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Abstract

In practical applications, decoding speed is very important. Modern structured learning technique adopts template based method to extract millions of features. Complicated templates bring about abundant features which lead to higher accuracy but more feature extraction time. We propose Two Dimensional Trie (2D Trie), a novel efficient feature indexing structure which takes advantage of relationship between templates: feature strings generated by a template are prefixes of the features from its extended templates. We apply our technique to Maximum Spanning Tree dependency parsing. Experimental results on Chinese Tree Bank corpus show that our 2D Trie is about 5 times faster than traditional Trie structure, making parsing speed 4.3 times faster.1

1 Introduction

In practical applications, decoding speed is very important. Modern structured learning technique adopts template based method to generate millions of features. Such as shallow parsing (Sha and Pereira, 2003), named entity recognition (Kazama and Torisawa, ), dependency parsing (McDonald et al., 2005), etc.

The problem arises when the number of templates increases, more features generated, making the extraction step time consuming. Especially for maximum spanning tree (MST) dependency parsing, since feature extraction requires quadratic time even using a first order model. According to Bohnet’s report (Bohnet, 2009), a fast feature extraction beside of a fast parsing algorithm is important for the parsing and training speed. He takes 3 measures for a 40X speedup, despite the same inference algorithm. One important measure is to store the feature vectors in file to skip feature extraction, otherwise it will be the bottleneck.

Now we quickly review the feature extraction stage of structured learning. Typically, it consists of 2 steps. First, features represented by strings are generated using templates. Then a feature indexing structure searches feature indexes to get corresponding feature weights. Figure 1 shows the flow chart of MST parsing, where \( p_0.\text{word} \), \( p_0.\text{pos} \) denotes the word and POS tag of parent node respectively. Indexes correspond to the features conjoined with dependency types, e.g., lucky/ADJ/OBJ, lucky/ADJ/NMOD, etc.

\[ \text{Feature Generation} \]

\[ \text{Template: } p_0.\text{word}+p_0.\text{pos} \]

\[ \rightarrow \]

\[ \text{Feature: } \text{lucky/ADJ} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\[ \text{Feature Retrieval} \]

\[ \text{Index: } 3228 \sim 3233 \]

\[ \rightarrow \]

\[ \text{Parse Tree} \]

\[ \text{Build lattice, inference etc.} \]

Figure 1: Flow chart of dependency parsing. \( p_0.\text{word} \), \( p_0.\text{pos} \) denotes the word and POS tag of parent node respectively. Indexes correspond to the features conjoined with dependency types, e.g., lucky/ADJ/OBJ, lucky/ADJ/NMOD, etc.

1The Chinese dependency parser is available at http://ctbparser.sourceforge.net/ A language independent dependency parsing toolkit and source code is available at http://crfparser.sourceforge.net/
gate decoding time of MSTParser, a state-of-the-art java implementation of dependency parsing. Chinese Tree Bank 6 (CTB6) corpus (Palmer and Xue, 2009) with standard train/development/test split is used for evaluation. Experimental results are shown in Table 1. The observation is that time spent of inference is trivial compared with feature extraction. Thus, speeding up feature extraction is critical especially when large template set is used for high accuracy.

General indexing structure such as Hash and Trie does not consider the relationships between templates, therefore they could not speed up feature generation, and are not completely efficient for searching feature indexes. For example, feature string $s_1$ generated by template “p$_0$.word” is prefix of feature $s_2$ from template “p$_0$.word + c$_0$.word” (word pair of parent and child), hence index of $s_1$ could be used for searching $s_2$. Further more, if $s_1$ is not in the feature set, then $s_2$ must be absent, its generation can be skipped. This is still correct if $s_1$ is removed after feature selection, as long as we use Trie structure.

We propose Two Dimensional Trie (2D Trie), a novel efficient feature indexing structure which takes advantage of relationship between templates. We apply our technique to Maximum Spanning Tree dependency parsing. Experimental results on CTB6 corpus show that our 2D Trie is about 5 times faster than traditional Trie structure, making parsing speed 4.3 times faster.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2, we describe template tree which represents relationship between templates; in section 3, we describe our new 2D Trie structure; in section 4, we analyze the complexity of the proposed method and general string indexing structures for parsing; in section 5, we describe template tree which represents relationship between templates; in section 6, we conclude the work.

### Table 1: Time spent of each step (seconds) of MSTParser on CTB6 standard test data (2660 sentences). Details of the hardware and corpus are described in section 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Feature Generation</th>
<th>Index Retrieval</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>300.27</td>
<td>61.66</td>
<td>59.48</td>
<td>421.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Template units appearing in this paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p_{i-1}$/$p_i$</td>
<td>the $i^{th}$ node left/right to parent node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{i-1}$/$c_i$</td>
<td>the $i^{th}$ node left/right to child node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{i-1}$/$r_i$</td>
<td>the $i^{th}$ node left/right to root node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.word</td>
<td>word of node n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.pos</td>
<td>POS tag of node n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.length</td>
<td>word length of node n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>conjoin current feature with direction of dependency (left/right)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental results are shown in section 5; we conclude the work in section 6.

