

Scoring Coreference Chains with Split-Antecedent Anaphors

Silviu Paun*

*School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science
Queen Mary University of London*

SPAUN3691@GMAIL.COM

Juntao Yu*

*School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering
University of Essex*

J.YU@ESSEX.AC.UK

Nafise Sadat Moosavi

*Department of Computer Science
University of Sheffield*

N.S.MOOSAVI@SHEFFIELD.AC.UK

Massimo Poesio

*School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science
Queen Mary University of London*

M.POESIO@QMUL.AC.UK

Abstract

Anaphoric reference is an aspect of language interpretation covering a variety of types of interpretation beyond the simple case of identity reference to entities introduced via nominal expressions covered by the traditional coreference task in its most recent incarnation in ONTONOTES and similar datasets. One of these cases that go beyond simple coreference is anaphoric reference to entities that must be added to the discourse model via accommodation, and in particular split-antecedent references to entities constructed out of other entities, as in split-antecedent plurals and in some cases of discourse deixis. Although this type of anaphoric reference is now annotated in many datasets, systems interpreting such references cannot be evaluated using the Reference coreference scorer Pradhan et al. (2014). As part of the work towards a new scorer for anaphoric reference able to evaluate all aspects of anaphoric interpretation in the coverage of the Universal Anaphora initiative, we propose in this paper a solution to the technical problem of generalizing existing metrics for identity anaphora so that they can also be used to score cases of split-antecedents. This is the first such proposal in the literature on anaphora or coreference, and has been successfully used to score both split-antecedent plural references and discourse deixis in the recent CODI/CRAC anaphora resolution in dialogue shared tasks.

Keywords: Coreference, Evaluation, Split-Antecedent Anaphors

1. Introduction

The performance of models for single-antecedent anaphora resolution on the aspects of anaphoric interpretation annotated in the reference ONTONOTES dataset Pradhan et al. (2012) has greatly improved in recent years Wiseman et al. (2016); Clark and Manning (2016); Lee et al. (2017, 2018); Kantor and Globerson (2019); Joshi et al. (2020). So the attention of the community has started to turn to cases of anaphora not annotated or not properly tested in ONTONOTES. Well-known examples of this trend is research on the cases of anaphora whose interpretation requires some form of commonsense knowledge tested by benchmarks for the Winograd Schema Challenge Rahman and Ng (2012); Liu et al. (2017); Sakaguchi et al. (2020), or the pronominal anaphors that cannot be re-

*. Equal contribution. Listed by alphabetical order

solved purely using gender, for which benchmarks such as GAP have been developed [Webster et al. \(2018\)](#). In addition, more research has been carried out on aspects of anaphoric interpretation that go beyond identity anaphora but are covered by datasets such as ANCORA for Catalan and Spanish [Recasens and Martí \(2010\)](#), ARRAU [Poesio et al. \(2018\)](#); [Uryupina et al. \(2020\)](#) and GUM for English [Zeldes \(2017\)](#), or the Prague Dependency Treebank for Czech [Nedoluzhko \(2013\)](#).¹ These aspects include, e.g., bridging reference [Clark \(1975\)](#); [Hou et al. \(2018\)](#); [Hou \(2020\)](#); [Yu and Poesio \(2020\)](#), discourse deixis [Webber \(1991\)](#); [Marasović et al. \(2017\)](#); [Kolhatkar et al. \(2018\)](#) and, finally, **split-antecedent anaphoric reference**, the type of anaphoric interpretation on which we are focusing in this paper. The best known example of split-antecedent are cases of plural anaphoric references such as pronoun *They* in (1) [Eschenbach et al. \(1989\)](#); [Kamp and Reyle \(1993\)](#), a plural anaphoric reference to a set composed of two or more discourse entities (John and Mary) introduced by separate noun phrases.

(1) [John]₁ met [Mary]₂. [He]₁ greeted [her]₂. [They]_{1,2} went to the movies.

Split-antecedent plural anaphors can be found in all corpora and in all languages, so an increasing number of annotation schemes cover them, including ANCORA [Recasens and Martí \(2010\)](#), ARRAU [Poesio et al. \(2018\)](#); [Uryupina et al. \(2020\)](#), GUM [Zeldes \(2017\)](#), FRIENDS [Zhou and Choi \(2018\)](#), *Phrase Detectives* [Poesio et al. \(2019\)](#), the Prague Dependency Treebank [Nedoluzhko \(2013\)](#), and the recently created CODI/CRAC 2021 Shared Task corpus of anaphora resolution in dialogue [Khosla et al. \(2021\)](#).² Split-antecedent anaphors are not always common but e.g., in the FRIENDS corpus 9% of the mentions have more than one antecedent [Zhou and Choi \(2018\)](#). A number of computational models for the interpretation of split-antecedent plural anaphoric references have been proposed as well [Vala et al. \(2016\)](#); [Zhou and Choi \(2018\)](#); [Yu et al. \(2020a, 2021\)](#).

But in fact, other types of anaphoric reference besides split-antecedent plural references can have multiple antecedents introduced by separate text segments in exactly the same way. This can happen, for instance, with discourse deixis, as illustrated in (1), where the antecedent for discourse-deictic demonstrative *that* in 4.2 is the plan formed by the actions in 1.5 and 3.1, evoked by utterances from speaker M separated by utterances from speaker S. (This example is from the TRAINS subset of the ARRAU corpus [Uryupina et al. \(2020\)](#).)

1.1 M all right system
 1.2 we've got a more complicated problem
 1.3 uh
 1.4 first thing I'd like you to do
 1.5 is send engine E2 off with a boxcar to Corning to pick up oranges
 (2) 1.6 uh as soon as possible
 2.1 S okay
 3.1 M and while it's there it should pick up the tanker
 4.1 S okay
 4.2 and [that] can get
 4.3 we can get that done by three

1. See [Poesio et al. \(2016a\)](#) for a more detailed survey and [Nedoluzhko et al. \(2021\)](#) for a more recent, extensive update.

2. See the COREFUD report prepared for the Universal Anaphora initiative for an extensive discussion of the coverage of split-antecedent and other anaphors in the Universal Anaphora corpora [Nedoluzhko et al. \(2021\)](#).

Split-antecedent plural references and discourse deixis are important from the point of view of anaphora theory because they all illustrate the fact that reference possibilities in discourse models are not limited to entities introduced in the discourse model via nominals—indeed, such cases were one of the reasons for, e.g., Webber’s development of the idea of discourse model Webber (1979). Unlike simple cases of identity coreference, such cases of anaphora refer to entities that need to be **added to the discourse model at the point in which the anaphoric reference is encountered** via some form of inference, or **accommodation** Lewis (1979). Assigning an antecedent to split-antecedent anaphors requires a particularly simple form of inference—creating a new plural object out of two atomic objects—but more complex cases are known requiring additional inferences (as in, e.g., context change accomodation Webber and Baldwin (1992)). These types of anaphoric reference thus test the ability of an anaphora resolution system to create antecedents *ex novo* instead of choosing them from the already introduced mentions, which is what differentiates proper discourse models from simple history lists of referents.

Assessing this ability, however, requires a scorer that can evaluate the interpretation produced by a system in cases that require accommodation. Simplified forms of evaluation have been developed for bridging reference and discourse deixis and used, e.g., in the 2018 CRAC Shared Task Poesio et al. (2018), but have not become part of a standardized scorer for anaphora, and the existing metrics for discourse deixis do not work for split-antecedent discourse deixis cases such as (1). As for the solutions proposed for split-antecedent plural anaphors Vala et al. (2016); Zhou and Choi (2018); Yu et al. (2021), they either work only for split-antecedent plurals in isolation, or require a substantial redefinition of the notion of coreference chain, or only generalize one existing metrics, as discussed in detail in Section 6, even though split-antecedent plurals are cases of identity anaphora after all and should therefore be in the scope of the existing Reference Coreference Scorer Pradhan et al. (2014).

The objective of this paper is to fill this gap in the literature, as part of the effort to develop the new Universal Anaphora scorer Yu et al. (2022),³ an extension of the Reference Coreference scorer Pradhan et al. (2014); Moosavi and Strube (2016); Poesio et al. (2018) that can be used to evaluate all aspects of anaphoric interpretation covered by the Universal Anaphora (UA) initiative, including bridging reference, discourse deixis, and some cases of accommodation. We start in Section 2 with a summary of the types of anaphoric interpretation the new scorer is meant to cover, and with a brief description of the metrics we set to extend in Section 3. Crucially, these include *all* the standard metrics for coreference evaluation Luo and Pradhan (2016): mention and entity-based metrics such as B³ (Bagga and Baldwin, 1998) and CEAF (Luo, 2005) respectively, as well as link-based metrics such as MUC (Vilain et al., 1995), LEA (Moosavi and Strube, 2016), and BLANC (Luo et al., 2014; Recasens and Hovy, 2011). Our proposed extensions of the metrics, able to evaluate both single and split-antecedent references, are presented in Section 4 and illustrated with an example in Section 5. Our solution is compared with all alternative proposals regarding the scoring of split antecedent anaphors in Section 6. For a more thorough demonstration of how the metrics can be used, we use the new UA scorer incorporating these extended metrics to score both split antecedent plural reference and discourse deixis with multiple antecedents was used as the official scorer for the 2021 CODI/CRAC Shared Task on Anaphoric Interpretation in Dialogue Khosla et al. (2021).⁴ In this paper, we use this scorer to show how the proposed generalization, unlike the proposal by Zhou and Choi (2018) and our own proposal in Yu et al. (2021), can be used to score both single

3. <https://github.com/juntaoy/universal-anaphora-scorer>

4. <https://competitions.codalab.org/competitions/30312>

and split antecedent anaphora in exactly the same way, as well as to further illustrate and analyze the behavior of our generalized metrics on the data used in previous work on split-antecedent plurals (Section 7). Finally, in Section 8 we discuss how the approach proposed here could be extended to cover other types of anaphoric interpretation requiring accommodation.

2. Anaphora, Coreference and the Scope of a Universal Anaphora Scorer

The ultimate objective of the Universal Anaphora scorer, which incorporates the proposals for split-antecedent reference in this paper, is to assess the interpretation of all forms of anaphoric reference, not just identity anaphora. We briefly summarize here the types of anaphoric reference covered by the current version of the scorer, including in particular the type of reference that is the focus of the present paper because of the lack of widely accepted evaluation methods: reference to accommodated entities, as exemplified by split-antecedent anaphora.

2.1 (Identity) Anaphora and Coreference

In much CL / NLP literature following the first Message Understanding Conference (MUC) shared tasks (Chinchor and Sundheim, 1995) a distinction is made between anaphora resolution and **coreference resolution**, and the term ‘anaphora’ is used to indicate pronominal anaphora only, whereas the term coreference is used in a more general sense. In this article, however, the terms ‘anaphora’ and ‘anaphoric reference’ will be used in the more general sense of reference to entities in the discourse model adopted in linguistics (see, e.g., (Lyons, 1977; Kamp and Reyle, 1993)) psycholinguistics (see, e.g., (Garnham, 2001)) and the pre-MUC computational work (see, e.g., Webber (1979)). In Discourse Representation Theory (DRT) (Kamp and Reyle, 1993), for instance, proper name *John* in example (1) introduces a new discourse entity 1 in the discourse model, and all subsequent mentions of John, whether using pronouns or proper names, are considered (identity) anaphoric references to entity 1. The term coreference resolution was introduced for the Message Understanding Conference Chinchor and Sundheim (1995) to specify a rather different task from anaphora, covering several interrelated aspects of language interpretation of interest for information extraction including not just identity anaphora resolution but also, e.g., the association of properties with entities in cases such as (2.1), where the NP *an NLP researcher*, normally considered predicative from a linguistic perspective, would be considered ‘co-referent’ with *Mary*):

(3) [Mary]₁ is [an NLP researcher]₁.

This term ‘coreference’ was maintained in NLP even when criticism of the earlier definition van Deemter and Kibble (2000) led the field to adopt a definition of the task focusing exclusively on (a subset of) identity anaphora in the (psycho-) linguistic sense, as done, e.g., in ONTONOTES Pradhan et al. (2012), but we will use here the more traditional linguistic terminology.

2.2 Identity Anaphora and Beyond

Most modern anaphoric annotation projects cover the basic case of identity anaphora exemplified by (2.2), where *Mary* and *her* are mentions of the same discourse entity 1 (‘belong to the same coreference chain’), and *a new dress* and *it* refer to the same discourse entity 2. In both cases, the discourse entity is explicitly introduced with a nominal phrase.

(4) [Mary]₁ bought [a new dress]₂ but [it]₂ didn’t fit [her]₁.

