Supplementary Material of "An Empirical Study of Building a Strong Baseline for Constituency Parsing"



A Detailed explanation of the model used in our experiments

This figure (Figure A) shows the sketch of how we incorporate several generic techniques explained in Sec.3: subword features ($\S3.1$), unknown token embeddings ($\S3.2$), and jointly estimating POS-tags (with bracketing) as an auxiliary task of multitask learning ($\S3.3$).

B Actual Evaluation Results

The following subsections from B.1 through B.6 show the actual outputs of the evalb evaluation script in our experiments.

Note that all the results reported in this paper get zero for both "Number of Error sentence" and "Number of Skip sentence". This is essentially very important to confirm since there is a known issue in the evalb evaluation script that it simply discards malformed (error) outputs from the evaluation. As a result, the system with many malformed outputs gets better performance since the malformed (error) outputs from the evaluation. the parser that generates the better scores

B.1 Actual evaluation output of (e): (d) + Pos in Table 4

\$./EVALB/evalb -p EVALB/	COLL	INS.prm	data	/sec23.	gold	\${FILE}	tail	-n31
90.22 9	1.02	39948	44276	43889	1872	49892	49892	100.00
=== Summary ===								
All								
Number of sentence	=	2416						
Number of Error sentence	=	0						
Number of Skip sentence								
Number of Valid sentence								
Bracketing Recall								
Bracketing Precision								
Bracketing FMeasure								
Complete match								
Average crossing	=	0.77						
No crossing	=	69.50						
2 or less crossing	=	89.82						
Tagging accuracy	= 1	00.00						
len<=40								
Number of sentence	=	2245						
Number of Error sentence	=	0						
Number of Skip sentence	=	0						
Number of Valid sentence	=	2245						
Bracketing Recall								
Bracketing Precision								

Bracketing FMeasure	=	91.23
Complete match	=	43.83
Average crossing	=	0.64
No crossing	=	71.98
2 or less crossing	=	91.67
Tagging accuracy	=	100.00

B.2 Actual evaluation output of (j): (i) + Pos in Table 4

\$./EVALB/evalb -p EVALB/COLLINS.prm data/sec23.gold \${FILE} | tail -n31

91.01 9	1.72	40294	44276	43930	1748	49892	49892	100.00
=== Summary ===								
All								
Number of sentence								
Number of Error sentence								
Number of Skip sentence								
Number of Valid sentence	=	2416						
Bracketing Recall								
Bracketing Precision	=	91.72						
Bracketing FMeasure	=	91.36						
Complete match								
Average crossing	=	0.72						
No crossing	=	71.23						
2 or less crossing	=	90.65						
Tagging accuracy	= 1	00.00						
len<=40								
Number of sentence								
Number of Error sentence	=	0						
Number of Skip sentence	=	0						
Number of Valid sentence	=	2245						
Bracketing Recall	=	91.65						
Bracketing Precision								
Bracketing FMeasure	=	91.99						
Complete match	=	46.10						
Average crossing	=	0.58						
No crossing	=	73.85						
2 or less crossing								
Tagging accuracy								

B.3 Actual evaluation output of (k): (e) + ensemble A = 8 shown in Table 5

\$./EVALB/evalb -p EVALB/		-	-		
91.81				49892 49892	
=== Summary ===					
All					
Number of sentence	=	2416			
Number of Error sentence	=	0			
Number of Skip sentence	=	0			
Number of Valid sentence	=	2416			
Bracketing Recall	=	91.81			
Bracketing Precision	=	92.55			
Bracketing FMeasure	=	92.18			
Complete match	=	45.90			
Average crossing No crossing	=	0.63			
No crossing	=	73.43			
2 or less crossing					
Tagging accuracy	= 1	L00.00			
len<=40					
Number of sentence	=	2245			
Number of Error sentence	=	0			
Number of Skip sentence	=	0			
Number of Valid sentence					
Bracketing Recall	=	92.21			
Bracketing Precision	=	92.95			

Bracketing FMeasure	=	92.58
Complete match	=	48.33
Average crossing	=	0.53
No crossing	=	75.68
2 or less crossing	=	93.05
Tagging accuracy	=	100.00

B.4 Actual evaluation output of (1) (k) + LM-rerank C = 80 shown in Table 5

B.5 Actual evaluation output of (m): (j) + ensemble A = 8 shown in Table 5

92.35 93.13 40890 44276 43907 1392 49892 49892 10	0.00
	••••
=== Summary ===	
All	
Number of sentence = 2416	
Number of Error sentence = 0	
Number of Skip sentence = 0	
Number of Valid sentence = 2416	
Bracketing Recall = 92.35	
Bracketing Precision = 93.13	
Bracketing FMeasure = 92.74 Complete match = 47.27	
Complete match = 4/.27	
Average crossing=0.58No crossing=75.17	
No crossing = 75.17 2 or less crossing = 92.26	
Tagging accuracy $= 100.00$	
Tugging accuracy 100.00	
len<=40	
Number of sentence = 2245	
Number of Error sentence = 0	
Number of Skip sentence = 0	
Number of Valid sentence = 2245	
Bracketing Recall = 92.77	

Bracketing Precision	=	93.55
Bracketing FMeasure	=	93.16
Complete match	=	49.53
Average crossing	=	0.47
No crossing	=	77.37
2 or less crossing	=	93.99
Tagging accuracy	=	100.00

B.6 Actual evaluation output of (n): (m) + LM-rerank C = 80 shown in Table 5

93.91 9	4.7	2 41580	44276	43896	1014	49892	49892	100.00
=== Summary ===								
All								
Number of sentence	=	2416						
Number of Error sentence								
Number of Skip sentence								
Number of Valid sentence								
Bracketing Recall								
Bracketing Precision								
Bracketing FMeasure								
Complete match								
Average crossing	=	0.42						
No crossing	=	80.92						
2 or less crossing	=	94.66						
Tagging accuracy	=	100.00						
len<=40								
Number of sentence	=	2245						
Number of Error sentence								
Number of Skip sentence	=	0						
Number of Valid sentence	=	2245						
Bracketing Recall	=	94.25						
Bracketing Precision								
Bracketing FMeasure	=	94.64						
Complete match								
Average crossing	=	0.35						
No crossing	=	82.72						
2 or less crossing								
Tagging accuracy	=	100.00						

Acknowledgement

We thank three anonymous reviewers for their insightful and valuable comments.