

# EXCEEDS: Extracting Complex Events as Connecting the Dots to Graphs in Scientific Domain

Yi-Fan Lu  
Beijing Institute of Technology  
Haidian, Beijing, China  
yifanlu@bit.edu.cn

Xian-Ling Mao  
Beijing Institute of Technology  
Haidian, Beijing, China

Bo Wang  
Beijing Institute of Technology  
Haidian, Beijing, China

Xiao Liu  
Beijing Institute of Technology  
Haidian, Beijing, China


Heyan Huang  
Beijing Institute of Technology  
Haidian, Beijing, China

## ABSTRACT

It is crucial to utilize events to understand a specific domain. There are lots of research on event extraction in many domains such as news, finance and biology domain. However, scientific domain still lacks event extraction research, including comprehensive datasets and corresponding methods. Compared to other domains, scientific domain presents two characteristics: denser nuggets and more complex events. To solve the above problem, considering these two characteristics, we first construct SciEvents, a large-scale multi-event document-level dataset with a schema tailored for scientific domain. It has 2,508 documents and 24,381 events under refined annotation and quality control. Then, we propose EXCEEDS, a novel end-to-end scientific event extraction framework by storing dense nuggets in a grid matrix and simplifying complex event extraction into a dot construction and connection task. Experimental results demonstrate state-of-the-art performances of EXCEEDS on SciEvents. Additionally, we release SciEvents and EXCEEDS on GitHub.

## KEYWORDS

Event Extraction



**Figure 1: An Instance of Document-level Event Extraction in Scientific Domain. The solid line indicates the link from an event trigger to an event argument, and the dashed line indicates the hierarchy formed by the two event triggers.**

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Event Extraction (EE) aims to detect event instance(s) as well as all of its participants and attributes in texts by analyzing and identifying mentions of semantically defined entities and relationships within them [8, 52]. EE task usually consists of 2 subtasks, Event Detection (ED) and Event Argument Extraction (EAE). Specifically, an ED system identifies the word(s) that most clearly refer to the occurrence of an event, i.e., event trigger, and also detects the type of event that is evoked by the event trigger [35]. EAE subtask aims to recognize nuggets as event arguments and classify their roles in events.

EE is widely utilized to extract structured information from enormous natural language texts in various scenarios and domains, including internet news wire, radio conversation, internet blogs [1, 7, 41, 46], business [16, 20, 53, 58], biology [10, 30], legislation [13, 39, 55], and so on. In scientific domain, the historical accumulation and the increasing addition of new literature make up a large amount of corpus content, which requires efficient data governance and information extraction.

However, there is a divide between scientific domain and general domain that is difficult to cross directly. Firstly, there are more complex information forms in scientific domain. Even though most general EE is task-specialized and relies on demand-specific ontologies [25], these various ontologies usually follow the same kind of plain tabular schema, which neglects hierarchical structure of events, restricts the continuity of arguments, and complicates the coreference problem, while these complex information forms are often the case in scientific domain. For example in Figure 1, (1) the trigger *evaluate* and the trigger *using* form a hierarchical relationship; (2) the trigger *identity* connects an inconsecutive argument *state-of-the-art performance of candidate models*; (3) the trigger *evaluate* connects an argument *FIESTA* with a far distance from itself. These three examples demonstrate complex nuggets and events in scientific domain. Secondly, the content in scientific domain, especially in abstracts of literature, tends to be denser in nuggets and events (Statistical evidence will be presented later). While many event datasets in general domain consist of sentence-level data or document-level with single event data, events in scientific domain spread triggers and several arguments across a document within a few sentences, leading to denser multi-event document-level data like the example in Figure 1. Even though documents in scientific domain present a high volume of domain-specific terminologies,

the lack of datasets hinders the development of event extraction in scientific domain as well as domain migration research.

