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Abstract

Named Entity Disambiguation (NED) systems perform well on news articles and other texts covering a specific time interval. However, NED quality drops when inputs span long time periods like in archives or historic corpora. This paper presents the first time-aware method for NED that resolves ambiguities even when mention contexts give only few cues. The method is based on computing temporal signatures for entities and comparing these to the temporal contexts of input mentions. Our experiments show superior quality on a newly created diachronic corpus.\textsuperscript{1}

1 Introduction

Problem. Schumacher convinced to win on Sunday. When this news headline is fed into modern tools for Named Entity Disambiguation (NED), virtually all of them would map the mention Schumacher onto the former Formula One champion Michael Schumacher, as the best-fitting entity from a Wikipedia-centric knowledge base (KB). However, knowing that Sunday refers to August 14, 1949, i.e., ignoring the surface form but exploiting normalized information, it becomes clear that the text actually refers to the German politician Kurt Schumacher. State-of-the-art NED methods (see surveys by Hachey et al. (2013), Ling et al. (2015), Shen et al. (2015)) tend to miss this because they are designed and trained for temporally focused input corpora such as current news, and do not cope well with longitudinal archives and other diachronic corpora that span decades. Standard NED benchmarks from CoNLL and TAC do not reflect this difficulty either.

\textsuperscript{1}The diaNED corpus and the temporal signatures of entities are publicly available: https://www.mpi-inf.mpg.de/yago-naga/dianed/.

Figure 1: Temporal signatures of candidate entities for the following three sample sentences (vertical lines represent temporal contexts):

a) Ronaldo comeback cut to 14 minutes. (2001)

b) Bush to stress domestic issues in speech. (1989)

c) Schumacher convinced to win on Sunday. (1949)

What is needed here is a better way of capturing temporal context, for both the mention Schumacher and each of the candidate entities. Figure 1 illustrates “time profiles” for sample entities with highly ambiguous names. Normalized temporal information from the input context, such as Sunday (1949-08-14), can provide additional cues for proper disambiguation. The problem addressed in this paper is how to model and capture temporal contexts and how to enhance NED with this novel asset.

Contribution. Our approach to this problem is to compute temporal signatures for entities in the KB, and to use these as expressive features when comparing candidate entities against the context of an input mention. Temporal signatures are embeddings that reflect the importance of different years for entities. They are automatically constructed by extracting and normalizing temporal expressions in entity descriptions such as Wikipedia articles. Analogously, temporal signals are captured in the contexts of textual mentions and represented by embeddings.

The time-aware NED method that we devise with these features can robustly cope with inputs
from diachronic corpora. We propose a new evaluation benchmark, based on the New York Times Archive, spanning more than 20 years, and the history collection historynet.com, spanning several centuries. Our experiments demonstrate that time-aware NED substantially outperforms some of the best standard NED tools.

2 Temporal Signatures and Contexts

Better context representation improves disambiguation quality (see, e.g., Shen et al. (2015)). As the underlying entity descriptions (e.g., Wikipedia articles) are not only textually but also temporally related to their mentions, we enrich the context representation with a temporal dimension, which no prior work handles explicitly.

We model the temporal dimension by embedding vectors. The embeddings represent the temporal signatures of entities in a KB and the temporal contexts of entity mentions in text in a joint vector space. Then, the similarity between them quantifies their temporal relatedness.

Temporal vector space. We use 2,050 dimensions (years 1 AD to 2050) to define the vector space. Coarser and finer granularities than years could be used, but finer ones (e.g., days) are rarely needed for NED and coarser granularities (e.g., centuries) are too vague.\footnote{In an analysis of temporal expressions extracted with HeidelTime from the Wikipedia corpus (August 2016 dump), we find that there are on average 18.500 expressions per year value (with year values ranging from 0001 AD to 2050 AD) in contrast to only 9.64 expressions per day value (with day values ranging from 0001-01-01 to 2050-12-31). Therefore, using year level identifiers to define our temporal vector space results in short and non-sparse temporal vectors.}