### 2 Template tree

#### 2.1 Formulation of template

A template is a set of template units which are manually designed: $T = \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\}$. For convenience, we use another formulation: $T = t_1 + \ldots + t_m$. All template units appearing in this paper are described in Table 2, most of them are widely used. For example, “$T = p_0$.word + c_0$.word|$l$” denotes the word pair of parent and child nodes, conjoined with their distance.

#### 2.2 Template tree

In the rest of the paper, for simplicity, let $s_i$ be a feature string generated by template $T_i$.

We define the relationship between templates: $T_1$ is the ancestor of $T_2$ if and only if $T_1 \subset T_2$, and $T_2$ is called the descendant of $T_1$. Recall that, feature string $s_1$ is prefix of feature $s_2$. Suppose $T_3 \subset T_1 \subset T_2$, obviously, the most efficient way to look up indexes of $s_1$, $s_2$, $s_3$ is to search $s_3$ first, then use its index $id_3$ to search $s_1$, and finally use $id_1$ to search $s_2$. Hence the relationship between $T_2$ and $T_3$ can be neglected.

Therefore we define direct ancestor of $T_1$: $T_2$ is a direct ancestor of $T_1$ if $T_2 \subset T_1$, and there is no template $T'$ such that $T_2 \subset T' \subset T_1$. Correspondingly, $T_1$ is called the direct descendant of $T_2$.  

---

2http://sourceforge.net/projects/mstparser
Template graph $G = (V, E)$ is a directed graph that represents the relationship between templates, where $V = \{T_1, \ldots, T_n\}$ is the template set, $E = \{e_1, \ldots, e_N\}$ is the edge set. Edge from $T_i$ to $T_j$ exists, if and only if $T_i$ is the direct ancestor of $T_j$. For templates having no ancestor, we add an empty template as their common direct ancestor, which is also the root of the graph.

The left part of Figure 2 shows a template graph for templates $T_1 = p_0\.word$, $T_2 = p_0\.pos$, $T_3 = p_0\.word + p_0\.pos$. In this example, $T_3$ has 2 direct ancestors, but in fact $s_3$ has only one prefix which depends on the order of template units in generation step. If $s_3 = s_1 + s_2$, then its prefix is $s_1$, otherwise its prefix is $s_2$. In this paper, we simply use the breadth-first tree of the graph for disambiguation, which is called template tree. The only direct ancestor $T_1$ of $T_2$ in the tree is called father of $T_2$, and $T_2$ is a child of $T_1$. The right part of Figure 2 shows the corresponding template tree, where each vertex saves the subset of template units that do not belong to its father.

2.3 Virtual vertex

Consider the template tree in the left part of Figure 3, black vertex and gray vertex are partially overlapped, their intersection is $p_0\.word$, if string $s$ from template $T = p_0\.word$ is absent in feature set, then both nodes can be neglected. For efficiently pruning candidate templates, each vertex in template tree is restricted to have exactly one template unit (except root). Another important reason for such restriction will be given in the next section.

3 2D Trie

3.1 Single template case

Trie stores strings over a fixed alphabet, in our case, feature strings are stored over several alphabets, such as word list, POS tag list, etc. which are extracted from training corpus.

To illustrate 2D Trie clearly, we first consider a simple case, where only one template is used. The
template tree degenerates to a sequence, we could use a Trie like structure for feature indexing, the only difference from traditional Trie is that nodes at different levels could have different alphabets. One example is shown in Figure 4. There are 3 feature strings from template “p₀.word + p₀.pos”: {parse/VV, tag/NN, tag/VV}. Alphabets at level 1 and level 2 are the word set, POS tag set respectively, which are determined by corresponding template vertexes.

As mentioned before, each vertex in template tree has exactly one template unit, therefore, at each level, we look up an index of a word or POS tag in sentence, not their combinations. Hence the number of alphabets is limited, and all the indexes could be searched beforehand for reuse. For example, suppose the template is “r₀.word + r₁.word”, index of the i + 1th word is required for feature extraction for the i-th and i + 1-th words. As shown in Figure 5, the token table is converted to an index table, these index values stand for unique identifiers of original strings.

3.2 General case

Generally, for vertex in template tree with K children, children of corresponding Trie node are arranged in a matrix of K rows and L columns, L is the size of corresponding alphabet. If the vertex is not virtual, i.e., it generates features, one more row is added at the bottom to store feature indexes. Figure 6 shows the 2D Trie for a general template tree.