Equally, the several proposed metrics for evaluating ‘coreference’ (reviewed in Section 3) and the Reference Coreference Scorer developed for the CONLL shared task and incorporating many of these metrics Pradhan et al. (2014) all focus exclusively on evaluating identity reference / identity anaphora in this sense.

However, many other types of anaphoric reference exist beyond basic identity anaphora, including, e.g., anaphoric reference depending on relations other than identity reference, and anaphoric reference to entities not introduced using nominals. These types of anaphoric reference were not covered in ONTONOTES because of complexity and cost reasons (see Pradhan et al. (2012) as well as the discussion in Zeldes (2022)), but are covered in many of the most recent corpora, including ANCOR Recasens and Martí (2010), ARRAU Poesio and Artstein (2008); Poesio et al. (2018); Uryupina et al. (2020), GUM Zeldes (2017), *Phrase Detectives* Poesio et al. (2019), the Prague Dependency Treebank Nedoluzhko (2013), the TÜBA-DZ corpus Versley (2008) and the recently created CODI/CRAC corpus of anaphoric reference in dialogue Khosla et al. (2021). The objective of the UA initiative is to define a common scheme to annotate all types of anaphoric reference and to develop a scorer that can be used to evaluate anaphora resolution with all these datasets.

Bridging references Possibly the most studied type of non-identity anaphora is **bridging reference** or **associative anaphora** Clark (1975) as in (2.2), where bridging reference / associative anaphora *the roof* refers to an object which is related to / associated with, but not identical to, the *hall*.

- (5) There was not a moment to be lost: away went Alice like the wind, and was just in time to hear it say, as it turned a corner, ‘Oh my ears and whiskers, how late it’s getting!’ She was close behind it when she turned the corner, but the Rabbit was no longer to be seen: she found herself in [a long, low hall, which was lit up by a row of lamps hanging from the roof].

Although no Reference scorer for bridging reference existed when we started work on the Universal Anaphora scorer, approaches for evaluating bridging reference resolution did exist, in particular the approach from Hou et al. (2018) already used for the CODI/CRAC 2018 Shared Task Poesio et al. (2018). This method was integrated in the Universal Anaphora scorer Khosla et al. (2021).

2.3 Anaphoric References Requiring Accommodation

Another type of anaphoric reference not covered in older datasets such as ONTONOTES and not evaluated by the Coreference reference scorers, but annotated in more advanced datasets, is anaphoric reference to entities *not* introduced via nominals. Split-antecedent anaphora, the type of anaphoric reference whose scoring is the focus of this paper, belongs to this category. Split-antecedent anaphora is an example of a more general class of anaphoric references that require so-called **accommodation** of a new antecedent (Lewis, 1979; van der Sandt, 1992; Beaver and Zeevat, 2007).⁵ In this paper we propose a general method for scoring split-antecedent anaphora resolution that can be extended to cover other types of anaphoric reference involving accommodation, in particular discourse deixis. In this Section we briefly introduce this type of anaphoric references.

5. Note that in fact bridging references discussed earlier require a form of accommodation as well: in (2.2) the bridging reference *the roof* refers to an entity related to the already introduced *the hall* but has to be added to the discourse model.

Accommodation One of the most powerful arguments for the discourse model view of anaphora, as opposed to older history-list approaches⁶ is the fact that many cases of anaphoric reference cannot be interpreted with respect to the entities already introduced in the discourse model with a nominal, but require new entities to be added to the discourse model, or accommodated (Webber, 1979; Kamp and Reyle, 1993; Garnham, 2001). Accommodation as conceived by Lewis (1979) is a general operation on the discourse model which involves adding new content that is required to process a statement being. For instance, (2.3) presupposes that it was raining; when processing the statement, that fact has to be added to the discourse model.

(6) Mary realized it was raining.

Webber (1979); Kamp and Reyle (1993); Garnham (2001) discuss a number of cases of anaphoric interpretation requiring new entities to be added to the discourse model to interpret anaphoric reference.

Split-antecedent anaphora In ONTONOTES, plural reference is only marked when the antecedent is mentioned by a single noun phrase. However, **split-antecedent plural reference** is also possible Eschenbach et al. (1989); Kamp and Reyle (1993), as in (2.3). These are also cases of plural identity reference, but where the antecedents are sets whose elements are two or more entities introduced by separate noun phrases, which have to be accommodated in (i.e., added to) the discourse model Kamp and Reyle (1993); Beaver and Zevat (2007). Such references are annotated in, e.g., ARRAU Uryupina et al. (2020), GUM Zeldes (2017) and *Phrase Detectives* Poesio et al. (2019).

(7) [John]₁ met [Mary]₂. [He]₁ greeted [her]₂. [They]_{1,2} went to the movies.

This type of anaphoric reference is not covered either by the standard Coreference Reference Scorer Pradhan et al. (2014) or by the CODI/CRAC 2018 scorer Poesio et al. (2018), and therefore not generally attempted by anaphoric resolvers. A few dedicated evaluation methods concerned with evaluating this type of reference were however proposed, are discussed in Section 6, but these proposals either work only for split-antecedent plurals in isolation, or require a substantial redefinition of the notion of coreference chain, or only generalize one existing metrics. The key contribution of this paper is a method for scoring references to accommodated objects created out of antecedents separately introduced that generalizes all existing metrics and thus can be used to score both single and split antecedent anaphoric reference in exactly the same way.

Discourse deixis A case of anaphoric reference also requiring accommodation and which has been the focus of much more NLP research is **discourse deixis**, or anaphora with non-nominal antecedents (Webber, 1991; Byron, 2002; Gundel et al., 2003; Artstein and Poesio, 2006; Kolhatkar et al., 2018). Discourse deixis, exemplified by the reference *this issue* in (2.3), is a type of abstract anaphora (Asher, 1993) in which the antecedent is some type of abstract entity ‘evoked’ by the propositional content of a previous sentence. The evidence on discourse deixis interpretation suggests that these antecedents are not introduced in the discourse model immediately, but are accommodated upon encountering the anaphoric reference Kolhatkar et al. (2018).

(8) The municipal council had to decide [whether to balance the budget by raising revenue or cutting spending]_i. The council had to come to a resolution by the end of the month. [This issue]_i was dividing communities across the country. (Kolhatkar et al., 2018)

6. See e.g., Poesio et al. (2016b) for a review of early approaches to anaphoric interpretation.

Discourse deixis is not annotated in all corpora Artstein and Poesio (2006); Kolhatkar et al. (2018), and when it is, the problem is simplified in a number of ways. In ONTONOTES, only **event anaphora**, a subtype of discourse deixis, is marked, as exemplified by *that* in (2.3), which refers to the event of a white rabbit with pink ears running past Alice. (This example is from the annotated version of *Alice in Wonderland* in the *Phrase Detectives* corpus (Poesio et al., 2019).)

- (9) ... when suddenly a White Rabbit with pink eyes ran close by her. There was nothing so VERY remarkable in [that]; nor did Alice think it so VERY much out of the way to hear the Rabbit say to itself, 'Oh dear! Oh dear! I shall be late!'

The whole range of discourse deixis—i.e., including, in addition to event anaphora, references such as *this issue* in (2.3)—is annotated in more recent corpora, such as, e.g., ANCORA and ARRAU. But even in these corpora the task of annotating discourse deixis is simplified in a number of ways. One such simplification is that the annotators are not asked to mark as antecedent the accommodated abstract entity, but the list of sentences or clausal units that evoke the antecedent (e.g., the clause [whether to balance the budget by raising revenue or cutting spending] in (2.3)).

No standard metric for scoring discourse deixis resolution exists, but typically systems are scored by their ability to identify the sentence evoking the antecedent. The **success @ N** metric, introduced by (Kolhatkar et al., 2013), considers a response as correct if the key sentence is among the top N candidate response sentences identified as ‘antecedent’ by the system. This metric was used by Marasović et al. (2017) and in the CRAC 2018 shared task Poesio et al. (2018). The key point from the perspective of this paper is that this metric cannot be used to evaluate discourse deictic references with split antecedents, such as the example in (1). In the Universal Anaphora scorer, discourse deixis is scored using the same metrics used for identity anaphora; and the method introduced in this paper for scoring split antecedent plural references is also used to handle split antecedent cases of discourse deixis such as the one in (1). (In fact, whereas split antecedent plurals are relatively rare, split antecedent discourse deictic references are very common e.g., in ARRAU.)

Context Change Accommodation As a final example of anaphoric reference requiring accommodation we will mention the cases of **context change accommodation** discussed by Webber and Baldwin (1992) such as (2.3), where a new entity, the dough, is obtained by mixing together flour and water.

- (10) Add [the water]_i to [the flour]_j little by little.
Then work [the dough]_k^{i+j}

As far as we are aware, no evaluation method has been proposed for scoring this type of anaphoric interpretation. Although the type of accommodation required by this type of reference does not involve combining separate entities in the discourse model in sets, a slightly modified version of the proposal in this paper could be adapted to score this type of anaphoric reference, as discussed in Section 8.

3. Metrics for Scoring Identity Anaphora (Coreference)

Before we introduce the proposed extensions that allow to additionally evaluate split-antecedent references, we briefly describe in this Section the existing definition of the metrics standardly used to evaluate single antecedent reference. Please consult, e.g., (Luo and Pradhan, 2016) for more in-depth discussion.

3.1 Notation

The standard coreference evaluation metrics are based on the simplification that entities can be identified with coreference chains of mentions introduced in a text, and the assumption that each mention refers to a single entity. We use the following notation to indicate an entity K_i which can be identified with a coreference chain of mentions:

$$K_i = \{k_{i,1}, k_{i,2}, \dots, k_{i,M_i}\}$$

We follow the standard convention and use K and R to refer to entities from the key and from the response sets, respectively. The key entities represent the gold standard, whereas the response entities are the entities proposed by a system to be evaluated. The metrics to be described below adopt different approaches to comparing key and response entities.

3.2 The Standard Metrics for Coreference Resolution Evaluation

3.2.1 STANDARD MUC

MUC (Vilain et al., 1995) is a link-based metric that evaluates response entities on the basis of the number of links they have in common with the entities in the key. It is standard practice to compute this information indirectly, by counting the number of missing links, and discarding them from the maximum number of possible links, as we are about to see.⁷ When computing we have:

$$\text{Recall}_{MUC} = \frac{\sum_i |K_i| - |\mathcal{P}(K_i; R)|}{\sum_i |K_i| - 1}$$

In the equation above $\mathcal{P}(K_i; R)$ is a function called the partition function, that returns all the partitions of key entity K_i with respect to the response R of a system:

$$\mathcal{P}(K_i; R) = \{K_i \cap R_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq |R|\} \bigcup_{k_{i,u} \in K_i \setminus R} \{\{k_{i,u}\}\}$$

Notice how the number of partitions indicate the number of links found in the key entities but not in the response entities. To compute precision, we simply swap the key and response sets:

$$\text{Precision}_{MUC} = \frac{\sum_i |R_i| - |\mathcal{P}(R_i; K)|}{\sum_i |R_i| - 1}$$

The MUC metric reports as a final value an F1-measure, which is the harmonic mean between the precision and recall presented above:

$$F = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$$

3.2.2 STANDARD B³

The B³ metric (Bagga and Baldwin, 1998) is a mention-based metric: the evaluation measures the number of mentions common between the entities in the key and in the response. Recall is computed by calculating recall for every mention, which is:

7. In MUC the maximum number of links in an entity is the minimum number of links needed to connect its mentions.

$$r(m) = \frac{|K_i \cap R_j|}{|K_i|}$$

And then summing all these mention recalls up. This can be done by finding all $|K_i \cap R_j|$ mentions in the intersection of key entity K_i and response entity R_j , summing up recall for these:

$$r(i, j) = \sum_{m \in K_i \cap R_j} r(m) = |K_i \cap R_j| * \frac{|K_i \cap R_j|}{|K_i|} = \frac{|K_i \cap R_j|^2}{|K_i|}$$

and then summing up across all i, j pairs and averaging by the total number of mentions. The result is:

$$\text{Recall}_{B^3} = \frac{\sum_{i,j} \frac{(|K_i \cap R_j|)^2}{|K_i|}}{\sum_i |K_i|}$$

Precision is computed in a similar way, again by swapping the key entities and the response entities. An F1 measure can then be computed from precision and recall in the usual way.

