

EDM3: Event Detection as Multi-task Text Generation

Ujjwala Anantheswaran* Himanshu Gupta Mihir Parmar
Kuntal Kumar Pal Chitta Baral
Arizona State University

{uananthe, hgupta35, mparmar3, kkpal, chitta}@asu.edu

Abstract

Event detection refers to identifying event occurrences in a text and comprises of two subtasks; event identification and classification. We present EDM3, a novel approach for Event Detection that formulates three generative tasks: identification, classification, and combined detection. We show that EDM3 helps to learn transferable knowledge that can be leveraged to perform Event Detection and its subtasks concurrently, mitigating the error propagation inherent in pipelined approaches. Unlike previous dataset- or domain-specific approaches, EDM3 utilizes the existing knowledge of language models, allowing it to be trained over any classification schema. We evaluate EDM3 on multiple event detection datasets: RAMS, WikiEvents, MAVEN, and MLEE, showing that EDM3 outperforms 1) single-task performance by 8.4% on average and 2) multi-task performance without instructional prompts by 2.4% on average. We obtain SOTA results on RAMS (71.3% vs. 65.1% F-1) and competitive performance on other datasets. We analyze our approach to demonstrate its efficacy in low-resource and multi-sentence settings. We also show the effectiveness of this approach on non-standard event configurations such as multi-word and multi-class event triggers. Overall, our results show that EDM3 is a promising approach for Event Detection that has the potential for real-world applications¹.

1 Introduction

Event Detection (ED) is a fundamental task in natural language processing that involves identifying the occurrence and intent of an event from unstructured text, by recognizing its *event triggers* and assigning it to an appropriate *event type*. The event type is defined by a schema that characterizes the event’s nature and specifies the scope of

roles involved in understanding the event. ED has a wide range of applications in various downstream tasks, such as information retrieval (Kanhabua and Anand, 2016), event prediction (Souza Costa et al., 2020), and implicit argument detection (Cheng and Erk, 2018). Typically, ED comprises two subtasks: Event Identification (EI), which is the identification of an event trigger, and Event Classification (EC), or the classification of the identified trigger.

Existing methods for ED cannot easily leverage pretrained semantic knowledge (Lai et al., 2020b). These models fall short of correctly identifying complex events and face difficulties in few-shot ED settings. Lastly, these models, once trained, lack cross-domain or cross-task adaptability. The subpar performance of these event detection modules may handicap the overall efficacy of pipelined event extraction systems (Liu et al., 2020).

We address the above challenges by proposing a new training paradigm wherein we train a generative model on ED alongside its constituent subtasks, called EDM3 i.e. **Event Detection by Multi-task Text Generation over 3 subtasks**. We show that by modeling ED and its subtasks as individual, similarly-formatted sequence generation tasks, a model can learn transferable knowledge from the subtasks that can be leveraged to improve performance on ED. In contrast with the conventional token classification discriminative approaches, EDM3 leverage text-to-text generation methods which give the advantage to perform individual subtasks in a non-pipelined fashion. To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first to utilize all ED subtasks separately and jointly, while moving away from the traditional token classification paradigm. EDM3 also generalizes well without the need for the creation of domain-specific embeddings. Table 1 highlights the advantages of EDM3 over previous SOTA approaches.

We conduct extensive experiments using T5-base model (Raffel et al., 2020) on RAMS,

*Now at Microsoft Corporation

¹Data and source code are available at https://github.com/ujjwalaanant/EDM3_EventDetection

Approaches	Datasets	Tasks Covered			Domain Generalization	Comparative Performance
		Identification	Classification	Detection		
Liu et al. (2022)	ACE, MAVEN	✗	✗	✓	✗	SOTA on MAVEN
Veyseh et al. (2021)	ACE, RAMS, CysecED	✓	✗	✓	✓	SOTA on ACE and CysecED Competitive on RAMS
He et al. (2022)	MLEE	✗	✗	✓	✗	SOTA on MLEE
EDM3 (Ours)	MAVEN, MLEE WikiEvents, RAMS	✓	✓	✓	✓	SOTA on RAMS Competitive on MLEE & MAVEN Benchmark on WikiEvents

Table 1: Comparison of EDM3 with other state-of-the-art approaches highlighting the advantages of the approach over them. Columns ‘Identification’, ‘Classification’, and ‘Detection’ denote whether the approach can be used to perform these tasks independently and end-to-end with no model modification. “Domain Generalization” refers to the ability to perform ED or its subtasks over non-general domains as well as on the general domain. We add some additional information to provide the context in terms of performance metrics. EDM3 demonstrates high efficacy on multiple domains and can be leveraged to perform identification, classification, and combined detection, independently and in an end-to-end fashion without model modification, over all the domains it is used on.

WikiEvents, MAVEN, and MLEE datasets. We achieve an F_1 score of 71.3% on RAMS, surpassing GPTEDOT’s (Veyseh et al., 2021) score of 65.1%. This training approach also helps achieve competitive performance on the MAVEN dataset, obtaining 58.0% F_1 . We also fine-tune the same domain-agnostic model on the biomedical-domain MLEE dataset to obtain a score of 78.1%. Finally, we also establish the benchmark performance on the ED task for the WikiEvents dataset with 60.7% F_1 score. The results on the aforementioned datasets not only demonstrate the paradigm’s cross-domain adaptability but also show its efficiency, as a T5-base (220M) model achieves a SOTA and competitive score compared to more sophisticated or domain-specific modeling approaches.

We conduct investigations along multiple lines of inquiry to get notable insights. This includes an exploration of the efficacy of our approach in adapting to low-resource event scenarios, the effects of multi-tasking, and using instructional prompts, with a further dive into the type of instructional prompts that add the most value. We also evaluate the performance of this approach over non-standard event configurations, such as multi-word and multi-class triggers, which are notably absent from benchmark datasets but are highly prevalent in real-world data. Finally, we discuss the influence of the data on the effectiveness of the paradigm, focusing on the presence of negative examples and the importance of contextual information. In summary, our contributions are as follows:

1. We propose ED as a division of subtasks converted into *sequence generation (text-to-text)*

format which utilizes transferable knowledge from atomic tasks to improve performance on a complex primary task (ED).

2. We use this unified paradigm to obtain SOTA or competitive performances over various datasets across multiple domains.
3. We perform a methodical analysis of the impact of our method on various facets of the task and demonstrate its efficacy over complex real-world scenarios.

2 Related Work

Transformer-based models (Vaswani et al., 2017) have been at the forefront of many language tasks due to the wealth of pretrained knowledge. Models using BERT (Yang et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2019) treat ED as word classification, in graph-based architectures (Wadden et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2020). Models that improve ED performance for low resource settings include Lu et al. (2019); Deng et al. (2021). Other works (Tong et al., 2020; Veyseh et al., 2021) generate ED and EI samples respectively to augment training data. Many models frame ED as a question-answering task (Du and Cardie, 2020; Boros et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2020). APEX (Wang et al., 2022a) augments input with type-specific prompts. With the advent of more powerful sequence-to-sequence models such as T5, there has been an increased interest in formulating event detection and event extraction as sequence generation tasks (Paolini et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2021; Si et al., 2022)².

²Extended related work is discussed in App. A

Large-scale hostilities mostly [ended](#) with the cease-fire agreements after the 1973 Yom Kippur [War](#).