To build a strongly comprehensive schema tailored for scientific domain and address the training data availability problem, we design a nugget-event schema for scientific literature abstracts by dividing abstracts into four different environments and designing specific event types for each environment. With this schema, we create **SciEvents**, a large-scale multi-event document-level dataset with 2508 refined annotated data. In contrast to event datasets in other domains, SciEvents has denser nuggets in documents and more complex events. Firstly, statistics show that SciEvents has nearly 40% tokens belonging to nuggets, a proportion that far exceeds that of other datasets in general domain. What’s more, event arguments in SciEvents have over 3 tokens on average, while arguments of datasets in other domains have no more than 2.2 tokens on average. Secondly, non-flat nuggets and hierarchical event structure lead to complex events. There are over 36% non-flat nuggets representing event arguments. Also, more than 25% sub-events form a rich hierarchy of events.

Denser and more complex nuggets and events pose two challenges to existing event extraction methods. On the one hand, the density requires methods to utilize global information rather than only extracting events at the level of individual sentences or isolation events. Also, overlap among dense nuggets and events requires precise demarcation of nugget boundaries. On the other hand, to address the complexity problem, models are expected to recognize and extract the relationships between tokens and between events.

In response to the density and complexity characteristics of SciEvents, in this paper, we propose **EXCEEDS**, a method to **extract complex events as connecting the dots to graphs on scientific domain**. As for the density, our method stores dense nuggets and events in a word-word event grid by modeling relations between each token pair in a document. Through the grid, we can encode all nuggets and events simultaneously and decode them at once during inference. In terms of complexity, our method simplifies complex event extraction into a dot construction and connection task. Regarding nuggets as dots and event-argument as well as event-event links as edges, EXCEEDS encodes dots and edges at the same time.

In experiments, we complement the existing event extraction task by adding event correlation metrics that evaluate the ability of models to extract hierarchical events. Then, we conduct state-of-the-art and recent event extraction methods on SciEvents. Results demonstrate that our method exhibits superior performance than other methods on all tasks, especially in the extraction of hierarchy events. Additionally, experiments on complex scenarios reveal the challenge of extracting complex nuggets.

Our contributions are three-fold: (1) To address the lack of event extraction research in scientific domain, we construct SciEvents, a large-scale event extraction dataset in scientific domain with a refined schema. The proposed dataset is the first scientific event extraction dataset. (2) To solve problems of dense and complex nuggets and events in scientific domain, we propose EXCEEDS, a novel end-to-end extractive method to model relationships of all token pairs at once and simplify complex event extraction into a dot construction and connection task. (3) We define the event

extraction task on SciEvents with additional complementary metrics. Experiments demonstrate that the proposed method EXCEEDS achieves state-of-the-art performances on SciEvent.

## 2 RELATED WORKS

*Event Extraction Datasets.* When dealing with EE tasks, there are various kinds of target domains and corresponding datasets are constructed. General domain usually describes events in realistic scenarios and there are commonly used datasets [1, 7, 41, 46]. Recently, general domain datasets are created from numerous data sources like Wikipedia [14, 44, 48], Reddit[4], Baidu news [15], FrameNet [33] and multi-lingual candidate data [35]. In financial domain, specialized ontologies along with datasets are proposed to analyze the specific characteristics of financial documents [16, 20, 53, 58]. What’s more, datasets in biomedical domain are constructed to cover hot topics that reflect the evolving needs of biologists [10, 30], while nowadays some datasets similar to those in biomedical domain are also proposed like [27] in clinic and [42] in pharmacovigilance. In addition, some researchers construct datasets for other domains such as literary [40], cybersecurity [29, 38], legal event [13, 39, 55] and suicide [9, 36]. However, there is a lack of information structure analysis and event datasets for scientific domain. In our work, we will analyze the characteristics of literature abstracts and construct a scientific domain event dataset, SciEvents.