3.2.3 STANDARD CEAFF

CEAF (Luo, 2005) is an entity-level metric: it aligns one to one the entities in the key with those in the response, and then it computes their similarity following the same function used for the alignment step. The metric comes in two flavors, depending on the similarity function used to align and compare the entities. Given a key entity K_i and a response entity R_j , **mention-based** CEAFF is calculated using a similarity function measuring their mention overlap:

$$\phi_M(K_i, R_j) = |K_i \cap R_j|$$

Whereas in **entity-based** CEAFF, the similarity between the two entities, is computed using the DICE coefficient:

$$\phi_E(K_i, R_j) = \frac{2(|K_i \cap R_j|)}{|K_i| + |R_j|}$$

At the alignment step, the Kuhn-Munkres algorithm Kuhn (1955); Munkres (1957) is used to find the optimal one-to-one mapping between the entities in the key and the response such that their cumulative similarity is maximal. Let $K^* \subset K$ and $R^* \subset R$ be the key and the response entities for which an alignment was established, respectively, and let $g : K^* \rightarrow R^*$ be an alignment function storing the one-to-one mappings. Then recall is defined as the sum of the similarities over the maximal possible similarity:

$$\text{Recall}_{CEAF} = \frac{\sum_i \phi(K_i^*, g(K_i^*))}{\sum_i \phi(K_i, K_i)}$$

And again, precision is computed by swapping the entities from the key with those from the response set, and $F1_{CEAF}$ is computed from Recall_{CEAF} and Precision_{CEAF} as usual.

3.2.4 STANDARD LEA

LEA (Moosavi and Strube, 2016) is a link-based metric which measures the resolution score of entities while taking into consideration their importance. So for instance for recall we have:

$$\text{Recall}_{LEA} = \frac{\sum_i \text{importance}(K_i) \times \text{resolution-score}(K_i)}{\sum_i \text{importance}(K_i)}$$

The importance of an entity could be defined in a different ways depending on the task, but for instance, it could be defined as being proportional to the entity’s size so that more weight is given to more frequently mentioned entities:

$$\text{importance}(K_i) = |K_i|$$

The resolution score, for recall, measures the proportion of links in the key that are recovered in the response:

$$\text{resolution-score}(K_i) = \sum_j \frac{\text{links}(K_i \cap R_j)}{\text{links}(K_i)}$$

In LEA the number of links in an entity is counted as the total number of links that can be formed between their mentions. For example, for an entity K_i , we have:

$$\text{links}(K_i) = \binom{|K_i|}{2}$$

As with the other metrics seen so far, Precision is evaluated by swapping the key with the response entities, and F1 is computed as usual.

3.2.5 STANDARD BLANC

BLANC (Recasens and Hovy, 2011; Luo et al., 2014) is an adaptation for coreference resolution of the Rand Index used in clustering. The Rand Index is computed assessing not only a clustering algorithm’s decisions to put two entities in the same cluster, but also its decisions to put them in different clusters. BLANC adapts this approach to the case of coreference also taking into account the imbalance between the number of **coreference** (same cluster, aka coreference chain) vs. **non-coreference** (different cluster / coreference chain) links. To compute BLANC we need to determine the number of common coreference and non-coreference links found in the key and in the response entities. For a key K_i the coreference links are computed as follows:

$$C_K(i) = \{(k_{i,u}, k_{i,v}) \mid k_{i,u} \in K_i, k_{i,v} \in K_i, k_{i,u} \neq k_{i,v}\}$$

Whereas the non-coreference links between two key entities K_i and K_j are computed as follows:

$$N_K(i, j) = \{(k_{i,u}, k_{j,v}) \mid k_{i,u} \in K_i, k_{j,v} \in K_j\}$$

It follows that the set of all coreference and non-coreference links from the keys are:

$$C_K = \cup_i C_K(i), \quad N_K = \cup_{i \neq j} N_K(i, j)$$

The coreference C_R and the non-coreference N_R links for the response entities are computed in a similar way. Precision and recall values are then computed for both coreference and non-coreference links. For example, for recall, we have:

$$\text{Recall}_C = \frac{|C_K \cap C_R|}{|C_K|}, \quad \text{Recall}_N = \frac{|N_K \cap N_R|}{|N_K|}$$

4. Generalizing Standard Evaluation to Allow for Split-Antecedent References

The standard metrics for coreference resolution discussed in the previous Section all expect mentions to refer to a single entity. In this Section we describe an extension of these metrics that also allows for references to multiple entities, as in the cases of split-antecedent anaphors illustrated in (1). The generalization we propose follows the spirit of the existing metrics. The existing metrics assess the proposed single-antecedent references in the response on the basis of whether they refer to the same entity as the key; we propose that split-antecedent references should be evaluated in the same way, i.e., on whether the entities they refer to are the same. This ensures that two systems which propose as antecedents of a split-antecedent anaphor different mentions, but that refer to the same entities, will be considered equivalent. Conversely, two systems will be considered different when a split antecedent anaphor is taken to refer to different entities by the two systems.

The key idea on which our generalisation is based is to compare the entities referred to by a split-antecedent anaphor *using the very same metrics we set to extend*. So, for example, when scoring a system using MUC, we propose to score split-antecedent anaphora resolution according to how well the component entities of an accommodated set in the response match the key (gold) entities *according to the same MUC metric*. Similarly, for B³ evaluation we use the B³ metric, and so on for the other metrics. In this way, we can handle split-antecedent anaphora evaluation within coreference evaluation without altering the existing evaluation paradigm. We assess both single and split-antecedent references using the very same metrics, preserving their individual strengths and weaknesses, as evolved over years of research. A second important characteristic of our proposed extension is that when no split-antecedents are present, the scores produced by the extended metrics are identical to the scores obtained using their standard formulation.

4.1 An Extended Notation and Terminology for Entities

In order to handle split-antecedent references, we generalize the notion of entity introduced in Section 3.1 to also allow entities consisting of the merge of an object constructed from the discourse model K_i^o (e.g., a set constructed from the existing entities in the case of split antecedent anaphors) and a traditional coreference chain K_i^m of mentions of that object:

$$K_i = K_i^o \oplus K_i^m$$

This generalization of the notion of entity is used in this paper to provide scores for split-antecedent references, but could also be used to score chains including a deictic reference to an object in the visual situation, a discourse deixis, and also potentially the cases of entities introduced in the discourse model as the result of actions studied by Webber and Baldwin (1992). (See Section 8.)

In the case of split-antecedents anaphors, we use the notation K_i^s to refer to the set that serves as antecedent for the split-antecedent reference. As per definition, K_i^s is a set composed of two or more *entities*:

$$K_i^s = \{K_{i,1}, K_{i,2}, \dots, K_{i,S_i}\}$$

We use the term **accommodated set** to refer to K_i^s , i.e., the set of two or more entities in the discourse model which was accommodated in the context to serve as the antecedent of a split antecedent *anaphor*.

The antecedent entities of a split-antecedent pronoun, in our representation above, are *atomic* entities, –i.e., entities all of whose mentions refer to a single antecedent. It is however possible for

a split-antecedent anaphor to refer to an entity which in turn contains a split antecedent anaphor among its mentions. For instance, in the following example, the split antecedent anaphor *they all* has as split antecedents the entity Bill and the set consisting of John and Mary, which in turn was accommodated in the discourse as a consequence of the split antecedent anaphor *they* in the second utterance.

- (11) John met Mary.
 They went to the movies, and met Bill.
 Afterwards, they all went to dinner.

In this case, we recursively replace the antecedents which are themselves accommodated sets (i.e., {John,Mary}) with their element entities, so that the outer accommodated set (the antecedent of *they all*) has as its elements entities referred to using single-antecedent anaphors only ({John,Mary,Bill}). Note that this does not lead to any loss of generality; we resolve the split-antecedent references to sets of atomic entities as those are the actual antecedents if you unpack the recursive references. (See Section 5 for a more detailed discussion of such cases.)

We use the following notation to indicate the set of all accommodated sets, and of all regular mentions (i.e., the single-antecedent references), respectively:

$$K^s = \bigcup_i K_i^s, \quad K^m = \bigcup_i K_i^m$$

The notation above was introduced for the entities in the key, but the corresponding notions will also be used for the entities in the response. Also, the formulation of the coreference metrics involves computing the cardinality of an entity. We generalize the notion of cardinality to complex entities $K_i^s \oplus K_i^m$ in the obvious way as follows:

$$|K_i^s \oplus K_i^m| = 1 + |K_i^m|$$

Finally, notice how an entity without a split-antecedent has the same representation as seen before in Section 3.1, where only single-antecedent references were allowed:

$$K_i = K_i^m = \{k_{i,1}, k_{i,2}, \dots, k_{i,M_i}\}$$

4.2 Aligning Accommodated Sets

All the standard coreference evaluation metrics assume an implicit ‘alignment’ between the mentions in the key and in the response (the single-antecedent references). We say a mention in the key and one in the response are **aligned** if they share the same boundaries. We need to know which mentions align so we can compute the metrics: depending on the metric, the aligned mentions or the links between these mentions are used to compare the key and response entities following that metric’s strategy, as discussed in Section 3. If only single-antecedent anaphors are present, and if response entities are well-formed, i.e., if mentions are not repeated across entities, each mention from the key is aligned with at most one mention in the response.

However, only aligning mentions is not sufficient if we also have split-antecedent anaphors. As discussed in Section 4.1, split-antecedent anaphors result in the introduction of accommodated sets into the entities. Thus, evaluating split-antecedent anaphora interpretation requires aligning these accommodated sets. To align the accommodated sets we align their element entities. If we do not

specify a one-to-one alignment, the metrics would be ill-defined, i.e., contributions from multiple partially-overlapping accommodated sets may accumulate and inflate the scores.

As briefly mentioned in the beginning of this Section, we propose to align the accommodated sets using the very same metric that a system is being evaluated with, for both single and split-antecedent anaphora. I.e., we propose to align the accommodated sets in the key entities and in the response entities for the purpose of computing metric m using the $F1$ scores that the same metric m returns for the element entities of those accommodated sets. For example, when computing a MUC score, we compute the alignment score between a key accommodated set K_i^s included in an entity i and a response accommodated set R_j^s from an entity j as follows:

$$\phi(K_i^s, R_j^s) = \text{MUC}_{F1}(K_i^s, R_j^s)$$

The alignment process involves finding the pairs of accommodated sets from the key and the response that lead to the largest cumulative $F1$ score. Since a brute-force approach to this problem can be computationally unfeasible, we use the Kuhn-Munkres algorithm [Kuhn \(1955\)](#); [Munkres \(1957\)](#) already used in CEAF, which solves alignment in polynomial time. Let $K^{s'} \subset K^s$ and $R^{s'} \subset R^s$ be the subsets of the aligned key and response accommodated sets; then we shall make use of the following function (and its inverse for the reverse mappings) to access the aligned split-antecedent pairs:

$$\tau : K^{s'} \rightarrow R^{s'}$$

4.3 The Generalized Definitions

We can now provide generalizations of the existing evaluation metrics that can be used to score both single and split-antecedent references. The generalization is uniform across all metrics and only requires an additional δ term responsible for the comparison between accommodated sets or between links involving accommodated sets, depending on the metric. As noted earlier in this Section, to compute the score between accommodated sets for metric m we compute the score according to m between the component entities of these accommodated sets. The accommodated sets will receive scores between 0 and 1 for how well they are resolved by a system. If entity i contains no accommodated sets ($\delta_i = 0$) the metrics are equivalent to their original formulation (see Section 3). When accommodated sets are perfectly resolved ($\delta_i = 1$) the contribution from the accommodated sets equals that from regular mentions in the entity; they are after all just another element of the coreference chains. Partially resolved accommodated sets are given scores between 0 and 1.

4.3.1 GENERALIZED MUC

As just discussed, the MUC metric is generalized to score both single and split-antecedent references by including into the original formula an additional δ term responsible for scoring the split-antecedent references:

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\sum_i |K_i| - |\mathcal{P}(K_i^m; R^m)| - \delta_i}{\sum_i |K_i| - 1}$$

The partition function $\mathcal{P}()$ takes as arguments the regular mentions portion of the entities, i.e., the single-antecedent references (cfr. Section 4.1), so that part of the MUC formula stays unchanged. What changes is (i) the new δ term which we are about to introduce and (ii) that the cardinality of

an entity, if it contains a split-antecedent reference, is one greater than the cardinality of the entities with single-antecedent references only (see Section 3.2.1 for a direct comparison).

