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Abstract

Inspired by recent advances in retrieval augmented methods in NLP (Khandelwal et al., 2019, 2020; Meng et al., 2021b), in this paper, we introduce a \(k\) nearest neighbor NER (\(k\)-NN-NER) framework, which augments the distribution of entity labels by assigning \(k\) nearest neighbors retrieved from the training set. This strategy makes the model more capable of handling long-tail cases, along with better few-shot learning abilities. \(k\)-NN-NER requires no additional operation during the training phase, and by interpolating \(k\) nearest neighbors search into the vanilla NER model, \(k\)-NN-NER consistently outperforms its vanilla counterparts: we achieve a new state-of-the-art F1-score of 72.03 (+1.25) on the Chinese Weibo dataset and improved results on a variety of widely used NER benchmarks. Additionally, we show that \(k\)-NN-NER can achieve comparable results to the vanilla NER model with 40% less amount of training data.  

1 Introduction

Named Entity Recognition (NER) is an important problem in NLP, which refers to identifying named entities (e.g., person names, organizations, or locations) from a given chunk of text. The most widely employed strategy for the NER task is to train a sequential labeling model based on a labeled dataset, and this model learns to assign named entities to each token (Chiu and Nichols, 2016; Ma and Hovy, 2016; Devlin et al., 2018). This process of training can be viewed as memorization, in which the model iterates over the whole training set to memorize and generalize the most confident named entity assigned to the given word. This strategy of memorization has difficulty in handling long-tail cases, and requires a large training set as sentence semantics get diverse and complicated (Hammerton, 2003; Collobert et al., 2011; Lample et al., 2016; Chiu and Nichols, 2016; Devlin et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019a; Shao et al., 2021).

Motivated by recent progress in retrieval augmented methods (Khandelwal et al., 2019, 2020), which have been successfully employed to handle similar issues in language generation, i.e. Language Modeling (LM) and Neural Machine Translation (NMT), we propose the \(k\)-NN-NER framework for the NER task. \(k\)-NN-NER first retrieves \(k\) nearest neighbors from the cached training set. Then, it computes the distribution over labels by interpolating the distribution over labels output from a vanilla NER model, and weights for labels from similar examples in the training set, retrieved using token-level \(k\)NN search. In this way, we are able to resolve the long-tail issue mentioned above: by accessing the cached training examples through \(k\)NN search during inference, similar cases (and their labels) will shed light on the test examples, which makes memorizing the entire dataset unnecessary.

We conducted extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed \(k\)-NN-NER framework. We show that \(k\)-NN-NER consistently outperforms its vanilla counterpart, which is based only on the distribution output from a vanilla tagging model and does not rely on similar examples in the training set. By applying \(k\)NN on the vanilla NER model with BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) as the backbone, we are able to achieve a new state-of-the-art result 72.03 (+1.25) F1-score on the Chinese Weibo NER dataset and results comparable to SOTA performances on a variety of widely applied NER benchmarks, including CoNLL03, OntoNotes5.0, Chinese MSRA, and Chinese OntoNotes4.0. Additionally, our experiments show that \(k\)-NN-NER can achieve comparable results to the vanilla NER model with 40% less amount of training data.

2 Related Work

**Retrieval Augmented Model**  
Retrieval augmented models additionally use the input to re-
An example for the process of \(k\)NN-NER. The datastore contains a set of representation-label pairs, which are extracted from the hidden states of the vanilla NER model. By given an inference sentence: *Obama lives in Washington*, suppose that at current test time \(t\) we need to assign named entity to the word *Washington*. The word representation of *Washington* is used to query \(k\) nearest neighbors from the datastore according to the similarity distance, and through the softmax function, the similarity distances are converted to \(k\)NN entity distribution. Interpolating the \(k\)NN distribution with the vanilla NER model distribution, we get the final distribution for the assigned named entities.