Subtask	Output
<i>Event Identification</i>	ended War
<i>Event Classification</i>	process_end military_operation
<i>Event Detection</i>	ended -> process_end War -> military_operation

Figure 1: Illustration of generatively reformulated outputs for ED and its subtasks. The outputs for EI and EC are singly-delimited strings containing extracted triggers or event types present in the instance. The output for ED is a doubly-delimited string containing all event triggers and their corresponding event types.

Multi-Task Learning is a training paradigm in which a single machine learning model is trained on multiple separate tasks (Caruana, 1997; Crawshaw, 2020). Across domains, models trained on multiple disparate tasks are better performing due to shared learning. Multi-Task learning has been leveraged to great effect in Xie et al. (2022); Lourie et al. (2021), and in specific domains as well (Chen, 2019; Parmar et al., 2022). This paradigm is also the basis of the generative T5 model. Paolini et al. (2021) carried out multi-task learning experiments over a number of information retrieval tasks. Specifically for Event Detection, multi-tasking over ED subtasks is implemented in GPTEDOT (Veysseh et al., 2021), where EI is used to augment ED performance. This is because the simplicity of EI makes it easier to evaluate the quality of generated data. However, there is a risk of introducing noise or generating low-quality samples due to the characteristics of the source data.

Prompt engineering Prompt-based models have been used for Event Detection and Event Extraction as well. More recently, Si et al. (2022) used predicted labels from earlier in the pipeline as prompts for later stages of trigger identification and argument extraction, while Wang et al. (2022a), following the example of other works that use prototype event triggers (Wang and Cohen, 2009; Bronstein et al., 2015; Lai and Nguyen, 2019; Lyu et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021) from the dataset, used triggers as part of tailored prompts for each event type in the schema. In proposing EDM3, we are the first to explore the efficacy of instructional prompts for ED.

3 Methodology

Given an input instance containing event triggers of various event types, we aim to identify all the triggers present and classify them. As a prelimi-

nary step, we decompose and reformulate ED and its subtasks as sequence generation tasks. Having done so, we train a T5 model on all 3 generative tasks simultaneously to create a single multi-task model. We also provide task-specific natural language instructional prompts with illustrative examples. Finally, we use beam search decoding to select tokens during sequence generation. We delineate these steps in more detail below.

Task Decomposition ED is a multi-level task requiring both event identification and classification, which traditional sequence labeling approaches conduct in a single step. We decompose ED into independent atomic sequence generation tasks that are carried out in parallel with each other or with the primary task, to augment the training process.

3.1 Generative reformulation

The task labels, whether event triggers, event types, or a more comprehensive list of event and corresponding type annotations, are converted to a delimited string. This creates a consistent pattern that can be learned by the model. In the absence of any events, we use the label NONE. Due to the presence of multi-class triggers, the number of unique event types and unique triggers for an instance might differ, making all tasks notably distinct from one another, as opposed to ED being simply a linear combination of EI and EC.

Event Identification/Classification Each label for these tasks contains a single component, i.e., either the event trigger or the event type. Hence, we can represent the output of each instance as a singly-delimited sequence of labels. For example, an instance with x unique triggers would have the following label representation for the EI task:

$$T_1 | T_2 | T_3 \dots T_x$$

Where T_i is the i^{th} event trigger occurring in

an input instance. Similarly, an instance with y unique event types occurring in it would have the following output representation for the EC task:

$$E_1 | E_2 | E_3 \dots E_y$$

Where E_i is the i^{th} type of event occurring in the instance. We delimit all triggers and types with a pipe (|) symbol.

Event Detection Each label for ED is composed of 2 components: the event trigger, and its corresponding event type. Similar to our sequence formulation for EI and EC, we create a doubly-delimited sequence of events for an instance with x events. We use \rightarrow as a delimiter between trigger and type, creating a unique format to enumerate the list of events. This allows us to represent multiple events in an instance as follows:

$$T_1 \rightarrow E_1 | T_2 \rightarrow E_2 | T_3 \rightarrow E_3 \dots T_x \rightarrow E_x$$

For an example of an instance showing the reformulated outputs for all tasks, see Figure 1.

3.2 Multi-Task Learning

We posit that by explicitly modeling individual sub-tasks concurrently with Event Detection (ED), a multi-task learning model can acquire knowledge that is transferable across atomic tasks, thereby enhancing ED performance. Our proposed method involves modeling Entity Classification (EC) separately for rarer event types. By doing so, the model gains the ability to explicitly identify instances containing these events, leading to improved identification and classification of their triggers.

3.3 Instructional Prompt Tuning for Generative ED

We use instructional prompts to improve multitasking. We design natural language prompts that describe how to perform event identification, classification, or detection. An illustration of this is mentioned in Figure 2.

4 Data

The datasets we choose to demonstrate our approach on span a range of characteristics, from sentence-level to multi-sentence level, with varying proportions of non-event instances. We also include a biomedical domain dataset to illustrate the adaptability of our approach. In Table 2, we note the document and event instance statistics across datasets. Table 3 delineates the dataset statistics post-data processing. We note the average and max-




Figure 2: An example of an input instance for reformulated generative ED. The input comprises a task definition followed by diverse domain examples before the input sentence containing the events to be detected.

imum number of events and distinct event types that occur per data instance for each dataset.

MAVEN Wang et al. (2020) proposed this dataset with the idea of combating data scarcity and low coverage problem in prevailing general domain event detection datasets. The high event coverage provided by MAVEN results in more events per sentence on average, including multi-word triggers, as compared to other general domain ED datasets (more details in App. C). The dataset, reflective of real-world data, has a long tail distribution (see Figure 5). We follow the example of SaliencyED (Liu et al., 2022) and evaluate our model performance on the development split of the original MAVEN dataset.

WikiEvents Existing work on this dataset proposed by Li et al. (2021) focuses exclusively on document-level argument extraction and event extraction. Sentences without any event occurrences make up nearly half of the entire dataset (see Table 3). In the absence of existing baselines, we estab-

Dataset	Docs			#triggers	#types
	Train	Dev	Test		
MLEE	131	44	87	8014	30
RAMS	3194	399	400	9124	38
MAVEN	2913	710	857	118732	168
WikiEvents	206	20	20	3951	49

Table 2: Dataset statistics, including number of documents per data split, as well as number of event triggers and unique event types across the dataset.

Dataset	Neg (%)	Events per row		Types per row		#zs
		Avg	Max	Avg	Max	
MLEE	18.22	2.867	16	2.369	9	3
RAMS	0	1.066	6	1.061	4	0
MAVEN	8.64	2.433	15	2.314	15	0
WikiEvents	54.11	1.671	7	1.429	6	1

Table 3: Dataset statistics (post-processing) for training. Neg%: Proportion of input instances with no event occurrences. Events per row: Number of event triggers per input instance. Types per row: Number of unique event types per input instance. #zs: Number of event types in test split not seen during training.

lish the benchmark performances on sentence-level ED on this dataset for future researchers.

RAMS This dataset, created by [Ebner et al. \(2020\)](#), is primarily geared towards the task of multi-sentence argument linking. The annotated argument roles are in a 5-sentence window around the related event trigger. In its native form, the dataset is geared towards multi-sentence argument role linking. Using the original configuration allows us to test the efficacy of our model on the multi-sentence level. Furthermore, on the sentence level, the dataset is imbalanced: 77% of the sentences contain no events. Training a model on this incentivizes event occurrence detection over ED.

