
INFORMED NAMED ENTITY RECOGNITION DECODING FOR GENERATIVE LANGUAGE MODELS

A PREPRINT

✉ Tobias Deußner^{*1,2}, ✉ Lars Hillebrand², ✉ Christian Bauckhage^{1,2}, and ✉ Rafet Sifa^{1,2}

¹University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

²Fraunhofer IAIS, Sankt Augustin, Germany

ABSTRACT

Ever-larger language models with ever-increasing capabilities are by now well-established text processing tools. Alas, information extraction tasks such as named entity recognition are still largely unaffected by this progress as they are primarily based on the previous generation of encoder-only transformer models. Here, we propose a simple yet effective approach, Informed Named Entity Recognition Decoding (iNERD), which treats named entity recognition as a generative process. It leverages the language understanding capabilities of recent generative models in a future-proof manner and employs an informed decoding scheme incorporating the restricted nature of information extraction into open-ended text generation, improving performance and eliminating any risk of hallucinations. We coarse-tune our model on a merged named entity corpus to strengthen its performance, evaluate five generative language models on eight named entity recognition datasets, and achieve remarkable results, especially in an environment with an unknown entity class set, demonstrating the adaptability of the approach.

Keywords Named Entity Recognition · Information Extraction · Large Language Models · Natural Language Processing · Machine Learning

1 Introduction

Recent public releases of large language models (LLMs) with human-like writing skills have drawn unprecedented attention to natural language processing (NLP). Indeed, the performance of transformer-based LLMs increases notably, and they develop “emergent abilities”, i.e. their performance increases significantly, when their number of parameters exceeds a certain level (Wei et al., 2022).

On the other hand, tasks not based on generative transformers, say sentiment analysis, contradiction detection, or named entity recognition, have been relegated to the backseat of this latest push in NLP. As of this writing, they are usually tackled using “encoder-only”¹ language models (Heinsen, 2022; Deußner et al., 2023; Verma et al., 2023) which are typically much smaller than their “decoder-only” counterparts.

Here, we intend to narrow the gap between generative and extractive NLP and introduce a novel named entity recognition (NER) framework. Our Informed Named Entity Recognition Decoding (iNERD) approach has three main features: First, it leverages proven capabilities of “decoder-only” models. Our current approach works with the latest generative LLMs but can easily incorporate even better models once they become available and thus keep up with rapid release cycles (Zhao et al., 2023) making it future-proof and quick to upgrade.

Second, we exploit the extensive pre-training and the resulting language understanding capabilities of state-of-the-art LLMs. Our approach involves an informed decoding algorithm which eliminates any hallucinations current models might suffer from during our approach (Bang et al., 2023) and improves performance by ruling out impossible tokens

*tdeusser@uni-bonn.de

¹“Encoder-only” refers to transformer models which only consist of encoder blocks. This contrasts with the original encoder-decoder structure proposed by Vaswani et al. (2017) or the “decoder-only” structure of generative models.

during generation. To strengthen the model’s understanding of the NER task, we “coarse-tune” it on a merged corpus of various task-specific datasets.

Third, we propose a simple decoding strategy which allows for casting the extractive task of named entity recognition as a generative task. Our idea is to let the model generate extended texts of the following form:

```
“EU rejects German call to boycott British lamb. <CT> Organisation <TCS> EU <ES> Location <TCS> German <ES> Location <TCS> British <ES>”
```

Here, the special tokens inside angular brackets signal the start of the entity string (<CombineToken>), separate entity type and entity content (<TypeContentSeparator>), and identify different entities (<EntitySeparator>). During inference, we enforce this structure and thus reduce the complexity of the generation step.

Extensive evaluations show that this approach achieves remarkable performances in various NER settings ranging from general-purpose over bio-medical to finance.

In short, our contributions presented in this paper are the following:

- We propose a novel future-proof architecture to cast the extractive process of named entity recognition as a generative one, incorporating natural language understanding capabilities of generative models into the process.
- We introduce a novel decoding strategy for such an architecture, which prevents the model from hallucinating and improves performance.
- We “coarse-tune” decoder-only models like Llama (Touvron et al., 2023a) or GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) on a merged named entity recognition dataset to further improve the contextual awareness of these models for NER tasks.
- We publicly provide our code as well as the weights of our best-performing model².

Next, we review recent related work on named entity recognition and generative language models. We then elaborate on our framework, our encoding scheme for named entities, and the corresponding informed decoding. Afterwards, we discuss our experimental protocol and present and discuss the results obtained on eight benchmark datasets. Finally, we summarize our main results and provide an outlook to auspicious future work.

2 Related Work

Named entity recognition (Grishman and Sundheim, 1996) is a fundamental task in text mining and natural language processing. Among others, it allows for anonymization (Pilán et al., 2022) or relation extraction (Hillebrand et al., 2022) and, owing to its practical importance, has been studied w.r.t. standardized corpora early on (e.g. the CoNLL-2003 data collected by Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder (2003)).

