Syntactic Pattern Recognition

By Nicolette Nicolosi Ishwarryah S Ramanathan

Syntactic Pattern Recognition

- Statistical pattern recognition is straightforward, but may not be ideal for many realistic problems.
 - Patterns that include structural or relational information are difficult to quantify as feature vectors.
- Syntactic pattern recognition uses this structural information for classification and description.
- □ Grammars can be used to create a definition of the structure of each pattern class.

Classification

- Producing a classification can be done based on a measure of structural similarity in patterns.
- Each pattern class can be represented by a structural representation or description.
- It is often difficult to classify patterns that contain a large number of features.

Description

- A description of the pattern structure is useful for recognizing entities when a simple classification isn't possible.
- Can also describe aspects that cause a pattern to not be assigned to a particular class.
- In complex cases, recognition can only be achieved through a description for each pattern rather than through classification.

When to Use It

- Picture recognition and scene analysis are problems in which there are a large number of features and the patterns are complex.
 - For example, recognizing areas such as highways, rivers, and bridges in satellite pictures.
- In this case, a complex pattern can be described in terms of a hierarchical composition of simpler subpatterns.

Hierarchical Approach

- The hierarchical approach comes from the similarity that can be seen between the structure of patterns and the syntax or grammar of languages.
- Following this analogy, patterns can be built up from sub-patterns in a number of ways, similarly to how one builds words by concatenating characters, and builds a phrase or sentence by concatenating words.

Definitions

- The simplest sub-patterns are called pattern primitives, and should be much easier to recognize than the overall patterns.
- The language used to describe the structure of the patterns in terms of sets of pattern primitives is called the *pattern description language*.
- The pattern description language will have a grammar that specifies how primitives can be composed into patterns.

Syntax Analysis

When a primitive within the pattern is identified, syntax analysis (parsing) is performed on the sentence describing the pattern to determine if it is correct with respect to the grammar.

Syntax analysis also gives a structural description of the sentence associated with the pattern.

Syntax Analysis

One advantage of this approach is that a grammar (rewriting) rule can be applied many times.

This allows for expressing basic structural characteristics for an infinite number of sentences in a number of compact ways.

Other Representations

Relational graph - describe a pattern using the relations between subpatterns and primitives.

Relational matrix - any relational graph can also be expressed as a matrix.

Other Representations

Generalizing to allow for any relation that can be determined from the pattern, we can express richer descriptions than through tree-based structures.

Hierarchical (tree-based) approaches are convenient because it is easy to apply formal language theory.

Consists of two main parts:

- Analysis primitive selection and grammatical or structural inference
- Recognition preprocessing, segmentation or decomposition, primitive and relation recognition, and syntax analysis
- Preprocessing includes the tasks of pattern encoding and approximation, filtering, restoration, and enhancement.



Figure 1.10. Block diagram of a syntactic pattern recognition system.



"Or 'parser' or 'recognizer'

Figure 1: Using SyntPR for classification (with explicit characterization of structure).

After preprocessing, the pattern is segmented into sub-patterns and primitives using predefined operations.

Sub-patterns are identified with a given set of primitives, so each pattern is represented by a set of primitives with the specified syntactic operations.

Syntax Parsing

For example, using the concatenation operation, each pattern is recognized by a string of concatenated primitives.
At this point, the parser will determine if the pattern is syntactically correct.
It belongs to the class of patterns described by the grammar if it is correct.

Syntax Parsing

During parsing/syntax analysis, a description is produced in terms of a parse tree, assuming the pattern is syntactically correct.

If it isn't correct, it will either be rejected or analyzed based on a different grammar, which could represent other possible pattern classes.

Matching

- The simplest form of recognition is template matching, in which a string of primitives representing an input pattern is compared to strings of primitives representing reference patterns.
- The input pattern is classified in the same class as the prototype that is the best match, which is determined by a similarity criterion.

Matching vs. Complete Parsing

- □ In this case, the structural description is ignored.
- □ The opposite approach is a complete parsing that uses the entire structural description.
- There are many intermediate approaches; for example, a series of tests designed to test the occurrence of certain primitives, sub-patterns, or combinations of these. The result of these tests will determine a classification.

Parsing

- Parsing is required if the problem necessitates using a complete pattern description for recognition.
- Efficiency of the recognition process is improved by simpler approaches that do not require a complete parsing.
- Basically, parsing can be expensive, so don't use it unnecessarily.

Inferring Grammars

Grammatical inference machine similar to "learning" in the discriminant approach; it infers a grammar from a set of training patterns.

The inferred grammar can then be used for pattern description and syntax analysis.

Parsing - Fundamentals

- Parser Hierarchical Structure
 - Smaller decompositions
 - Graphically shown by derivation trees



Parsing Problems

- Approaches of Parsing
- Parsing/Generation Similarities
 - Application of grammar is easier in generative mode than analytic mode.

