

Johnny Bigert and Ola Knutsson

Royal Institute of Technology Stockholm, Sweden

johnny@nada.kth.se
knutsson@nada.kth.se



Detection of context-sensitive spelling errors

- Identification of less-frequent grammatical constructions in the face of sparse data
- Hybrid method
 - Unsupervised error detection
 - Linguistic knowledge used for phrase transformations



Properties

- Find difficult error types in unrestricted text (spelling errors resulting in an existing word etc.)
- No prior knowledge required, i.e. no classification of errors or confusion sets



A first approach

Algorithm:

for each position i in the stream if the frequency of $(t_{i-1} t_i t_{i+1})$ is low report error to the user report no error



Problems:

- Data sparseness for trigram statistics
- Phrase and clause boundaries may produce almost any trigram



Example:

- "It is every manager's task to…"
- "It is every" is tagged (pn.neu.sin.def.sub/obj, vb.prs.akt, dt.utr/neu.sin.ind) and has a frequency of zero
- Probable cause: out of a million words in the corpus, only 709 have been assigned the tag (dt.utr/neu.sin.ind)



We try to replace

"It is every manager's task to..."
with

■ "It is a manager's task to..."

- "It is every" is tagged
 (pn.neu.sin.def.sub/obj, vb.prs.akt,
 dt.utr/neu.sin.ind) and had a frequency of 0
- "It is a" is tagged
 (pn.neu.sin.def.sub/obj, vb.prs.akt,
 dt.utr.sin.ind) and have a frequency of 231
- (dt.utr/neu.sin.ind) had a frequency of 709
- (dt.utr.sin.ind) has a frequency 19112



When replacing a tag:

- All tags are not suitable as replacements
- All replacements are not equally appropriate...
- ...and thus, we require a penalty or probability for the replacement



To be considered:

- Manual work to create the probabilities for each tag set and language
- The probabilities are difficult to estimate manually
- Automatic estimation of the probabilities (other paper)



Examples of replacement probabilities:

```
100% vb.prt.akt.kop vb.prt.akt.kop
74% vb.prt.akt.kop vb.prs.akt.kop
50% vb.prt.akt.kop vb.prt.akt____
48% vb.prt.akt.kop vb.prt.sfo
```

Mannen <u>var</u> glad. (The man <u>was</u> happy.) Mannen är glad. (The man is happy.)



Examples of replacement probabilities:

```
100% dt.utr/neu.plu.def dt.utr/neu.plu.def
44% dt.utr/neu.plu.def dt.utr/neu.plu.ind/def
42% dt.utr/neu.plu.def ps.utr/neu.plu.def
41% dt.utr/neu.plu.def jj.pos.utr/neu.plu.ind.nom
```

Mannen talar med de anställda.

(The man talks to <u>the</u> employees.)

Mannen talar med <u>våra</u> anställda.

(The man talks to <u>our</u> employees.)

•

Weighted trigrams

Replacing $(t_1 t_2 t_3)$ with $(r_1 r_2 r_3)$:

- $f = \text{freq}(r_1 r_2 r_3) \cdot penalty$
- penalty = Pr[replace t_1 with r_1] · Pr[replace t_2 with r_2] · Pr[replace t_3 with r_3]



Weighted trigrams

Replacement of tags:

- Calculate f for all representatives for t_1 , t_2 and t_3 (typically $3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3$ of them)
- The weighted frequency is the sum of the penalized frequencies

Algorithm

Algorithm:

for each position i in the stream if weighted freq for $(t_{i-1} t_i t_{i+1})$ is low report error to the user report no error



An improved algorithm

- Problems with sparse data
- Phrase and clause boundaries may produce almost any trigram
- Use clauses as the unit for error detection to avoid clause boundaries



- We identify phrases to transform rare constructions to those more frequent
- Replacing the phrase with its head
- Removing phrases (e.g. AdvP, PP)



Example:

Alla hundar som <u>är bruna är</u> lyckliga

(All dogs that <u>are brown are</u> happy)

Hundarna är lyckliga

INP

(The dogs are happy)



- Den bruna (jj.sin) hunden (the brown dog)
- De bruna (jj.plu) hundarna (the brown dogs)



The same example with a tagging error:

Alla hundar som <u>är bruna</u> (jj.sin) <u>är</u> lyckliga

(All dogs that are brown are happy)

Robust NP detection yield

Hundarna är lyckliga

(The dogs are happy)



Error types found:

- context-sensitive spelling errors
- split compounds
- spelling errors
- verb chain errors



Comparison between probabilistic methods

- The unsupervised method has a good error capacity but also a high rate of false alarms
- The introduction of linguistic knowledge dramtically reduces the number of false alarms



Future work

- The error detection method is not only restricted to part-of-speech tags - we consider adopting the method to phrase n-grams
- Error classification
- Generation of correction suggestions



Summing up

- Detection of context-sensitive spelling errors
- Combining an unsupervised error detection method with robust shallow parsing



Internal Evaluation

- POS-tagger: 96.4%
- NP-recognition: P=83.1% and R=79.5%
- Clause boundary recognition: P=81.4% and 86.6%