Prior to the deep learning revolution, NER was usually tackled in a rule-based manner (Etzioni et al., 2005) or with unsupervised- or feature-based supervised learning (Collins and Singer, 1999; Zhang and Elhadad, 2013; Bikel et al., 1997; McNamee and Mayfield, 2002).

In their seminal paper on BERT, an encoder-only transformer, Devlin et al. (2019) achieved remarkable results on the CoNLL-2003 data by adding a classifier on top of the encoder and fine-tuning the model. Much subsequent work on similar approaches towards NER then focused on improved context awareness. To name but a few, Luo et al. (2020) fused hierarchical contextualized representations with input token embeddings, Lee et al. (2019) applied additional pre-training aimed at biomedical texts, and Wang et al. (2021) added a conditional random field on top of BERT. Going even further, Yamada et al. (2020) forced entity extraction during pre-training and Zhou and Chen (2021) added a co-regularization framework for entity-centric information extraction, to achieve state-of-the-art results. Nevertheless, all of these approaches are built upon an encoder-only transformer model and are unsuited to incorporate the decoder-only transformer architecture powering the recent popularity and success of natural language processing.

Closest to the ideas proposed in this paper, Yan et al. (2021) formulated NER as an entity span sequence generation task, in which they added special tokens to their vocabulary to then generate entities and their types in an autoregressive fashion. Fei et al. (2022) extended this to cover more tasks in the information extraction field. The advantage of our approach is that we do *not* add the entity type tokens as special tokens, but as regular tokens already known to the

²The link to the GitHub repository will be published upon acceptance of this paper.




Figure 1: Illustration of Named Entity Recognition as a token classification task with the IOB tagging scheme. Each input token is classified either as B-Entity type, I-Entity type, or O.

model. Furthermore, Wang et al. (2023) leveraged the GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) API to tag entities in a sentence in a zero and few-shot approach.

Generative language models gained widespread public interest with the introduction of GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), which both reported impressive language understanding and writing capabilities, but did not make their models and exact architectures known to the research community. On the other hand, their predecessors, GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) and GPT (Radford et al., 2018), are openly available and were the first to implement a “decoder-only” architecture, which discarded the Encoder-Decoder structure proposed in Vaswani et al. (2017) in favour of an autoregressive generation process, trained by teacher-forcing.

In recent years, this field expanded rapidly, driven by its prominent place in public discourse, and many new models emerged and were studied, e.g. Llama (Touvron et al., 2023a) and its second iteration (Touvron et al., 2023b), RedPajama (Together Computer, 2023), Falcon (Almazrouei et al., 2023), Bloom (Scao et al., 2023), or OPT (Zhang et al., 2022). As already mentioned in the previous section, a critical property of such a large language model (LLM) is that performance experiences a remarkable increase once the model scale, i.e. its parameter size, surpasses a certain threshold, dubbed “emergent abilities of LLMs”, studied in Wei et al. (2022) and Rae et al. (2022). Due to the sheer size of these models, reaching into the hundreds of billions, it is apparent that training and even fine-tuning them is costly and time-consuming. To alleviate this and make the training of pre-trained LLMs accessible to a broader audience, Hu et al. (2021) introduced LoRA, a framework that freezes the pre-trained model weights and injects trainable rank decomposition matrices into the transformer layers.

Regardless, these LLMs are trained to be capable text generation tools and are, at their current state, mostly incompatible with other NLP tasks like information extraction, a flaw which we alleviate with the iNERD approach introduced in this work.

3 Methodology

Here, we describe how we formulate named entity recognition (NER) as a task suited for generative language models. Following this, we shed light on how our algorithm for Informed Named Entity Recognition Decoding (iNERD) and the complete setup is defined and point out the advantages compared to other approaches.

3.1 Named entity decoding

NER is usually formulated as a “token classification” task, as seen in Dou et al. (2023) or Nguyen et al. (2023). In such a setup, an embedding of each token is generated using a text encoder, often an encoder-only transformer model like BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). This embedding is then fed into a classifier, which can be anything from a simple logistic regression to a more involved deep neural network to classify each token as either a part of an entity or not. This prediction generally has to include the entity start and entity end information, which can be achieved with, among others, the *IOB* tagging scheme (Ramshaw and Marcus, 1995). Figure 1 illustrates this setup.

In contrast, we propose to model this task as a generative process, simplifying its machine-learning components to just one building block: a decoder-only transformer model.

To formalize this, we define the input I for our generative model during the training phase for n entities e as

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= I_s \oplus \kappa \oplus \left| \left| \right| \right|^n (\xi_e \oplus \tau \oplus I_e \oplus \epsilon) \\
&= I_s \oplus \kappa \oplus E,
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where \oplus is the concatenation operator, I_s the actual sentence from which we intend to extract entities, κ the “combine” token, ξ_e the type of entity e , τ the “type-content” separator token, I_e the actual entity string, ϵ the “entity separator” token, and $\left| \left| \right| \right|^n$ concatenates its input along the number of entities n . This concatenation $\left| \left| \right| \right|^n (\xi_e \oplus \tau \oplus I_e \oplus \epsilon)$ is the entity string E of our input I , i.e. what is unknown during inference and has to be predicted.