Recent success on various NLP tasks has shown the effectiveness of retrieval augmented models in improving the quality of neural NLP models, such as language modeling (Khandelwal et al., 2019; Meng et al., 2021b), question answering (Giu et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2020a,b; Xiong et al., 2020), text classification (Lin et al., 2021b), dialog generation (Fan et al., 2020; Thulke et al., 2021; Weston et al., 2018) and neural machine translation (Khandelwal et al., 2019; Meng et al., 2021a; Wang et al., 2021).

**Named Entity Recognition**

Research on NER has a long history. Hammerton (2003) first attempted to solve this problem using unidirectional LSTMs. Collobert et al. (2011) presented a CNN-CRF structure and Lample et al. (2016) combined the bidirectional LSTMs with CRFs. Ma and Hovy (2016) and Chiu and Nichols (2016) further added character feature via character CNN. Many works then focus on better improve the decoding structure: leveraging the context information (Liu et al., 2018, 2019a; Lin et al., 2021a; Cui and Zhang, 2019); interpolating latent variables (Lin et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2021); transferring to CRF model (Ye and Ling, 2018; Panchendrarajan and Amaresan, 2018); combining positive information (Dai et al., 2019). Other researches like viewing the NER task as a machine reading comprehension(MRC) task also have made great performance (Li et al., 2019a,b; Gan et al., 2021).

### 3 Proposed Method: \(k\)NN-NER

#### 3.1 Background: Vanilla NER

**Sequence labeling for NER** Given an input sentence \(x = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}\) with length \(n, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, x_i\) denotes the \(i\)-th word token within this sentence. We formalize the NER task as a sequence labeling task which assigns a label \(y_i\) to each given word \(x_i\). A training set with \(N\) samples is then denoted by \(\{X, Y\} = \{(x_1, y_1), \cdots, (x_N, y_N)\}\), where \((x, y)\) is the text sequence and corresponding label sequence.

For the vanilla NER model, we decompose the above sequence labeling task into two steps: (i) using a text encoder to represent word tokens as high-dimensional vectors, and (ii) classifying each high-dimensional vector into a named entity category. For step (i), we use masked language models, e.g., BERT(Devlin et al., 2018) and RoBERTa(Liu et al., 2019b), as the feature extractor. For a given word \(x_i\), the output \(h_i\) from the last layer of feature extractor is used as the contextualized word embedding vector, where \(h_i \in \mathbb{R}^m\) with \(m\) as the embedding dimension. Then for the step (ii), we pass the word representation \(h_i\) through a multilayer perceptron (MLP), and obtain the distribution over the named entity vocabulary via a softmax.
operation:

\[ p_{\text{NER}}(y_i | x, x_i) = \text{softmax}(\text{MLP}(h_i)). \]  

(1)

### 3.2 \( k \) Nearest Neighbor NER

The key idea of the \( k \)NN-NER model is that it augments the process of classification during inference stage with a \( k \) nearest neighbor retrieval mechanism. As shown in Figure 1, the \( k \)NN-NER process can be split into two parts: (i) following the vanilla NER steps, i.e., extracting word representation \( h \) and then assigning probability distribution \( p_{\text{NER}} \) for each word in a given input sentence; and (ii) finding the most similar contexts in the datastore and adjust the final entity distribution \( p_{\text{final}} \) with a \( k \)NN-augmented entity distribution \( p_{\text{NN}} \). In the following parts, we focus on two major components of \( k \)NN-NER framework: datastore construction and \( k \)NN entity probability interpolation.

**Building datastore** The datastore \( D \) consists of a set of key-value pairs. Each key is the contextualized word embedding of a word from a given sentence, and the corresponding value is the name entity of that word in that sentence. Then the datastore \( D \) is formulated as:

\[ D = \{ K, \mathcal{V} \} = \{(h_i, y_i) | \forall x_i \in x, \forall y_i \in y, \ (x, y) \in \{X, \mathcal{Y}\} \}. \]

where \( h_i \) is the contextualized representation of word \( x_i \), \( K \) represents the set of keys and \( \mathcal{V} \) represents the corresponding value set.