Temporal signatures of entities. We use the temporal tagger HeidelTime (Strögen and Gertz, 2010; Strögen and Gertz, 2015) to extract and normalize date expressions from an entity’s Wikipedia page\footnote{August 2016 Wikipedia dump} and aggregate them by years. This results in a count-based temporal vector \( t_e^s = (t_{0001}^s, ..., t_i^s, ..., t_{2050}^s) \) such that \( t_i^s = \alpha \cdot t_{i-1}^s + (1 - \alpha) \cdot t_i^b \), for \( i \geq 0001 \) where \( \alpha \) is the smoothing factor with \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \). For further smoothing, this procedure can be recursively applied \( n \) times. In experiments, we set \( \alpha = 0.2 \) and \( n = 2 \) based on cross-validation.

Temporal contexts of entity mentions. We exploit temporal expressions in the surrounding text of entity mentions and the texts’ publication dates. In news-style articles, entities are likely to be related to the document creation time (dct), while dates in the content are important for other types of documents (Strögen and Gertz, 2016).

Temporal vectors for mentions \( t_m \) are thus a combination of a one-hot temporal vector \( t_{tm}^{dct} = (0, ..., t_i, ..., 0) \) where \( t_i = 1 \) if \( i \) is the dct’s year, and \( t_{tm}^{content} \) containing dates extracted by a temporal tagger in the immediate context of the mention (e.g., in the same sentence or paragraph), aggregated by year. \( t_{tm}^{dct} \) and \( t_{tm}^{content} \) are linearly combined as \( t_m = \lambda \cdot t_{tm}^{dct} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot t_{tm}^{content} \) where \( \lambda \) (with \( 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 \)) weights the components.

Relatedness. We calculate the temporal relatedness between a mention and all candidate entities as the cosine similarity between \( t_m \) and \( t_e \).

3 Time-aware NED

To test the importance of time-awareness for NED, we use two settings. We enhance a basic NED system and a state-of-the-art system by enriching both with temporal signatures and contexts.

diaNED-1. as basic NED system, uses a mention-entity prior reflecting entity prominence and a keyphrase-based language model for the similarity of mention and entity contexts (as suggested by Hoffart et al. (2011)). These components are cast into edge weights for a graph over which the final disambiguation is computed. Hyper-parameters for the relative influence of the two components are tuned using an SVM.

We added the temporal dimension to the feature set and retrained the model accordingly to get new feature weights.

diaNED-2 based on Yamada et al. (2016): This is a learning-to-rank-based model. Besides mention-entity priors and string-similarity features, it uses word and entity embeddings trained in a joint vector space to model context and coherence. The intuition is that a good candidate entity vector must be close to the word and entity vectors appearing in the same context.
Yamada et al. (2016) measures entity context by averaging the word vectors of the proper noun neighbors and calculating the cosine similarity with each candidate entity. Similarly, the coherence between entities is measured by computing the cosine similarity between candidates and the average of the other entities in the neighborhood.

diaNED-2 enhances this model as follows. We compute the cosine similarity between the mention’s and the candidate entities’ temporal vectors, and normalize the time relatedness scores across candidate entities. Finally, all similarity features are used to train a binary classifier with gradient-boosted decision trees. The top-ranked candidate entity in each pool of candidates is assigned to the mention being evaluated.

4 A Diachronic NED Data Set

Datasets for NED evaluation contain articles published within a short period. Consequently, all mentions share a temporal context making it difficult to evaluate temporal variability. CoNLL-AIDA (Hoffart et al., 2011) are newswire articles from 1996, TAC 2010 (Ji et al., 2010) news and forum articles from 2004–2007, and Microposts-2014 (Cano et al., 2014) tweets from 2011.

To account for this limitation, we create a new diachronic benchmark containing documents with heterogeneous temporal context. As in Microposts-2014, we limit documents to single sentences and headlines from HistoryNet.com (HN) and The New York Times corpus (NYT). For the annotation process, we followed the entity annotation guidelines, which have been used for annotating CoNLL-AIDA (Hoffart et al., 2011).