To make Equation 1 more accessible, we can review the example from the introduction,

“EU rejects German call to boycott British lamb. <CT> Organisation <TCS> EU <ES> Location <TCS> German <ES> Location <TCS> British <ES>”,

in which

- I_s is the input sentence “EU rejects German call to boycott British lamb”,
- κ the string “<CT>”,
- ξ_e the entity types “Organisation” and “Location”,
- τ the string “<TCS>”,
- I_e the actual entity content “EU”, “German” and “British”,
- ϵ the string “<ES>”,
- E the entity string “Organisation <TCS> EU <ES> Location <TCS> German <ES> Location <TCS> British <ES>”

We can then fine-tune the pre-trained decoder-only model to predict each token of the input I autoregressively using teacher forcing (Williams and Zipser, 1989), i.e. the causal language modelling task is unchanged for these models. We calculate the loss on all predicted tokens after the κ token.

Compared to the approach introduced in Yan et al. (2021), the essential advantage of our framework for named entity decoding is that we do *not* add entity type tokens ξ as special tokens, but as regular tokens already known to the model. Their approach, where the example sentence above becomes “EU rejects German call to boycott British lamb. <ORG> EU <LOC> German <LOC> British”, loses the meaningful embedding a transformer model has learned for ξ , i.e. the model has to learn anew what the introduced special tokens mean.

3.2 Informed named entity recognition decoding

In the previous section on *Named entity decoding*, we only considered the training process, in which we apply teacher forcing to correct the model if it “makes a mistake” during the generation to accelerate convergence. However, during inference, applying teacher forcing would either be cheating or simply impossible if no ground truth exists.

Nevertheless, we do know quite a bit about what tokens to expect at a certain point during inference, described by these four rules:

1. After the combine token κ or the entity separator token ϵ , the entity type token ξ or the end-of-sequence token has to be predicted.
2. After predicting the entity type ξ , the type-content separator τ has to be predicted.
3. After the type-content separator τ , any token from the input I_s may be predicted (signalling the start of the entity e).
4. After a token from the input I_s has been predicted, the only allowed tokens for prediction are either the entity separator token ϵ (signalling the end of the entity e) or the token following the previous token in the input I_s (signalling the continuation of the entity e).

These four rules comprise the Informed Named Entity Recognition (iNERD) algorithm, as illustrated in Algorithm 1. This algorithm is implemented as a post-processing step and is executed after the model calculates the score over its vocabulary and before mapping this score to the actual token to be predicted.

Algorithm 1 iNERD for a batch size of 1**Input:** Scores S with the size of the vocabulary, input IDs I holding the considered sentence and prior predictions**Parameters:** Combine token κ , entity separator token ϵ , type content separator token τ , entity type tokens ξ **Output:** Updated scores S with iNERD applied

-
- 1: Let p be the previously predicted token, i.e. the last token in the sequence I .
 - 2: Let g be a boolean value representing if we are in the “entity generation phase”, i.e. if in the reversed sequence of I we can find the token τ before we can find the token ϵ .
 - 3: Let I_s be the sentence considered, i.e. everything of I before the token κ .
 - 4: **if** $p = \kappa$ or $p = \epsilon$ **then**
 - 5: Mask S to only allow ξ or the end-of-sequence token.
 - 6: **else if** $p \in \xi$ **then**
 - 7: Mask S to only allow τ .
 - 8: **else if** g **then**
 - 9: **if** $p = \tau$ **then**
 - 10: Mask S to only allow tokens present in I_s .
 - 11: **else**
 - 12: Mask S to only allow the token after p in I_s or ϵ .
 - 13: **end if**
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: **return** S
-

The advantages of this approach are clear: First, the decoder-only model is unable to hallucinate, as any prediction that does not follow the decoding scheme introduced in Equation 1, is simply masked out, i.e. the score of this token is set to 0. Second, we can apply this model to unseen data and still expect reasonable results if we define our set of entity type tokens ξ beforehand, as later shown in the Experiments section.

3.3 Complete Model Setup

Now, we can build our model with the blocks introduced in the sections on *Named entity decoding* and *iNERD*. First of all, we transform our input to the structure described in Equation 1, which during training contains the entity string E , but becomes

$$I_{\text{inference}} = I_s \oplus \kappa \tag{2}$$

during inference. This is passed through the generative language model, which assigns a score s to each token in the vocabulary. The resulting score vector S is the input to the iNERD algorithm, as described in Algorithm 1. This masks out impossible tokens for the current step, resulting in an updated score vector S_{iNERD} , which is then used to calculate the next token by taking the one with the highest score s_{iNERD} . This token is concatenated with the input and the whole process is repeated until the model predicts the end-of-sequence token. Figure 2 illustrates this procedure for the first two steps.

4 Experiments

To practically evaluate the merits of our approach, we conducted experiments on eight datasets. Here, we describe our protocol, discuss data and results, and point out the strengths and flaws. We report the performance in *micro-F1* in %, which describes the F_1 score, the harmonic mean of precision and recall, when we aggregate the results on all samples individually, independent of the classes. On the other hand, the *macro-F1* would compute the metric for each class and then average over each of these.

