance** on OSCAR D_{t2} -test.

Model	Unknown Entities			Known Entities		
	R@1	P@1	NMI	R@1	P@1	NMI
L_{t1}	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.5	75.8	95.4
L_{t2}	33.6	25.0	98.3	70.6	75.4	95.3
L_{t1} -Descp	33.9	20.0	98.0	71.2	74.4	95.3
L_{t1} -Cluster-Gold	7.8	55.6	90.6	70.1	75.9	95.6
EDIN (L_{t1} -Cluster)	1.8	15.4	93.4	71.1	74.1	95.3

Table 7: **End-to-end EL performance** on Wikipedia D_{t2} -test.