

Syntax-driven Data Augmentation for Named Entity Recognition

Arie Pratama Sutiono

University of Arizona

Linguistics

ariesutiono@arizona.edu

Gus Hahn-Powell

University of Arizona

Linguistics

hahnpowell@arizona.edu

Abstract

In low resource settings, data augmentation strategies are commonly leveraged to improve performance. Numerous approaches have attempted document-level augmentation (e.g., text classification), but few studies have explored token-level augmentation. Performed naively, data augmentation can produce semantically incongruent and ungrammatical examples. In this work, we compare simple masked language model replacement and an augmentation method using constituency tree mutations to improve the performance of named entity recognition in low-resource settings with the aim of preserving linguistic cohesion of the augmented sentences.

1 Introduction

Deep neural networks have proven to be effective for a wide variety of tasks in natural language processing; however, these networks often require large annotated datasets before they begin to outperform simpler models. Such data is not always available or diverse and its collection and annotation can be an expensive and slow process. The trend of fine-tuning large-scale language models originally trained using self-supervision has helped to alleviate the need for large datasets, but this approach relies on the dataset for fine-tuning being diverse enough to train a model that generalizes well. Careful data augmentation can help to improve dataset diversity and ultimately the model’s ability to generalize.

Data augmentation continues to play a critical role in low-resource settings. The majority of work on data augmentation focuses on improving document-level tasks, such as text classification. Less attention has been paid to token-level tasks (Feng et al., 2021).

Prevailing approaches to sequence tagging tasks such as named entity recognition (NER) require token-level ground truth. Naive replacement-based

methods for augmentation may introduce noise in the form of sentences that are ungrammatical, semantically vacuous, or semantically incongruent. Whether in the form of insertions, deletions, or substitutions, care must be taken with token-level augmentation to preserve linguistic cohesion.

In this work, we focus on sequence labeling in a simulated low-resource setting. We use the i2b2-2010 dataset (Uzuner et al., 2011).

This experiment explores using constituency trees to guide data augmentation. Our intention is to mutate the sentence while minimizing undesired side effects of syntactic mutation (e.g., grammatically, linguistic cohesion).

We compare our syntax-driven method with no augmentation (our baseline), augmented data generated through cloze-style (Taylor, 1953) masked language modeling using a BERT-based classifier, successful approaches introduced by Dai and Adel (2021), and two of the top-performing augmentation strategies according to past work: synonym-based replacement and mention-based replacement.

2 Related work

A number of approaches have been explored for document-level data augmentations. The usage of backtranslation to generate augmented sample was introduced by Kobayashi (2018). Wei and Zou (2019) explored synonym replacement, random insertion, random swap, and random deletion for text classification. Quteineh et al. (2020) introduced an approach using monte carlo tree search (MCTS) to guide generation of synthetic data.

Augmentation for token-level sequence tagging token level, however, is seemingly understudied. Simple approaches for token-level classification (e.g., synonym replacement, mention replacement, shuffling, etc.) was studied by Devlin et al. (2019). They used a sample of 50, 100, and 500 sentences to simulate a low-resource setting. Token linearization (TL) was introduced by Ding et al. (2020). The

main idea of TL is incorporate NER tags inside the training sentences themselves. They experimented with [1000, 2000, 4000, 6000, 8000] training sentences in 6 languages. In an active learning setting,

3 Approach

3.1 Synonym Replacement (SR)

Dai and Adel (2021) experimented with replacing randomly selected tokens from the training corpus with their synonyms originating from WordNet (Miller, 1992). The synonym produced by WordNet consisted of more than one token. In this case, if the replaced token is the beginning of a mention (B-Entity), then the first synonym token will be tagged as B-Entity, the rest will be considered as I-Entity. In cases where the replaced token is in the middle of a mention (I-Entity), then all of the synonym will be assigned to I-Entity.

3.2 Mention Replacement (MR)

Dai and Adel (2021) described mention replacement as using a binomial distribution to decided whether each mention should be replaced. If yes, then we select another mention from the original training set which has the same entity type as replacement. For instance, if we decide a mention "myelopathy / B-problem" should be replaced, then we can select one of ["C5-6", "COPD", ...] which will have the same entity type.

3.3 Language Model (LM)

We experimented with token replacement using a masked language model. We restrict the system to replace only non mention tokens (tokens with category O). This is because, if we replace tokens with a named entity, we cannot guarantee that the output from the masked language model will have the same category, such that if we replace a token categorized as B-test, we could not guarantee that the masked language model will replace it with a similar token to those in B-test category.

We randomly select, without replacement, n tokens as candidates to be replaced. The selected tokens are masked from the original sentence and ask the language model to generate replacements for the masked tokens. We may repeat this token generations up to k times to generate different augmented sentences. We use Allen AI’s SciBERT model from Hugging Face model repository.

3.4 Constituency Replacement (ST)

As a preprocessing step, we perform constituency parsing over all of the training data using Stanza (Qi et al., 2020). Given an XP non-terminal, we then will select p non-terminals as candidates to be replaced. For each non-terminal, we find other non-terminal with the same category from the training data, to replace the candidate. Assuming that we chose VP as the non-terminal node to be replaced, the algorithm will choose another VP from structures from the training corpus and mutate the whole subtree (VP root and the nodes below it). We can repeat this process to generate k augmented sentences. Additionally, we target nodes that have NER mentions as one of its children.

