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## Language models

- Language models answer the question:

How likely is a string of English words good English?

- Help with reordering

$$
p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\text { the house is small })>p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\text { small the is house })
$$

- Help with word choice

$$
p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { am going home })>p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { am going house })
$$

## N-Gram Language Models

- Given: a string of English words $W=w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, \ldots, w_{n}$
- Question: what is $p(W)$ ?
- Sparse data: Many good English sentences will not have been seen before
$\rightarrow$ Decomposing $p(W)$ using the chain rule:

$$
p\left(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)=p\left(w_{1}\right) p\left(w_{2} \mid w_{1}\right) p\left(w_{3} \mid w_{1}, w_{2}\right) \ldots p\left(w_{n} \mid w_{1}, w_{2}, \ldots w_{n-1}\right)
$$

(not much gained yet, $p\left(w_{n} \mid w_{1}, w_{2}, \ldots w_{n-1}\right)$ is equally sparse)

## Markov Chain

- Markov assumption:
- only previous history matters
- limited memory: only last $k$ words are included in history (older words less relevant)
$\rightarrow k$ th order Markov model
- For instance 2-gram language model:

$$
p\left(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, \ldots, w_{n}\right) \simeq p\left(w_{1}\right) p\left(w_{2} \mid w_{1}\right) p\left(w_{3} \mid w_{2}\right) \ldots p\left(w_{n} \mid w_{n-1}\right)
$$

- What is conditioned on, here $w_{i-1}$ is called the history


## Estimating N-Gram Probabilities

- Maximum likelihood estimation

$$
p\left(w_{2} \mid w_{1}\right)=\frac{\operatorname{count}\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)}{\operatorname{count}\left(w_{1}\right)}
$$

- Collect counts over a large text corpus
- Millions to billions of words are easy to get (trillions of English words available on the web)


## Example: 3-Gram

- Counts for trigrams and estimated word probabilities

| the green (total: 1748) |  |  | the red (total: 225) |  |  | the blue (total: 54) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| word | c. | prob. | word | c. | prob. | word | c. | prob. |
| paper | 801 | 0.458 | cross | 123 | 0.547 | box | 16 | 0.296 |
| group | 640 | 0.367 | tape | 31 | 0.138 | . | 6 | 0.111 |
| light | 110 | 0.063 | army | 9 | 0.040 | flag | 6 | 0.111 |
| party | 27 | 0.015 | card | 7 | 0.031 |  | 3 | 0.056 |
| ecu | 21 | 0.012 |  | 5 | 0.022 | angel | 3 | 0.056 |

- 225 trigrams in the Europarl corpus start with the red
- 123 of them end with cross
$\rightarrow$ maximum likelihood probability is $\frac{123}{225}=0.547$.


## How good is the LM?

- A good model assigns a text of real English $W$ a high probability
- This can be also measured with cross entropy:

$$
H(W)=-\frac{1}{n} \log _{2} p\left(W_{1}^{n}\right)
$$

- Or, perplexity

$$
\operatorname{perplexity}(W)=2^{H(W)}
$$

## Example: 3-Gram

| prediction | $p_{\mathrm{LM}}$ | $-\log _{2} p_{\mathrm{LM}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{i} \mid</ \mathrm{s}><\mathrm{s}>)$ | 0.109 | 3.197 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ would $\mid<\mathrm{s}>\mathrm{i})$ | 0.144 | 2.791 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ like $\mid$ i would $)$ | 0.489 | 1.031 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ to $\mid$ would like $)$ | 0.905 | 0.144 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ commend $\mid$ like to $)$ | 0.002 | 8.794 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ the $\mid$ to commend $)$ | 0.472 | 1.084 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ rapporteur $\mid$ commend the $)$ | 0.147 | 2.763 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ on $\mid$ the rapporteur $)$ | 0.056 | 4.150 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ his $\mid$ rapporteur on $)$ | 0.194 | 2.367 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}($ work $\mid$ on his $)$ | 0.089 | 3.498 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}(. \mid$ his work $)$ | 0.290 | 1.785 |
| $p_{\mathrm{LM}}(</ \mathrm{s}>\mid$ work $)$ | 0.99999 | 0.000014 |
|  | average | 2.634 |