3.3 Feature extraction

When extracting features for a pair of nodes in a sentence, template tree and 2D Trie are visited in breath first traversal order. Each time, an alphabet and a token index j from index table are selected according to current vertex. For example, POS tag set and the index of the POS tag of parent node are selected as alphabet and token index respectively for vertex “p₀.pos”. Then children in the j-th column of the Trie node are visited, valid children and corresponding template vertexes are saved for further retrieval or generate feature indexes if the child is at the bottom and current Trie node is not virtual. Two queues are maintained to save the valid children and Trie nodes. Details of feature extraction algorithm are described in Algorithm 1.

3.4 Implementation

We use Double Array Trie structure (Aoe, 1989) for implementation. Since children of 2D Trie node are arranged in a matrix, not an array, so each element of the base array has a list of bases, not one base in standard structure. For children that store features, corresponding bases are feature indexes. One example is shown in Figure 7. The root node has 3 bases that point to three rows of
Algorithm 1 Feature extraction using 2D Trie

**Input:** 2D Trie that stores features, template tree, template graph, a table storing token indexes, parent and child positions

**Output:** Feature index set $S$ of dependency from parent to child.

Create template vertex queue $Q_1$ and Trie node queue $Q_2$. Push roots of template tree and Trie into $Q_1, Q_2$ respectively. $S = \emptyset$

while $Q_1$ is not empty, do

Pop a template vertex $T$ from $Q_1$ and a Trie node $N$ from $Q_2$. Get token index $j$ from index table according to $T$.

for $i = 1$ to child number of $T$

if child of $N$ at row $i$ column $j$ is valid, push it into $Q_2$ and push the $i^{th}$ child of $T$ into $Q_1$.

else

remove decedents of $i^{th}$ child of $T$ from template tree

end if

end for

if $T$ is not virtual and the last child of $N$ in column $j$ is valid

Enumerate dependency types, add valid feature indexes to $S$

end if

end while

Return $S$. 

Figure 7: Difference between ordinary base array (left) and base array for 2D Trie (right)

the child matrix of vertex “$p_{0}.\text{word}$” respectively. Number of bases in each element need not to be stored, since it can be obtained from template vertex in extraction procedure.

Building algorithm is similarly to Double Array Trie, when inserting a Trie node, each row of the child matrix is independently insert into base and check arrays using brute force strategy. The insertion repeats recursively until all features stored.

4 Complexity analysis

Let

$|T| =$ number of templates

$|t| =$ number of template units

$|V| =$ number of vertexes in template tree

$|F| =$ number of features

$|f| =$ average length of feature strings

The procedure of 2D Trie for feature extraction consists of 2 steps: tokens in string table are mapped to their indexes, then Algorithm 1 is carried out for all node pairs of sentence. In the first step, we use double array Trie for efficient mapping. In fact, time spent is trivial compared with step 2 even by binary search. The main time spent of Algorithm 1 is the traversal of the whole template tree, in the worst case, no vertexes removed, so the time complexity for each word pair is $|V|$.

For other indexing structures, feature generation is a primary step of retrieval. For each word pair, $|t|$ template units are processed, including concatenations of tokens and split symbols (split tokens in feature strings), boundary check (e.g, $p_{-1}.\text{word}$ is out of boundary for beginning node
Table 3: Time complexity of different indexing structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Retrieval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D Trie</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash / Trie</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary Search</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of sentence). Notice that, time spent of each process varies on the length of tokens.

For feature string $s$ with length $|s|$, if perfect hashing technique is adopted for index retrieval, it takes $|s|$ calculations to get hash value and a string comparison to check the string at the calculated position. So the time complexity is proportional to $|s|$, which is the same as Trie. Hence the total time for a word pair is $|f||T|$. If binary search is used instead, $\log |F|$ string comparisons are required, complexity for a word pair is $|T| \log |F|$.

Time complexity of these structures is summarized in Table 3.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental settings

We use Chinese Tree Bank 6.0 corpus for evaluation. The constituency structures are converted to dependency trees by Penn2Malt toolkit and the standard training/development/test split is used. 257 sentences that failed in the conversion were removed, yielding 23316 sentences for training, 2060 sentences for development and 2660 sentences for testing respectively.

Since all the dependency trees are projective, a first order projective MST parser is naturally adopted. Previous studies show that a second order model achieve higher performance, in this case, complexities of decoding and feature extraction are $l$ times of the first order model if second order features are based on word triples. Therefore the effect of the proposed method are insensitive to order of model, so we only focus on the first order model. Online Passive Aggressive algorithm (Crammer et al., 2006) is used for fast training. The quality of the parser is measured by the labeled attachment score (LAS).

