

Fusing Heterogeneous Factors with Triaffine Mechanism for Nested Named Entity Recognition

Zheng Yuan^{1*} Chuanqi Tan^{2†} Songfang Huang² Fei Huang²

¹Tsinghua University ²Alibaba Group

yuanz17@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

{chuanqi.tcq, songfang.hsf, f.huang}@alibaba-inc.com

Abstract

Nested entities are observed in many domains due to their compositionality, which cannot be easily recognized by the widely-used sequence labeling framework. A natural solution is to treat the task as a span classification problem. To increase performance on span representation and classification, it is crucial to effectively integrate all useful information of different formats, which we refer to heterogeneous factors including tokens, labels, boundaries, and related spans. To fuse these heterogeneous factors, we propose a novel triaffine mechanism including triaffine attention and scoring, which interacts with multiple factors in both the stages of representation and classification. Experiments results show that our proposed method achieves the state-of-the-art F_1 scores on four nested NER datasets: ACE2004, ACE2005, GENIA, and KBP2017.

1 Introduction

Named entity recognition (NER) is a fundamental natural language processing task that extracts entity spans from texts. Flat NER has been well studied and is usually viewed as a sequence labeling problem (Lample et al., 2016). However, nested entities also widely exist in real-world applications due to their multi-granularity semantic meaning (Alex et al., 2007; Yuan et al., 2020), which cannot be solved by the sequence labeling framework since tokens may have multiple labels (Finkel and Manning, 2009).

Various paradigms for nested NER have been proposed in recent years. One representative direction is the span-based approach that learns deep representation for every possible span and then classifies it to corresponding types (Zheng et al., 2019; Xia et al., 2019; Luan et al., 2019; Wadden et al., 2019; Tan et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Yu et al.,

a defective NF - chi B site was completely inactive in EBV - transformed B cells , ...

Figure 1: An example sentence with nested entities from the GENIA dataset.

2020; Zhong and Chen, 2021). Taking a closer look at Figure 1, we observe that the following factors are critical in nested NER. (1) **Tokens**: It is obvious that the span, or more specifically, tokens inside the span, contributes to the classification. (2) **Labels**: The label is an important factor not just because each span corresponds to a label. In the nested setting, a token could belong to entities with different labels. Therefore, the model needs to pay more attention to the alignment between the token and each label. For example, the token “NF” is close to the type “protein” as well as the token “chi” and “B” are close to “DNA”. (3) **Boundaries**: Boundaries (or boundary tokens) help to locate the span, which is the important indicator of which alignments the model should focus on between tokens and labels. One can easily determine the span “in EBV - transformed B cells” and “NF chi B site was” are not entities due to their boundary tokens. In addition, one token could be the boundary of entities with different labels (e.g., “NF”, “B”, and “cells”), which shows the uniqueness of boundaries in this task. (4) **Related spans**: Interactions among spans are important in nested NER. The insider and outsider entities may hint at each other’s types. For example, entities inside “EBV-transformed B cells” have more possibilities to be cell-related entities. Interactions can also help the non-entity span like “transformed B cells” to validate its partialness by looking at outer entity “EBV - transformed B cells”.

Based on this, we propose a span-based method to fuse these multiple heterogeneous factors with

* Work done at Alibaba DAMO Academy.

† Corresponding author.

a novel triaffine mechanism. The triaffine transformation is designed as the tensor multiplication with three rank-1 tensors (vectors) and a rank-3 tensor, which can jointly consider high-order interactions among multiple features. Specifically, the proposed triaffine mechanism is used in the stages of both representation aggregation and span classification. Firstly, we apply the triaffine attention to aggregate the span representation based on the tokens, labels, and their boundaries. Secondly, a similar triaffine attention is applied to produce the cross-span representation by the fusion of related spans, labels, and boundaries representation. Finally, we fuse the previously produced span representations, labels, and boundaries for classification with a triaffine score function. In addition, we propose to decompose the triaffine scoring into dot products of two triaffine transformations to accelerate calculations. In practice, we add an auxiliary objective function to classify spans without the cross-span interaction, which benefits learning robust span representation and can be used as a span filter to speed up both training and inference.

We conduct experiments on four nested NER datasets: ACE2004, ACE2005, GENIA, and KBP2017. Our model achieves 88.56, 88.83, 81.23, and 87.27 scores in terms of F_1 , respectively, outperforming state-of-the-art methods. Ablation studies show the effectiveness of the heterogeneous factors and the superiority of the triaffine mechanism. Our contributions are summarized as:

- We propose that heterogeneous factors (i.e., tokens, labels, boundaries, related spans) should be taken into consideration in the span-based methods for nested NER.
- We propose a span-based method with a novel triaffine mechanism including triaffine attention and scoring to fuse the above-mentioned heterogeneous factors for span representations and classification.
- Experiments show that our proposed method performs better than existing span-based methods and achieves state-of-the-arts performances on four nested NER datasets.