4 Experiments and Results

4.1 Dataset

We used the i2b2-2010 dataset (Uzuner et al., 2011) for both training and evaluation an training and validation set. Similar to Dai and Adel (2021) we use 3 different sizes of dataset to simulate low-resource setting. We select the first 50, 150, and 500 sentences in the dataset and denote them as S, M, L. We used the default train-test split and limit the augmentations to training set.

4.2 Model

Following Dai and Adel (2021), we model NER task as sequence-labeling. We used same components for modeling: a neural encoder and a conditional random field layer. Let T be the number of tokens in sequence. Each token x will have corresponding tag y , then each token x will be converted into an embedding r . Then the predicted tag given embedding for a token in index i , \hat{P} could be computed as:

$$\hat{P}(y_{i:T}|r_{i:T}) \propto \prod_{i=1}^T \psi_i(y_{i-1}, y_i, r_i)$$

For our neural encoder, We used SciBERT. This model has been proven to work effectively with scientific and medical data, like i2b2-2010.

4.3 Experiments

Each experiment was repeated with 5 different random seeds to calculate standard deviation.

For our SR and MR approaches, our hyperparameters are the replace ratio (0.3) and the number of generated samples (1).

LM and ST hyperparameters are similar. Both will have the number of generated samples and number of replaced tokens (only for LM) or non-terminals (only for ST). In this work, we limit ST replacements to non-terminals (phrases) in the following set: {NP, VP, ADJP, ADVP, PP, FRAG}.

One question to be explored is whether more augmented data could result in continued gains in model performance. In order to answer this, we experimented with {5, 10, 20} number of generated samples. For each number of generated samples, we also set the number of replaced tokens for LM and the number of replaced non-terminal for ST to be {1, 3, 5}. We have described the distribution of non terminals in Table 1. All of these settings were tested against the 27,625 sentences from validation set.

Phrase	S	M	L
NP	332	637	2562
VP	93	189	881
PP	54	130	690
ADJP	31	42	189
ADVP	16	27	126
FRAG	2	2	4

Table 1: Distribution of number of phrases in each training dataset.

4.4 Results

Table 2 described the highest F1 scores for each augmentation strategy. The best F1 scores were taken for each strategy, across multiple hyperparameters. We found that synonym replacement still outperforms other augmentation strategies in small and medium dataset size.

Experiment	S	M	L
NoA	46.3 ± 0.5	61.4 ± 0.1	70.7 ± 0.1
SR	53.0 ± 0.2	65.7 ± 0.1	71.0 ± 0.0
MR	51.9 ± 0.2	61.7 ± 0.1	70.2 ± 0.0
LM	52.9 ± 0.1	63.3 ± 0.1	73.3 ± 0.2
ST - ADJP	47.8 ± 0.2	61.0 ± 0.1	71.2 ± 0.1
ST - ADVP	50.5 ± 0.3	61.9 ± 0.1	71.3 ± 0.1
ST - FRAG	49.6 ± 0.2	61.6 ± 0.1	71.1 ± 0.0
ST - NP	52.1 ± 0.3	60.6 ± 0.1	70.2 ± 0.1
ST - PP	52.1 ± 0.1	62.4 ± 0.1	71.9 ± 0.1
ST - VP	52.9 ± 0.2	62.8 ± 0.1	72.8 ± 0.1

Table 2: Results for data augmentation experiments across different data set sizes. Top results for each data partition are marked in **bold**.

All augmentation methods tested seem to improve performance in terms of F1 for the small

training set (50 sentences). When we look at the medium dataset, however, some methods such as ST - ADJP or ST - NP, start to have a negative impact compared to no augmentation settings. Even more augmentation strategies begin to show diminishing or negative effects on performance for the larger dataset (e.g., MR and ST - NP). This suggests that some of the augmented data might be detrimental for the model fine-tuning process.

To understand how the augmented data may start to hurt original model performance, we consider one original sentence, processed on ST - NP strategy. For example, “Dr. Foutchner will arrange for an outpatient Holter monitor”. In the case of the St strategy, the augmentation algorithm draws an NP from another training sentence, resulting in “Dr. Foutchner will arrange for a T2 signal change” or “Dr. Foutchner will arrange for 10 beats”. These augmented sentences are grammatical, but they lack cohesion. This semantic drift phenomenon, therefore, may impact the model negatively. Future work should explore strategies to control semantic drift. For instance, by fine-tuning a large-scale language model to perform masked language modeling on sentence where a portion of tokens are provided in terms of phrasal category (XP) or functional category (part of speech tag), we might hybridize syntax-driven transformations and instantiate syntactic templates using large-scale language models.