We use the model setup introduced in the previous section for all our experiments and compare it to various benchmarks from other approaches. We test various decoder-only language models for this setup, namely the 1.5 billion parameter GPT2-XL (Radford et al., 2019), the 2.7 billion parameter BioMedLM (Bolton et al., 2022), the 3 billion parameter RedPajama (Together Computer, 2023), the 7 billion parameter Falcon (Almazrouei et al., 2023), the 7 and 13 billion parameter Llama (Touvron et al., 2023a), and the 7 billion parameter Llama-2 (Touvron et al., 2023b). Additionally, we apply LoRA (Hu et al., 2021), a framework that freezes the pre-trained model weights while integrating trainable rank decomposition matrices into the transformer layers, to every model with a parameter size above 3 billion.




Figure 2: Illustration of the first two steps taken during the inference pipeline of our complete model setup. The model starts with the Input $I_{\text{Inference}}$ as shown in Equation 2, which is fed into the generative language model (GLM). This outputs a score vector S over the vocabulary, which in turn is processed by the iNERD algorithm as described in Algorithm 1. The highest-scoring token from the vocabulary is then appended to the input, and the process starts anew. This is repeated until the model predicts the end-of-sequence token.

Our general approach is as follows. We first coarse-tune (see Section “Coarse-tuning” for more details) each language model on our merged NER dataset. We then evaluate each model *without additional fine-tuning* on the test set of each dataset, before we fine-tune them on the respective training set and again report the performance on the test set. Additionally, we conduct an ablation study to highlight the improvements of each component of our approach.

Due to the sheer computational complexity, we only run each experiment once and do not test various seeds to take the average of each run. Furthermore, and for the same reason, we apply no hyperparameter tuning in this scenario. The fixed hyperparameters we used are an (accumulated) batch size of 16, a learning rate of 0.00001 with a weight decay of 0.01 for the adam optimizer with weight decay (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019). The LoRA configuration, if applicable, is 8 for the rank of the update matrices, 32 for the scaling factor, and 0.1 for dropout. We are certain that the performance of our approach can be further improved if one focuses on a singular dataset and finds the optimal hyperparameter configuration for each dataset, but the computational cost of doing such a hyperparameter search is immense and beyond our financial scope and the general scope of this paper, which aims to point out the general merits of our approach.

All experiments were run on a shared GPU cluster outfitted with the 40GB and 80GB versions of the Nvidia A100 GPU, an AMD EPYC 7742 CPU, and 512GB of RAM. The code is implemented in PyTorch and PyTorch Lightning, and the initial model weights were loaded from HuggingFace.

4.1 Data

We train and test on a total of eight datasets to show where our approach demonstrates notable and promising performances. Special attention is placed on the most prominent of these eight, the CoNLL–2003 dataset (Tjong Kim Sang and De Meulder, 2003) sporting four different entity classes and its second iteration CoNLL++ (Wang et al., 2019), which corrected 5.38% of the apparently wrongly annotated test sentences.

Furthermore, we include the OntoNotes (Pradhan et al., 2013) and Few–NERD (Ding et al., 2021) datasets, which are similar to CoNLL–2003 but have more granular entities (18 and 66 entity classes, respectively). For example, whereas in CoNLL–2003, we only have a coarse-grained entity type “Person”, this is split into eight types in Few–NERD: “Actor“, “Artist/Author“, “Athlete“, “Director“, “Politician“, “Scholar“, “Soldier“, and “Other“.

Going a different route, the WNUT-17 (Derczynski et al., 2017) dataset features six different entity classes and focuses on identifying unusual, previously-unseen entities in the context of emerging discussions. We also include three domain-specific datasets, two focusing on biomedical named entities (JNLPBA in Collier et al. (2004) and NCBI-Disease in Doğan et al. (2014)) and one on financial ones (FiNER-ORD in Shah et al. (2023)). The two bio-medical datasets have five and one different entity classes, respectively, and the financial NER dataset has three.

The combined length of this dataset is 290,317 sentences for the training set, 42,016 for the validation set, and 60,477 sentences for the test set.

| Model | Size | Dataset | LoRA | Micro-F ₁ in % |
|-----------|------|---------|------|---------------------------|
| GPT2-XL | 1.5b | All | No | 72.91 |
| RedPajama | 3b | All | No | 73.61 |
| Falcon | 7b | All | Yes | 62.64 |
| Llama | 7b | All | Yes | 71.81 |
| Llama | 13b | All | Yes | 70.86 |
| GPT2-XL | 1.5b | Bio | No | 79.30 |
| BioMedLM | 2.7b | Bio | No | 81.31 |
| Llama | 7b | Bio | Yes | 76.18 |

Table 1: Results of coarse-tuning various models on our combined Named Entity Decoding dataset. The LoRA column signals if a low-rank adaptation (Hu et al., 2021) was applied. The table is split into two, the first half reports performance when all datasets are combined and the second when we only consider the two biomedical datasets. We train each model for 15 epochs and report the best micro-F₁ on the combined validation set. Due to its weak performance during this step, we do not continue our experiments with the Falcon model.