When computing Recall, the additional δ term, measures how well the system resolves the links in the key involving accommodated sets. If an entity K_i does not contain an accommodated set, then there is no such link for the response to recover, and therefore $\delta_i = 0$. When this is the case for all entities (i.e., when no split-antecedent anaphor is present in a document) then generalized MUC is equivalent to standard MUC. When a key entity does contain an accommodated set, however, we need to score the response for how well it recovers the link to this accommodated set. A response link is credited if one of its nodes matches a split-antecedent anaphor in the key and the other consists of the aligned accommodated set (see Section 4.2 for why alignment is necessary). Formally, if $\exists (R_j^m, R_j^s)$ s.t. $R_j^m \in K_i^m$ and $\tau(K_i^s) = R_j^s$ then:

$$\delta_i = 1 - \text{MUC}_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_i^s, R_j^s \right)$$

To reiterate, notice that we are comparing the accommodated sets in the key and in the response using the very same metric ($\text{MUC}_{\text{Recall}}$) we are evaluating the system for both single and split-antecedent references. If the key accommodated set K_i^s and the aligned response accommodated set $\tau(K_i^s)$ match perfectly, i.e., if their component entities are the same, we have $\delta_i = 0$, and so the system is fully rewarded for correctly producing the link to a split-antecedent contained by the key. A partial penalty is applied for an accommodated set in the response with MUC recall < 1 , i.e., when the component entities of the accommodated set are not perfectly resolved by the system. If there is no link in the response that satisfies the aforementioned conditions, i.e., either its nodes do not contain a regular mention matching with the key, or the aligned accommodated set, then a missing link penalty is applied, and we set $\delta_i = 1$.

To compute MUC precision we simply swap the entities in the key and the response, as per standard practice:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\sum_i |R_i| - |\mathcal{P}(R_i^m, K_i^m)| - \delta_i}{\sum_i |R_i| - 1}, \quad \delta_i = 1 - \text{MUC}_{\text{Precision}} \left(K_i^s, R_j^s \right)$$

Note also that this time the δ term is computed using the precision of the metric, in accordance with the principle discussed earlier of using the very same metric for both single and split-antecedent references. MUC F1 is computed as usual.

4.3.2 GENERALIZED B³

We generalize B³ as we just did with the MUC metric, by adding to the standard formula (discussed in Section 3.2.2) a δ term responsible for evaluating the resolution of split-antecedent references. For recall, we have:

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\sum_{i,j} \frac{(|K_i^m \cap R_j^m| + \delta_{i,j})^2}{|K_i|}}{\sum_i |K_i|}$$

When a key K_i and a response R_j contain an aligned accommodated set, i.e., $\tau(K_i^s) = R_j^s$, we need to evaluate how well the system resolved the component entities of the accommodated set. As before, we do so using the very same metric used for the evaluation of the single-antecedents:

$$\delta_{i,j} = \text{B}^3_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_i^s, R_j^s \right)$$

A system is given full credit ($\delta_{i,j} = 1$) when the component entities in the accommodated set in the response exactly match (recall-wise) those in the key. Perfectly resolved split-antecedent references have a contribution to recall equal to correctly identified single-antecedent references. When the conditions expressed earlier are not met, i.e., when the system does not produce an accommodated set as the interpretation of a split-antecedent anaphor or this accommodated set is not aligned with that in the key, $\delta_{i,j} = 0$. When the document does not contain any accommodated sets generalized B^3 is equivalent to standard B^3 .

To compute precision, we proceed in the usual way and replace the keys with the responses and vice-versa. The B^3 F1 value is also computed in the usual way.

4.3.3 GENERALIZED CEAF

As discussed in Section 3.2.3, central to computing the CEAF metric are the similarity functions used to both align and compare the key and response entities. To extend the metric to evaluate split-antecedent references as well we add, as in the other cases, an additional δ term to both the similarity function used in the computation of mention-based CEAF, and to that used in entity-based CEAF:

$$\phi_M(K_i, R_j) = |K_i^m \cap R_j^m| + \delta_{i,j}^M, \quad \phi_E(K_i, R_j) = \frac{2(|K_i^m \cap R_j^m| + \delta_{i,j}^E)}{|K_i| + |R_j|}$$

It is only when a key K_i and a response R_j contain aligned accommodated sets –i.e., $\tau(K_i^s) = R_j^s$ – that we need to evaluate how well their component entities were resolved. δ for recall is computed as follows:

$$\delta_{i,j}^M = \text{CEAF}_{\text{Recall}}^M(K_i^s, R_j^s), \quad \delta_{i,j}^E = \text{CEAF}_{\text{Recall}}^E(K_i^s, R_j^s)$$

When there are no accommodated sets or they are not aligned, $\delta_{i,j} = 0$. Otherwise, $\text{Recall}_{\text{CEAF}}$ is computed exactly as discussed in Section 3.2.3, and so for $\text{Precision}_{\text{CEAF}}$ and F1_{CEAF} .

4.3.4 GENERALIZED LEA

To extend LEA to evaluate both single and split-antecedent references we modify both the *importance* and the *resolution-score* functions. Starting with the former, we define the importance function to additionally include a β term to further reward entities which contain an accommodated set:

$$\text{importance}(K_i) = \beta_i |K_i|$$

The resolution score function is defined as in the standard version of the metric, but computed differently to also consider split-antecedent references:

$$\text{resolution-score}(K_i) = \sum_j \frac{\text{links}(K_i \cap R_j)}{\text{links}(K_i)}$$

Counting the number of links in K_i is trivial: $\text{links}(K_i) = \binom{|K_i|}{2}$. But special attention needs to be paid when counting the number of links between the set of mentions in common between a key K_i and a response R_j :

$$\text{links}(K_i \cap R_j) = \binom{|K_i^m \cap R_j^m|}{2} + \delta_{i,j} \times (|K_i^m \cap R_j^m| - 1)$$

We distinguish two types of links between the mentions common to both a key and a response entity. First, we have links between regular mentions present in both entities, i.e., links between single-antecedent references. The number of these links is expressed in the first term of the equation above. The second type are links involving an accommodated set. When a key K_i and a response R_j contain aligned accommodated sets, i.e., $\tau(K_i^s) = R_j^s$, we need to assess how well their element entities compare:

$$\delta_{i,j} = \text{LEA}_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_i^s, R_j^s \right)$$

After evaluating how well the key and the response accommodated sets compare, we use this information to weigh the number of links that can have an accommodated set as a node; this is expressed in the second term from the link counting formula presented earlier. When there are no accommodated sets in the entities, or when they are not aligned, we set $\delta_{i,j} = 0$.

The generalized version of the metric is equivalent to the standard version presented in Section 3.2.4 when the entities in the key and response do not contain any accommodated sets (when $\delta_{i,j} = 0$, we have $\text{link}(K_i \cap R_j) = \binom{|K_i^m \cap R_j^m|}{2}$). When accommodated sets do exist, however, and they were perfectly resolved by a system, the scorer allocates full credit to each of these links involving accommodated sets, just as it does for the links between correctly identified single-antecedent references: when $\delta_{i,j} = 1$, $\text{links}(K_i \cap R_j) = \binom{|K_i^m \cap R_j^m| + 1}{2}$. For imperfectly resolved accommodated sets the credit allocated to a system lies in-between the two extremes.

4.3.5 GENERALIZED BLANC

We saw back in Section 3.2.5 that to compute BLANC we need to establish the *coreference* and the *non-coreference* links found in the key and in the response entities. In the standard version of the metric these links are only between regular mentions, i.e., between single-antecedent references. In the generalized version, in which entities may also include accommodated sets, we additionally distinguish two types of links: (i) links where both nodes are accommodated sets,⁸ and (ii) links where one node is an accommodated set, and the other is a single-antecedent reference.

BLANC evaluates a response by comparing the coreference and non-coreference links in the response set with those in the key. In standard BLANC this is done by simply computing the intersection of these sets. In the generalized version of the metric, however, we cannot do this anymore, due to the introduction of accommodated sets and the additional types of links that get created, as discussed above. To help us compare different types of links we introduce a new function $\delta()$ that takes as argument two links—one from the key (m_1^k, m_2^k) , the other from the response (m_1^r, m_2^r) —and specifies how to allocate them credit. In short, this function will allocate full credit (i.e., a value of 1) to links between regular mentions that match, and partial credit (a value between 0 and 1) to those key and response links whose nodes involve aligned accommodated sets. The partial credit in this case will depend on how well the element entities in the accommodated sets compare. The function will not allocate any credit (a value of 0) to all other pairs of links. We can assess how the coreference and the non-coreference links in the response compared to those in the key by evaluating the credit allocated by the function above to all pairs of links found between these sets. If no accommodated sets are present in the entities in the key and the response, using the function as described has the same effect as the set intersection operation mentioned before used in standard BLANC.

8. These can occur among the non-coreference links.

We illustrate below how the $\delta()$ function is used to compute recall for the non-coreference links:

$$R_N = \frac{1}{|N_K|} \sum_{\substack{(m_1^k, m_2^k) \in N_K \\ (m_1^r, m_2^r) \in N_R}} \delta\left((m_1^k, m_2^k), (m_1^r, m_2^r)\right)$$

A link from the key and one from the response whose nodes are regular mentions receive a credit of 1 if their mentions match. Formally, if $m_1^k, m_2^k \in K^m$, $m_1^r, m_2^r \in R^m$, and $m_1^k = m_1^r, m_2^k = m_2^r$ (or $m_1^k = m_2^r, m_2^k = m_1^r$), then:

$$\delta\left((m_1^k, m_2^k), (m_1^r, m_2^r)\right) = 1$$

Two links one of whose nodes is a regular mention while the other is an accommodated set are scored based on how well the accommodated sets compare, assuming they are aligned, and that the regular mentions match. In line with the rest of the metric extensions, we compare accommodated sets by comparing their element entities using the very same metric we are evaluating the system with overall, for both single and split-antecedent references. The current example is for the recall of the non-coreference links, so this is the metric that is used here as well. Formally, if $\exists m_s^k, m_m^k \in \{m_1^k, m_2^k\}$ s.t. $m_s^k \in K^s, m_m^k \in K^m$, and $\exists m_s^r, m_m^r \in \{m_1^r, m_2^r\}$ s.t. $m_s^r \in R^s, m_m^r \in R^m$, and $m_m^k = m_m^r, \tau(m_s^k) = m_s^r$ then:

$$\delta\left((m_1^k, m_2^k), (m_1^r, m_2^r)\right) = \text{BLANC}_{R_N}(m_s^k, m_s^r)$$

Two links whose nodes are aligned accommodated sets receive credit on the basis of how well their element entities compare. Formally, if $m_1^k, m_2^k \in K^s, m_1^r, m_2^r \in R^s$, and $\tau(m_1^k) = m_1^r, \tau(m_2^k) = m_2^r$ (or $\tau(m_1^k) = m_2^r, \tau(m_2^k) = m_1^r$) then:

$$\delta\left((m_1^k, m_2^k), (m_1^r, m_2^r)\right) = \text{BLANC}_{R_N}\left(m_1^k, \tau(m_1^k)\right) \times \text{BLANC}_{R_N}\left(m_2^k, \tau(m_2^k)\right)$$

All other links in the key and response are unrelated and receive no credit. For these, we have:

$$\delta\left((m_1^k, m_2^k), (m_1^r, m_2^r)\right) = 0$$

All the other computations required by BLANC, i.e., the precision of the non-coreference links, together with both the precision and the recall of the coreference links, are computed in a similar fashion. BLANC then reports as its final value the arithmetic mean of the F1 values for the coreference and the non-coreference links.

4.4 Separate Scores for the Split-antecedent References

Split-antecedent anaphoric references are much rarer compared to single entity anaphoric references. As a result, they typically do not make a significant contribution to the overall evaluation score. Thus, to offer a clear picture of the performance of a system on split-antecedents, our scorer also reports separate scores for the split-antecedent references only. The scores for the separate evaluation of split-antecedents are the micro-average F_1 of all the aligned gold and system pairs. Those accommodated sets for which an alignment could not be found (e.g., missing or spurious accommodated sets) were paired with empty sets when computing the scores.

5. An (Artificial) Illustrative Example

It is not possible to evaluate the new generalized metrics by showing that they produce more intuitive outputs on some examples, as done in papers introducing new coreference metrics, for the simple reason that no generalization of the existing metrics to cover split antecedent references was proposed so far. (We discuss in Section 6 the existing proposals regarding scoring such cases, none of which involves generalizing all existing metrics, explaining why they are not satisfactory.) Therefore we had to adopt a different approach to show that our generalization make sense.

In this section, we describe in detail how the scores for each metric are computed under the proposed extension with reference to the following example, with the dual objective of illustrating how our generalization works in practice and showing that the results obtained are sensible. In the following Section, we compare these metrics in detail to the few existing and very partial previous proposals. Finally, in Section 7, we show that the extended metrics work in practice, in that they are effective at differentiating between systems which are intuitively better at the task and systems which are intuitively worse, and compare to the existing metrics, by using them to evaluate a system carrying out split-antecedent reference resolution on the same datasets used by Yu et al. (2021) and Zhou and Choi (2018).