We compare the proposed structure with Trie and binary search. For easy comparison, all feature indexing structures and the parser are implemented with C++. All experiments are carried out on a 64bit linux platform (CPU: Intel(R) Xeon(R) E5405, 2.00GHz, Memory: 16G Bytes). For each template set, we run the parser five times on test data and the averaged parsing time is reported.

5.2 Parsing speed comparison

To investigate the scalability of our method, rich templates are designed to generate large feature sets, as shown in Table 4. All templates are organized into 4 groups. Each row of Table 5 shows the details of a group, including parsing accuracy and number of templates, vertexes in template tree, and features in decoding stage (zero weighted features are excluded).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>IDs</th>
<th>#Temp.</th>
<th>#Vert.</th>
<th>#Feat.</th>
<th>LAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.23M</td>
<td>79.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.4M</td>
<td>81.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>25.0M</td>
<td>81.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>34.8M</td>
<td>82.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a rough trend that parsing accuracy increases as more templates used. Though such trend is not completely correct, the clear conclusion is that, abundant templates are necessary for accurate parsing.

Results of parsing time comparison are shown in Table 6. We can see that though time complexity of dynamic programming is cubic, parsing time of all systems is consistently dominated by feature extraction. When efficient indexing structure adopted, i.e, Trie or Hash, time index retrieval is greatly reduced, about 4-5 times faster than binary search. However, general structures search features independently, their results could not guide feature generation. Hence, feature generation is still time consuming. The reason is that processing each template unit includes a series of steps, much slower than one integer comparison in Trie search.

On the other hand, 2D Trie greatly reduces the
Table 4: Templates used in Chinese dependency parsing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$p_i.word$ $p_i.pos$ $p_i.word + p_i.pos$ $(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_i.length$ $c_i.pos$ $c_i.length + c_i.pos$ $(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_0.length + p_0.pos + c_0.pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$r_0.word$ $r_0.pos$ $r_0.word + r_0.pos$ $(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_i.pos + c_j.pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_i.word + p_i.pos + c_j.word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_i.word + p_j.word + c_k.word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_i.pos + p_i.pos + c_j.pos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Parsing time of 2660 sentences (seconds) on a 64bit linux platform (CPU: Intel(R) Xeon(R) ES405, 2.00GHz, Memory: 16G Bytes). Title “Generation” and “Retrieval” are short for feature generation and feature index retrieval steps respectively.
number of feature generations by pruning the template graph. In fact, no string concatenation occurs when using 2D Trie, since all tokens are converted to indexes beforehand. The improvement is significant, 2D Trie is about 5 times faster than Trie on the largest feature set, yielding 13.4 sentences per second parsing speed, about 4.3 times faster.

The reason why 2D Trie is slower than Trie retrieval is the similar with feature generation, many other computations are required beside search, such as push and pop of two queues, boundary check, etc. Table 7 shows the numbers of checking check values of two structures, which are theoretically analyzed in Table 3. We could see that 2D Trie requires much less checks than Trie when large feature set used, hence is more efficient without other computations.

### 5.3 Comparison against state-of-the-art

Recent works on dependency parsing speedup mainly focus on inference, such as expected linear time non-projective dependency parsing (Nivre, 2009), integer linear programming (ILP) for higher order non-projective parsing (Martins et al., 2009). They achieve 0.632 seconds per sentence over several languages. On the other hand, Goldberg and Elhadad proposed splitSVM (Goldberg and Elhadad, 2008) for fast low-degree polynomial kernel classifiers, and applied it to transition based parsing (Nivre, 2003). They achieve 53 sentences per second parsing speed on English corpus, which is faster than our results, since transition based parsing is linear time, while for graph based method, complexity of feature extraction is quadratic. Xavier Lluís et al. (Lluís et al., 2009) achieve 8.07 seconds per sentence speed on CoNLL09 (Hajič et al., 2009) Chinese Tree Bank test data with a second order graphic model. Bernd Bohnet (Bohnet, 2009) also uses second order model, and achieves 610 minutes on CoNLL09 English data (2399 sentences, 15.3 seconds per sentence). Although direct comparison of parsing time is difficult due to the differences in data, models, hardware and implementations, these results demonstrate that our structure can actually result in a very fast implementation of a parser. Moreover, our work is orthogonal to others, and could be used for other learning tasks.

### 6 Conclusion

We proposed 2D Trie, a novel feature indexing structure for fast template based feature extraction. The key insight is that feature strings generated by a template are prefixes of the features from its extended templates, hence indexes of searched features can be reused for further extraction. We applied 2D Trie to dependency parsing task, experimental results on CTB corpus demonstrate the advantages of our technique, about 5 times faster than traditional Trie structure, yielding parsing speed 4.3 times faster, while using only 1.7 times as much memory.
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