| Model | Results after coarse-tuning in micro-F ₁ in % on dataset ... | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | CoNLL-2003 | CoNLL++ | OntoNotes | Few-NERD | WNUT-17 | JNLPBA | NCBI-Disease | FiNER-ORD |
| iNERD + ... | | | | | | | | |
| GPT2-XL | 89.57 | 90.54 | 83.39 | 50.95 | 43.40 | 58.49 | 79.30 | 75.96 |
| BioMedLM | - | - | - | - | - | 59.06 | 84.05 | - |
| RedPajama | 91.06 | 92.09 | 86.93 | 51.25 | 49.03 | 57.65 | 81.17 | 80.69 |
| Llama-7b | 90.33 | 91.83 | 83.19 | 51.01 | 43.41 | 46.70 | 77.46 | 74.13 |
| Llama-13b | 90.88 | 92.09 | 81.68 | 50.22 | 39.90 | 57.85 | 75.37 | 75.56 |

Table 2: Micro-F₁ in % on each dataset before fine-tuning and after coarse-tuning each model on the complete dataset, except BioMedLM, which was only coarse-tuned on the bio-medical domain. We applied LoRA to all models with a size above 3 billion parameters. The model sizes are as reported in Table 1. We do not report the performance of bio-medical coarse-tuned GPT2-XL and Llama-7b variations, as they show worse performances than the general coarse-tuned ones.

4.2 Coarse-tuning

As a first step, we merge all training splits of the datasets discussed before and train a language model on the task of predicting the entity string E . We call this step “coarse-tuning” the pre-trained language model, as we infuse the model with a general sense of “what named entities are”. We do not apply iNERD during the validation phase to simplify this step. The results are reported in Table 1.

It should be noted that the models have to deal with quite noisy data, as the entity type tokens ξ are not the same among the datasets. Take the CoNLL-2003 and Few-NERD datasets for example. The former has four different entity type tokens, whereas the latter has 66. Nevertheless, we theorize that by simply letting the model get exposure to the general structure introduced in Equation 1 it can gather valuable insights and might even understand the link between a coarse-grained entity type like “Organization” (in CoNLL-2003) and its fine-grained subtype “Company” (in Few-NERD).

4.3 Results without dataset specific fine-tuning

Looking at Table 2, it becomes apparent that strong performances across datasets are attainable without applying specific fine-tuning on the respective training dataset. An interesting observation is that a larger model size does not consistently yield improved performance outcomes. Our largest studied model, the 13-billion parameter version of Llama, can mostly beat its smaller sister, the 7-billion version, but is largely overcome by the drastically smaller RedPajama (3-billion parameter). We theorize that the most likely explanation for this phenomenon is that during coarse-tuning, we apply LoRA to both Llama models to be able to train them in a reasonable time frame, which reduces the number of trainable parameters drastically. Therefore, for datasets with many entity classes ξ , like Few-NERD and OntoNotes, models with LoRA applied struggle to learn the subtle nuances between different classes and thus fail to outperform smaller models, likely because their available updateable parameter size is simply too small to fit these nuances.

| Model | Fine-tuning results in micro- F_1 in % on dataset ... | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | CoNLL-2003 | CoNLL++ | OntoNotes | Few-NERD | WNUT-17 | JNLPBA | NCBI-Disease | FiNER-ORD |
| iNERD + ... | | | | | | | | |
| GPT2-XL | 91.51 | 92.71 | 86.15 | 51.63 | 53.25 | 58.70 | 83.79 | 81.69 |
| BioMedLM | - | - | - | - | - | 60.08 | 86.37 | - |
| RedPajama | 91.06 | 92.09 | 87.71 | 51.81 | 55.26 | 59.38 | 85.75 | 82.82 |
| Llama-7b | 92.75 | 94.10 | 84.27 | 51.72 | 55.59 | 57.91 | 80.81 | 82.42 |
| Llama-13b | 93.09 | 94.21 | 84.58 | 51.13 | 55.76 | 59.27 | 85.07 | 83.75 |
| BERT-Base | 92.4 | - | - | - | - | - | 86.37 | - |
| BERT-Large | 92.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| BioBERT | - | - | - | - | - | 77.59 | 89.71 | - |
| PL-Marker | 94.0 | - | 91.9 | 70.9 | - | - | - | - |
| FiNER-LFs | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 79.48 |
| CrossWeigh | 93.43 | 94.28 | - | - | 50.03 | - | - | - |
| CL-KL | 93.85 | 94.81 | - | - | 60.45 | - | 88.96 | - |

Table 3: Micro- F_1 in % on each test dataset after fine-tuning. The table is divided into two parts. The first shows the performance of iNERD plus a generative language model. The second part shows the performances of various encoder-only approaches. BERT-Base and BERT-Large are taken from Devlin et al. (2019), BioBERT from Lee et al. (2019), PL-Marker from Ye et al. (2022), FiNER-LFs from Shah et al. (2023), CrossWeigh from Wang et al. (2019), and CL-KL from Wang et al. (2021).