2 Related Work

2.1 Nested NER

Nested NER approaches do not have a unified paradigm. Here we mainly focus on span-based methods since they are close to our work.

The span-based methods are one of the most mainstream ways for the nested NER. With the development of pre-training, it is easy to obtain the span representation by the concatenation of boundary representation (Luan et al., 2019; Zhong and Chen, 2021) or the aggregated representation of tokens (Zheng et al., 2019; Wadden et al., 2019), and then follow a linear layer (Xia et al., 2019) or biaffine transformation (Yu et al., 2020) for classification. Several works improve the span-based methods with additional features or supervision. Zheng et al. (2019); Tan et al. (2020) point out the importance of boundaries and therefore introduce the boundary detection task. Wang et al. (2020) propose Pyramid to allow interactions between spans from different layers. Fu et al. (2021) adopt TreeCRF to model interactions between nested spans. Compared with previous methods, our method can jointly fuse multiple heterogeneous factors with proposed triaffine mechanism.

Other methods for nested NER vary greatly. Earlier research on nested NER is rule-based (Zhang et al., 2004). Lu and Roth (2015); Katiyar and Cardie (2018); Wang and Lu (2018) leverage the hypergraph to represent all possible nested structures, which needs to be carefully designed to avoid spurious structures and structural ambiguities. Li et al. (2020a) transfer nested NER tasks to the machine reading comprehension task; however, it needs additional resources to produce the question for each entity type. Wang et al. (2018); Fisher and Vlachos (2019) predict the transition actions to construct nested entities. Lin et al. (2019) propose an anchor-based method to recognize entities. There are other works that recognize entities in a generative fashion (Yan et al., 2021; Shen et al., 2021; Tan et al., 2021). Generally, it is not a unified framework for nested NER, and we model it with a span-based method since it is most straightforward.

2.2 Affine Transformations in NLP

Dozat and Manning (2017) introduces the biaffine transformation in the dependency parsing task for arc classification. Later, it is widely used in many tasks that need to model bilateral representations (Li et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2020). To extend biaffine transformation for high-order interaction, triaffine transformation is introduced. However, it usually only models the homogeneous features such as three tokens in dependency parsing (Wang et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020) and semantic role label-




Figure 2: The architecture of our method. Green cubes indicate triaffine attention. Blue cubes indicate triaffine scoring. Orange arrows mean boundary information. Blue arrows mean inside tokens or related spans information. For each span, we have head and tail representations in yellow and $R + 1$ span representations in different colors. The grey color indicates None class.

ing (Li et al., 2020b) to obtain log potentials for CRFs. In this work, our proposed triaffine mechanism can model the heterogeneous inputs and can be used in both the stages of attention and scoring.

3 Approach

Figure 2 shows an overview of our method. Triaffine transformations lie in the heart of our model to fuse heterogeneous factors. After obtaining token representation by an LSTM encoder with inputs including pre-trained language models and syntax features, we first fuse the label and boundary information into tokens with the triaffine attention among head boundaries, tail boundaries, inside tokens and labels. We then use a similar triaffine attention among head boundaries, tail boundaries, related spans, and labels to fuse information from related spans, labels, and boundaries for cross-span representations. Finally, we classify spans with triaffine score function among head boundaries, tail boundaries, and cross-span representations. An auxiliary task that classifies spans without cross-span representations is added to learn robust intermediate span representations and filter spans for calculating cross-span representations.

3.1 Triaffine Transformation

We define the triaffine transformation with vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a tensor $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ which outputs a scalar by applying tensor vector multiplications. A constant 1 is concatenated with

\mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} to retain the biaffine transformations:

$$\mathbf{u}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{v}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{TriAff}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}, \mathcal{W}) := \mathcal{W} \times_1 \mathbf{u}' \times_2 \mathbf{w} \times_3 \mathbf{v}', \quad (2)$$

where \times_n is the mode- n tensor vector multiplication. The tensor \mathcal{W} is initialized using $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. We use head and tail boundary representations as \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} . Inside tokens or span representations are used as \mathbf{w} . We denote the tensors in the triaffine attention as $\{\mathcal{W}_r\}$ and triaffine scoring as $\{\mathcal{V}_r\}$ which decouples attention weights and scores for different labels.

3.2 Text Encoding

For text $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]$ with N tokens, we convert the words to the contextual embeddings. Following Shen et al. (2021) and Tan et al. (2021), we generate the contextual embedding \mathbf{x}_i^c with the pre-trained language model,

$$\mathbf{x}_1^c, \mathbf{x}_2^c, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N^c = \text{PLM}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N). \quad (3)$$

Then, we concatenate \mathbf{x}_i^c with word embedding \mathbf{x}_i^w , part-of-speech embedding \mathbf{x}_i^p and character embedding \mathbf{x}_i^{ch} , and feed the concatenated embedding \mathbf{x}_i into a BiLSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) for the token representations.