HN is an online resource of world history with information on popular historical topics. Its section Today in History contains short texts on what happened on a specific day with a total of 7,061 facts/events (excluding born today). Using Stanford NER (Finkel et al., 2005), we extracted 13,773 entity mentions and randomly selected 350 of them. We annotated all entity mentions in respective sentences with their Wikipedia ids. After removing NER errors and out-of-KB entities, the dataset contains 865 gold entity mentions in 334 sentences. Examples are: “Conrad II claims the throne in France” from 1032 or “The Old Pretender, son of James III dies” from 1766.

NYT contains more than 1.5 million documents published between 1987 and 2007. After applying the same procedure, the dataset contains 368 manually annotated mentions in 290 news headlines. Examples are “Arafat’s Faction is Said to Avoid Guerrilla Actions” from 1989 or “U.N. Aide to Meet Milosevic, Angering Some” from 1999.

As HN texts come without further context, entity mentions are rather explicit. Entity mentions in NYT’s headlines are more ambiguous as more information is available in the articles and the entities are mostly, at the time of publication, prominent and obvious to the reader.

Finally, we created a third subset from the 7,061 documents of HistoryNet.com with 13,773 entity mentions. It contains the sentences with all the entity mentions which are linked to different entities by diaNED-2 depending on whether it uses its time-awareness or not, i.e., whether diaNED-2 is trained with or without the temporal feature. This set (HN-timediff) contains 567 manually annotated entities from 547 documents. It is the most challenging subset as all entity mentions are difficult to disambiguate.

5 Evaluation

To evaluate the importance of temporal information in NED, we focus in our analysis on the newly created diaNED corpus. As standard NED datasets CoNLL-AIDA and TAC 2010 contain only articles published within a short period of time, they are not suited for evaluating time-aware NED (cf. Section 4), and experiments on these datasets showed no significant differences between using diaNED-1 and diaNED-2 with or without their time-awareness features.

Note that the temporal contexts in the HN sentences and the NYT headlines of the diaNED corpus are part of the metadata. Thus, to ensure a fair comparison among all systems, we added the temporal contexts in the form of year information to all documents to allow the non-time-aware systems to exploit the temporal context in case the respective year number occurs as part of the entities’ textual context.4

5.1 Intra-system Comparison

As described above, we (re-)implemented two NED systems as diaNED-1 and diaNED-2. To al-

4Disambiguation quality of non-time-aware systems was generally lower without this additional information. The diaNED corpus contains all sentences with and without year information so that evaluation results can be reproduced for both settings.
Table 1: Micro-accuracy of diaNED-1 with and without time-awareness feature.

| Feature set | HN subset | NYT subset |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
|             | w/o time  | w time     |
|             | w/o time  | w time     |
| Prior       | 72.26     | 54.24*     |
| Context     | 63.63     | 62.71*     |

* significant over w/o time (Welch’s t-test at level of 0.01)

Table 2: Micro-accuracy of diaNED-2 with and without time-awareness feature.

| Feature set | HN subset | NYT subset |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
|             | w/o time  | w time     |
|             | w/o time  | w time     |
| Base        | 89.44     | 87.36*     |
| String      | 89.40     | 87.07*     |
| Context     | 91.10     | 88.34*     |
| Coherence   | 91.16     | 88.69*     |

* significant over w/o time (Welch’s t-test at level of 0.01)

Table 3: F1-scores of various systems on the HN and NYT subsets of the diaNED benchmark.

| System                                | HN    | NYT   |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| xLisa-NGRAM (Zhang and Rettinger, 2014) | 87.07 | 66.30 |
| WAT (Ferragina and Scaiella, 2012)    | 82.26 | 70.95 |
| PBOH (Ganea et al., 2016)            | 90.26 | 71.75 |
| FREME NER (Dojchinovski and Kliegr, 2013) | 48.50 | 45.27 |
| FRED (Consoli and Recupero, 2015)    | 23.18 | 15.44 |
| FOX (Speck and Ngomo, 2014)          | 77.85 | 54.25 |
| Dexter (Ceccarelli et al., 2013)     | 69.66 | 49.12 |
| DBpedia Spotlight (Mendes et al., 2011) | 56.92 | 61.91 |
| AIDA (Hoffart et al., 2011)          | 82.35 | 70.14 |
| AGDISTIS (Usbeck et al., 2014)       | 70.77 | 50.14 |
| Gupta et al. (2017)                  | 62.82 | 43.33 |
| reimpl. of (Yamada et al., 2016)     | 90.87 | 72.55 |
| diaNED-2 w time                      | 91.68 | 76.09 |

