

Home | Computational Linguistics | List Article navigation of Issues | Volume 30, No. 4 | Intricacies of Collins' Parsing Model



Quarterly (March, June, September,

160pp. per issue

Founded: 1974

Scholar h5-index:

ISSN: 0891-2017

Journal

Indexing

Resources

Editorial Info

Abstracting and

**Release Schedule** 

Advertising Info

E-ISSN: 1530-9312

2018 Impact Factor: 1.319 2018 Google

32

December)

6 3/4 x 10

# Intricacies of Collins' Parsing Model

# Daniel M. Bikel

Posted Online March 13, 2006 https://doi.org/10.1162/0891201042544929

© 2004 Association for Computational Linguistics

Computational Linguistics Volume 30 | Issue 4 | December 2004 p.479-511

Download Options >

# **Abstract Authors**

This article documents a large set of heretofore unpublished details Collins used in his parser, such that, along with Collins' (1999) thesis, this article contains all information necessary to duplicate Collins' benchmark results. Indeed, these as-yet-unpublished details account for an 11% relative increase in error from an implementation including all details to a cleanroom implementation of Collins' model. We also show a cleaner and equally well-performing method for the handling of punctuation and conjunction and reveal certain other probabilistic oddities about Collins' parser. We not only analyze the effect of the unpublished details, but also reanalyze the effect of certain well-known Intricacies of Collins' Parsing Model | Computational Linguistics | MIT Press Journals

# **Author** Resources

Submission Guidelines Publication Agreement Author Reprints

# Reader **Resources**

# Forthcoming

**Rights and** Permissions Most Read Most Cited

More About Computational Linguistics

#### Metrics



66 Total citations 5 Recent

citations

15 Field Citation Ratio n/a Relative **Citation Ratio** 

### **Open Access**

Computational Linguistics Computational Linguistics is **Open Access.** All content is freely available in

details, revealing that bilexical dependencies are barely used by the model and that head choice is not nearly as important to overall parsing performance as once thought. Finally, we perform experiments that show that the true discriminative power of lexicalization appears to lie in the fact that unlexicalized syntactic structures are generated conditioning on the headword and its part of speech.

## Most Read

**b** Lexicon-Based Methods for Sentiment Analysis Deep Learning (14087 times) Maite Taboada et al. Computational Linguistics Volume: 37, Issue: 2, pp. 267-307

**Computational** Linguistics and (10542 times) Christopher D. Manning Computational Linguistics Volume: 41, Issue: 4, pp. 701-707

#### b Near-Synonymy and Lexical Choice (3675 times) Philip Edmonds et al. Computational Linguistics Volume: 28, Issue: 2, pp. 105-144

See More

See More

(Note that the Most Read numbers are based on the number of full text downloads over the last 12 months.)

# Most Cited

b Lexicon-Based Methods for Sentiment Analysis Various Statistical (436 times) Maite Taboada et al. Computational Linguistics Volume: 37, Issue: 2, pp. 267-307

Systematic Comparison of **Alignment Models** (174 times) Franz Josef Och et al. Computational Linguistics Volume: 29, Issue: 1, pp. 19-51

Solution Section Section Section Section 2017 Section 201 Expansion and Target Extraction through Double **Propagation** (147 times) Guang Qiu et al. Computational Linguistics Volume: 37, Issue: 1, pp. 9-27

(Note that the Most Cited numbers are based on Crossref's Cited-by service and reflect citation information for the past 24 months.)

D Download Options Sign up for Alerts Favorite

Intricacies of Collins' Parsing Model | Computational Linguistics | MIT Press Journals