3.3 Triaffine Attention for Span Representations

For the span starts from i -th token and ends with j -th token (denoted as (i, j)), we learn $R + 1$ (R is

the count of labels, plus the None class) span representations $\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}$ with the triaffine attention to fuse information from tokens, labels and boundaries:

$$\mathbf{h}_k^{in} = \text{MLP}^{in}(\mathbf{h}_k), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r} = \sum_{k=i}^j \alpha_{i,j,k,r} \mathbf{h}_k^{in}, \quad (5)$$

where MLP^{in} is a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) layer. $\alpha_{i,j,k,r}$ weighs the importance of inside token k regarding label r and boundaries i, j . We use $\text{MLP}^{mode,*}$ to obtain head/tail/inside representations to calculate triaffine attention score $s_{i,j,k,r}$ and normalize it to $\alpha_{i,j,k,r}$ among inside tokens k . Figure 3a illustrates the triaffine attention.

$$\mathbf{h}_{i/j/k}^{head/tail/in,*} = \text{MLP}^{head/tail/in,*}(\mathbf{h}_{i/j/k}), \quad (6)$$

$$s_{i,j,k,r} = \text{TriAff}(\mathbf{h}_i^{head,*}, \mathbf{h}_j^{tail,*}, \mathbf{h}_k^{in,*}, \mathcal{W}_r), \quad (7)$$

$$\alpha_{i,j,k,r} = \frac{\exp(s_{i,j,k,r})}{\sum_{k'=i}^j \exp(s_{i,j,k',r})}. \quad (8)$$

3.4 Triaffine Attention for Cross-span Representations

Motivated by the span level interactions in nested NER, we fuse the span information with labels and boundaries to obtain cross-span representations. Similar to the equation 5, we obtain $R + 1$ cross-span representations $\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}^c$ for the span (i, j) based on triaffine attention with related spans.

$$\mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}^{span,c} = \text{MLP}^{span,c}(\mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}), \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}^c = \sum_g \beta_{i,j,g,r} \mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}^{span,c}, \quad (10)$$

where $\{(i_g, j_g)\}$ are the spans interacted with (i, j) (could be all possible spans or a subset of spans). The cross-span representation for (i, j) is aggregated by $\beta_{i,j,g,r}$ which weighs the influences of span (i_g, j_g) regarding label r and span (i, j) . We use $\text{MLP}^{mode,c*}$ to extract features of head i , tail j and span (i_g, j_g) , and then apply the triaffine transformation on them for $\beta_{i,j,g,r}$:

$$\mathbf{h}_{i/j}^{head/tail,c*} = \text{MLP}^{head/tail,c*}(\mathbf{h}_{i/j}), \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}^{span,c*} = \text{MLP}^{span,c*}(\mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}), \quad (12)$$

$$q_{i,j,g,r} = \text{TriAff}(\mathbf{h}_i^{head,c*}, \mathbf{h}_j^{tail,c*}, \mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}^{span,c*}, \mathcal{W}_r), \quad (13)$$

$$\beta_{i,j,g,r} = \frac{\exp(q_{i,j,g,r})}{\sum_{g'} \exp(q_{i,j,g',r})}. \quad (14)$$

3.5 Triaffine Scoring for Span Classification

We leverage the boundaries information and cross-span representations for span classification via triaffine scoring. Specifically, we estimate the logits $p_{i,j,r}^c$ of the span (i, j) for label r using triaffine scoring with $\text{MLP}^{mode,c}$ transformation on boundaries $\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j$ and cross-span representations $\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}^c$.

$$\mathbf{h}_{i/j}^{head/tail,c} = \text{MLP}^{head/tail,c}(\mathbf{h}_{i/j}), \quad (15)$$

$$p_{i,j,r}^c = \text{TriAff}(\mathbf{h}_i^{head,c}, \mathbf{h}_j^{tail,c}, \mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}^c, \mathcal{V}_r). \quad (16)$$

Since $\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}^c$ can be decomposed into weighted sum of $\mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}^{span,c}$, we decompose equation 16 into:

$$t_{i,j,g,r} = \text{TriAff}(\mathbf{h}_i^{head,c}, \mathbf{h}_j^{tail,c}, \mathbf{h}_{i_g,j_g,r}^{span,c}, \mathcal{V}_r), \quad (17)$$

$$p_{i,j,r}^c = \sum_g \beta_{i,j,g,r} t_{i,j,g,r}. \quad (18)$$

Figure 3b and 3c show the mechanism of triaffine scoring and the decomposition.

Additionally, an auxiliary span classification task applies the triaffine scoring on boundary representations and intermediate span representations $\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}$ to estimate logits $p_{i,j,r}$ which applies similar decomposition techniques.