**\( k \)NN-augmented Entity Probability** Suppose that we have constructed the datastore \( D \). During inference time, for each word \( x_i \) from a given input sentence \( x \), our \( k \)NN-NER model first generates contextualized word embedding \( h_i \) and distribution over the entire entity labels \( p_{\text{NER}}(y_i | x, x_i) \) for each word \( x_i \). Then for each word \( x_i \), corresponding \( h_i \) is used to query \( k \) nearest neighbors set \( \mathcal{N} \) from datastore \( D \) with \( L^2 \) Euclidean distance \( d(h_i, \cdot) \) as similarity measure.

The retrieved named entity set is then converted into a distribution over the entire named entity vocabulary based on an RBF kernel output (Vert et al., 2004) of the distance to the original word embedding \( h_i \). The probability of predicting the label as an entity \( e_j \) is proportional to the summarization of kernel outputs from all values in \( \mathcal{N} \) which equal to \( e_j \).

\[ p_{\text{NN}}(y_i = e_j | x, x_i) \propto \sum_{(k, v) \in \mathcal{N}} 1_{v = e_j} \exp\left(-\frac{d(h_i, k)}{T}\right) \]

where \( e_j \) represents the \( j \)th entity within the entity vocabulary and \( T \) is a temperature parameter to flatten the distribution. Note that, for the labels that do not appear in the retrieved set, we always assign zero probability to these entities. Finally, we augment the pure NER distribution \( p_{\text{NER}}(y_i | x, x_i) \) with \( p_{\text{NN}}(y_i | x, x_i) \) as:

\[ p_{\text{final}}(y_i | x, x_i) = \lambda p_{\text{NER}}(y_i | x, x_i) + (1 - \lambda) p_{\text{NN}}(y_i | x, x_i) \]

where \( \lambda \) makes a balance between \( k \)NN distribution and pure NER distribution.

### 4 Experiments

#### 4.1 Datasets

We conduct experiments on commonly used English datasets and Chinese datasets. For English datasets, we use the widely used CoNLL2003 and OntoNotes 5.0 benchmarks. For Chinese datasets, we use OntoNotes 4.0, MSRA and Weibo NER.

We adopt the general evaluation metric: span-level precision, recall and F1 score. Dataset details are described at Appendix A.

#### 4.2 Experiment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English CoNLL 2003</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Base (Devlin et al., 2018)</td>
<td>90.69</td>
<td>91.96</td>
<td>91.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Base+NN</td>
<td>91.50</td>
<td>91.58</td>
<td>91.54 (+0.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Large (Devlin et al., 2018)</td>
<td>91.54</td>
<td>92.79</td>
<td>92.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Large+NN</td>
<td>92.26</td>
<td>92.43</td>
<td>92.40 (+0.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-Large (Liu et al., 2019b)</td>
<td>92.77</td>
<td>92.81</td>
<td>92.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-Large+NN</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>92.99</td>
<td>92.93 (+0.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English OntoNotes 5.0</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Base (Devlin et al., 2018)</td>
<td>85.09</td>
<td>85.99</td>
<td>85.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Base+NN</td>
<td>85.27</td>
<td>86.13</td>
<td>85.70 (+0.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Large (Devlin et al., 2018)</td>
<td>85.84</td>
<td>87.61</td>
<td>86.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-Large+NN</td>
<td>85.92</td>
<td>87.84</td>
<td>86.87 (+0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-Large (Liu et al., 2019b)</td>
<td>86.59</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>87.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-Large+NN</td>
<td>86.73</td>
<td>88.29</td>
<td>87.51 (+0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results for two English datasets: CoNLL 2003 and OntoNotes 5.0.
Table 2: Results for three Chinese datasets: OntoNotes 4.0, MSRA and Weibo NER.