- (12) [John]₁ met [Mary]₂ after work and asked [her]₃ to go see a play.
 [She]₄ liked the idea but suggested [him]₅ to have dinner first.
 On [their]₆ way to the restaurant [they]₇ met [Bill]₈ and [Jane]₉.
 [The two]₁₀ were very happy to see [Bill]₁₁, as [they]₁₂ go way back.
 [He]₁₃ introduced [Jane]₁₄ and [all four]₁₅ agreed to have dinner together to catch up.

Only the mentions of entities referred to by split-antecedent anaphors are marked in (5); other mentions that would be interpreted by coreference resolvers in a normal way, such as *a play* or *the restaurant*, are left out from our discussion, to keep things simpler, although their interpretation would also be scored by our generalized scorer of course.

The *key* entities mentioned in the example above are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 K_1 &= \{\text{John}_1, \text{him}_5\} \\
 K_2 &= \{\text{Mary}_2, \text{her}_3, \text{She}_4\} \\
 K_3 &= \{K_1, K_2\} \oplus \{\text{their}_6, \text{they}_7, \text{The two}_{10}\} \\
 K_4 &= \{\text{Bill}_8, \text{Bill}_{11}, \text{He}_{13}\} \\
 K_5 &= \{\text{Jane}_9, \text{Jane}_{14}\} \\
 K_6 &= \{K_1, K_2, K_4\} \oplus \{\text{they}_{12}\} \\
 K_7 &= \{K_1, K_2, K_4, K_5\} \oplus \{\text{all four}_{15}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice first how the accommodated set component of K_6 is represented. The anaphor *they*₁₂ refers to entity K_4 (Bill) and to entity K_3 referred to by *The two*₁₀, but entity K_3 in turn contains an accommodated set with elements the entities K_1 (John) and K_2 (Mary). As described in Section 4.1, we normalize the representation of split-antecedents so that they only contain atomic entities as

constituents:

$$\begin{aligned} K_6 &= \{K_3, K_4\} \oplus \{\text{they}_{12}\} \\ &= \{K_1, K_2, K_4\} \oplus \{\text{they}_{12}\} \end{aligned}$$

Consider next the following example response from a hypothetical coreference resolver. Let us call this coreference resolver ‘system A ’ and assume it outputs the following response:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A,1} &= \{\text{John}_1, \text{him}_5\} \\ R_{A,2} &= \{\text{Mary}_2, \text{She}_4\} \\ R_{A,3} &= \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}\} \oplus \{\text{their}_6, \text{they}_7, \text{The two}_{10}, \text{they}_{12}\} \\ R_{A,4} &= \{\text{Bill}_8, \text{Bill}_{11}\} \\ R_{A,5} &= \{\text{Jane}_9, \text{Jane}_{14}\} \\ R_{A,6} &= \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}, R_{A,5}\} \oplus \{\text{all four}_{15}\} \end{aligned}$$

System A makes several mistakes. It does not include mention her_3 in $R_{A,2}$ and He_{13} in $R_{A,4}$ respectively, and mistakenly interprets $they_{12}$ as a reference to John and Mary instead of to John, Mary and Bill. Also, System A only produces a partially-correct interpretation of the split antecedent anaphor $all\ four_{15}$ which in the key refers to John, Mary, Bill, and Jane, whereas A only recovers 3 of the 4 constituent entities. Using the method discussed in Section 4.2, the accommodated sets in the response from system A align with those in the key as follows:⁹

$$\tau(K_3^s) = R_{A,3}^s, \quad \tau(K_6^s) = \emptyset, \quad \tau(K_7^s) = R_{A,6}^s, \quad \tau(R_{A,3}^s) = K_3^s, \quad \tau(R_{A,6}^s) = K_7^s$$

We will compare the score assigned to system A with those assigned to systems B , C and D whose output is a variation on how the accommodated set in K_7 may be resolved that raise interesting questions about the way our proposed generalizations operate:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{B,6} &= \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}, R_{A,4}, R_{A,5}\} \oplus \{\text{all four}_{15}\} \\ R_{C,6} &= \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}, R_{A,4}\} \oplus \{\text{all four}_{15}\} \\ R_{D,6} &= \{R_{A,2}, R_{A,4}, R_{A,5}\} \oplus \{\text{all four}_{15}\} \end{aligned}$$

Compared with $R_{A,6}$, the accommodated set in $R_{B,6}$ proposed by system B for $all\ four_{15}$ correctly includes all 4 entities: John, Mary, Bill and Jane. The entity $R_{C,6}$ in C ’s response includes an accommodated set consisting of the entities John, Mary and Bill, that aligns better with the accommodated set in the key interpretation for $they_{12}$, K_6 , than with the key interpretation for $all\ four_{15}$, K_7 . System D ’s interpretation for $all\ four_{15}$, $R_{D,6}$, also proposes 3 entities as antecedents for the anaphor, like $R_{A,6}$, but the interpretation is slightly worse than that proposed in A ($R_{A,1} = K_1$, but $R_{A,4} = K_4 \setminus \{He_{13}\}$).

Showing a step-by-step computation of all of the metric scores, for both single and split-antecedent references, would be tedious. Since the proposed generalization does not modify the

9. This alignment is optimal irrespective of the similarity metric used.

standard computation of the metrics, but just adds an additional δ term for the evaluation of split-antecedent references, we only illustrate here the computation of this term. For a step-by-step guide to the computation of the standard version of the metrics, i.e., defined only for single-antecedent references, see (Luo and Pradhan, 2016).

5.1 Computing generalized MUC

As above, we will focus on recall. The key entities K_1, K_2, K_4 and K_5 are only referred to using single-antecedent mentions. This means there is no link to an accommodated set that the response should recover; thus, for these entities, we have $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta_4 = \delta_5 = 0$ for all systems we are considering, A, B, C and D, and the value of the metrics is not affected by our generalization. The other entities in the key, however, do contain split-antecedent references, whose interpretation must be found in the responses and assessed.

We start with the response provided by system A. The accommodated set in entity K_6 cannot be optimally aligned with any accommodated set in R_A ; therefore, a missing link penalty is applied in this case, i.e., $\delta_{A,6} = 1$. In the case of the other two entities in the key containing an accommodated set, K_3 and K_7 , links to an accommodated set are recovered in the response (as the conditions to have a matching regular mention and aligned accommodated sets are satisfied) and need to be evaluated. The accommodated set in $R_{A,3}$, $\{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}\}$, is an example of a system identifying the correct number of antecedents for a split antecedent anaphor, but resolving imperfectly the antecedent entities:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{A,3} &= 1 - \text{MUC}_{\text{Recall}}\left(K_3^s, R_{A,3}^s\right) \\ &= 1 - \text{MUC}_{\text{Recall}}\left(\{K_1, K_2\}, \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}\}\right) \\ &= 1 - \frac{\sum_{K_i \in \{K_1, K_2\}} |K_i| - |\mathcal{P}(K_i; \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}\})|}{\sum_{K_i \in \{K_1, K_2\}} |K_i| - 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \end{aligned}$$

The entities included in the response accommodated set above have a recall of $2/3$. The system is thus missing $1/3$ to be credited a full link to the accommodated set in the key. (Note that the ‘mention’ component of $R_{A,3}$, $R_{A,3}^m$, is also incorrect as it includes an extra mention in comparison with K_3 , but this aspect of the interpretation is not discussed here as it is not affected by our generalization.)

In the case of the accommodated set in K_7 , system A recovers only 2 of the 3 antecedents; the missing link penalty is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{A,7} &= 1 - \text{MUC}_{\text{Recall}}\left(K_7^s, R_6^s\right) \\ &= 1 - \text{MUC}_{\text{Recall}}(\{K_1, K_2, K_4, K_5\}, \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}, R_{A,5}\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Let us now compare the penalty applied to system A with those applied to B, C and D . The relevant δ terms are:

$$\delta_{A,7} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \delta_{B,7} = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \delta_{C,7} = 1, \quad \delta_{C,6} = 1, \quad \delta_{D,7} = \frac{1}{2}$$

We can see that system B receives a smaller penalty compared to system A , which makes sense considering B recovers all 4 entity references. System C is the one most heavily penalised by the scorer. First of all, because the optimal alignment for the accommodated set produced by C is not the one in K_7 , but that in K_6 , it ends up completely missing the accommodated set in K_7 that the other systems get some credit for. Still, when computing the recall with respect to K_6 system C continues to get a full penalty even though the accommodated sets align this time around, but a link cannot be determined because no regular mentions match. Finally, system D gets the same penalty as system A . This is because $R_{A,1}$ and $R_{A,4}$, the entities that are different between the accommodated sets from A and D , both contribute with one link when computing MUC recall. (We will see when discussing the B^3 metric below system A will get a boost in score over system D with this metric.)

5.2 Computing generalized B^3

Again, we focus on computing recall, as precision proceeds in the same way. Let us start with system A . When a key and a response entity contain aligned accommodated sets, we need to credit the system for how well it resolved the key accommodated set. Looking at the mappings specified by the alignment function, this only happens in two cases. The first case involves the accommodated sets from the K_3 and $R_{A,3}$ entities:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{A,3,3} &= B^3_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_3^s, R_{A,3}^s \right) \\ &= B^3_{\text{Recall}} \left(\{K_1, K_2\}, \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}\} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{3} \end{aligned}$$

The second is between the accommodated sets in K_7 and $R_{A,6}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{A,7,6} &= B^3_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s \right) \\ &= B^3_{\text{Recall}} \left(\{K_1, K_2, K_4, K_5\}, \{R_{A,1}, R_{A,2}, R_{A,5}\} \right) \\ &= \frac{8}{15} \end{aligned}$$

In all other cases, i.e., $\forall(i, j) \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 6\} \setminus \{(3, 3), (7, 6)\}$, $\delta_{A,i,j} = 0$. We additionally compare how well system A resolved the split-antecedent references with systems B , C , and D . The relevant δ terms are the following:

$$\delta_{A,7,6} = \frac{8}{15}, \quad \delta_{B,7,6} = \frac{2}{3}, \quad \delta_{C,7,6} = 0, \quad \delta_{C,6,6} = \frac{7}{12}, \quad \delta_{D,7,6} = \frac{7}{15}$$

Among the four systems, system B gets the highest credit for identifying all 4 entity elements of the accommodated set in K_7 . System C gets no credit for that accommodated set due to a different alignment with the accommodated set from entity K_6 . Finally, system D gets a slightly lower score compared with system A which is intuitive since entity $R_{A,1}$ is better resolved compared with $R_{A,4}$.

5.3 Computing CEAF

As with B^3 , it is only when a key and a response entity contain aligned accommodated sets that we need to evaluate how well the two match. Again, we start with the computations for system A . We have seen there is an alignment in two cases, one between the accommodated sets in entities K_3 and R_3 :

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{3,3}^{M/E} &= \text{CEAF}_{\text{Recall}}^{M/E} \left(K_3^s, R_{A,3}^s \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{4}{5} & \text{for mention-based CEAF} \\ \frac{9}{10} & \text{for entity-based CEAF} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

The calculation is done for recall, precision is analogous. The other accommodated set alignment is between those in the K_7 and $R_{A,6}$ entities:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{7,6}^{M/E} &= \text{CEAF}_{\text{Recall}}^{M/E} \left(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{3}{5} & \text{for mention-based CEAF} \\ \frac{7}{10} & \text{for entity-based CEAF} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

All other cases either involve entities without accommodated sets, or whose accommodated sets do not align, so we have $\delta_{i,j}^{M/E} = 0$. We now introduce, for comparison, the relevant δ terms for the other systems:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{A,7,6}^M &= \frac{3}{5}, & \delta_{B,7,6}^M &= \frac{4}{5}, & \delta_{C,7,6}^M &= 0, & \delta_{C,6,6}^M &= \frac{3}{4}, & \delta_{D,7,6}^M &= \frac{3}{5} \\ \delta_{A,7,6}^E &= \frac{7}{10}, & \delta_{B,7,6}^E &= \frac{9}{10}, & \delta_{C,7,6}^E &= 0, & \delta_{C,6,6}^E &= \frac{13}{15}, & \delta_{D,7,6}^E &= \frac{13}{20}\end{aligned}$$

As with the other metrics presented so far system B gets the highest score for identifying all four entities from the split-antecedent reference in K_7 . System C is not allocated any credit for the accommodated set in K_7 , only for the one from K_6 , because of how the split-antecedents get aligned. And system D is found on par with system A when using mention-based CEAF and slightly worse (as it intuitively should) when the evaluation is conducted using entity-based CEAF. This is another illustration of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing metrics for coreference evaluation which our scorer inherit. For the computation of the rest of the metrics, the observations for systems B , C , and D will be similar to those expressed so far, and will be omitted. The computations will focus from now on on system A exclusively just to exemplify the methodology.