3.6 Training and Inference

In practice, it is expensive and non-informative to consider interactions between all spans. We rank all spans based on the maximum of logits (except None) from intermediate span representations $p_{i,j} = \max_{r=1}^R p_{i,j,r}$, and we retain top- m spans $\{(i_l, j_l)\}_{l=1}^m$ as candidates to calculate cross-span representations $\mathbf{h}_{i_l,j_l,r}^c$ and estimate logits $p_{i_l,j_l,r}^c$ where spans in $\{(i_l, j_l)\}_{l=1}^m$ interact with each other. Thus, we have two groups of logits in our model $\{p_{i,j,r}\}_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N}$ and $\{p_{i_l,j_l,r}^c\}_{1 \leq l \leq m}$. $\{p_{i,j,r}\}$ are




Figure 3: Visualization of triaffine attention, triaffine scoring, and the decomposition of triaffine scoring.

calculated for every possible span, and $\{p_{i_l, j_l, r}^c\}$ are calculated only on top- m spans.

In the training phase, we jointly minimize the cross-entropy losses with two types of predictions:

$$\mathcal{L}_{aux} = -\frac{2}{N(N+1)} \sum_{i,j} \log \frac{\exp(p_{i,j,r_{ij}})}{\sum_r \exp(p_{i,j,r})}, \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{main} = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq l \leq m} \log \frac{\exp(p_{i_l, j_l, r_{i_l, j_l}}^c)}{\sum_r \exp(p_{i_l, j_l, r}^c)}, \quad (20)$$

$$\mathcal{L} = \mu_{aux} \mathcal{L}_{aux} + \mathcal{L}_{main}. \quad (21)$$

where r_{ij} is the label of span (i, j) .

In both the training and inference phase, $\{p_{i,j,r}\}$ is used to select candidate spans with high possibility based on the supervision from \mathcal{L}_{aux} . We inference the labels of selected spans using $\{p_{i_l, j_l, r}^c\}$ by assigning label $\tilde{r}_{i_l, j_l} = \arg_r \max p_{i_l, j_l, r}^c$ for the span (i_l, j_l) , and we assign None class for others.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We conduct our experiments on the ACE2004¹, ACE2005² (Doddington et al., 2004), GENIA (Kim et al., 2003) and KBP2017³ (Ji et al., 2017) datasets. To fairly compare with previous works, we follow the same dataset split with Lu and Roth (2015) for ACE2004 and ACE2005 datasets and use the split from Lin et al. (2019) for GENIA and KBP2017 datasets. Table 1 shows the statistics of all datasets. Following previous work, we measure the results using span-level precision, recall, and F_1 scores.

¹<https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2005T09>

²<https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2006T06>

³<https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2019T12>

4.2 Implementation Details

To encode texts, we use BERT-large-cased (Devlin et al., 2019) and albert-xxlarge-v2 (Lan et al., 2020) as the contextual embedding, fastText (Bojanowski et al., 2017) as the word embedding in ACE2004, ACE2005 and KBP2017 dataset. We use BioBERT-v1.1 (Lee et al., 2020) and BioWordVec (Zhang et al., 2019) as the contextual and word embedding in the GENIA dataset respectively. We truncate the input texts with context at length 192. The part-of-speech embeddings are randomly initialized with dimension 50. The char embeddings are generated by a one-layer BiLSTM with hidden size 50. The two-layers BiLSTM with a hidden size of 1,024 is used for the token representations. For triaffine transformations, we use $d = 256$ for the ACE2004, ACE2005, and KBP2017 dataset, and $d = 320$ for the GENIA dataset, respectively. We set μ_{aux} to 1.0, and select $m = 30$ in both training and inference. We use AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) to optimize our models with a linear learning rate decay.

4.3 Baselines

Below we list comparable baseline methods.

DYIE (Luan et al., 2019) uses multi-task learning to extract entities, relations, and coreferences.

MGNER (Xia et al., 2019) uses a detector to find span candidates and a classifier for categorization.

BENSC (Tan et al., 2020) trains the boundary detection and span classification tasks jointly.

TreeCRF (Fu et al., 2021) views entities as nodes in a constituency tree and decodes them with a Masked Inside algorithm.

Biaffine (Yu et al., 2020) classifies spans by a biaffine function between boundary representations.

Pyramid (Wang et al., 2020) designs pyramid layer and inverse pyramid layer to decode nested entities.

