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Overview

First hour: Recursive Neural Networks

• Motivation: Compositionality
• Structure prediction: Parsing
• Backpropagation through Structure
• Vision Example

Second hour:

• Matrix-Vector RNNs: Relation classification
• Recursive Neural Tensor Networks: Sentiment Analysis
• Tree LSTMs: Phrase Similarity
Building on Word Vector Space Models

But how can we represent the meaning of longer phrases? By mapping them into the same vector space!
Building on Word Vector Space Models

But how can we represent the meaning of longer phrases? By mapping them into the same vector space!
Semantic Vector Spaces

Vectors representing Phrases and Sentences that do not ignore word order and capture semantics for NLP tasks

Single Word Vectors
- Distributional Techniques
- Brown Clusters
- Useful as features inside models, e.g. CRFs for NER, etc.
- Cannot capture longer phrases

Documents Vectors
- Bag of words models
- PCA (LSA, LDA)
- Great for IR, document exploration, etc.
- Ignore word order, no detailed understanding
How should we map phrases into a vector space?

Use principle of compositionality

The meaning (vector) of a sentence is determined by
(1) the meanings of its words and
(2) the rules that combine them.

Models in this section can jointly learn parse trees and compositional vector representations.
Sentence Parsing: What we want

The cat sat on the mat.
The cat sat on the mat.
Why Learn Structure and Representation?

• The syntactic rules of language are highly recursive – need a better model to respect that!

• We can now input sentences of arbitrary length
  • was a huge head scratcher for using Neural Nets in NLP (see tricks introduced Bengio et al., 2003; Henderson, 2003; Collobert & Weston, 2008)

• Why not use word2vec infra and learn bigram, trigram, etc?
  • infinite amount of possible combinations of words. Storing and training an infinite amount of vectors would just be absurd.
  • Some combinations of words while they might be completely reasonable to hear in language, may never be represented in our training/dev corpus. So we would never learn them.
Sidenote: Recursive vs recurrent neural networks

```
the          country       of          my          birth
```

```
0.4          0.3          2.1          3.3          7            7
```

```
1            3.5          5.5          6.1          2.5          3.8
```

```
0.4          0.3          2.1          3.3          7            7
```

```
1            5            5.5          6.1          4            3.8
```

```
0.4          0.3          2.1          3.3          7            7
```

```
1            5            5.5          6.1          4            3.8
```

```
2.5          3.8          2.3          3.6
```

Sidenote: Are languages recursive?

- Cognitively debatable
- But: recursion helpful in describing natural language
- Example: “the church which has nice windows”, a noun phrase containing a relative clause that contains a noun phrases
- Arguments for now: 1) Helpful in disambiguation:
Sidenote: Are languages recursive?

2) Helpful for some tasks to refer to specific phrases:
   • John and Jane went to a big festival. They enjoyed the trip and the music there.
   • “they”: John and Jane (co-reference resolution)
   • “the trip”: went to a big festival
   • “there”: big festival

3) Labeling less clear if specific to only subphrases
   • I liked the bright screen but not the buggy slow keyboard of the phone. It was a pain to type with. It was nice to look at.

4) Works better for some tasks to use grammatical tree structure (but maybe we can just have a very deep LSTM model?)
   • This is still up for debate.
Recursive Neural Networks for Structure Prediction

Inputs: two candidate children’s representations
Outputs:
1. The semantic representation if the two nodes are merged.
2. Score of how plausible the new node would be.
Recursive Neural Network Definition

score = 1.3

parent

Neural Network

8 5

3 3

$\text{score} = \frac{8}{5}$

$\text{Same} \ W \text{parameters at all nodes of the tree}$
Recursive Neural Networks for Structure Prediction

\[ h^{(1)} = \tanh(W^{(1)} \begin{bmatrix} L_{29} \\ L_{430} \end{bmatrix} + b^{(1)}) \]

\( W^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2d} \) and \( b^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( h^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

\( h \) is a point in the same word vector space for the bigram "this assignment".
Recursive Neural Networks for Structure Prediction

A standard Recursive Neural Network
The cat sat on the mat.
The cat sat on the mat.
The cat sat on the mat.
The cat sat on the mat.
The score of a tree is computed by the sum of the parsing decision scores at each node:

\[ s(x, y) = \sum_{n \in \text{nodes}(y)} s_n \]
Max-Margin Framework – Details

• Similar to max-margin parsing (Taskar et al. 2004), a supervised max-margin objective. Maximize the objective of:

\[ J = \sum_i s(x_i, y_i) - \max_{y \in A(x_i)} (s(x_i, y) + \Delta(y, y_i)) \]