The augmentation strategies explored in this work can be further divided into two groups: strategies that produce new vocabularies and strategies that do not produce new vocabularies. SR and LM methods fall into augmentation that produce new vocabularies. SR use the Penn Treebank (Marcus et al., 1993) to generate synonym of replaced tokens. LM use its word embedding to guess the masked target token and may generate new words that do not exist in the training data. The other strategy, MR, ST, relies solely on the current training dataset. This phenomena suggest augmentation strategies that produce new vocabularies seems to be more effective. This is plausible since new words will make the fine-tuned model more robust to unseen data. Although ST does not generate new words like the LM and SR methods, it still performs competitively in comparison. The delta between F1 scores produced by ST - VP and LM with our best hyperparameters for all dataset sizes are remarkably small at around 0.5 points. The

	S			M			L		
	5	10	20	5	10	20	5	10	20
LM	71.1	70.8	70.6	61.2	60.8	61.0	50.6	51.5	50.6
ST - VP	71.9	72.3	72.3	61.9	62.3	62.5	50.5	52.0	52.3

Table 3: Comparison between ST-VP and LM augmentation. ST-VP holds more consistent performance across number of generated sentences, while LM performance drops when the number of generated sentences.

effect of simpler data augmentation strategies, SR and MR, seems to be diminishing as the data size goes up; however, it is not the case with the LM and ST - VP strategies. They seem to perform well when more training data is available.

Looking at Table 3, the ST - VP augmentation strategy seems to show more consistent performance growth compared to the LM strategy. Whether it is 5, 10 or 20 sentences generated, ST-VP consistently trends upward as the number of augmented sentences increases (cf the instability of the LM). The average performance of the ST strategy shows an increased F1 as the number of synthetic sentences grows. In contrast, the average performance of the LM strategy is inconsistent and trending downward as the number of synthetic sentences increases.

Lastly, the performance of the ST strategy will also be affected by the performance of constituency parser component itself. For one of our augmented examples, the original sentence “She [_{VP} had a workup by her neurologist] and an MRI [_{VP} call with any fevers , chills , increasing weakness...]” was mutated into “She [_{VP} had a workup by her neurologist] and an MRI [_{VP} flare]”. Here, the word *flare* was falsely predicted as verb and thus erroneously predicted as a VP constituent, while the word *flare* here should be a part of *COPD flare* and should be classified as noun.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we examined data augmentation with a large-scale language model (LM) and constituency tree mutation (ST). We compared these augmentation methods with a baseline and previously proposed simple strategies for data augmentation: synonym replacement (SR) and mention replacement (MR). We found that SR performance is still most effective, by a small margin, but the performance degrades quickly as the data size increased. We have also observed that both LM and ST retained their performance throughout larger

dataset sizes. We also showed that ST performance seems to be consistent in its improvement as the dataset size increases, while the LM showed degrading performance with more augmented data.

Future work should include improvements that hybridize the syntactic transformations with a large-scale language model. One possibility to increase the performance of the baseline language model is to train it to recognize phrase-level constituents and functional categories to understand more about constituency tags by first randomly swapping a few tokens with constituency tags. For example, the original training sentence is “I take my medicine.”, then the pre-training sentence is “I VB my medicine.” and “I take my NN.”. We hypothesize that this pre-training will improve the prediction performance of baseline language model that we used for ST augmentation. Another possibility is to assign different weights that inform the model how much to “trust” augmented data compared to gold data. This weight could be in the form of different learning rate.

References

- Xiang Dai and Heike Adel. 2021. [An analysis of simple data augmentation for named entity recognition](#). pages 3861–3867.
- 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.
- Bosheng Ding, Linlin Liu, Lidong Bing, Canasai Kruengkrai, Thien Hai Nguyen, Shafiq Joty, Luo Si, and Chunyan Miao. 2020. [DAGA: Data augmentation with a generation approach for low-resource tagging tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6045–6057, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Steven Y. Feng, Varun Gangal, Jason Wei, Sarath Chandar, Soroush Vosoughi, Teruko Mitamura, and Eduard Hovy. 2021. [A survey of data augmentation approaches for NLP](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 968–988, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sosuke Kobayashi. 2018. [Contextual augmentation: Data augmentation by words with paradigmatic relations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of*

the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers), pages 452–457, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mitchell P. Marcus, Beatrice Santorini, and Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz. 1993. [Building a large annotated corpus of English: The Penn Treebank](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 19(2):313–330.

George A. Miller. 1992. [WordNet: A lexical database for English](#). In *Speech and Natural Language: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Harriman, New York, February 23-26, 1992*.

Peng Qi, Yuhao Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Jason Bolton, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [Stanza: A python natural language processing toolkit for many human languages](#). *CoRR*, abs/2003.07082.

Husam Quteineh, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Richard Sutcliffe. 2020. [Textual data augmentation for efficient active learning on tiny datasets](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7400–7410, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wilson L. Taylor. 1953. [“cloze procedure”: A new tool for measuring readability](#). *Journalism Quarterly*, 30(4):415–433.

Özlem Uzuner, Brett R. South, Shuying Shen, and Scott L Duvall. 2011. 2010 i2b2/va challenge on concepts, assertions, and relations in clinical text. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*, 18 5:552–6.

Jason Wei and Kai Zou. 2019. [EDA: Easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 6382–6388, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.