

## Appendix A Used notation

We list the notation used throughout the paper

- $\mathbb{V}$ : vocabulary of words
- $\mathcal{V}$ : vocabulary of groups
- $w, v$ : a word
- $F_w$ : relative frequency of a word  $w$
- $\gamma_i, \gamma_j$ : a group
- $\mathbb{V} \times \Gamma$ : set of all possible pairs  $(w, \gamma_i)$
- $c_{\gamma_i}$ : relative frequency of a group  $\gamma_i$
- $\gamma$ : an assignment (grouping)
- $H(\gamma)$ : unigram entropy of a grouping  $\gamma$
- $G(c_{\gamma_j})$ : partial entropy of a group  $\gamma_i$
- $C$ : number of groups
- $[1, \dots, C]$  - natural numbers from 1 to  $C$
- $\mathbb{N}$  - natural numbers

## Appendix B Omitted proofs

**Definition 1** (Matroid). *Let  $\Omega$  be a finite set (universe) and  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^\Omega$  be a set family (independent sets). A pair  $\mathcal{M} = (\Omega, \mathcal{I})$  is called a matroid if*

1.  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$
2. If  $Q \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $R \subseteq Q$  then  $R \in \mathcal{I}$
3. For any  $Q, R \in \mathcal{I}$  with  $|R| < |Q|$  there exists  $\{x\} \in Q \setminus R$  such that  $R \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{I}$ .

Let us denote a family of all grouping sets of  $\mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  as  $\mathcal{G}$ .

*Proof of Lemma ??.* We have to show that  $(\mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{G})$  satisfies three condition from the Definition 1.

1. An empty grouping is a grouping.
2. Consider an arbitrary  $Q \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $R \subset Q$ . Since  $Q$  defines a grouping, for any  $(w, \gamma_i) \in Q$  we have  $(w\gamma_j) \notin Q$  for all  $\gamma_j \neq \gamma_i$ . Therefore, for all  $(w, \gamma_i) \in R$  we have  $(w\gamma_j) \notin R$  given  $\gamma_j \neq \gamma_i$  and thus  $R$  defines a grouping as well.
3. Consider two arbitrary  $R, Q \in \mathcal{G}$  with  $|R| < |Q|$ . Let us denote  $\{w \in \mathbb{V} : (w, \gamma_i) \in Q \text{ for some } \gamma_i\}$  as  $\pi(Q)$ . We claim that  $|Q| = |\pi(Q)|$ . Otherwise, there must exist  $w$  such that  $(w, \gamma_i), (w, \gamma_j) \in Q$  and  $\gamma_i \neq \gamma_j$ . However, this is forbidden for a set which defines a grouping. Analogously,  $|R| = |\pi(R)|$ . Since both  $R, Q$  are finite, we have  $0 < |Q \setminus R| = |\pi(Q)| - |\pi(R)| = |\pi(Q) \setminus \pi(R)|$ . Consider

an arbitrary  $w' \in \pi(Q) \setminus \pi(R)$  and its group  $\gamma_{i'}$  in  $Q$ ; we have  $(w', \gamma_{i'}) \in Q \setminus R$ . Moreover, since  $w'$  is ungrouped by  $R$ , we conclude that  $R \cup \{(w', \gamma_{i'})\} \in \mathcal{G}$  and finish the proof.  $\square$

**Definition 2** (Submodular function). *A function  $f : 2^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\Omega$  is finite, is submodular if for any  $X \subseteq Y \subseteq \Omega$  and any  $x \in \Omega \setminus Y$  we have*

$$f(X \cup \{x\}) - f(X) \geq f(Y \cup \{x\}) - f(Y). \quad (1)$$

For any non-negative real  $x$  and fixed  $a > 0$ , we denote  $-(x+a)\log_2(x+a) + x\log_2 x$  as  $L_a(x)$ .