• The loss \( \Delta(y, y_i) \) penalizes all incorrect decisions

• Structure search for \( A(x) \) was maximally greedy
  • Instead: Beam Search with Chart
Backpropagation Through Structure

Introduced by Goller & Küchler (1996)

Principally the same as general backpropagation

\[
\delta^{(l)} = \left((W^{(l)})^T \delta^{(l+1)}\right) \circ f'(z^{(l)}),
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial W^{(l)}} E_R = \delta^{(l+1)}(a^{(l)})^T + \lambda W^{(l)}
\]

Three differences resulting from the recursion and tree structure:

1. Sum derivatives of \( W \) from all nodes
2. Split derivatives at each node
3. Add error messages
BTS: 1) Sum derivatives of all nodes

You can actually assume it’s a different $W$ at each node

Intuition via example:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial W} f(W(f(Wx)))$$

$$= f'(W(f(Wx))) \left( \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial W} W \right) f(Wx) + W \frac{\partial}{\partial W} f(Wx) \right)$$

$$= f'(W(f(Wx))) (f(Wx) + W f'(Wx)x)$$

If we take separate derivatives of each occurrence, we get same:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial W_2} f(W_2(f(W_1x))) + \frac{\partial}{\partial W_1} f(W_2(f(W_1x)))$$

$$= f'(W_2(f(W_1x))) (f(W_1x)) + f'(W_2(f(W_1x))) (W_2 f'(W_1x)x)$$

$$= f'(W_2(f(W_1x))) (f(W_1x)) + W_2 f'(W_1x)x$$

$$= f'(W(f(Wx))) (f(Wx) + W f'(Wx)x)$$
BTS: 2) Split derivatives at each node

During forward prop, the parent is computed using 2 children:

\[
p = \tanh(W \begin{bmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{bmatrix} + b)
\]

Hence, the errors need to be computed wrt each of them:

\[
\delta_{p \rightarrow c_1 c_2} = [\delta_{p \rightarrow c_1} \delta_{p \rightarrow c_2}]
\]

where each child’s error is \(n\)-dimensional.
BTS: 3) Add error messages

• At each node:
  • What came up (fprop) must come down (bprop)
  • Total error messages \( \delta = \text{error messages from parent} + \text{error message from own score} \)
Many times you can get an overflow (especially with Relu) – so this is a trick to solve this.
def backProp(self, node, error=None):
    # Softmax grad
    deltas = node.probs
    deltas[node.label] -= 1.0
    self.dWs += np.outer(deltas, node.h)
    self dbs += deltas
    deltas = np.dot(self.Ws.T, deltas)

    # Add deltas from above
    if error is not None:
        deltas += error

    # \( f'(z) \) now:
    deltas *= (node.h != 0)

    # Update word vectors if leaf node:
    if node.isLeaf:
        self.dL[node.word] += deltas
    return

    # Recursively backprop
    if not node.isLeaf:
        self.dW += np.outer(deltas, np.hstack([node.left.h, node.right.h]))
        self.db += deltas

        # Error signal to children
        deltas = np.dot(self.Ws.T, deltas)
        self.backProp(node.left, deltas[:self.hiddenDim])
        self.backProp(node.right, deltas[self.hiddenDim:])

\[
\delta^{(l)} = (W^{(l)^T} \delta^{(l+1)}) \circ f'(z^{(l)}),
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial W^{(l)}} E_R = \delta^{(l+1)}(a^{(l)})^T + \lambda W^{(l)}
\]
BTS: Optimization

• As before, we can plug the gradients into a standard off-the-shelf L-BFGS optimizer or SGD
• Best results with AdaGrad (Duchi et al, 2011):

\[ \theta_{t,i} = \theta_{t-1,i} - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t} g_{\tau,i}^2}} g_{t,i} \]

• For non-continuous objective use subgradient method (Ratliff et al. 2007)
Discussion: Simple RNN

• Good results with single matrix RNN (more later)

• Single weight matrix RNN could capture some phenomena but not adequate for more complex, higher order composition and parsing long sentences

• The composition function is the same for all syntactic categories, punctuation, etc
Solution: Syntactically-Untied RNN

- Idea: Condition the composition function on the syntactic categories, “untie the weights”
- Allows for different composition functions for pairs of syntactic categories, e.g. Adv + AdjP, VP + NP
- Combines discrete syntactic categories with continuous semantic information
Solution: Compositional Vector Grammars

- Problem: Speed. Every candidate score in beam search needs a matrix---vector product.