5.4 Computing LEA

When computing LEA, for those key and response sets that contain aligned accommodated sets, we need to evaluate how well these accommodated sets compare. For recall, we have:

$$\delta_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \text{LEA}_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_3^s, R_{A,3}^s \right) & \text{for } i = j = 3 \\ \text{LEA}_{\text{Recall}} \left(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s \right) & \text{for } i = 7, j = 6 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

When computing precision, LEA precision is used instead to evaluate accommodated sets.

5.5 Computing BLANC

For this metric we need to determine how the coreference and the non-coreference links in the key and response entities compare. The link space is large, but let us look, for example, at $N_K(3, 7)$ and $N_R(3, 6)$, the sets of non-coreference links between keys K_3 and K_7 , and response entities $R_{A,3}$ and $R_{A,6}$, respectively. Starting with the former, we have:¹⁰

$$N_K(3, 7) = \left\{ (K_3^s, K_7^s), (K_3^s, 15), (6, K_7^s), (6, 15), (7, K_7^s), (7, 15), (10, K_7^s), (10, 15) \right\}$$

The non-coreference links between the response entities $R_{A,3}$ and $R_{A,6}$ are:

$$N_R(3, 6) = \left\{ (R_{A,3}^s, R_{A,6}^s), (R_{A,3}^s, 15), (6, R_{A,6}^s), \right. \\ \left. (6, 15), (7, R_{A,6}^s), (7, 15), (10, R_{A,6}^s), (10, 15), (12, R_{A,6}^s), (12, 15) \right\}$$

Let us now consider how matching links are determined in a recall-based evaluation. Two links, one from the key, and the other from the response, whose nodes are regular mentions, get full credit if their mentions match. In our example that happens in 3 cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\left((6, 15), (6, 15)\right) &= 1 \\ \delta\left((7, 15), (7, 15)\right) &= 1 \\ \delta\left((10, 15), (10, 15)\right) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Two links, where one of the nodes is a regular mention, and the other an accommodated set, are given credit if the regular mentions match and the accommodated sets are aligned. The allocated credit depends on how well the accommodated sets evaluate:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\left((K_3^s, 15), (R_{A,3}^s, 15)\right) &= \text{BLANC}_{R_N}(K_3^s, R_{A,3}^s) \\ \delta\left((6, K_7^s), (6, R_{A,6}^s)\right) &= \text{BLANC}_{R_N}(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s) \\ \delta\left((7, K_7^s), (7, R_{A,6}^s)\right) &= \text{BLANC}_{R_N}(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s) \\ \delta\left((10, K_7^s), (10, R_{A,6}^s)\right) &= \text{BLANC}_{R_N}(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s) \end{aligned}$$

Two links both of whose nodes are accommodated sets receive credit if the accommodated sets are aligned, and the score depends on how well the response evaluates against the key:

$$\delta\left((K_3^s, K_7^s), (R_{A,3}^s, R_{A,6}^s)\right) = \text{BLANC}_{R_N}\left(K_3^s, R_{A,3}^s\right) \times \text{BLANC}_{R_N}\left(K_7^s, R_{A,6}^s\right)$$

There is no alignment for all other key and response links, so no credit can be allocated in these cases, and $\delta = 0$. Finally, notice we used R_N to compare the entities included in the accommodated sets, as the computations above were used to determine the credit allocated to non-coreference links in a recall-based evaluation. Computing the credit for the coreference links involves the same steps, but using R_C instead. And when turning to precision, P_N and P_C , the precision related metrics from BLANC are used.

10. We shall use the id of the mentions, single or split-antecedent, for a more concise representation.

6. The alternatives

There is limited previous work on split-antecedent anaphora resolution and its evaluation. We are aware of four proposals, two of which advanced by ourselves in previous work.

Vala et al. (2016) and Yu et al. (2020a) only evaluate their models on split-antecedent anaphors (gold mentions only), and compute precision, recall, and F1 measures based on the links between split-antecedent anaphors and their antecedent. Because they only evaluate on gold split-antecedents, their evaluation method does not require any form of alignment or worry about both single and multiple antecedents.

Zhou and Choi (2018) propose a method to evaluate split-antecedent resolution using the standard CONLL scorer. This is done by adding the plural mention to each of the clusters for its atomic elements: for example, they represent the $\{\{John, Mary\}, They\}$ entity as two gold clusters— $\{John, They\}$ and $\{Mary, They\}$. This representation however violates the fundamental assumption behind the notion of coreference chain—that all mentions in the chain refer to the same entity. In order to compare our approach to evaluation with theirs, in the next Section we test our state-of-the-art coreference resolver interpreting both single and split antecedent anaphora on the same corpus used in their paper.

Finally, Yu et al. (2021) proposed an extension of the LEA metric that can also score split-antecedent references. The first advantage of the current proposal over our earlier proposal is that the extension proposed in this paper covers *all* existing metrics for coreference, thus does not require changing the current evaluation paradigm—the same metrics score both single and split-antecedent entities. Secondly, (Yu et al., 2021) compare split-antecedents not by evaluating the entities they refer to as done here, but merely the mentions of these entities. In terms of the notation introduced in Section 4.1, the difference is as follows. Let K_i^{sm} be the set of mentions of the plural entity K_i^s , i.e., the mentions that are explicitly annotated for specifying K_i^s in the text. The first difference between their approach and ours lies in the alignment step: a gold split-antecedent K_i^s has a matching response split-antecedent R_j^s , i.e., $\tau(K_i^s) = R_j^s$, if this is the split-antecedent in the system entities that has the largest number of mentions in common with K_i^s , i.e., $R_j^{sm} = \operatorname{argmax}_{R_{j^*}^{sm}} |K_i^{sm} \cap R_{j^*}^{sm}|$. Following our presentation of LEA in Section 4.3.4, the aligned-split antecedents, when evaluating recall, are assessed based on the recall of their mentions:

$$\delta_{i,j} = \frac{|K_i^{sm} \cap R_j^{sm}|}{|K_i^{sm}|}$$

As with our extension, no credit is given for those split-antecedents which are not aligned. In addition to the alignment step above, the method by Yu et al. also needs a pre-alignment step on the regular entities using the CEAF score, which is not required here. The pre-alignment step is deterministic and impose a hard alignment between key and response clusters, and the later scoring step does *not* take into account how good the alignments are. This is problematic as the hard one-to-one constraint is not robust to align multiple equivalent response clusters. Consider the following example. Suppose we have the following key entities:

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \{John_1, John_2, him_5, he_2\} \\ K_2 &= \{Mary_2, her_3, She_4\} \\ K_3 &= \{K_1, K_2\} \oplus \{they_7\} \end{aligned}$$

And we have the response:

$$R_1 = \{\text{John}_1, \text{him}_5\}$$

$$R_2 = \{\text{John}_2, \text{he}_2\}$$

$$R_3 = \{\text{Mary}_2, \text{her}_3, \text{She}_4\}$$

$$R_4 = \{R_1, R_3\} \oplus \{\text{they}_7\}$$

$$R'_4 = \{R_2, R_3\} \oplus \{\text{they}_7\}$$

For R_4 we have two system predictions (R_4 and R'_4), which in theory should be equivalent since they both get the half of the K_1 and all of K_2 . However, because the pre-alignment step requires a hard alignment, either R_1 or R_2 will be aligned with K_1 . Suppose R_1 is aligned with K_1 ; the Yu et al.’s scorer will then give a score of 100% to $\{R_1, R_3\}$ but 50% to $\{R_2, R_3\}$. By contrast, the new scorer proposed in this paper will correctly assign the same scores to both interpretations.

In order to compare our new approach to evaluation to the one proposed by Yu et al. (2021), in the next Section we use our metrics to score the same system tested by Yu et al on the same corpus.

7. Using the Metrics for Scoring Generalized Anaphoric Reference

Because no generalizations of the existing coreference metrics to cover split-antecedent anaphoric reference was previously proposed, it is not possible to compare our generalization to others. However, it is possible to show that, unlike the existing and partial solutions discussed in the previous Section, the proposed metrics can be used to compare anaphoric resolvers in exactly the same way as done using the existing coreference metrics.

In this Section, our extended metrics were incorporated in the new Universal Anaphora scorer, a new scorer for anaphora that can also score split antecedent anaphora resolution (as well as non-referring mentions identification, bridging reference resolution and discourse deixis resolution) (Yu et al., 2022), and this scorer was then used to score the performance of the state of the art system able to carry out split-antecedent anaphora resolution on real data, and to compare it with simpler baselines, both on the corpus used by Yu et al. (2021) and on the corpus used by Zhou and Choi (2018).

7.1 The models being compared

In order to evaluate the generalized coreference metrics on a real system output, we obtained the best-performing output and all the baselines from the system by Yu et al. (2021), the only modern system that can process both single- and split-antecedent anaphors, and ran our scorer on all six predictions. Yu et al.’s model is an extension of the system proposed by Yu et al. (2020b) which further interprets split-antecedents. The model shares most of the network architecture with (Yu et al., 2020b), but in addition, it includes a dedicated feed-forward network for split-antecedents. The baselines are based on heuristic rules or random selection. The same candidate split-antecedent anaphors/singular clusters are used in the baselines as in the best model from Yu et al. (2021). Then these baselines attempt to interpret the mentions belonging to a small list of plural pronoun which could be interpreted as split antecedent anaphor (e.g., *they*, *their*, *them*, *we*) but were classified as discourse-new by the single-antecedent anaphoric resolver, and attempt to resolve them as split-antecedent anaphors. The **random** baseline randomly assigns two to five antecedents to these candidate split antecedent anaphors. After that, the **recent-x** baseline uses the x closest singular

| | MUC | | | B^3 | | | CEAF ^E | | | CoNLL |
|------------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|-------|
| | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | F1 |
| Recent 2 | 76.6 | 77.3 | 76.9 | 78.8 | 76.1 | 77.5 | 78.0 | 74.3 | 76.1 | 76.8 |
| Recent 3 | 76.7 | 77.3 | 77.0 | 78.9 | 76.2 | 77.5 | 78.0 | 74.4 | 76.1 | 76.9 |
| Recent 4 | 76.8 | 77.3 | 77.0 | 79.0 | 76.2 | 77.5 | 78.0 | 74.4 | 76.1 | 76.9 |
| Recent 5 | 76.7 | 77.3 | 77.0 | 79.0 | 76.2 | 77.5 | 78.0 | 74.3 | 76.1 | 76.9 |
| Random | 76.5 | 77.1 | 76.8 | 78.8 | 76.0 | 77.4 | 77.9 | 74.2 | 76.0 | 76.7 |
| Single Ant | 76.3 | 78.4 | 77.4 | 78.7 | 76.9 | 77.8 | 78.0 | 74.4 | 76.2 | 77.1 |
| Best Model | 77.1 | 77.9 | 77.5 | 79.1 | 76.5 | 77.8 | 78.1 | 74.5 | 76.3 | 77.2 |
| Oracle | 77.6 | 78.4 | 78.0 | 79.5 | 76.8 | 78.1 | 78.3 | 74.6 | 76.4 | 77.5 |

(a) MUC, B^3 , CEAF^E and CONLL F1.

| | CEAF ^M | | | BLANC | | | LEA ($\beta=1$) | | | LEA($\beta=10$) | | |
|------------|-------------------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|
| | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 |
| Recent 2 | 77.2 | 75.4 | 76.3 | 75.3 | 71.5 | 73.4 | 70.3 | 66.9 | 68.6 | 59.7 | 61.2 | 60.5 |
| Recent 3 | 77.3 | 75.4 | 76.3 | 75.3 | 71.5 | 73.4 | 70.4 | 66.9 | 68.6 | 60.3 | 61.3 | 60.8 |
| Recent 4 | 77.3 | 75.4 | 76.3 | 75.3 | 71.6 | 73.4 | 70.4 | 66.9 | 68.6 | 60.7 | 61.5 | 61.1 |
| Recent 5 | 77.3 | 75.4 | 76.3 | 75.3 | 71.6 | 73.4 | 70.4 | 66.9 | 68.6 | 60.7 | 61.1 | 60.9 |
| Random | 77.2 | 75.3 | 76.2 | 75.3 | 71.5 | 73.3 | 70.3 | 66.7 | 68.4 | 59.3 | 59.9 | 59.6 |
| Single Ant | 77.2 | 75.8 | 76.5 | 75.2 | 72.3 | 73.7 | 70.3 | 67.4 | 68.8 | 59.0 | 67.4 | 62.9 |
| Best Model | 77.4 | 75.7 | 76.6 | 75.5 | 71.9 | 73.6 | 70.7 | 67.2 | 68.9 | 62.8 | 64.7 | 63.7 |
| Oracle | 77.8 | 75.9 | 76.8 | 75.9 | 72.1 | 74.0 | 71.2 | 67.6 | 69.4 | 65.9 | 68.4 | 67.1 |

(b) CEAF^M, BLANC and LEA with different split-antecedent importance (β).