Table 4: Micro-accuracy of diaNED-2 on HN-timediff with and without time-awareness feature.

| System                                | HN    | NYT   |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| time-agnostic                         | 27.51 | 33.77 |
| time-aware                            | 42.50 | 45.22 |

5.3 Type-based Analysis

To gain further insights about the importance of time-awareness, we analyzed the results of diaNED-2 with and without temporal feature on the HN-timediff set of our benchmark (Table 4). On these particularly challenging documents, the time-awareness feature helps to improve NED quality for all entity types. While location and organization entities moderately benefit, there is a huge performance increase for person entities. The explanation that person entities benefit most could be that person entities have comparably short life spans and are thus most time-sensitive.

6 Related Work

Starting with the early work of Bunescu and Pasca (2006), Cucerzan (2007), Mihalcea and Csomai (2007), and Milne and Witten (2008),
NED methods and tools have been greatly advanced and become mature. Many systems use a combination of (i) local features like string similarities, lexico-syntactic characteristics and context between mentions and candidate entities and (ii) global features like the coherence among a set of selected entities. The inference over this feature space is typically performed by probabilistic graphical models, learning-to-rank techniques or algorithms related to such models (see, e.g., Ratinov et al. (2011), Hoffart et al. (2011), Ferragina and Scaiella (2012), Cheng and Roth (2013), Guo and Barbosa (2014), Durrett and Klein (2014), Chisholm and Hachey (2015), Pershina et al. (2015), Lazic et al. (2015), Nguyen et al. (2016), Globerson et al. (2016), Eshel et al. (2017), and Ganea and Hofmann (2017)). The GERBIL framework (Usbeck et al., 2015) provides a unified way of evaluating a wide variety of NED tools and services.

A recent line of work uses representational learning to characterize contexts through embeddings (e.g., He et al. (2013), Sun et al. (2015), Francis-Landau et al. (2016), Yamada et al. (2016), Gupta et al. (2017), Yamada et al. (2017)). These approaches naturally lend themselves towards inference by neural networks such as LSTMs. In our experiments, the Neural Text-Entity Encoder by Yamada et al. (2016) serves as state-of-the-art baseline.

While temporal information was used as a global feature to compute coherence between entity lifespans (Hoffart et al., 2013), no prior work on named entity disambiguation made explicit use of temporal information as a local feature. However, the value of time has been shown in a variety of other information extraction tasks, such as relation extraction (UzZaman et al., 2013; Mirza and Tonelli, 2016), event extraction (Kuzey et al., 2016; Spitz and Gertz, 2016), and slot filling (Ji et al., 2011; Surdeanu et al., 2011; Surdeanu, 2013), as well as in the context of information retrieval (Berberich et al., 2010; Agarwal and Strötgen, 2017) and fact checking (Popat et al., 2017). In this paper, inspired by the importance of temporal information for many NLP tasks, we analyzed its value for NED.

7 Conclusions and Ongoing Work

We proposed the first NED method with explicit consideration of temporal background. As demonstrated in our experiments, this time-awareness improves NED quality over diachronic texts that span long time periods. The diaNED dataset and the temporal signatures of entities are publicly available.

Currently, we integrate a strategy for handling out-of-KB entities to determine how temporal affinity may help in the nil detection problem. Furthermore, we plan large-scale experiments with distant supervision data which will also allow to evaluate the effectiveness of considering temporal expressions in the context of the entity mentions as further temporal context information. Finally, using a multilingual temporal tagger (Strötgen and Gertz, 2015), the value of time for NED could be studied for further languages.
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