MLEE This biomedical ED corpus by [Pyysalo et al. \(2012\)](#) is taken from PubMed abstracts centered around tissue-level and organ-level processes. The majority of the datasets used in this work are Event Extraction (EE) datasets, maintaining the scope of possible extensions of the proposed reformulation and multi-tasking approach to EE.

5 Experiments and Results

5.1 Experimental Setup

We use the generative T5 base (220M) model, a Transformer-based model.

Hyperparameters GPU: 2x NVIDIA GTX1080 GPUs. Maximum sequence length 1024 for multi-

Model	P	R	F-1
DMBERT (Wang et al., 2019)	62.6	44.0	51.7
GatedGCN (Lai et al., 2020a)	66.5	59.0	62.5
GPTEDOT (Veyseh et al., 2021)	55.5	78.6	65.1
EDM3	71.6	71.0	71.3

Table 4: Results on RAMS. All previous models are sentence-level BERT-based models.

Model	P	R	F-1	W-1
Single-task	60.0	49.6	54.3	52.1
EDM3	60.8	60.6	60.7	59.4

Table 5: Results on WikiEvents. W-1: Weighted F-1 %

sentence input for 512 for sentence-level input. All models are trained for 50 epochs, with a batch size of 1. For beam search decoding, we use 50 beams.

To compare the efficacy of our method fairly with established baselines, we evaluate our predictions by converting them to token-level labels. We evaluate ED on two-level event type labels for RAMS and WikiEvents.

5.2 Results

RAMS As shown in Table 4, we achieve a 71.33% F-1 score, which surpasses GPTEDOT by 6.2%. Furthermore, the difference between precision and recall is drastically lower than the competing non-generative, indicating that our model is less biased, and more robust.

WikiEvents As there are no existing event detection baselines on this dataset, we use single-task ED sequence generation performance as a baseline. This helps contextualize the benefits of our proposed prompted multi-task learning approach. We establish the benchmark performance of 60.7% F-1 score on this dataset. The single-task and EDM3 micro F-1 and weighted F-1 scores can be found in Table 5. This is the model performance over the entire dataset, including negative instances, where false positives may occur. On evaluating solely over the sentences with at least one event, we observe that the performance increases to 65.67%. See App. D for the example.

MAVEN We obtain a maximum F-1 score of 62.66%, as seen in Table 6. While this score is below the existing best performance on this dataset, the class imbalance in the MAVEN dataset con-

Model	P	R	F-1	F-1*
SaliencyED (Liu et al., 2022)	64.9	69.4	67.1	60.3
EDM3	60.1	65.5	62.7	58.1

Table 6: Results on MAVEN. All results are on the publicly-available dev split. F-1*: Macro F-1 %

Model	P	R	F-1
SVM2 (Zhou and Zhong, 2015) *	72.2	82.3	76.9
Two-stage (He et al., 2018a) *	79.2	80.3	79.8
EANNP (Nie et al., 2015)	71.0	84.6	77.2
LSTM + CRF (w/o TL)	81.6	74.3	77.8
LSTM + CRF (Chen, 2019)	81.8	77.7	79.7
BiLSTM + Att (He et al., 2022)	82.0	78.0	79.9
EDM3	75.9	80.4	78.1

Table 7: Results on MLEE dataset. * indicates models which require engineering hand-crafted features. All neural-network based models in this table use dependency-based embeddings specific to biomedical texts. w/o TL: results when 4 biomedical datasets are not used for transfer learning.

Dataset	Single-task		EDM3 (tags)		EDM3 (instr)	
	All	Pos	All	Pos	All	Pos
MLEE	71.07	72.20	74.57	75.82	77.09	78.45
RAMS	63.21	63.21	67.66	67.66	69.53	69.53
MAVEN	58.10	59.18	62.29	63.56	62.40	63.66
WikiEvents	54.31	58.47	56.77	61.35	58.71	64.31

Table 8: Results on all datasets. Single-task: Event Detection results. EDM3 (tags): training with EI and EC tasks on the same dataset. EDM3 (instr): incorporating instructional prompts. All denotes performance on all input instances. Pos denotes performance on only event-containing instances.

tributes to a lower micro F-1 score. This is shown by the fact that our model has a competitive macro F-1 score (58.1% versus 60.3%), indicating relatively better performance on sparsely populated classes. Further analysis of low-resource settings with examples can be found in the Analysis section of this work. As shown in Table 10, our model shows significant advantages in performing ED on complex instances, such as events with multi-class and multi-word event triggers which occur most frequently in this dataset as compared to others. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to explicitly explore this facet of ED on MAVEN in the Analysis section.

MLEE We distinguish between 2 sets of approaches for biomedical event detection as shown in Table 7. The former set includes approaches that are comparatively labour-intensive, requiring the creation of handcrafted features for these tasks. The second set of models includes neural network-based models that use domain-specific embeddings obtained by parsing Pubmed or Medline abstracts. Even without domain-specific embeddings, our approach achieves 78.1% F-1 score which is competitive with more sophisticated and domain-specific approaches. We observe that our model also has higher recall (80.4%) than the majority of the neural network-based approaches. More results are discussed in App. B.

6 Analysis

In this work, we conduct various experiments to assess the performance of our model over different scenarios.

6.1 Multi-tasking over EI and EC improves performance over ED

Our hypothesis, that including EI and EC improves ED performance, is supported by results in Table 8. EI helps identify multi-word triggers and event triggers that are missed in the single-task setting, while EC helps identify multi-class triggers. Even without instructional prompts, EDM3 improves performance by at least 3% over single-tasking for all datasets. This can be attributed to the success of the subtask-level multi-tasking paradigm, with the improved performance due to the knowledge obtained by training the model over EI and EC in addition to the primary task of ED. In the interests of a fair comparison, we use a greedy decoding scheme for all experiments conducted along this line of inquiry. Table 8 documents the metrics for single-task and multi-task models over all datasets. Examples demonstrating observably improved ED performance can be found in the appendix §D.

6.2 Diversity is key to effective instructional prompts

In this study, we investigate the impact of example diversity in instructional prompts on the performance of a task. Previous research suggests that prompts that consist of the task definition and two examples are optimal (Wang et al., 2022b). To examine the effect of example diversity, we include a biomedical example in the instructional prompt.

Dataset	Multi-word triggers		Multi-class triggers	
	%instances	%rows	%instances	%rows
RAMS	3.38	2.89	3.97	3.72
MAVEN	3.42	7.39	0.06	0.13
WikiEvents	2.86	2.18	0	0

Table 9: Statistics on multi-word and multi-class triggers in all datasets. %instances: the % of total triggers present. %rows: the % of all input instances that contain at least 1 multi-word or multi-class trigger.

Dataset	#mwt		EM acc %
	Train	Test	
MAVEN	2442	633	90.84
RAMS	228	20	88.89
WikiEvents	127	18	44.44

Table 10: Results on multi-word triggers. #mwt: number of multi-word triggers in training and testing data. EM acc %: exact match accuracy, i.e. percentage of multi-word triggers in test data predicted by our model.

Our findings indicate that examples, even from a different domain, can provide transferable knowledge. The addition of a domain-relevant example results in the best performance on MLEE, achieving a score of 77.43% before beam search decoding and 78.09% after decoding. Moreover, the performance on general domain datasets improves with the inclusion of the biomedical example.