Table 1: Evaluation of Yu et al. (2021)’s model and of the baselines on ARRAU using the new Universal Anaphora scorer.

clusters as antecedents to each chosen anaphor. In addition, we also include scores for the system only resolving single antecedent anaphors (Single Ant) and system augmented with the gold split-antecedent anaphors (Oracle)¹¹.

7.2 Evaluation on ARRAU

Table 1 shows the overall scores (single and split-antecedent anaphors) on ARRAU evaluated using the new scorer.¹² The general direction of the results doesn’t change from those reported in Yu et al. (2021) (see below). What changes is that whereas in Yu et al. (2021) the system’s performance on split antecedents could only be evaluated using a single, *ad-hoc* metric (see, e.g., Tables 3 and 5 in

11. For oracle setting we allow the system to use the gold split-antecedent anaphors annotations when possible. Please note the system still constrained by the quality of singular clusters. This simulates a better system on resolving the split-antecedent anaphors.

12. Following Yu et al. (2021), we only report scores for documents in which at least one split-antecedent anaphor is annotated.

| | MUC | B ³ | CEAF ^E | CEAF ^M | BLANC | LEA | CoNLL |
|------------|------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Recent 2 | 25.6 | 22.2 | 15.9 | 23.6 | 15.8 | 21.9 | 21.2 |
| Recent 3 | 27.1 | 24.2 | 20.8 | 26.3 | 18.2 | 23.5 | 24.0 |
| Recent 4 | 28.0 | 25.2 | 21.0 | 27.5 | 17.5 | 24.4 | 24.7 |
| Recent 5 | 26.6 | 23.6 | 19.0 | 26.0 | 15.9 | 22.9 | 23.1 |
| Random | 19.6 | 15.3 | 7.9 | 16.8 | 11.4 | 14.8 | 14.3 |
| Best Model | 35.8 | 31.9 | 37.0 | 32.8 | 18.2 | 30.9 | 34.9 |
| Oracle | 70.1 | 63.7 | 62.9 | 68.1 | 68.6 | 61.4 | 65.6 |

Table 2: Split-antecedent F1 scores only for Yu et al.’s systems on ARRAU evaluated using our extension of the coreference scorers.

that paper), thanks to the extension proposed in this paper it is now possible to score both single-antecedent and split-antecedent anaphors using the same metrics.

The results with all the metrics confirm the results obtained by Yu et al with their specialized metric. First of all, as already observed by Yu et al. (2021), the difference between the baselines and the best model is small when single- and split-antecedent anaphors are evaluated together, because the number of split-antecedents is low (only 0.8% of the clusters containing split-antecedents). Secondly, the difference becomes very clear when considering the performance on split antecedents only (see Table 2): up to 20 percentage points in CONLL score. The Oracle setting has again much better split-antecedent F1 scores, and this results a considerable improvements on all the scores when evaluated with singular clusters. Confirming our hypothesis on the need for partial credit on split-antecedents, we find that only 16% of the split-antecedents were fully resolved by the best model. The vast majority of the split-antecedents that were partially resolved rely on the partial credit to get a fair assessment.

7.3 Evaluation on FRIENDS

In order to compare our metrics in practice with the evaluation approach proposed by Zhou and Choi (2018), we further tested our extended metrics on the FRIENDS corpus used in (Zhou and Choi, 2018), which contains a larger percentage of split-antecedent anaphors. We follow Zhou and Choi (2018) in using episodes 1 - 19 for training, 20, 21 for development and 22, 23 for testing. The original corpus is annotated for entity-linking, so the coreference clusters are created by grouping the mentions that refer to the same entity (character in the show). 14.5% of those clusters contain split-antecedents. In the original annotation, split-antecedent anaphors represent 9% of all mentions; however, this is because in the original version of the FRIENDS corpus all subsequent mentions of a set accommodated using a split-antecedent anaphor are also marked as split-antecedents instead of being coreferent with the first mention. (E.g. in our illustrative example, *they*₇ and *The two*₁₀ are treated as single-antecedent by linking them to *their*₆, whereas in the FRIENDS corpus would be annotated as split-antecedent as well.) We transformed all of these cases into single-antecedent anaphors; after this transformation, 4.1% of the mentions remain split-antecedent anaphors.

| | MUC | | | B^3 | | | CEAF ^E | | | CoNLL |
|------------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|-------|
| | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | F1 |
| Recent 2 | 80.0 | 80.4 | 80.2 | 71.0 | 72.0 | 71.5 | 59.1 | 61.7 | 60.4 | 70.7 |
| Recent 3 | 80.0 | 80.6 | 80.3 | 71.1 | 72.1 | 71.6 | 59.3 | 61.6 | 60.4 | 70.8 |
| Recent 4 | 80.1 | 81.0 | 80.6 | 71.1 | 72.5 | 71.8 | 59.9 | 61.9 | 60.9 | 71.1 |
| Recent 5 | 79.6 | 81.3 | 80.4 | 70.6 | 72.9 | 71.7 | 60.2 | 61.8 | 61.0 | 71.1 |
| Random | 79.8 | 79.9 | 79.9 | 71.0 | 71.4 | 71.2 | 60.6 | 61.3 | 61.0 | 70.7 |
| Single Ant | 77.9 | 85.0 | 81.3 | 69.1 | 77.0 | 72.8 | 64.0 | 63.0 | 63.5 | 72.6 |
| Best Model | 80.7 | 82.2 | 81.4 | 71.7 | 73.5 | 72.6 | 63.6 | 64.8 | 64.2 | 72.7 |
| Oracle | 81.5 | 83.9 | 82.7 | 72.5 | 75.3 | 73.9 | 66.5 | 65.3 | 65.9 | 74.2 |

(a) MUC, B^3 , CEAF^E and CoNLL F1.

| | CEAF ^M | | | BLANC | | | LEA ($\beta=1$) | | | LEA($\beta=10$) | | |
|------------|-------------------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|
| | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 | R | P | F1 |
| Recent 2 | 70.8 | 71.8 | 71.3 | 73.1 | 75.9 | 74.5 | 60.9 | 62.0 | 61.4 | 43.1 | 42.8 | 42.9 |
| Recent 3 | 70.8 | 71.9 | 71.3 | 73.3 | 76.2 | 74.7 | 61.1 | 62.0 | 61.5 | 43.4 | 42.6 | 43.0 |
| Recent 4 | 70.8 | 72.2 | 71.5 | 73.3 | 76.5 | 74.9 | 61.3 | 62.3 | 61.8 | 43.5 | 43.8 | 43.7 |
| Recent 5 | 70.5 | 72.3 | 71.4 | 73.2 | 76.9 | 75.0 | 60.9 | 62.5 | 61.7 | 40.9 | 43.9 | 42.3 |
| Random | 71.1 | 71.5 | 71.3 | 73.5 | 75.7 | 74.6 | 60.8 | 61.1 | 61.0 | 42.5 | 39.8 | 41.1 |
| Single Ant | 70.4 | 74.7 | 72.5 | 72.4 | 80.1 | 76.0 | 60.5 | 65.5 | 62.9 | 34.8 | 65.5 | 45.5 |
| Best Model | 72.0 | 73.3 | 72.6 | 73.6 | 76.8 | 75.2 | 63.0 | 64.2 | 63.6 | 47.6 | 50.5 | 49.0 |
| Oracle | 73.0 | 74.1 | 73.6 | 74.6 | 78.1 | 76.3 | 64.6 | 66.2 | 65.4 | 53.4 | 61.2 | 57.1 |

(b) CEAF^M, BLANC and LEA with different split-antecedent importance (β).

Table 3: Evaluation of Yu et al. (2021)’s model and of the baselines on the Friends Corpus using the new Universal Anaphora scorer.

To obtain the system predictions, we trained the Yu et al. (2021) system on the FRIENDS corpus and computed all the baselines in the same way as for the ARRAU corpus¹³. As shown in Table 3, the best model outperforms the baselines by a large margin according to all the metrics even though the performance improvements on split-antecedent anaphors (see Table 4) are smaller than those we observed with the ARRAU evaluation. This was expected, as the FRIENDS corpus contains many more split-antecedent anaphors. When comparing the best model with the single-antecedent only system (Single Ant), the best model has a better recall but a lower precision, overall having similar F1 scores for most of the matrices. This is because system performance on the split-antecedent part is not good enough to make a clear difference. With the oracle setting, however, the better performance on split-antecedent anaphors contributed to a robust improvement on overall performance on both single- and split-antecedent anaphors. This indicates a better split-antecedent anaphora resolver is needed to achieve a significant improvement when compared with systems that only resolve single-antecedent anaphors. If split-antecedent anaphors are the main focus of the evalua-

13. We contacted the authors of Zhou and Choi (2018) to obtain their system’s outputs but did not get a reply.

| | MUC | B ³ | CEAF ^E | CEAF ^M | BLANC | LEA | CoNLL |
|------------|------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Recent 2 | 43.4 | 37.5 | 30.9 | 42.7 | 28.3 | 36.1 | 37.3 |
| Recent 3 | 45.1 | 38.9 | 32.0 | 43.8 | 30.7 | 37.3 | 38.6 |
| Recent 4 | 44.0 | 37.7 | 31.2 | 42.7 | 30.2 | 36.0 | 37.6 |
| Recent 5 | 42.8 | 36.3 | 28.5 | 41.4 | 30.6 | 34.5 | 35.9 |
| Random | 43.5 | 36.9 | 34.2 | 42.2 | 31.1 | 35.3 | 38.2 |
| Best Model | 52.3 | 44.9 | 43.3 | 50.8 | 37.8 | 43.3 | 46.8 |
| Oracle | 65.5 | 57.1 | 65.6 | 65.1 | 50.9 | 54.8 | 62.7 |

Table 4: Split-antecedent F1 scores only for Yu et al.’s systems evaluated on the FRIENDS corpus using our generalization of the coreference scorers.

tion, one can use the split-antecedent F1 scores or the LEA metric with appropriate split-antecedent importance (e.g. $\beta = 10$) to prioritise split-antecedent anaphors.

8. Scoring other types of split-antecedent anaphora and of anaphora involving accommodation

As discussed in the Introduction and in Section 2, split-antecedent plurals are just one example of anaphoric reference referring to an entity which wasn’t previously mentioned, thus requiring accommodation of a new antecedent (Beaver and Zeevat, 2007; van der Sandt, 1992). In all of these cases, the new entity is composed of a part constructed out of the pre-existing discourse model, together with a ‘coreference chain’ part—i.e., the structure proposed here for split antecedent plurals:

$$K_i = K_i^o \oplus K_i^m$$

The difference is the relation linking the new entity to existing entities in the context. For split antecedents, this relation is set membership: the new set is the set of the entities mentioned by the split antecedents. This type of accommodation is required not just for plurals, but for discourse deixis as well. In the case of bridging references, the relation is associative, not coreference. In the case of context change accommodation, the new entity is typically the result of an action carried out over the entities in the context. So, the proposed notation could potentially also serve as the basis for extensions covering these cases.

Split-antecedent discourse deixis Another example mentioned in Section 2 of anaphoric reference possibly involving split-antecedents is discourse deixis (Webber, 1991; Kolhatkar et al., 2018), illustrated by (1). The Universal Anaphora scorer evaluates discourse deixis exactly in the same way as other types of coreference, the only difference being that the first mention(s) in the chain are utterances rather than nominal phrases. The extension proposed in this paper can then be immediately used for the cases of split-antecedent discourse deixis such as (1).

Bridging references In the case of split-antecedent anaphora, what is accommodated is a new set composed of already introduced entities. In the cases of bridging references, as in (8), we use the

notation $[The\ door]_j^{poss(i)}$ to indicate that the door is a new object, but is related to entity i , the house, by a part-of relation.

(13) John walked towards $[the\ house]_i$. $[The\ door]_j^{poss(i)}$ was open.

It's not clear however whether such an extension is needed for bridging references, as the evaluation metric proposed by Hou et al. (2018) and used both in the 2018 CRAC Shared Task and in the 2021 CODI/CRAC shared task (and implemented in the UA scorer) (Khosla et al., 2021) appears adequate.