*Proof of Lemma ??.* First, we show that  $H(Q) \geq 0$  for all  $Q \subseteq \mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ . By definition, we have  $H(\emptyset) = 0$ . Consider an arbitrary non-empty  $Q \subseteq \mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ . For any  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{V}$  we have

$$0 \leq c_{\gamma_i} = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathbb{V}: \\ (w, \gamma_i) \in Q}} F_w \leq \sum_{w \in \mathbb{V}} F_w = 1. \quad (2)$$

Therefore,  $-c_{\gamma_i} \log c_{\gamma_i} \geq 0$  and

$$\sum_{i=1}^C L(c_{\gamma_i}) \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

Now we establish submodularity. Consider an arbitrary  $Q \subseteq \mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ ,  $R \subset Q$  and any  $(w', \gamma_{i'}) \notin Q$ . Let  $Q' := Q \cup \{(w', \gamma_{i'})\}$ ,  $R' := R \cup \{(w', \gamma_{i'})\}$ . We need to show that

$$H(R') - H(R) \geq H(Q') - H(Q). \quad (4)$$

Let us denote the frequency of the unigram  $\gamma_j$  in  $Q, Q'$  as  $c_{\gamma_j}(Q), c_{\gamma_j}(Q')$ . Since  $Q$  and  $Q'$  differ only in the group  $\gamma_{i'}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(Q') - H(Q) &= \\ &= -c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q') \log c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q') + c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q) \log c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Similarly, (5) holds for  $H(R') - H(R)$ . Thus, to proof (4) it is enough to show

$$\begin{aligned} -c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R') \log c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R') + c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R) \log c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R) &\geq \\ -c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q') \log c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q') + c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q) \log c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q) &\end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We have  $c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q') = c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q) + F_{w'}$ ; therefore, (6) can be rewritten as  $L_{F_{w'}}(c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q))$ . Similarly,  $c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R') = c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R) + F_{w'}$  hence we need to establish

$$L_{F_{w'}}(c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R)) \geq L_{F_{w'}}(c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q)). \quad (7)$$

For any  $(w, i') \in R$  we have  $(w, i') \in Q$ ; thus  $c_{\gamma_{i'}}(R) < c_{\gamma_{i'}}(Q)$ , and (3) follows from the fact that  $L_{F_{w'}}(x)$  is monotone decreasing for all non-negative real  $x$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem ??.* By the result (Lee et al., 2009), the Algorithm ?? outputs the map  $\gamma'$  such that

$$\frac{1}{4 + 4\varepsilon} H(\gamma^*) \leq H(\gamma'). \quad (4)$$

where  $\gamma^*$  is the grouping which achieves largest value of  $H$ . We need to show that the approximation guarantee still holds if  $\gamma'(w)$  is undefined for some  $w$ .

After Step 8, the groupings  $\gamma'$  and  $\gamma$  differ only for the group  $i_0$ ; thus,

$$H(\gamma) - H(\gamma') = L(c_{\gamma_{i_0}}) - L(c_{\gamma'_{i_0}}).$$

Assume that  $H(\gamma) - H(\gamma') < 0$ . First, there must exist  $j \in \mathcal{V}$  such that

$$L(c_{\gamma'_{j_0}}) \leq \frac{1}{C} H(\gamma')$$

and thus for the group  $i_0$  we have

$$L(c_{\gamma'_{i_0}}) \leq \frac{1}{C} H(\gamma') \quad (5)$$

From (5) and  $L(x) \geq 0$  we obtain

$$L(c_{\gamma_{i_0}}) - L(c_{\gamma'_{i_0}}) \geq -L(c_{\gamma'_{i_0}}) \geq -\frac{1}{C} H(\gamma')$$

hence

$$H(\gamma) \geq \frac{C-1}{C} H(\gamma') \geq \frac{C-1}{4C+4\varepsilon C} H(\gamma^*).$$

For a single matroid constrain, the algorithm from (Lee et al., 2009) runs in time  $(|\Omega|)^{O(1)}$  where  $\Omega$  is the universe. In our case,  $\Omega = \mathbb{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  hence the running time is  $O(C|\mathbb{V}|)^{O(1)}$ . The rest of the Algorithm ?? takes  $O(C|\mathbb{V}|)^{O(1)}$  steps, thus we obtain the stated running time and finish the proof.  $\square$