6.3 Negative instances hamper ED performance

From the dataset statistics in Table 3, we see that the WikiEvents dataset has close to 54% instances that have no annotated events, i.e. negative instances. We hypothesize that this detracts from the model’s ability to discern relevant events and their types, and instead emphasizes the binary classification task of identifying event presence. We analyze the effect of negative examples further experimentally (Table 8). The consistent trend of higher Pos scores indicates that, given a sentence, our approach is better at extracting its events accurately as opposed to identifying whether it contains an event.

The difference between both metrics is stark in the case of WikiEvents. We observe increased performance (60.71% to 65.67% after beam search decoding) over WikiEvents, which is significantly

...Osman Hussein was **arrested** in ... **extradited** to the UK

Approach	Output
Single-task	arrested>arrest
EDM3	arrested->arrest extradited->extradition

Figure 3: EDM3 capturing the event type *extradition*, which has only 11 annotated instances in MAVEN.

higher than what we observe on other datasets. From further analysis, we find that training on only positive examples improves the ED performance on event sentences by nearly 5%. Furthermore, despite the fact that MAVEN has 168 event types and WikiEvents has only 49 (Table 2), the ED performance on MAVEN (62.4%) is higher than on WikiEvents (58.7%). This indicates that rather than the complexity of the ED task, the distribution of positive and negative instances may hamper the model’s ability to perform the task.

6.4 EDM3 is well-suited to low-resource scenarios

The majority of instances in MAVEN deal with a subset of its 168 event types. Zhang et al. (2022) show that 18% of all event types have less than 100 annotated instances, making them hard to learn and identify. For example, the event types, *Breathing* and *Extradition*, have less than 20 annotated train instances in more than 8K training sentences (6 and 11 annotated triggers, respectively). Despite this, we see the model accurately identifies all triggers in test data that are of these event types (see Figure 3), achieving 100% testing precision on both, and 100% and 80% micro F-1 score respectively.

6.5 Successful identification of multi-word triggers

Token classification is inadequate for accurately measuring the performance of ED on real-world datasets with multi-word event triggers, which comprise a significant portion of triggers (3.42% in MAVEN and 3.38% in RAMS) as shown in Table 9. Treating multi-word triggers as individual tokens can yield misleading results, as many triggers only represent the event type when the entire phrase is annotated. For example, for the trigger phrase "took place", labeling only either "took" or "place" would be incorrect: the individual words are semantically distinct from the meaning of the whole phrase, and individually denote different event types.

...He cut his teeth in the 90s **purchasing** and producing the Miss Universe pageant, then made...

Approach	Output
Single-task	purchasing->transaction.transferownership
EDM3	purchasing->transaction.transferownership purchasing->transaction.transfermoney
Gold	purchasing->transaction.transferownership purchasing->transaction.transfermoney

Figure 4: EDM3 improving prediction on multi-class triggers. In the single-task setting, only one sense of the event trigger is identified. EDM3 accurately extracts all senses of the given multi-class trigger.

To evaluate our model’s performance on multi-word trigger phrases, we calculate exact match accuracy for all multi-word triggers. We achieve nearly 91% and 89% on MAVEN and RAMS, respectively (Table 10). Although the WikiEvents dataset has fewer multi-word triggers, our model achieves a respectable performance, with partially predicted triggers ("assault", "in touch") often being semantically similar to the gold annotations ("the assault", "been in touch"). For trigger phrases where partial predictions are semantically unequal to complete predictions, such as "took place" and "set off," our model still performs well.

6.6 Successful classification of multi-class triggers

In a real-world ED scenario, event triggers may function as triggers of multiple event types within the same context. We observe these most commonly in RAMS, where nearly 4% of all event triggers are classified as triggers of multiple event types (see Table 9). For example, **purchasing** in Figure 4 triggers two distinct types of transaction events. *transferownership* is an event type with arguments such as previous and current owner, while *transfermoney* requires the *amount* as an argument. To accurately detect these events, it is necessary to capture all the senses of a particular trigger.

Existing token classification methods are not well-suited to this task as they perform and evaluate event detection as multi-class classification rather than multi-label classification. Our approach of multi-tasking over subtasks, specifically, training the model over EC, enables the model to predict multi-class triggers. We use prediction accuracy to evaluate the model’s performance on multi-class triggers. The accuracy is evaluated as 50% over a particular multi-class trigger if we predict one of two event types that it triggers in that input instance.

We find that the average prediction accuracy is close to 61% on the RAMS dataset, indicating that the model can capture most of the senses in which each multi-class trigger functions.

6.7 Multi-sentence context is crucial to ED

Consider the examples from the WikiEvents dataset.

Example 1: The whole building has **collapsed**.

Example 2: He chose **destruction**.

In Example 1, our model extracts the token in bold as a relevant event trigger and classifies it as an event of the type *artifactexistence* with the subtype *damage – destroy – disable – dismantle*. However, upon closer examination, we find that this example is taken from a document that primarily focuses on events of the type *conflict.attack*, with **bombing** and **explosion** being the annotated event triggers. Therefore, **collapsed** can be seen as an auxiliary event, and the model should predict the sentence as NONE. Conversely, in Example 2, our model classifies the sentence as NONE, indicating no salient event was found. However, the following sentences in the same document provide the necessary context to demonstrate that destruction is, in fact, the salient event in this case. The gold annotation identifies **destruction** as a trigger of event type *artifactexistence* with the subtype *damage-destroy-disable-dismantle*.

This shows us that sentences tagged NONE may nevertheless have salient events predicted by the model, but are tagged NONE because, in the original multi-sentence context, the salient event in the sentence is less important than events that are the subject of the passage. It is difficult for our model to judge the saliency of an event without the semantic context of its document, and the relevance of other events in its vicinity. This is why it is vital to include multi-sentence or document-level context, as sentence-level information can be misleading in the broader context.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a domain-agnostic generative approach to the Event Detection task that demonstrates the effectiveness of breaking down complex generation tasks into subtasks. Our method leverages a multi-tasking strategy that incorporates instructional prompts to improve model performance on imbalanced data and complex event instances. Our analysis shows an improve-

ment in F-1 score over single-task performance, supporting our main hypothesis viz. the effectiveness of breaking down complex generation tasks into subtasks that can support model learning on the primary task. Furthermore, our results highlight the potential for generative models in traditionally discriminative tasks like ED, paving the way for future advancements in the field.

Limitations

Our work demonstrates a prompted and generative approach on a single task, Event Detection, which can be easily adapted to other information retrieval tasks. However, the model faces relative difficulty in distinguishing non-event sentences, which could be addressed by implementing a binary classification system. In addition, including contextual information could help identify trigger candidates better. Our decoding scheme can also be improved for better recall without negatively impacting precision. Furthermore, there is a possibility of improving prompt quality further by analyzing the number and scope of examples required to achieve the best prompted performance. Finally, integrating domain knowledge could improve event-type classification, and we encourage future researchers to explore this area. Despite these limitations, our work provides a strong foundation for generative, instructional prompt-based frameworks for end-to-end Event Extraction and opens up exciting avenues for future research in this area.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Research Computing (RC) at Arizona State University (ASU) for providing computing resources for experiments.