Context change accomodation A more complex case of anaphoric reference involving accomodation are the cases of **context change accommodation** discussed by Webber and Baldwin (1992), where a new entity, the dough, is obtained by mixing together flour and water.

(14) Add $[the\ water]_i$ to $[the\ flour]_j$ little by little.
Then work $[the\ dough]_k^{i+j}$

As far as we are aware context change accommodation is not annotated in any existing dataset and there is no evaluation method, so developing an approach based on the proposal in this paper would appear to fill a gap in the literature, but such an approach cannot at present be tested.

9. Conclusion

In order to push forward the state of the art in anaphora resolution beyond the simplest form of identity anaphora it is not sufficient to create suitable datasets annotated with the more general cases of anaphora, although that is an important effort. It is also necessary to develop methods for evaluating the performance of anaphoric resolvers on these cases. In this paper we proposed a method for evaluating one of these more general cases—the case of anaphoric reference to entities that need introducing in a discourse model via accomodation, exemplified by split-antecedent anaphors but including other cases as well, such as discourse deixis—that is a straightforward extension of existing proposals for coreference evaluation and thus does not require introducing additional metrics, an issue in a field already over-rich with proposals in this direction.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the DALI project, ERC Grant 695662.

References

- Ron Artstein and Massimo Poesio. Identifying reference to abstract objects in dialogue. In D. Schlangen and R. Fernandez, editors, *Proc. of BRANDIAL*, Potsdam, September 2006.
- Nicholas Asher. *Reference to Abstract Objects in English*. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1993.
- Amit Bagga and Breck Baldwin. Algorithms for scoring coreference chains. In *The First International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC) - Workshop on linguistics coreference*, volume 1, pages 563–566. ACL, 1998.
- David Beaver and Henk Zeevat. Accommodation. In G. Ramchand and C. Reiss, editors, *The Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, pages 503–536. Oxford, 2007.

- Donna Byron. Resolving pronominal references to abstract entities. In *Proc. of the ACL*, pages 80–87, 2002.
- Nancy A. Chinchor and Beth Sundheim. Message Understanding Conference (MUC) tests of discourse processing. In *Proc. AAAI Spring Symposium on Empirical Methods in Discourse Interpretation and Generation*, pages 21–26, Stanford, 1995.
- Herbert H. Clark. Bridging. In *Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing*, 1975.
- Kevin Clark and Christopher D. Manning. Improving coreference resolution by learning entity-level distributed representations. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 643–653, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P16-1061. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-1061>.
- Carola Eschenbach, Christopher Habel, Michael Herweg, and Klaus Rehkämper. Remarks on plural anaphora. In *Proceedings of the fourth conference on European chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 161–167. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1989.
- Alan Garnham. *Mental models and the interpretation of anaphora*. Psychology Press, 2001.
- Jeanette K. Gundel, Michael Hegarty, and Kaja Borthen. Cognitive status, information structure, and pronominal reference to clausally introduced entities. *Journal of Logic Language and Information*, 12(3):281–299, 2003.
- Yufang Hou. Bridging anaphora resolution as question answering. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1428–1438, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.132. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.acl-main.132>.
- Yufang Hou, Katja Markert, and Michael Strube. Unrestricted bridging resolution. *Computational Linguistics*, 44(2):237–284, 2018.
- Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Yinhan Liu, Daniel S. Weld, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. SpanBERT: Improving pre-training by representing and predicting spans. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:64–77, 2020. doi: 10.1162/tacl_-a_00300.
- Hans Kamp and Uwe Reyle. *From Discourse to Logic*. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1993.
- Ben Kantor and Amir Globerson. Coreference resolution with entity equalization. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 673–677, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1066. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P19-1066>.
- Sopan Khosla, Juntao Yu, Ramesh Manuvinakurike, Vincent Ng, Massimo Poesio, Michael Strube, and Carolyn Rose. The CODI-CRAC 2021 shared task on anaphora, bridging, and discourse deixis in dialogue. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Computational Models of Reference, Anaphora and Coreference*, 2021.

- Varada Kolhatkar, Heike Zinsmeister, and Graeme Hirst. Interpreting anaphoric shell nouns using antecedents of cataphoric shell nouns as training data. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, Seattle, 2013. URL <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D13-1030>.
- Varada Kolhatkar, Adam Roussel, Stefanie Dipper, and Heike Zinsmeister. Anaphora with non-nominal antecedents in computational linguistics: a Survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 44(3):547–612, 2018. doi: 10.1162/coli_a-00327. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/J18-3007>.
- Harold W Kuhn. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97, 1955.
- Kenton Lee, Luheng He, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. End-to-end neural coreference resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 188–197, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D17-1018. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D17-1018>.
- Kenton Lee, Luheng He, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Higher-order coreference resolution with coarse-to-fine inference. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 687–692, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N18-2108. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N18-2108>.
- David K. Lewis. Scorekeeping in a language game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 8:339–359, 1979.
- Quan Liu, Hui Jiang, Andrew Evdokimov, Zhen-Hua Ling, Xiaodan Zhu, Si Wei, and Yu Hu. Cause-effect knowledge acquisition and neural association model for solving a set of winograd schema problems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, pages 2344–2350, 2017. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2017/326. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/326>.
- Xiaoqiang Luo. On coreference resolution performance metrics. In *Proceedings of Human Language Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 25–32, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, October 2005. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/H05-1004>.
- Xiaoqiang Luo and Sameer Pradhan. Evaluation metrics. In Massimo Poesio, Roland Stuckardt, and Yannick Versley, editors, *Anaphora Resolution: Algorithms, Resources and Applications*, pages 147–170. Springer, 2016.
- Xiaoqiang Luo, Sameer Pradhan, Marta Recasens, and Eduard Hovy. An extension of BLANC to system mentions. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 24–29, Baltimore, Maryland, June 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/P14-2005. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P14-2005>.

John Lyons. *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Ana Marasović, Leo Born, Juri Opitz, and Anette Frank. A mention-ranking model for abstract anaphora resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 221–232, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D17-1021. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D17-1021>.

Nafise Sadat Moosavi and Michael Strube. Which coreference evaluation metric do you trust? a proposal for a link-based entity aware metric. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 632–642, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P16-1060. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-1060>.

James Munkres. Algorithms for the assignment and transportation problems. *Journal of the society for industrial and applied mathematics*, 5(1):32–38, 1957.

Anna Nedoluzhko. Generic noun phrases and annotation of coreference and bridging relations in the prague dependency treebank. In *Proc. of LAW*, pages 103–111, 2013.

Anna Nedoluzhko, Michal Novák, Martin Popel, Zdeněk Žabokrtský, and Daniel Zeman. Coreference in universal dependencies 0.1 (CorefUD 0.1), 2021. URL <http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-3510>. LINDAT/CLARIAH-CZ digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University.

Massimo Poesio and Ron Artstein. Anaphoric annotation in the ARRAU corpus. In *Proc. of LREC*, Marrakesh, May 2008. URL <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/L08-1091>.

Massimo Poesio, Sameer Pradhan, Marta Recasens, Kepa Rodriguez, and Yannick Versley. Annotated corpora and annotation tools. In M. Poesio, R. Stuckardt, and Y. Versley, editors, *Anaphora Resolution: Algorithms, Resources and Applications*, chapter 4. Springer, 2016a.

Massimo Poesio, Roland Stuckardt, and Yannick Versley, editors. *Anaphora Resolution*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016b. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-47909-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-662-47909-4>.

Massimo Poesio, Yulia Grishina, Varada Kolhatkar, Nafise Moosavi, Ina Roesiger, Adam Rousel, Fabian Simonjetz, Alexandra Uma, Olga Uryupina, Juntao Yu, and Heike Zinsmeister. Anaphora resolution with the ARRAU corpus. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Computational Models of Reference, Anaphora and Coreference*, pages 11–22, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W18-0702. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W18-0702>.

Massimo Poesio, Jon Chamberlain, Silviu Paun, Juntao Yu, Alexandra Uma, and Udo Kruschwitz. A crowdsourced corpus of multiple judgments and disagreement on anaphoric interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages

- 1778–1789, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1176. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1176>.
- Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue, Olga Uryupina, and Yuchen Zhang. CoNLL-2012 shared task: Modeling multilingual unrestricted coreference in OntoNotes. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2012)*, Jeju, Korea, 2012.
- Sameer Pradhan, Xiaoqiang Luo, Marta Recasens, Eduard Hovy, Vincent Ng, and Michael Strube. Scoring coreference partitions of predicted mentions: A reference implementation. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 30–35, Baltimore, Maryland, June 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/P14-2006. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P14-2006>.
- Altaf Rahman and Vincent Ng. Resolving complex cases of definite pronouns: The Winograd schema challenge. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 777–789, Jeju Island, Korea, July 2012. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D12-1071>.
- Marta Recasens and Ed Hovy. Blanc: Implementing the rand index for coreference evaluation. *Nat. Lang. Eng.*, 17(4):485–510, October 2011. ISSN 1351-3249. doi: 10.1017/S135132491000029X. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S135132491000029X>.
- Marta Recasens and M. Antònia Martí. AnCora-CO: Coreferentially annotated corpora for Spanish and Catalan. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 44(4):315–345, 2010.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34:8732–8740, Apr. 2020. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v34i05.6399. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/6399>.
- Olga Uryupina, Ron Artstein, Antonella Bristot, Federica Cavicchio, Francesca Delogu, Kepa J. Rodriguez, and Massimo Poesio. Annotating a broad range of anaphoric phenomena, in a variety of genres: the ARRAU corpus. *Journal of Natural Language Engineering*, 2020.
- Hardik Vala, Andrew Piper, and Derek Ruths. The more antecedents, the merrier: Resolving multi-antecedent anaphors. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2287–2296, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P16-1216. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-1216>.
- Kees van Deemter and Rodger Kibble. On coreferring: Coreference in MUC and related annotation schemes. *Computational Linguistics*, 26(4):629–637, 2000. Squib.
- Rob A. van der Sandt. Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of Semantics*, 9(4):333–377, 1992.

- Yannick Versley. Vagueness and referential ambiguity in a large-scale annotated corpus. *Research on Language and Computation*, 6:333–353, 2008.
- Marc Vilain, John Burger, John Aberdeen, Dennis Connolly, and Lynette Hirschman. A model-theoretic coreference scoring scheme. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Message Understanding Conference (MUC-6)*, 1995. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/M95-1005>.
- Bonnie L. Webber. *A Formal Approach to Discourse Anaphora*. Garland, New York, 1979.
- Bonnie L. Webber. Structure and ostension in the interpretation of discourse deixis. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 6(2):107–135, 1991.
- Bonnie Lynn Webber and Breck Baldwin. Accomodating context change. In *Proc. of the ACL*, pages 96–103, 1992.
- Kellie Webster, Marta Recasens, Vera Axelrod, and Jason Baldrige. Mind the GAP: A balanced corpus of gendered ambiguous pronouns. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:605–617, 2018. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00240. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/Q18-1042>.
- Sam Wiseman, Alexander M. Rush, and Stuart M. Shieber. Learning global features for coreference resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 994–1004, San Diego, California, June 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N16-1114. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N16-1114>.
- Juntao Yu and Massimo Poesio. Multitask learning based neural bridging reference resolution. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3534–3546, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.315. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.coling-main.315>.
- Juntao Yu, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, Silviu Paun, and Massimo Poesio. Free the plural: Unrestricted split-antecedent anaphora resolution. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6113–6125, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020a. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.538. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.coling-main.538>.
- Juntao Yu, Alexandra Uma, and Massimo Poesio. A cluster ranking model for full anaphora resolution. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 11–20, Marseille, France, May 2020b. European Language Resources Association. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.lrec-1.2>.
- Juntao Yu, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, Silviu Paun, and Massimo Poesio. Stay together: A system for single and split-antecedent anaphora resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.05320>.

Juntao Yu, Nafise Moosavi, Silviu Paun, Sopan Khosla, Sameer Pradhan, and Massimo Poesio. The universal anaphora scorer 1.0. In *Proceedings of LREC, 2022*. In preparation.

Amir Zeldes. The GUM corpus: Creating multilayer resources in the classroom. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 51(3):581–612, 2017. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10579-016-9343-x>.

Amir Zeldes. Can we fix the scope for coreference? *Dialogue and Discourse*, 13(1):41–62, 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5210/dad.2022.102>. URL <https://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/dad/article/view/11706>.

Ethan Zhou and Jinho D. Choi. They exist! introducing plural mentions to coreference resolution and entity linking. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 24–34, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA, August 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/C18-1003>.