We also report the results of models with other paradigms, including hypergraph-based methods (Wang and Lu, 2018), transition-based methods

	ACE2004			ACE2005			GENIA		KBP2017		
	Train	Dev	Test	Train	Dev	Test	Train	Test	Train	Dev	Test
# sentences	6,200	745	812	7,194	969	1,047	16,692	1,854	10,546	545	4,267
# wl nested ent	2,712	294	388	2,691	338	320	3,522	446	2,809	182	1,223
# entities	22,204	2,514	3,035	24,411	3,200	2,993	50,509	5,506	31,236	1,879	12,601
# nested ent	10,149	1,092	1,417	9,389	1,112	1,118	9,064	1,199	8,773	605	3,707
avg. word count	22.50	23.02	23.05	19.21	18.93	17.20	25.35	25.99	19.62	20.61	19.26
max entity count	28	22	20	27	23	17	25	14	58	15	21

Table 1: Statistics of nested NER datasets ACE2004, ACE2005, GENIA, and KBP2017.

Model + Encoder	ACE2004			ACE2005			GENIA		
	P	R	F_1	P	R	F_1	P	R	F_1
Span-based Methods									
DYGIE (Luan et al., 2019) + LSTM	-	-	84.7	-	-	82.9	-	-	76.2
MGNER (Xia et al., 2019) + ELMo	81.7	77.4	79.5	79.0	77.3	78.2	-	-	-
BENSC (Tan et al., 2020)	85.8	84.8	85.3	83.8	83.9	83.9	79.2	77.4	78.3
TreeCRF (Fu et al., 2021)	86.7	86.5	86.6	84.5	86.4	85.4	78.2	78.2	78.2
Biaffine (Yu et al., 2020)	87.3	86.0	86.7	85.2	85.6	85.4	81.8	79.3	80.5
Pyramid (Wang et al., 2020)	86.08	86.48	86.28	83.95	85.39	84.66	79.45	78.94	79.19
Pyramid (Wang et al., 2020) + ALBERT	87.71	87.78	87.74	85.30	87.40	86.34	80.33	78.31	79.31
Others									
SH (Wang and Lu, 2018) + LSTM	78.0	72.4	75.1	76.8	72.3	74.5	77.0	73.3	75.1
ARN (Lin et al., 2019) + LSTM	76.2	73.6	74.9	75.8	73.9	74.8	-	-	-
BiFlag (Luo and Zhao, 2020) + LSTM	-	-	-	75.0	75.2	75.1	77.4	74.6	76.0
Merge Label (Fisher and Vlachos, 2019)	-	-	-	82.7	82.1	82.4	-	-	-
Seq2seq (Straková et al., 2019)	-	-	84.40	-	-	84.33	-	-	78.31
Second-best (Shibuya and Hovy, 2020)	85.94	85.69	85.82	83.83	84.87	84.34	77.81	76.94	77.36
BartNER (Yan et al., 2021) + BART	87.27	86.41	86.84	83.16	86.38	84.74	78.87	79.60	79.23
Sequence to Set (Tan et al., 2021)	88.46	86.10	87.26	87.48	86.63	87.05	82.31	78.66	80.44
Locate and Label (Shen et al., 2021)	87.44	87.38	87.41	86.09	87.27	86.67	80.19	80.89	80.54
Triaffine (Ours)	87.13	87.68	87.40	86.70	86.94	86.82	80.42	82.06	81.23
Triaffine (Ours) + ALBERT	88.88	88.24	88.56	87.39	90.31	88.83	-	-	-

Table 2: Results on the ACE2004, ACE2005, and GENIA datasets. BERT is the default encoder if not specified.

Model + Encoder	KBP2017		
	P	R	F_1
ARN + LSTM	77.7	71.8	74.6
BiFlag + LSTM	77.1	74.3	75.6
Sequence to Set	84.91	83.04	83.96
Locate and Label	85.46	82.67	84.05
Triaffine (Ours)	86.50	83.65	85.05
Triaffine (Ours) + ALBERT	89.42	85.22	87.27

Table 3: Results on the KBP2017 dataset. BERT is the default encoder if not specified.

(Fisher and Vlachos, 2019), generative methods (Yan et al., 2021; Tan et al., 2021; Shen et al., 2021), and so on. We do not compare to BERT-MRC (Li et al., 2020a) since they use additional resources as queries. DYGIE++ (Wadden et al., 2019) and PURE (Zhong and Chen, 2021) use different splits of the ACE datasets which are not comparable.

4.4 Results

We compare proposed method with baseline methods in Table 2 for ACE2004, ACE2005, and GENIA and Table 3 for KBP2017. With BERT as the encoder, our model achieves 87.40, 86.82, 81.23, and 85.05 scores in terms of F_1 , outperforming all

other span-based methods such as BENSC, Pyramid, TreeCRF, and Biaffine (+0.70 on ACE2004, +1.42 on ACE2005, +0.73 on GENIA). Compared with methods in other paradigms, our model also achieves the state-of-the-art results on the GENIA (+0.69 vs. Locate and Label) and KBP2017 dataset (+1.00 vs. Locate and Label) and shows comparable performances on ACE2004 (-0.01 vs. Locate and Label) and ACE2005 (-0.23 vs. Sequence to Set). With a stronger encoder ALBERT, our model achieves 88.56, 88.83, and 87.27 scores in terms of F_1 on ACE2004, ACE2005, and KBP2017 respectively, which exceeds all existing baselines including the Pyramid model with ALBERT (+0.82 on ACE2004, +2.49 on ACE2005) and the previous state-of-the-art method on KBP2017 dataset (+3.22 vs. Locate and Label).