References

- David Ahn. 2006. [The stages of event extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Annotating and Reasoning about Time and Events*, pages 1–8, Sydney, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Miltiadis Allamanis, Marc Brockschmidt, and Mahmoud Khademi. 2017. Learning to represent programs with graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00740*.
- Uri Alon, Meital Zilberstein, Omer Levy, and Eran Yahav. 2018. code2vec: learning distributed representations of code. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3:1 – 29.
- Matej Balog, Alexander L Gaunt, Marc Brockschmidt, Sebastian Nowozin, and Daniel Tarlow. 2016. Deep-coder: Learning to write programs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01989*.
- Emanuela Boros, José G. Moreno, and Antoine Doucet. 2021. [Event detection as question answering with entity information](#). *CoRR*, abs/2104.06969.
- Ofer Bronstein, Ido Dagan, Qi Li, Heng Ji, and Anette Frank. 2015. [Seed-based event trigger labeling: How far can event descriptions get us?](#) In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 372–376, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rich Caruana. 1997. [Multitask learning](#). *Mach. Learn.*, 28(1):41–75.
- Chen Chen and Vincent Ng. 2012. Joint modeling for chinese event extraction with rich linguistic features. pages 529–544.
- Yifei Chen. 2019. [Multiple-level biomedical event trigger recognition with transfer learning](#). *BMC Bioinformatics*, 20.
- Yubo Chen, Shulin Liu, Xiang Zhang, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2017. [Automatically labeled data generation for large scale event extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 409–419, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yubo Chen, Liheng Xu, Kang Liu, Daojian Zeng, and Jun Zhao. 2015. [Event extraction via dynamic multi-pooling convolutional neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 167–176, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengxiang Cheng and Katrin Erk. 2018. [Implicit argument prediction with event knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 831–840, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Crawshaw. 2020. [Multi-task learning with deep neural networks: A survey](#).
- Subhasis Das. 2015. Contextual code completion using machine learning.
- Shumin Deng, Ningyu Zhang, Luoqi Li, Chen Hui, Tou Huaixiao, Moshu Chen, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. 2021. [OntoED: Low-resource event detection with ontology embedding](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th*

- Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2828–2839, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinya Du and Claire Cardie. 2020. [Event extraction by answering \(almost\) natural questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 671–683, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seth Ebner, Patrick Xia, Ryan Culkin, Kyle Rawlins, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2020. [Multi-sentence argument linking](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8057–8077, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Avia Efrat and Omer Levy. 2020. [The turking test: Can language models understand instructions?](#)
- Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. [CodeBERT: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1536–1547, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Reza Ghaeini, Xiaoli Fern, Liang Huang, and Prasad Tadepalli. 2016. [Event nugget detection with forward-backward recurrent neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 369–373, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Himanshu Gupta, Abhiram Anand Gulanikar, Lov Kumar, and Lalita Bhanu Murthy Neti. 2021a. [Empirical analysis on effectiveness of nlp methods for predicting code smell](#). In *Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2021*, pages 43–53, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Himanshu Gupta, Tanmay Girish Kulkarni, Lov Kumar, and Neti Lalita Bhanu Murthy. 2020. [A novel approach towards analysis of attacker behavior in ddos attacks](#). In *Machine Learning for Networking*, pages 392–402, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Himanshu Gupta, Tanmay Girish Kulkarni, Lov Kumar, Lalita Bhanu Murthy Neti, and Aneesh Krishna. 2021b. [An empirical study on predictability of software code smell using deep learning models](#). In *Advanced Information Networking and Applications*, pages 120–132, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Himanshu Gupta, Lov Kumar, and Lalita Bhanu Murthy Neti. 2019. [An empirical framework for code smell prediction using extreme learning machine](#). In *2019 9th Annual Information Technology, Electromechanical Engineering and Microelectronics Conference (IEMECON)*, pages 189–195.
- Himanshu Gupta, Sanjay Misra, Lov Kumar, and N. L. Bhanu Murthy. 2021c. [An empirical study to investigate data sampling techniques for improving code-smell prediction using imbalanced data](#). In *Information and Communication Technology and Applications*, pages 220–233, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Himanshu Gupta, Shreyas Verma, Tarun Kumar, Swaroop Mishra, Tamanna Agrawal, Amogh Badugu, and Himanshu Sharad Bhatt. 2021d. [Context-ner: Contextual phrase generation at scale](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08079*.
- Prashant Gupta and Heng Ji. 2009. [Predicting unknown time arguments based on cross-event propagation](#). In *Proceedings of the ACL-IJCNLP 2009 Conference Short Papers*, pages 369–372, Suntec, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Hase and Mohit Bansal. 2021. [When can models learn from explanations? a formal framework for understanding the roles of explanation data](#).
- Xinyu He, Lishuang Li, Yang Liu, Xiaoming Yu, and Jun Meng. 2018a. [A two-stage biomedical event trigger detection method integrating feature selection and word embeddings](#). *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 15(4):1325–1332.
- Xinyu He, Lishuang Li, Jia Wan, Dingxin Song, Jun Meng, and Zhanjie Wang. 2018b. [Biomedical event trigger detection based on bilstm integrating attention mechanism and sentence vector](#). In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 651–654.
- Xinyu He, Ping Tai, Hongbin Lu, Xin Huang, and Yong-gong Ren. 2022. [A biomedical event extraction method based on fine-grained and attention mechanism](#). *BMC Bioinformatics*, 23(1):1–17.
- Yu Hong, Jianfeng Zhang, Bin Ma, Jianmin Yao, Guodong Zhou, and Qiaoming Zhu. 2011. [Using cross-entity inference to improve event extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1127–1136, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ruihong Huang and Ellen Riloff. 2021. [Modeling textual cohesion for event extraction](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 26(1):1664–1670.
- Hamel Husain, Hongqi Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2019. [Code-searchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1909.09436.
- Heng Ji and Ralph Grishman. 2008. [Refining event extraction through cross-document inference](#). In *Proceedings of ACL-08: HLT*, pages 254–262, Columbus, Ohio. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Nattiya Kanhabua and Avishek Anand. 2016. [Temporal information retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '16*, page 1235–1238, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Adeniyi Jide Kehinde, Abidemi Emmanuel Adeniyi, Roseline Oluwaseun Ogundokun, Himanshu Gupta, and Sanjay Misra. 2022. Prediction of students' performance with artificial neural network using demographic traits. In *Recent Innovations in Computing*, pages 613–624, Singapore. Springer Singapore.
- Viet Dac Lai and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2019. [Extending event detection to new types with learning from keywords](#). *CoRR*, abs/1910.11368.
- Viet Dac Lai, Tuan Ngo Nguyen, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2020a. [Event detection: Gate diversity and syntactic importance scores for graph convolution neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5405–5411, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Viet Dac Lai, Tuan Ngo Nguyen, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2020b. Event detection: Gate diversity and syntactic importance scores for graph convolution neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14123*.
- Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014. [Dependency-based word embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 302–308, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jian Li, Yue Wang, Michael R Lyu, and Irwin King. 2017. Code completion with neural attention and pointer networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.09573*.
- Peifeng Li, Qiaoming Zhu, and Guodong Zhou. 2013a. [Argument inference from relevant event mentions in Chinese argument extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1477–1487, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qi Li, Heng Ji, and Liang Huang. 2013b. [Joint event extraction via structured prediction with global features](#). In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 73–82, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sha Li, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. 2021. Document-level event argument extraction by conditional generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.05919.
- Shasha Liao and Ralph Grishman. 2010. [Using document level cross-event inference to improve event extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 789–797, Uppsala, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shasha Liao and Ralph Grishman. 2011. [Acquiring topic features to improve event extraction: in pre-selected and balanced collections](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing 2011*, pages 9–16, Hissar, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ying Lin, Heng Ji, Fei Huang, and Lingfei Wu. 2020. [A joint neural model for information extraction with global features](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7999–8009, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jian Liu, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, Wei Bi, and Xiaojiang Liu. 2020. [Event extraction as machine reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1641–1651, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jian Liu, Yufeng Chen, and Jinan Xu. 2022. [Saliency as evidence: Event detection with trigger saliency attribution](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4573–4585, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021. [Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing](#). *CoRR*, abs/2107.13586.
- Shulin Liu, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2017. [Exploiting argument information to improve event detection via supervised attention mechanisms](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1789–1798, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shulin Liu, Kang Liu, Shizhu He, and Jun Zhao. 2016. A probabilistic soft logic based approach to exploiting latent and global information in event classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 30.
- Xiao Liu, Zhunchen Luo, and Heyan Huang. 2018. [Jointly multiple events extraction via attention-based graph information aggregation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1247–1256, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicholas Lourie, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavathula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. [Unicorn on rainbow: A universal commonsense reasoning model on a new multitask benchmark](#).
- Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. 2019. [Distilling discrimination and generalization knowledge for event detection via delta-representation learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*,