Another insight is that pre-training on a specific domain helps the model during named entity decoding immensely, as shown in the performance of the BioMedLM model. We see this as a vast opportunity for domain-specific pre-training of generative language models to make smaller models usable for the iNERD approach.

Even though the performances reported are *not* zero-shot, as a small part of the coarse-tuning dataset consists of the training dataset of the respective dataset, this still demonstrates the impressive capabilities of such a model, the coarse-tuning routine, and the iNERD algorithm, as later shown in the ablation study.

4.4 Fine-tuning results

After evaluating the iNERD approach on its capabilities after coarse-tuning, we further fine-tune it on each dataset. The results of this can be seen in Table 3. In there, we also report various competing approaches and their performances, taken from the respective papers.

A first observation is that iNERD is capable of performing on par with or better than the standard encoder-only approach reported for the BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) model. A more general observation is that iNERD performs considerably well on datasets with a smaller entity class size, like CoNLL-2003 or NCBI-Disease. For our main focus, the datasets CoNLL-2003 and its corrected version CoNLL++, iNERD is able to be almost on par with competing state-of-the-art encoder-only approaches (Ye et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2019), which are complex implementations and are thus in stark contrast to our simple and still effective approach.

On the one hand, it struggles especially on Few-NERD and OntoNotes, where the entity class size is significantly larger. Furthermore, the fine variations of various bio-medical terms in JNLPBA and the novel entities in WNUT-17 seem also to be a considerable hurdle for our approach. Of course, one could have simply excluded these datasets from this study, but we want to point out fields where our approach is struggling, where it might be improved upon with further research, and therefore, not simply ignore possible drawbacks of our method.

Nevertheless, on the other hand, we surpass the current best-performing model on FiNER-ORD, beating it by a considerable margin of more than 4% F_1 and establishing a new state-of-the-art for financial named entity recognition on this dataset.

In total, the results of our approach are promising for the concept of using generative language models for tasks that they are not originally intended for, as we show that our relatively simple approach can surpass the comparatively simple one proposed in Devlin et al. (2019).

4.5 Ablation study

To show the advantages of each component of our approach, we conduct an ablation study on the CoNLL-2003 and CoNLL++ datasets. The results are shown in Table 4.

As seen there, each component of the iNERD approach adds to the overall performance. If we subtract the coarse-tuning as well as informed decoding steps, the micro- F_1 score falls to a paltry but expected 0% for the no fine-tuning

| Approach | Results in micro-F ₁ in % | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| | no fine-tuning | fine-tuning |
| <i>CoNLL-2003</i> | | |
| iNERD + Llama-7b | 90.33 | 92.75 |
| - informed decoding | 86.52 | 92.43 |
| - coarse-tuning | 0.0 | 91.81 |
| - both | 0.0 | 91.72 |
| <i>CoNLL++</i> | | |
| iNERD + Llama-7b | 91.83 | 94.10 |
| - informed decoding | 87.81 | 93.71 |
| - coarse-tuning | 0.0 | 93.14 |
| - both | 0.0 | 93.01 |

Table 4: Reported here are the micro-F₁ scores in % on the test set of CoNLL-2003 and CoNLL++ for the original iNERD approach with a Llama-7b language model and the scores when we subtract either the informed decoding algorithm (see Algorithm 1), the coarse-tuning step, or both.

environment, similarly when we only exclude the coarse-tuning step. Not so momentous, but still significant, the informed decoding described in Algorithm 1 adds around 4% improvement for both datasets.

A similar, but not so severe, picture can be observed during fine-tuning, where the distance between each step subtracted shrinks, but is still present. In such a setting, we observe an overall improvement of more than 1% for the CoNLL-2003 and CoNLL++ datasets when we compare the complete approach to the one with all components turned off.

5 Conclusion

We introduced a novel approach for named entity recognition (NER) which leverages the outstanding language understanding capabilities of modern large language models (LLMs). Our Informed Named Entity Recognition Decoding (iNERD) algorithm is easy to implement and arguably as simple as an “encoder-only” transformer plus multilayer-perceptron classifier approach as proposed in the seminal BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) paper. It builds on top of recent LLMs and is thus future-proof, as the employed LLMs can easily be replaced by improved models whenever they become available. It furthermore incorporates an informed decoding scheme which further improves performance, eliminates any risk of hallucinations, and significantly increases the adaptability. This informed scheme leverages the named entity decoding structure proposed herein to mask out disallowed tokens during the prediction phase.

Extensive experimental validation shows the performance of our framework to be mostly on par with competing “encoder-only” approaches, if not better. Experiments further reveal considerable and outstanding adaptive capabilities and show that iNERD can react to changes in the underlying data distribution without any additional fine-tuning. This contrasts said “encoder-only” approaches, which dominate the current NER landscape, as these have to be retrained whenever their set of entity classes changes.