4.5 Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of each factor and the proposed triaffine mechanism, we conduct experiments with the following settings.

(a) The baseline biaffine model with the combina-

Setting	Setting							Datasets	
	Span Representation			Span Classification				ACE2004	GENIA
	Label	Boundary	Function	Boundary	Attention	Cross	Function	F_1	
(a)	×	×	×	✓	×	×	bi.	86.71	78.97
(b)	✓	✓	tri.	×	✓	×	lin.	87.36	80.50
(c)	×	✓	tri.	✓	✓	×	tri.	87.17	80.49
(d)	✓	×	lin.	✓	✓	×	tri.	87.14	80.50
(e)	✓	✓	lin.	✓	✓	×	tri.	87.35	80.63
(f)	✓	✓	tri.	✓	✓	×	lin.	87.49	80.70
(g)	✓	✓	tri.	✓	✓	×	tri.	87.54	80.84
(h)	✓	✓	tri.	✓	✓	✓	tri.	87.82	81.23

Table 4: Ablation tests on ACE2004 and GENIA datasets. Cross means using cross attention for span classification. Lin. means linear transformation, bi. means biaffine transformation, and tri. means triaffine transformation.

tion of boundary representations:

$$p_{i,j,r} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_i \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}_r \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

(b) Change the score function by removing the boundary information:

$$p_{i,j,r} = \mathbf{V}_r \mathbf{h}_{i,j,r} + \mathbf{b}_r. \quad (23)$$

(c) Change the triaffine attention by removing the label information:

$$\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r} = \mathbf{h}_{i,j} = \sum_{k=i}^j \alpha_{i,j,k} \mathbf{h}_k^{in,0}, \quad (24)$$

$$s_{i,j,k} = \text{TriAff}(\mathbf{h}_i^{head,*}, \mathbf{h}_j^{tail,*}, \mathbf{h}_k^{in,*}, \mathcal{W}). \quad (25)$$

(d) Change the triaffine attention by removing the boundary information :

$$\mathbf{h}_{i,j,r} = \sum_{k=i}^j \alpha_{k,r} \mathbf{h}_k^{in}, \quad (26)$$

$$s_{k,r} = \mathbf{q}_r \cdot \mathbf{h}_k^{in,*}. \quad (27)$$

(e) Replace triaffine attention with linear attention:

$$s_{i,j,k,r} = \mathbf{W}_r(\mathbf{h}_i^{head,*} \parallel \mathbf{h}_j^{tail,*} \parallel \mathbf{h}_k^{in,*}) + \mathbf{c}_r. \quad (28)$$

(f) Replace triaffine scoring to linear scoring:

$$p_{i,j,r} = \mathbf{V}_r(\mathbf{h}_i^{head} \parallel \mathbf{h}_j^{tail} \parallel \mathbf{h}_{i,j,r}) + \mathbf{b}_r. \quad (29)$$

(g) Our partial model without cross-span interactions (i.e. use $p_{i,j,r}$ as predictions).

(h) Our full model (i.e. use $p_{i,j,r}^c$ as predictions).

Table 4 shows the results of ablation studies on ACE2004 and GENIA datasets. We use

BERT-large-cased as the backbone encoder on ACE2004 and BioBERT-v1.1 on GENIA, respectively. By comparing (a) with (g), we observe significant performances drop (-0.87 on ACE2004, -1.87 on GENIA), which indicates that our proposed triaffine mechanism with multiple heterogeneous factors performs better than the biaffine baseline. Comparing (b) with (g), we find that the boundary information contributes to span classification. Comparing (c) and (d) with (g) supports that either label or boundary in the triaffine attention improves the performance. The setting (g) performs better than (e) and (f), which shows the superiority of the triaffine transformation than the linear function. We observe that (h) performs better than (g) (+0.28 on ACE2004, +0.39 on GENIA), proving the strength of triaffine attention with interactions among related spans. The above studies support that our proposed triaffine mechanism with associated heterogeneous factors are effective for span representation and classification.

4.6 Discussion

Figure 4 compares the F_1 scores between triaffine model (g) and biaffine model (a) grouped by different entity lengths. In all columns, the F_1 score of our method is better than the baseline. Furthermore, the right columns show that the F_1 score of the baseline gradually decreases with the incremental entity lengths. However, our method based on the triaffine mechanism with heterogeneous features takes advantage of the interaction from boundaries and related spans, which keeps a consistent result and outperforms the baseline.