Concerns

- Parser must determine the extent of the elements that comprise non terminals.
- Parser must find a use for all of x

Parsing Approaches

Top-Down Parsing

- From S to terminals. A derivation for x, where x is a sentence.
- Method 1: Depth First Expansion of nonterminals, starting with leftmost non-terminal. Allows back-up.
- Method 2: Recursive Descent may not work on all grammars. No back-up. Recursive functions to recognize sub-strings corresponding to the expansion of a non-terminal.
- Bottom-Up Parsing
 - Knowing x, we proceed to S by reversing the productions defined.

Comparing Top-down and Bottom-up

- Difficult to compare because the efficiency factor lies with the grammar.
- Normalization or Transformation of a grammar will affect parsing efficiency.
- Brute force method of the top-down and bottom-up approaches have computational complexity growing exponentially with |x|.

Alternative Approaches – CYK Parsing

Cocke-Younger-Kasami Algorithm

- Parse string x in number of steps proportional to |x|³.
- The CFG should be in Chomsky Normal Form

Building CYK table







 α

b.

input sitting to perse

B,C

l = 4

10.00

Stochastic Grammars

- Assumptions of the formal grammar used in SyntPR
 - Languages are disjoint
 - No errors in the sentences produced by the grammar
- In practice the assumptions are faulty
 - Errors in the primitive extraction process
 - Noise or pattern deformation in descriptions

 $\square P(t_{0,1} n' t_{1,2} n' ... t_{n-1,n}) = P(t_{0,1}) P(t_{1,2}) ... P(t_{n-1,n})$

- $\square P(t_{0,1}, t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{n-1,n}) = \prod_{q=1 \text{ to } n} P(t_{q-1,q})$
- This uses the assumption that every production is independent of the previous one applied.
- Proper Stochastic Grammar
 - Elements of Ps is of form
 - \Box A_i -> β_i with probability p_{ij}
 - Where $A_i \in V_N$, $\beta_i \in (V_N \cup V_T)^+$
 - Σ_{k=1 to ni} p_{ik} =1 (Sum of all the probabilities of each production in the Grammar is equal to 1)

Characteristic Grammar

Remove the probability measure from the Stochastic grammar

Stochastic Languages

- $L(G_s) = \{(x,p(x)) | x \in V_T^+, S_S \text{ derives } x \text{ with} probability } p_j, j = 1 \text{ to } k, p(x) = \Sigma_{j=1 \text{ to } k} p_j \}$
- Where p_j is the probability to parse a string x from S_S and p(x) is the total probability of deriving various strings (Say k number of strings) using the grammar.

- For example, x is 'abc' and productions of a grammar are
 - S->aA with p_1 ; A->bC with p_2
 - B->dC with p_3 ; C->eD with p_4
 - **B**->c with p_5 ; B->f with p_6
 - B->g with p_7 ; C->c with p_8
 - C->f with p_9 ; C->g with p_{10}
 - D->c with p_{11} ; D->f with p_{12}
 - D->g with p₁₃
- $\Box \quad \text{Then to get x we have } S->aA->abC->abc.$
- \square Here the probability to get abc is $p(abc)=p_1.p_2.p_8$

Structural Semantic Interconnections: A Knowledge-Based Approach to Word Sense Disambiguation

Paper by Roberto Navigli and Paola Verlardi

Word-Sense Disambiguation

- Same word, different meaning. For example, "bus" can be a vehicle or a connection on a computer.
- This leads to ambiguous situations in which it is not clear which word to use.
- This paper's approach uses syntactic pattern recognition in attempting to improve disambiguation.

Representation

Used a graph representation of

senses:



Data

Took data from a number of sources:

- WordNet 2.0 online resource featuring concepts that correspond to word senses
- Domain labels assigned to WordNet
- Annotated corpora text examples of word sense usages in context
- Dictionaries of collocations words that belong to a semantic domain (ie: bus, stop, station)

Algorithm

- $\Box T = [t1, ..., tn], I = [St1, ... Stn], P = {t_i | S^{t_i} = null}$
- Algorithm iteratively disambiguates words in the pending set P of words that have no currently defined sense, where S is the chosen sense for t.

Grammar

Describes meaningful connections in the graph representation.

Used to do the disambiguation task in the iterative algorithm.

Results

Performed better on large contexts.
Achieved a 66% recall rate when the number of elements in T is 5.
Achieved around a 90% recall rate where the number of elements in T is 40.

Synt Pattern Recognition of ECG



References

- Fu, K. S. (King Sun), 1930- "Syntactic pattern recognition and applications" Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, c1982
- Schalkoff, Robert J, "Pattern recognition : statistical, structural, and neural approaches" New York : J. Wiley, c1992
- Navigli, R.; Velardi, P., "Structural semantic interconnections: a knowledge-based approach to word sense disambiguation," Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on , vol.27, no.7, pp.1075-1086, July 2005
- Trahanias, P.; Skordalakis, E.; "Syntactic pattern recognition of the ECG"; Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on Volume 12, Issue 7, July 1990 Page(s):648 - 657