- pages 4366–4376, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Jin Xu, Xianpei Han, Jialong Tang, Annan Li, Le Sun, Meng Liao, and Shaoyi Chen. 2021. [Text2Event: Controllable sequence-to-structure generation for end-to-end event extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2795–2806, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qing Lyu, Hongming Zhang, Elior Sulem, and Dan Roth. 2021. Zero-shot event extraction via transfer learning: Challenges and insights. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 322–332.
- David McClosky, Mihai Surdeanu, and Christopher Manning. 2011. [Event extraction as dependency parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1626–1635, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. [Reframing instructional prompts to gptk’s language](#).
- Hiroki Nakayama. 2018. [seqeval: A python framework for sequence labeling evaluation](#). Software available from <https://github.com/chakki-works/seqeval>.
- Thien Huu Nguyen, Kyunghyun Cho, and Ralph Grishman. 2016. [Joint event extraction via recurrent neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 300–309, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thien Huu Nguyen and Ralph Grishman. 2015. [Event detection and domain adaptation with convolutional neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 365–371, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yifan Nie, Wenge Rong, Yiyuan Zhang, Yuanxin Ouyang, and Zhang Xiong. 2015. Embedding assisted prediction architecture for event trigger identification. *Journal of bioinformatics and computational biology*, 13 3:1541001.
- Roseline Oluwaseun Ogundokun, Sanjay Misra, Peter Ogirima Sadiku, Himanshu Gupta, Robertas Damasevicius, and Rytis Maskeliunas. 2022. Computational intelligence approaches for heart disease detection. In *Recent Innovations in Computing*, pages 385–395, Singapore. Springer Singapore.
- Giovanni Paolini, Ben Athiwaratkun, Jason Krone, Jie Ma, Alessandro Achille, Rishita Anubhai, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Bing Xiang, and Stefano Soatto. 2021. Structured prediction as translation between augmented natural languages. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021*.
- Mihir Parmar, Swaroop Mishra, Mirali Purohit, Man Luo, M. Hassan Murad, and Chitta Baral. 2022. [Inboxbart: Get instructions into biomedical multi-task learning](#).
- Siddharth Patwardhan and Ellen Riloff. 2009. [A unified model of phrasal and sentential evidence for information extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 151–160, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- S Pyysalo, F Ginter, H Moen, T Salakoski, and S Ananiadou. 2013. Distributional semantics resources for biomedical text processing. In *Proceedings of LBM 2013*, pages 39–44.
- Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, Makoto Miwa, Hanchchol Cho, Jun’ichi Tsujii, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2012. [Event extraction across multiple levels of biological organization](#). *Bioinformatics*, 28(18):i575–i581.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#).
- Sebastian Riedel and Andrew McCallum. 2011a. [Fast and robust joint models for biomedical event extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–12, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sebastian Riedel and Andrew McCallum. 2011b. [Robust biomedical event extraction with dual decomposition and minimal domain adaptation](#). In *Proceedings of BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*, pages 46–50, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*.
- Kevin Scaria, Himanshu Gupta, Saurabh Arjun Sawant, Swaroop Mishra, and Chitta Baral. 2023. [Instructabsa: Instruction learning for aspect based sentiment analysis](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08624*.
- Lei Sha, Feng Qian, Baobao Chang, and Zhifang Sui. 2018. [Jointly extracting event triggers and arguments by dependency-bridge rnn and tensor-based argument](#)

- interaction. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1).
- Jinghui Si, Xutan Peng, Chen Li, Haotian Xu, and Jianxin Li. 2022. [Generating disentangled arguments with prompts: A simple event extraction framework that works.](#)
- Tarcísio Souza Costa, Simon Gottschalk, and Elena Demidova. 2020. Event-qa: A dataset for event-centric question answering over knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, pages 3157–3164.
- Meihan Tong, Bin Xu, Shuai Wang, Yixin Cao, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, and Jun Xie. 2020. [Improving event detection via open-domain trigger knowledge.](#) In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5887–5897, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rahul V S S Patchigolla, Sunil Sahu, and Ashish Anand. 2017. [Biomedical event trigger identification using bidirectional recurrent neural network based models.](#) In *BioNLP 2017*, pages 316–321, Vancouver, Canada,. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need.](#) In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Deepak Venugopal, Chen Chen, Vibhav Gogate, and Vincent Ng. 2014. [Relieving the computational bottleneck: Joint inference for event extraction with high-dimensional features.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 831–843, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amir Poursan Ben Veyseh, Viet Dac Lai, Franck Dernoncourt, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2021. [Unleash gpt-2 power for event detection.](#) In *ACL*.
- Ashwin J. Vijayakumar, Abhishek Mohta, Oleksandr Polozov, Dhruv Batra, Prateek Jain, and Sumit Gulwani. 2018. [Neural-guided deductive search for real-time program synthesis from examples.](#) *ArXiv*, abs/1804.01186.
- David Wadden, Ulme Wennberg, Yi Luan, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2019. [Entity, relation, and event extraction with contextualized span representations.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5784–5789, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anran Wang, Jian Wang, Hongfei Lin, Jianhai Zhang, Zhihao Yang, and Kan Xu. 2017. [A multiple distributed representation method based on neural network for biomedical event extraction.](#) *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 17.
- Richard C. Wang and William W. Cohen. 2009. [Character-level analysis of semi-structured documents for set expansion.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1503–1512, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sijia Wang, Mo Yu, Shiyu Chang, Lichao Sun, and Lifu Huang. 2021. [Query and extract: Refining event extraction as type-oriented binary decoding.](#) *CoRR*, abs/2110.07476.
- Sijia Wang, Mo Yu, and Lifu Huang. 2022a. [The art of prompting: Event detection based on type specific prompts.](#)
- Xiaozhi Wang, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Peng Li. 2019. [Adversarial training for weakly supervised event detection.](#) 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 998–1008, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaozhi Wang, Ziqi Wang, Xu Han, Wangyi Jiang, Rong Han, Zhiyuan Liu, Juanzi Li, Peng Li, Yankai Lin, and Jie Zhou. 2020. [MAVEN: A Massive General Domain Event Detection Dataset.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1652–1671, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krina Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Maitreya Patel, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Savan Doshi, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy A, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, and Xudong Shen. 2022b. [Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ NLP tasks.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albert Webson and Ellie Pavlick. 2022. [Do prompt-based models really understand the meaning of their prompts?](#)
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, An-