Table 6 compares the results grouped by flat or nested entities. Our method has consistent improvements than the baseline, especially for the nested setting. Combined with the above observation, our method is good at solving long entities that are

Span	Type	$P^{i,j,r}$ Probability	Rank	Type	$P^{i,j,r}$ Probability
... [Cisco]ORG’s been slammed, but once [they]ORG’re exposed to [the rest of [the trading population]PER]PER ...					
Cisco	ORG	1.00	1	ORG	1.00
they	ORG	1.00	2	ORG	1.00
the rest of the trading population	PER	1.00	3	PER	1.00
the trading population	GPE	0.50	4	PER	0.68
population	None	1.00	5	None	1.00
... simian virus 40 enhancer activity was blocked by the [MnII-AluI fragment]DNA in [HeLa cells]cl but not in [B cells]ct.					
HeLa cells	cell line	0.99	1	cell line	0.99
B cells	cell type	0.97	2	cell type	0.88
MnII-AluI fragment	DNA	0.96	3	DNA	0.95
simian virus 40 enhancer	DNA	0.90	4	DNA	0.89
MnII-AluI	protein	0.43	5	None	0.41
40 enhancer	None	0.99	6	None	1.00

Table 5: Case study on ACE2004 and GENIA dataset. Colored brackets indicate the boundaries and semantic types of entities in true labels. “cl” and “ct” is the abbreviation of *cell line* and *cell type*, respectively.




Figure 4: Comparison between triaffine and biaffine models on GENIA with different lengths of entities. Entity counts are in the parentheses.

	ACE2004		GENIA	
	Flat (1,422)	Nested (1,092)	Flat (4,307)	Nested (1,199)
(a)	88.51	84.19	80.09	74.23
(h)	89.54	85.45	82.18	77.24
Δ	+1.03	+1.26	+2.09	+ 3.01

Table 6: Comparison between triaffine and biaffine models on ACE2004 and GENIA grouped by flat or nested entities. Entity counts are in the parentheses.

more likely to be nested, which supports our model is built upon the characteristics of nested NER.

As previously mentioned, we select top- m spans for cross-span interactions. We analyze the influence of the span counts in Figure 5. We observe that taking top-10 spans can achieve considerable results since the average number of entities is only 2.97 in the GENIA. Additionally, taking top-30 spans, which is slightly greater than the maximum number of entities (i.e., 25), achieves the best performance. Since there is no obvious difference in the results with a larger span set, we decide $m = 30$ to balance the performance and efficiency.




Figure 5: F_1 scores for GENIA with different counts of spans for calculating cross-span representations.

4.7 Case Study

To analyze the effect of fusing information from related spans with the cross-span interaction, we show two examples from ACE2004 and GENIA datasets in Table 5. In the first example, the model first predicts “*the trading population*” as “GPE”, however, it revises to “PER” correctly by considering span interactions with the outer span “*the rest of the trading population*”. In the second example, it first predicts “*MnII-AluI*” as “protein”. By interacting with surrounding entities “*MnII-AluI fragment*”, the model corrects its label to “non-entity”.

5 Conclusion

We propose a novel span-based method for nested NER. Heterogeneous factors including tokens, boundaries, labels, and related spans are introduced to improve span classification. We propose a tri-affine mechanism to fusing heterogeneous factors for better span representation and scoring. Experiments show that proposed method outperforms all previous span-based methods and achieves state-of-the-art performances on four nested NER datasets. Ablation studies show introduced heterogeneous factors and proposed triaffine mechanism are helpful for nested NER. In addition, although we only verify our model in the nested NER task, we believe that it can also be useful in other tasks such as parsing and semantic role labeling.