- Solution: Compute score only for a subset of trees coming from a simpler, faster model (PCFG)
  - Prunes very unlikely candidates for speed
  - Provides coarse syntactic categories of the children for each beam candidate

- Compositional Vector Grammars: CVG = PCFG + RNN
Details: Compositional Vector Grammar

• Scores at each node computed by combination of PCFG and SU–RNN:

\[ s(p^{(1)}) = (v^{(B,C)})^{T} p^{(1)} + \log P(P_1 \rightarrow B \ C) \]

• Interpretation: Factoring discrete and continuous parsing in one model:

\[ P((P_1, p_1) \rightarrow (B, b)(C, c)) = P(p_1 \rightarrow b \ c | P_1 \rightarrow B \ C)P(P_1 \rightarrow B \ C) \]

• Socher et al. (2013)
Related work for recursive neural networks

Pollack (1990): Recursive auto-associative memories

Previous Recursive Neural Networks work by Goller & Küchler (1996), Costa et al. (2003) assumed fixed tree structure and used one hot vectors.

Hinton (1990) and Bottou (2011): Related ideas about recursive models and recursive operators as smooth versions of logic operations
Related Work for parsing

- Resulting CVG Parser is related to previous work that extends PCFG parsers
- Klein and Manning (2003a): manual feature engineering
- Petrov et al. (2006): learning algorithm that splits and merges syntactic categories
- Lexicalized parsers (Collins, 2003; Charniak, 2000): describe each category with a lexical item
- Hall and Klein (2012) combine several such annotation schemes in a factored parser.
- CVGs extend these ideas from discrete representations to richer continuous ones
# Experiments

- Standard *WSJ* split, labeled F1
- Based on simple PCFG with fewer states
- Fast pruning of search space, few matrix--vector products
- 3.8% higher F1, 20% faster than Stanford factored parser

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parser</th>
<th>Test, All Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford PCFG, (Klein and Manning, 2003a)</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Factored (Klein and Manning, 2003b)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factored PCFGs (Hall and Klein, 2012)</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (Collins, 1997)</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSN (Henderson, 2004)</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Parser (Petrov and Klein, 2007)</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVG (RNN) (Socher et al., ACL 2013)</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVG (SU—RNN) (Socher et al., ACL 2013)</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charniak –Self Trained (McClosky et al. 2006)</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charniak –Self Trained---ReRanked (McClosky et al. 2006)</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SU—RNN Analysis

- Learns notion of soft head words

\[ \text{DT—NP} \]

\[ \text{VP—NP} \]
All the figures are adjusted for seasonal variations
1. All the numbers are adjusted for seasonal fluctuations
2. All the figures are adjusted to remove usual seasonal patterns

Knight-Ridder wouldn’t comment on the offer
1. Harsco declined to say what country placed the order
2. Coastal wouldn’t disclose the terms

Sales grew almost 7% to $UNK m. from $UNK m.
1. Sales rose more than 7% to $94.9 m. from $88.3 m.
2. Sales surged 40% to UNK b. yen from UNK b.
SU-RNN Analysis

• Can transfer semantic information from single related example

• Train sentences:
  • He eats spaghetti with a fork.
  • She eats spaghetti with pork.

• Test sentences
  • He eats spaghetti with a spoon.
  • He eats spaghetti with meat.
SU—RNN Analysis

(a) Stanford factored parser

(b) Compositional Vector Grammar
Labeling in Recursive Neural Networks

• We can use each node’s representation as features for a softmax classifier:

\[ p(c|p) = \text{softmax}(Sp) \]

• Training similar to model in part 1 with standard cross-entropy error + scores
Scene Parsing

Similar principle of compositionality.

- The meaning of a scene image is also a function of smaller regions,
- how they combine as parts to form larger objects,
- and how the objects interact.
Algorithm for Parsing Images

Same Recursive Neural Network as for natural language parsing! (Socher et al. ICML 2011)
### Multi-class segmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pixel CRF (Gould et al., ICCV 2009)</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classifier on superpixel features</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region-based energy (Gould et al., ICCV 2009)</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local labelling (Tighe &amp; Lazebnik, ECCV 2010)</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superpixel MRF (Tighe &amp; Lazebnik, ECCV 2010)</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous MRF (Tighe &amp; Lazebnik, ECCV 2010)</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recursive Neural Network</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stanford Background Dataset *(Gould et al. 2009)*