- drew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners.](#)
- Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I. Wang, Victor Zhong, Bailin Wang, Chengzu Li, Connor Boyle, Ansong Ni, Ziyu Yao, Dragomir Radev, Caiming Xiong, Lingpeng Kong, Rui Zhang, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. 2022. [Unifiedskg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models.](#)
- Mengwei Xu, Feng Qian, Qiaozhu Mei, Kang Huang, and Xuanzhe Liu. 2018. [Deeptype: On-device deep learning for input personalization service with minimal privacy concern.](#) *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.*, 2(4).
- Sen Yang, Dawei Feng, Linbo Qiao, Zhigang Kan, and Dongsheng Li. 2019. [Exploring pre-trained language models for event extraction and generation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5284–5294, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qinyuan Ye and Xiang Ren. 2021. [Learning to generate task-specific adapters from task description.](#)
- Pengcheng Yin, Graham Neubig, Miltiadis Allamanis, Marc Brockschmidt, and Alexander L. Gaunt. 2018. [Learning to represent edits.](#) *ArXiv*, abs/1810.13337.
- Hongming Zhang, Haoyu Wang, and Dan Roth. 2021. [Zero-shot Label-aware Event Trigger and Argument Classification.](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1331–1340, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenlong Zhang, Bhagyashree Ingale, Hamza Shabir, Tianyi Li, Tian Shi, and Ping Wang. 2022. [Event detection explorer: An interactive tool for event detection exploration.](#)
- Jieyu Zhao, Daniel Khashabi, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. [Ethical-advice taker: Do language models understand natural language interventions?](#)
- Ruiqi Zhong, Kristy Lee, Zheng Zhang, and Dan Klein. 2021. [Adapting language models for zero-shot learning by meta-tuning on dataset and prompt collections.](#)
- Deyu Zhou and Dayou Zhong. 2015. [A semi-supervised learning framework for biomedical event extraction based on hidden topics.](#) *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 64 1:51–8.

Appendix

A Extended Related Work

LMs and Deep learning methods have been used for a plethora of downstream tasks for a long time (Yin et al., 2018; Li et al., 2017; Das, 2015; Gupta et al., 2020, 2021b,c,a; Husain et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2020; Vijayakumar et al., 2018). Several recent works have leveraged NLP methods and simple sampling methods for different downstream results (Xu et al., 2018; Alon et al., 2018; Allamanis et al., 2017; Balog et al., 2016; Ogundokun et al., 2022; Kehinde et al., 2022; Gupta et al., 2019).

A.1 Event Detection and Identification

Ahn (2006) was the first work to distinguish between the subtasks of Event Detection and Event Identification. Early ED (Gupta and Ji, 2009; Liao and Grishman, 2010; Ji and Grishman, 2008; Hong et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2016) frameworks used highly engineered features. Chen and Ng (2012) proved that joint training allowed knowledge sharing and reduced error propagation along the ED pipeline. This denoted a shift from pipelined models (Ji and Grishman, 2008; Gupta and Ji, 2009; Patwardhan and Riloff, 2009; Liao and Grishman, 2011; McClosky et al., 2011; Huang and Riloff, 2021; Li et al., 2013a) to joint training architectures (Riedel and McCallum, 2011b,a; Li et al., 2013b; Venugopal et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2017).

Neural network-based methods leveraged pre-trained embeddings such as Word2Vec as features. Nguyen and Grishman (2015); Chen et al. (2015) formulated ED as a token-classification problem and proved domain-adaptability. NN-based models (Chen et al., 2015) used a range of other architectures including RNNs (Ghaeini et al., 2016; Sha et al., 2018), LSTMs (Nguyen et al., 2016), and GCNs (Liu et al., 2018).

A.2 Prompt Engineering

Using prompts and natural language instructions to augment input data and improve model learning is an active research area. The turking test (Efrat and Levy, 2020) was proposed as a method to evaluate how well machine learning models can learn from instructions, akin to humans, on a range of tasks. Later works have investigated how well PLMs gain a semantic understanding of prompts (Webson and Pavlick, 2022; Zhao et al., 2021). The instruction learning paradigm has been investigated in detail

(Hase and Bansal, 2021; Ye and Ren, 2021; Mishra et al., 2022), especially in settings such as low-resource or zero-shot settings (Zhong et al., 2021; Sanh et al., 2021; Wei et al., 2022). Several studies are present that show adding knowledge with instruction helps LMs understand the context better (Scaria et al., 2023; Gupta et al., 2021d).

A.3 Prompting for Generative ED

Adding natural language prompts have shown promising results in improving performance in PLMs (Liu et al., 2021). PLMs are trained on general domain data, making them less suited to successful right-out-of-the-box applications on tasks which require domain-specific knowledge and contexts. Prompt engineering is an active area of research across domains. Unlike previous prompt-based approaches (Wang et al., 2022a), we do not create prompts solely within the scope of the ED task, such as event type-specific prompts. Adding natural language prompts have shown promising results in improving performance in PLMs (Liu et al., 2021). Unlike previous prompt-based approaches (Wang et al., 2022a), we do not create prompts solely within the scope of the ED task, such as event type-specific prompts.

A.4 Previous State of the Art

RAMS Existing baselines perform ED on sentence-level. We compare our multi-sentence ED performance with DMBERT (Wang et al., 2019), GatedGCN (Lai et al., 2020a), and GPTEDOT (Veyseh et al., 2021). All these models are BERT-based. The state-of-the-art model, GPTEDOT, leverages the multi-task learning paradigm similarly, however, owing to the limits of classification-based representations, only uses EI, and requires generation of data to augment existing examples.

MAVEN The state-of-the-art model, (Wang et al., 2022a), leverages the prompting paradigm to perform word classification for ED. This model requires significant prompt engineering for all 168 event types in the schema. However, as its performance is evaluated on the unavailable test split, with access to possible trigger candidates, we do not report its performance as a comparable baseline. SaliencyED (Liu et al., 2022) explicitly states that it performs trigger extraction for trigger words, with no mention made of multi-class, or the far more frequent, multi-word triggers.

MLEE We distinguish between 2 sets of models for biomedical event detection. The former set of models include 2 SVM-based models (Pyysalo et al., 2012; Zhou and Zhong, 2015), and a pipelined two-stage model (He et al., 2018a), which treats event identification and classification separately. These approaches are comparatively labour-intensive; they require the creation of handcrafted features for these tasks. The second set of models are neural network-based models. These include a CNN with embeddings encoding event type, POS labels and topic representation (Wang et al., 2017), RNN with word and entity embeddings (V S S Patchigolla et al., 2017), and LSTM-based models that integrate other biomedical datasets in order to perform transfer learning (Chen, 2019). All existing baselines use pretrained embeddings and other language resources specifically for biomedical texts such as the resources published by (Pyysalo et al., 2013). For example, LSTM (He et al., 2018b) and the state-of-the-art BiLSTM (He et al., 2022), like the majority of existing models, employs Word2vecf (Levy and Goldberg, 2014) to train dependency-based word embeddings. These embeddings are trained on Pubmed abstracts that are parsed using the Gdep parser: a dependency parse tool built for use on biomedical texts. Likewise, EANNP (Nie et al., 2015) undertakes a similar approach to pretraining embeddings, but uses Medline abstracts instead.