References

- Beatrice Alex, Barry Haddow, and Claire Grover. 2007. Recognising nested named entities in biomedical text. In *Biological, translational, and clinical language processing*, pages 65–72.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Enriching word vectors with subword information](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- 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.
- George R Doddington, Alexis Mitchell, Mark A Przybocki, Lance A Ramshaw, Stephanie M Strassel, and Ralph M Weischedel. 2004. The automatic content extraction (ace) program-tasks, data, and evaluation. In *Lrec*, volume 2, pages 837–840. Lisbon.
- Timothy Dozat and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. Deep biaffine attention for neural dependency parsing. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Jenny Rose Finkel and Christopher D Manning. 2009. Nested named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2009 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 141–150.
- Joseph Fisher and Andreas Vlachos. 2019. [Merge and label: A novel neural network architecture for nested NER](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5840–5850, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yao Fu, Chuanqi Tan, Mosha Chen, Songfang Huang, and Fei Huang. 2021. Nested named entity recognition with partially-observed treecrfs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 12839–12847.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Heng Ji, Xiaoman Pan, Boliang Zhang, Joel Nothman, James Mayfield, Paul McNamee, and Cash Costello. 2017. Overview of tac-kbp2017 13 languages entity discovery and linking. *Theory and Applications of Categories*.
- Arzoo Katiyar and Claire Cardie. 2018. Nested named entity recognition revisited. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 861–871.
- J-D Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Yuka Tateisi, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. 2003. Genia corpus—a semantically annotated corpus for bio-textmining. *Bioinformatics*, 19(suppl_1):i180–i182.
- Guillaume Lample, Miguel Ballesteros, Sandeep Subramanian, Kazuya Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. 2016. [Neural architectures for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 260–270, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2020. ALBERT: A lite BERT for self-supervised learning of language representations. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. 2020. Biobert: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240.
- Xiaoya Li, Jingrong Feng, Yuxian Meng, Qinghong Han, Fei Wu, and Jiwei Li. 2020a. [A unified MRC framework for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5849–5859, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zuchao Li, Shexia He, Hai Zhao, Yiqing Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Xi Zhou, and Xiang Zhou. 2019. Dependency or span, end-to-end uniform semantic role labeling. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6730–6737.
- Zuchao Li, Hai Zhao, Rui Wang, and Kevin Parnow. 2020b. [High-order semantic role labeling](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1134–1151, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongyu Lin, Yaojie Lu, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. 2019. [Sequence-to-nuggets: Nested entity mention detection via anchor-region networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5182–5192, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*.

- Wei Lu and Dan Roth. 2015. Joint mention extraction and classification with mention hypergraphs. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 857–867.
- Yi Luan, Dave Wadden, Luheng He, Amy Shah, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. A general framework for information extraction using dynamic span graphs. 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 3036–3046, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ying Luo and Hai Zhao. 2020. Bipartite flat-graph network for nested named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6408–6418, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yongliang Shen, Xinyin Ma, Zeqi Tan, Shuai Zhang, Wen Wang, and Weiming Lu. 2021. Locate and label: A two-stage identifier for nested named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Takashi Shibuya and Eduard Hovy. 2020. Nested named entity recognition via second-best sequence learning and decoding. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:605–620.
- Jana Straková, Milan Straka, and Jan Hajic. 2019. Neural architectures for nested NER through linearization. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5326–5331, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chuanqi Tan, Wei Qiu, Mosha Chen, Rui Wang, and Fei Huang. 2020. Boundary enhanced neural span classification for nested named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 9016–9023.
- Zeqi Tan, Yongliang Shen, Shuai Zhang, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. 2021. A sequence-to-set network for nested named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*.
- David Wadden, Ulme Wennberg, Yi Luan, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Entity, relation, and event extraction with contextualized span representations. 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 5784–5789, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bailin Wang and Wei Lu. 2018. Neural segmental hypergraphs for overlapping mention recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 204–214, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bailin Wang, Wei Lu, Yu Wang, and Hongxia Jin. 2018. A neural transition-based model for nested mention recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1011–1017, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jue Wang, Lidan Shou, Ke Chen, and Gang Chen. 2020. Pyramid: A layered model for nested named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5918–5928.
- Xinyu Wang, Jingxian Huang, and Kewei Tu. 2019. Second-order semantic dependency parsing with end-to-end neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4609–4618, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Congying Xia, Chenwei Zhang, Tao Yang, Yaliang Li, Nan Du, Xian Wu, Wei Fan, Fenglong Ma, and Philip Yu. 2019. Multi-grained named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1430–1440, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hang Yan, Tao Gui, Junqi Dai, Qipeng Guo, Zheng Zhang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2021. A unified generative framework for various NER subtasks. 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 5808–5822, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Juntao Yu, Bernd Bohnet, and Massimo Poesio. 2020. Named entity recognition as dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6470–6476, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheng Yuan, Yuanhao Liu, Qiuyang Yin, Boyao Li, Xiaobin Feng, Guoming Zhang, and Sheng Yu. 2020. Unsupervised multi-granular chinese word segmentation and term discovery via graph partition. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 110:103542.
- Jie Zhang, Dan Shen, Guodong Zhou, Jian Su, and Chew-Lim Tan. 2004. Enhancing hmm-based biomedical named entity recognition by studying special phenomena. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 37(6):411–422.
- Yijia Zhang, Qingyu Chen, Zhihao Yang, Hongfei Lin, and Zhiyong Lu. 2019. Biwordvec, improving

biomedical word embeddings with subword information and mesh. *Scientific data*, 6(1):1–9.

Yu Zhang, Zhenghua Li, and Min Zhang. 2020. [Efficient second-order TreeCRF for neural dependency parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3295–3305, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Changmeng Zheng, Yi Cai, Jingyun Xu, HF Leung, and Guandong Xu. 2019. A boundary-aware neural model for nested named entity recognition. 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zexuan Zhong and Danqi Chen. 2021. A frustratingly easy approach for entity and relation extraction. In *North American Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.