An obvious next step is testing the largest generative language models, like the 70 billion parameter version of Llama, the 40 billion parameter version of Falcon, or even the 176 billion parameter version of Bloom. Using these could improve the performance of the complete iNERD setup on each dataset even further. On the other hand, training these huge model variations is extremely expensive and beyond our current computational capabilities. As already discussed in the Results section, applying LoRA, a method to freeze certain parts of the model to allow training large models, likely leads to a performance decrease. This is yet another interesting path to take for future research, as one could try pre-training large language models without this technique to improve the downstream performance further. Similarly, one could increase the size of the coarse-tuning dataset and include even more datasets.

Another promising starting point for future research is investigating how the various highly specialized named entity recognition techniques developed for encoder-only models like PL-Marker (Ye et al., 2022) or Co-Regularization (Zhou and Chen, 2021) can be applied to generative language models and iNERD to improve the performance further.

Different information extraction tasks like relation extraction or event identification are also clear candidates for future research, which we plan to tackle in a similar manner as iNERD, as these tasks are “rigid” like NER and would thus profit from an informed approach like the one we propose.

From a more practical standpoint, we plan to implement the iNERD approach in various real-world applications in the world of Financial Auditing and Bio-Medicine, for the advantages of our approach are clear: highly effective on unseen data with a variable entity set ξ (see Table 2) and easily upgradeable with the newest large language model.

Acknowledgments

This research has been funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany and the state of North-Rhine Westphalia as part of the Lamarr-Institute for Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence.

We would like to thank our colleagues and friends Armin Berger, Kostadin Cvejovski, Leonhard David, Maren Pielka, and Rajkumar Ramamurthy for providing valuable feedback on this paper.

References

- Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Merouane Debbah, Etienne Goffinet, Daniel Heslow, Julien Launay, Quentin Malartic, Badreddine Noune, Baptiste Pannier, and Guilherme Penedo. Falcon-40B: an open large language model with state-of-the-art performance, 2023. Forthcoming.
- Yejin Bang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Nayeon Lee, Wenliang Dai, Dan Su, Bryan Wilie, Holy Lovenia, Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Willy Chung, Quyet V. Do, Yan Xu, and Pascale Fung. A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of ChatGPT on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity, 2023.
- Daniel M. Bikel, Scott Miller, Richard Schwartz, and Ralph Weischedel. Nymble: a high-performance learning name-finder. In *Proc. Applied Natural Language Processing*, 1997.
- Elliot Bolton, David Hall, Michihiro Yasunaga, Tony Lee, Chris Manning, and Percy Liang. BioMedLM. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2022/12/15/biomedlm.html>, 2022. Accessed: 2023-24-07.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2020.
- Nigel Collier, Tomoko Ohta, Yoshimasa Tsuruoka, Yuka Tateisi, and Jin-Dong Kim. Introduction to the bio-entity recognition task at JNLPBA. In *Proc. NLPBA/BioNLP*, pages 73–78, 2004.
- Michael Collins and Yoram Singer. Unsupervised models for named entity classification. In *Proc. EMNLP*, 1999.
- Leon Derczynski, Eric Nichols, Marieke van Erp, and Nut Limsopatham. Results of the WNUT2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition. In *Proc. Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 140–147, September 2017. doi:10.18653/v1/W17-4418. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W17-4418>.
- Tobias Deuber, Maren Pielka, Lisa Pucknat, Basil Jacob, Tim Dilmaghani, Mahdis Nourimand, Bernd Kliem, Rüdiger Loitz, Christian Bauckhage, and Rafet Sifa. Contradiction detection in financial reports. In *Proc. NLDL*, volume 4, 2023. doi:10.7557/18.6799.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proc. NAACL-HLT*, 2019. doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423.
- Ning Ding, Guangwei Xu, Yulin Chen, Xiaobin Wang, Xu Han, Pengjun Xie, Haitao Zheng, and Zhiyuan Liu. Few-NERD: A few-shot named entity recognition dataset. In *Proc. ACL-IJCNLP*, pages 3198–3213, 2021. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.248.
- Chenxiao Dou, Xianghui Sun, Yaoshu Wang, Yunjie Ji, Baochang Ma, and Xiangang Li. Domain-adapted dependency parsing for cross-domain named entity recognition. In *Proc. AAAI*, 2023.
- Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, Robert Leaman, and Zhiyong Lu. Ncbi disease corpus: A resource for disease name recognition and concept normalization. *J. of Biomedical Informatics*, 47:1–10, feb 2014. ISSN 1532-0464.
- Oren Etzioni, Michael Cafarella, Doug Downey, Ana-Maria Popescu, Tal Shaked, Stephen Soderland, Daniel S. Weld, and Alexander Yates. Unsupervised named-entity extraction from the web: An experimental study. *Artificial Intelligence*, 165(1):91–134, 2005. ISSN 0004-3702. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2005.03.001>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004370205000366>.
- Hao Fei, Shengqiong Wu, Jingye Li, Bobo Li, Fei Li, Libo Qin, Meishan Zhang, Min Zhang, and Tat-Seng Chua. LasUIE: Unifying information extraction with latent adaptive structure-aware generative language model. In *Proc. NeurIPS*, volume 35, pages 15460–15475, 2022.
- Ralph Grishman and Beth Sundheim. Message Understanding Conference- 6: A brief history. In *Proc. COLING*, 1996. URL <https://aclanthology.org/C96-1079>.