B Alternative evaluation metric for sequence generation-based ED

The majority of existing works treat this as a multi-class word classification problem, and all baselines, including generative methods, evaluate model results consistent with word classification metrics popularly used for NER tasks (Nakayama, 2018). However, we see many multi-label trigger words. This becomes especially apparent in document level data, and in real world data, the same trigger may function as a trigger for multiple event types, with a different set of arguments corresponding to its role as each event type it triggers. This makes existing numbers misleading.

As an alternative evaluation scheme, we treat sequence generation based ED as a sentence or multi-sentence level multilabel classification, where multi-word triggers are considered distinct labels. For this problem, we treat NONE as a possible label for a given input text.

Dataset		P	R	F-1
MLEE	All	73.05	76.74	74.85
	Pos	73.97	77.49	75.69
RAMS	All	72.61	71.62	72.11
MAVEN	All	59.01	63.82	61.32
	Pos	60.5	64.67	62.51
WikiEvents	All	61.29	63.33	62.29
	Pos	56.73	57.61	57.17

Table 11: Results using alternative evaluation scheme on all datasets. All: Multi-label metrics on all rows, with NONE as a separate class. Pos: Multi-label metrics on instances with at least one event. Multi-class and multi-word triggers count as distinct labels, with an exact match, counted as true positive.

We calculate the metrics of precision, recall, and F-1 score using conventional formulae:

$$\text{Precision (P)} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$$

$$\text{Recall (R)} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$$

$$\text{F-1 score} = 2 \times \frac{P \times R}{P+R}$$

where a prediction is counted as true positive only if both trigger span and predicted event type (including subtype) match gold annotations.

In addition to more accurate performance metrics over multi-class triggers, this provides a stricter metric to evaluate multi-word triggers, where partial predictions do not contribute to model performance. Using this metric also allows us to evaluate the discriminative performance of an ED model, i.e. the accuracy with which it can identify whether an input text contains an event or not. We implement this evaluation metric based on publicly-available code from another sequence generation model for ED. The results on entire test data as well as event and non-event sentences obtained using this metric are reported in Table 11.

C Annotation issues

We present an approach that accurately extracts text terms for event annotations while preserving case sensitivity, a crucial factor in distinguishing different event triggers. Improper extraction or human error can lead to errors in existing annotations. Our approach can identify such errors by highlighting discrepancies in the case of event triggers. Additionally, we observe an ambiguity in some annotation schema, particularly in MAVEN, where the

Category	Event type	Example triggers
Anatomical	cell_proliferation development blood_vessel_development death breakdown remodeling growth	proliferation, proliferate, growing formation, progression, morphogenesis angiogenic, angiogenesis death, apoptosis, survival dysfunction, disrupting, detachment remodeling, reconstituted proliferation, growth, regrowth
Molecular	synthesis gene_expression transcription catabolism phosphorylation dephosphorylation	production, formation, synthesized expression, expressed, formation expression, transcription, mRNA disruption, degradation, depleted phosphorylation dephosphorylation
General	localization binding regulation positive_regulation negative_regulation	migration, metastasis, infiltrating interactions, bind, aggregation altered, targeting, contribute up-regulation, enhancement, triggered inhibition, decrease, arrests
Planned	planned_process	treatment, therapy, administration

Table 12: Event types in MLEE, along with example triggers.

extensive coverage of event types results in overlapping event type definitions. For instance, the event types motion, self_motion, and motion_direction exhibit minor differences, leading to inconsistent annotations. This ambiguity introduces noise into the classification and ED subtasks. Our proposed model resolves this issue and accurately extracts all events in the corpus. We provide examples that demonstrate the improved ED performance achieved through multi-tasking.

D EDM3 improves single-task ED performance on WikiEvents

Input:

Police in Calais have dispersed a rowdy anti-migrant protest with tear gas after clashes with protesters and detained several far-right demonstrators.

Single-task:

detained->movement.transportperson

EDM3:

detained->movement.transportperson | **clashes**
->**conflict.attack**

Gold:

detained->movement.transportperson | **clashes**
->**conflict.attack**

Event type	Frequency	Example triggers
process_start	2468	began, debut, took place
causation	2465	resulted in, caused, prompted
attack	2255	bombing, attacked, struck
hostile_encounter	1987	fought, conflict, battle
motion	1944	fell, pushed, moved
catastrophe	1785	explosion, hurricane, flooded
competition	1534	event, championships, match
killing	1380	killed, murder, massacre
process_end	1323	closing, complete, ended
statement	1269	asserted, proclaimed, said

Table 13: Top 10 event types in MAVEN, along with example triggers.

Event type	Frequency	Example triggers
conflict.attack	721	massacre, battle, bombing
movement.transportperson	491	smuggling, walked, incarcerate
transaction.transfermoney	482	reimbursed, paid, purchasing
life.die	442	die, murder, assassinating
life.injure	422	surgery, injured, brutalized
movement.transportartifact	367	imported, trafficking, smuggling
transaction.transferownership	327	auction, donated, acquire
contact.requestadvise	250	advocating, recommending, urged
contact.discussion	249	discuss, meet, negotiated
transaction.transaction	211	funded, donated, seized

Table 14: Top 10 event types in RAMS, along with example triggers.




Figure 5: Distribution of event types in MAVEN




Figure 6: Distribution of event types in WikiEvents

Event type	Frequency	Example triggers
conflict.attack	1188	explosion, shot, attack
contact.contact	530	met, said, been in touch
life.die	501	killed, died, shot
life.injure	273	injuring, wounded, maimed
movement.transportation	212	transferred, brought, arrived
justice.arrestjaildetain	176	arrested, capture, caught
artifactexistence.damagedestroydisabledismantle	103	damaged, destruction, removed
justice.investigatecrime	102	analysis, discovered, investigation
justice.chargeindict	96	charged, accused, alleged
artifactexistence.manufactureassemble	82	construct, make, build

Table 15: Top 10 event types in WikiEvents, along with example triggers.

WikiEvents	Common	RAMS
conflict.defeat, medical.intervention, disaster.diseaseoutbreak, justice.releaseparole, movement.transportation, cognitive.inspection, justice.acquit, justice.sentence, transaction.exchangebuysell, justice.trialhearing, cognitive.identifycategorize, justice.convict, artifactexistence.damagedestroydisabledismantle, genericcrime.genericcrime, artifactexistence.manufactureassemble, contact.requestcommand, control.impedeinterferewith, justice.investigatecrime, justice.chargeindict, cognitive.teachingtraininglearning, transaction.donation, cognitive.research, life.infect, disaster.crash, contact.contact	justice.arrestjaildetain, personnel.startposition, personnel.endposition, conflict.attack, conflict.demonstrate, life.injure, contact.threatencoerce, life.die	contact.collaborate, justice.investigate, contact.commitmentpromiseexpressintent, justice.judicialconsequences, contact.mediastatement, contact.commandorder, manufacture.artifact, contact.negotiate, transaction.transaction, government.legislate, contact.publicstatementinperson, contact.funeralvigil, disaster.fireexplosion, artifactexistence.damagedestroy, government.formation, justice.initiatejudicialprocess, government.agreements, personnel.elect, movement.transportperson, transaction.transferownership, conflict.yield, inspection.sensoryobserve, government.spy, government.vote, transaction.transfermoney, movement.transportartifact, disaster.accidentcrash, contact.discussion, contact.requestadvise, contact.prevarication

Table 16: Event types in RAMS and WikiEvents. Common: list of event types common to both datasets.