The vanilla models For the vanilla NER model, we choose BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019b) for both English datasets and Chinese datasets, and ChineseBERT (Sun et al., 2021) only for Chinese datasets. Both base and large version of the vanilla NER model are used in our experiments. The details of implementation can be found in the original work, BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019b) and ChineseBERT (Sun et al., 2021).

Results Table 1 and Table 2 show the results on English datasets and Chinese datasets respectively. 2 We observe a significant improvement by interpolating kNN model across all tasks. Especially on Chinese OntoNotes 4.0 and Chinese Weibo NER dataset, we observe an improvement of 1.75 and 1.63 respectively on F1-score based on BERT model.

Performance on low resource scenario Empirically, we also observe that kNN-NER can achieve comparable results with much fewer training samples benefitting from direct access to the cached datastore. On dataset Chinese OntoNotes 4.0, we conducted experiments by varying the percentage of training set while holding the full training set as the datastore for kNN search. Figure 2 shows that without additional training and annotation, kNN-NER can still generate comparable result to the vanilla NER model with 40% less amount of training data.

Effectiveness and Sensitivity of k To clearly observe the effectiveness of the hyperparameter k during kNN search, we varied k on dataset Chinese OntoNotes 4.0 with BERT as the vanilla NER model. From Table 3, we observe that with the increase of k, the F1-score first increases and then keeps horizontal after k reaches 256. A larger k can retrieve more informative neighbors from the cached datastore. As k continues increasing, the newly retrieved examples are less similar with the current input example and hence add ignorable change to the final performance. The steady performance with large enough k values shows that our kNN-NER model is robust and not sensitive to choice k.
Table 3: F1-score on Chinese OntoNotes 4.0 by varying the kNN parameter $k$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varying $k$</th>
<th>F1-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Vanilla NER Model</td>
<td>79.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=8$</td>
<td>79.49(+0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=16$</td>
<td>79.67(+0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=32$</td>
<td>80.01(+0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=64$</td>
<td>80.53(+1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=128$</td>
<td>80.83(+1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=256$</td>
<td><strong>80.91(+1.75)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by setting $k=512$</td>
<td><strong>80.91(+1.75)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a new kNN-NER framework, which augments the generated distribution through assigning $k$ nearest neighbors from the cached training set. This strategy requires no additional operation on training phase. By applying kNN search on the vanilla NER model, we achieve a new state-of-the-art result 72.03 F1-score on Chinese Weibo NER dataset and comparable results on a variety of datasets, e.g., Chinese MSRA and Chinese OntoNotes 4.0. Additionally, our experiments show that kNN-NER can achieve comparable results to the vanilla NER model with only 60% training data.
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A Experiments Datasets

**English CoNLL2003.** CoNLL2003 (Sang and De Meulder, 2003) is an English dataset containing four types of named entities: Location, Organization, Person and Miscellaneous, and we followed (Li et al., 2019a) leveraging protocols in (Ma and Hovy, 2016) to process it.

**English OntoNotes 5.0.** OntoNotes 5.0 (Pradhan et al., 2013) is an English dataset including 18 types of named entities: 11 types (e.g., Person, Organization) and 7 values (e.g., Date, Percent).

**Chinese OntoNotes 4.0.** OntoNotes 4.0 (Pradhan, 2011) is a Chinese dataset with 18 types of named entities and all of them are extracted from news domain texts. Same as the CoNLL2003 (Sang and De Meulder, 2003), we followed (Li et al., 2019a) to process it.

**Chinese MSRA.** MSRA (Levow, 2006) is a Chinese dataset collected from news domain texts. It contains three types of named entities and is used as shared task on SIGNAN backoff 2006.

**Chinese Weibo NER.** Weibo NER (Peng and Dredze, 2015) is a Chinese dataset drawn from the social media website Sina Weibo and includes four types of named entities.