- Franz A. Heinsen. An algorithm for routing vectors in sequences, 2022.
- Lars Hillebrand, Tobias Deußer, Tim Dilmaghani, Bernd Kliem, Rüdiger Loitz, Christian Bauckhage, and Rafet Sifa. KPI-BERT: A joint named entity recognition and relation extraction model for financial reports. In *Proc. ICPR*, pages 606–612, 2022. doi:10.1109/ICPR56361.2022.9956191.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, 2021.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240, 09 2019. ISSN 1367-4803. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz682. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz682>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.
- Ying Luo, Fengshun Xiao, and Zhao Hai. Hierarchical contextualized representation for named entity recognition. In *Proc. AAAI*, 2020.
- Paul McNamee and James Mayfield. Entity extraction without language-specific resources. In *Proc. COLING*, 2002. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W02-2020>.
- Ngoc Dang Nguyen, Wei Tan, Wray L. Buntine, Richard Beare, Changyou Chen, and Lan Du. Auc maximization for low-resource named entity recognition. In *Proc. AAAI*, 2023.
- OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report, 2023.
- Ildikó Pilán, Pierre Lison, Lilja Øvrelid, Anthi Papadopoulou, David Sánchez, and Montserrat Batet. The Text Anonymization Benchmark (TAB): A Dedicated Corpus and Evaluation Framework for Text Anonymization. *Computational Linguistics*, 48(4):1053–1101, 12 2022. ISSN 0891-2017. doi:10.1162/coli_a_00458. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/coli_a_00458.
- Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue, Hwee Tou Ng, Anders Björkelund, Olga Uryupina, Yuchen Zhang, and Zhi Zhong. Towards robust linguistic analysis using OntoNotes. In *Proc. CoNLL*, pages 143–152, 2013. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W13-3516>.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. <https://openai.com/research/language-unsupervised>, 2018. Accessed: 2023-07-07.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. <https://openai.com/research/better-language-models>, 2019. Accessed: 2023-07-07.
- Jack W. Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher, 2022.
- Lance Ramshaw and Mitch Marcus. Text chunking using transformation-based learning. In *Workshop on Very Large Corpora*, 1995. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W95-0107>.
- Tevan Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. BLOOM: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model, 2023.
- Agam Shah, Ruchit Vithani, Abhinav Gullapalli, and Sudheer Chava. Finer: Financial named entity recognition dataset and weak-supervision model, 2023.
- Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *Proc. Conf. on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL*, 2003. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W03-0419>.
- Together Computer. RedPajama: An open source recipe to reproduce llama training dataset. <https://github.com/togethercomputer/RedPajama-Data>, 2023. Accessed: 2023-17-07.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023a.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023b.

- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2017.
- Harsh Verma, Sabine Bergler, and Narjesossadat Tahaei. Comparing and combining some popular NER approaches on biomedical tasks. In *Proc. BioNLP*, 2023.
- Shuhe Wang, Xiaofei Sun, Xiaoya Li, Rongbin Ouyang, Fei Wu, Tianwei Zhang, Jiwei Li, and Guoyin Wang. GPT-NER: Named entity recognition via large language models, 2023.
- Xinyu Wang, Yong Jiang, Nguyen Bach, Tao Wang, Zhongqiang Huang, Fei Huang, and Kewei Tu. Improving named entity recognition by external context retrieving and cooperative learning. In *Proc. ACL-IJCNLP*, 2021.
- Zihan Wang, Jingbo Shang, Liyuan Liu, Lihao Lu, Jiacheng Liu, and Jiawei Han. CrossWeigh: Training named entity tagger from imperfect annotations. In *Proc. EMNLP-IJCNLP*, pages 5154–5163, 2019. doi:10.18653/v1/D19-1519.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yzkSU5zdwD>.
- Ronald J. Williams and David Zipser. A learning algorithm for continually running fully recurrent neural networks. *Neural Computation*, 1:270–280, 1989.
- Ikuya Yamada, Akari Asai, Hiroyuki Shindo, Hideaki Takeda, and Yuji Matsumoto. LUKE: Deep contextualized entity representations with entity-aware self-attention. In *Proc. EMNLP*, 2020.
- Hang Yan, Tao Gui, Junqi Dai, Qipeng Guo, Zheng Zhang, and Xipeng Qiu. A unified generative framework for various NER subtasks. In *Proc. ACL-IJCNLP*, 2021.
- Deming Ye, Yankai Lin, Peng Li, and Maosong Sun. Packed levitated marker for entity and relation extraction. In *Proc. ACL*, pages 4904–4917, May 2022. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.337. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.337>.
- Shaodian Zhang and Noémie Elhadad. Unsupervised biomedical named entity recognition: Experiments with clinical and biological texts. *J. of Biomedical Informatics*, 46 6:1088–98, 2013.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. OPT: Open pre-trained transformer language models, 2022.
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models, 2023.
- Wenxuan Zhou and Muhao Chen. Learning from noisy labels for entity-centric information extraction. In *Proc. EMNLP*, 2021.