## Comparison 1-4-Gram

| word | unigram | bigram | trigram | 4-gram |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| i | 6.684 | 3.197 | 3.197 | 3.197 |
| would | 8.342 | 2.884 | 2.791 | 2.791 |
| like | 9.129 | 2.026 | 1.031 | 1.290 |
| to | 5.081 | 0.402 | 0.144 | 0.113 |
| commend | 15.487 | 12.335 | 8.794 | 8.633 |
| the | 3.885 | 1.402 | 1.084 | 0.880 |
| rapporteur | 10.840 | 7.319 | 2.763 | 2.350 |
| on | 6.765 | 4.140 | 4.150 | 1.862 |
| his | 10.678 | 7.316 | 2.367 | 1.978 |
| work | 9.993 | 4.816 | 3.498 | 2.394 |
| . | 4.896 | 3.020 | 1.785 | 1.510 |
| $</ \mathrm{s}>$ | 4.828 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| average | 8.051 | 4.072 | 2.634 | 2.251 |
| perplexity | 265.136 | 16.817 | 6.206 | 4.758 |

## count smoothing

## Unseen N-Grams

- We have seen i like to in our corpus
- We have never seen i like to smooth in our corpus
$\rightarrow p(\operatorname{smooth} \mid \mathrm{i}$ like to $)=0$
- Any sentence that includes i like to smooth will be assigned probability 0


## Add-One Smoothing

- For all possible n-grams, add the count of one.

$$
p=\frac{c+1}{n+v}
$$

- $c=$ count of n-gram in corpus
- $n=$ count of history
- $v=$ vocabulary size
- But there are many more unseen n-grams than seen n-grams
- Example: Europarl 2-bigrams:
- 86,700 distinct words
- $86,700^{2}=7,516,890,000$ possible bigrams
- but only about $30,000,000$ words (and bigrams) in corpus


## efficiency

## Managing the Size of the Model

- Millions to billions of words are easy to get (trillions of English words available on the web)
- But: huge language models do not fit into RAM


## Number of Unique N-Grams

Number of unique n-grams in Europarl corpus 29,501,088 tokens (words and punctuation)

| Order | Unique n-grams | Singletons |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| unigram | 86,700 | $33,447(38.6 \%)$ |
| bigram | $1,948,935$ | $1,132,844(58.1 \%)$ |
| trigram | $8,092,798$ | $6,022,286(74.4 \%)$ |
| 4-gram | $15,303,847$ | $13,081,621(85.5 \%)$ |
| 5-gram | $19,882,175$ | $18,324,577(92.2 \%)$ |

$\rightarrow$ remove singletons of higher order n-grams

## Efficient Data Structures



- Need to store probabilities for
- the very large majority
- the very large number
- Both share history the very large

2-gram backoff

| large |
| :---: | :---: |
| boff:-0.470 |$\quad$| accept $p:-3.791$ <br> acceptable $p:-3.778$ <br> accession $p:-3.762$ <br> accidents $p:-3.806$ <br> accountancy $p:-3.416$ <br> accumulated $p:-3.885$ <br> accumulation $p:-3.895$ <br> action $p:-3.510$ <br> additional $p:-3.334$ <br> administration $p:-3.729$ <br> $\ldots$ |
| :---: |

1-gram backoff
aa-afns p:-6.154
aachen $p:-5.734$ aaiun $p:-6.154$ aalborg $p:-6.154$ aarhus $p:-5.734$ aaron $p:-6.154$ aartsen $p:-6.154$ ab p:-5.734 abacha $p:-5.156$ aback p:-5.876
$\rightarrow$ no need to store history twice
$\rightarrow$ Trie

## Reducing Vocabulary Size

- For instance: each number is treated as a separate token
- Replace them with a number token NUM
- but: we want our language model to prefer

$$
p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { pay } 950.00 \text { in May } 2007)>p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { pay } 2007 \text { in May } 950.00)
$$

- not possible with number token

$$
p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { pay NUM in May NUM })=p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { pay NUM in May NUM })
$$

- Replace each digit (with unique symbol, e.g., @ or 5), retain some distinctions

$$
p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { pay } 555.55 \text { in May } 5555)>p_{\mathrm{LM}}(\mathrm{I} \text { pay } 5555 \text { in May } 555.55)
$$