*Event Extraction Approaches.* Event Extraction (EE) has undergone considerable evolution, progressing from traditional sequence labeling approaches to the incorporation of sophisticated machine learning models, especially large language models (LLMs). To extract multiple heterogeneous annotation elements in EE datasets [34], many EE approaches initially leverage connections within or among events using joint methods [17, 21, 31, 32, 43, 54]. This paradigm shifted markedly with the adoption of Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) methods. MRC recast EE as a form of question-answering, significantly refining the extraction process [2, 3, 11, 50, 59]. The advancement continued with the development of sequence-to-structure generation using Transformer architectures, which combined event detection and argument extraction into a more cohesive framework [19, 23, 24, 26, 47]. The latest innovations involve LLMs that exhibit superior generalization capabilities due to their extensive pre-training, pushing the boundaries of traditional EE methods and enabling zero-shot capabilities in event extraction, representing a significant leap forward in NLP [5, 6, 37, 49, 51]. However, certain methods overlook the compositional diversity of mentions. They struggle with handling complex events that consist of inconsecutive, overlapping, reverse-ordered, etc., mentions. Consequently, these approaches may only perform effectively on specific datasets or necessitate additional modules when transitioning to different datasets or target domains. In our work, we tackle these challenges by introducing EXCEEDS, a novel approach designed for the complex SciEvents dataset.

## 3 DATASET CONSTRUCTION

Different from the data in social, biological, and financial domains, scientific documents are readily available and contain rich semantic information due to the vast amount of high-quality literature. Based on this fact, our main goal is to construct a scientific event dataset




Figure 2: Dataset Construction Process of SciEvents

by collecting the most representative literature in scientific domain and annotating abstracts of them. Because there is no scientific schema available for reference, we need to design a reasonable schema according to the observation of abstracts. Figure 2 shows the construction process of SciEvents and how data flows through the process. In the following sections, we will introduce schema in SciEvents firstly, the construction process secondly, and analysis of SciEvents finally.

### 3.1 Event Schema Construction

We find that an abstract generally consists of four-part environments, namely background, related works, methodology, and experimental results. They are almost arranged in this order to form the abstract of a paper. Based on this observation, we propose 10 types of events that fit the above environments. For example, in the methodology environment, there exists *Propose*, *WorkStatement*, and *MethodStep* events. Then, we define the argument types for each event type based on what researchers focus on when reading abstracts. Then we invite 2 professors and 3 experienced Ph.D. students majoring in natural language processing to annotate seed documents and revise the schema for 4 rounds. We provide the complete schema of SciEvents in Appendix A.

### 3.2 Candidate Document Collection

We collect both long and short papers from the recent 4 years (2019-2022) ACL<sup>1</sup> main conference papers. Overall, there are 2848 candidate documents.

### 3.3 Annotation Process

We hire a long-term labeling company to annotate and divide the annotation process into three stages:

*Pre-annotation.* At first, we train 3 directors for 3 months to help us achieve the following process. Each of them annotated 50 documents and received our feedback for every document. Then, we and these directors proclaimed this annotation project to approximately 40 employees and adopted 21 employees to pre-annotate. Then we screened out employees by checking their pre-annotation results with over 25 documents. And for each employee, one director would conduct a one-on-one question and answer session lasting 3 days with no less than 12 documents. Overall, 7 qualified employees entered into the next stage as annotators.

*Official Annotation.* We give both thorough and brief annotation guidelines to annotators. Because of the hierarchical structure in the schema, annotators are required to annotate each document independently instead of annotating specific event types which causes extra time costs in handing over all documents. During this stage, we meet weekly to review problems encountered to give timely feedback according to results in the simultaneous quality inspection stage.

*Quality Inspection.* 3 directors and 2 well-performing annotators will check most documents. We make sure that annotators and quality inspectors are staggered. Once there are over 2 conflicts in a document, it will be returned to the annotator with revision comments from a quality inspector.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

In this subsection, we will introduce the density and complexity of SciEvents through statistics.

<sup>1</sup><https://aclanthology.org/venues/acl/>

**Table 1: Statistics of widely-adopted event datasets. #NugProp.: Proportion of document tokens belonging to nuggets. #ArgToken.: Average number of tokens in an argument.**

Dataset	#Documents	#Sentences	#Tokens	#Events	#Tokens/Events	#NugProp.	#ArgToken.
ACE2005	597	18,927	305,266	5,055	60.389	0.037	1.179
RAMS	3,993	44,236	1,218,622	9,124	133.562	0.040	1.989
WIKIEVENTS	246	6,132	189,718	3,951	48.018	0.057	1.296
DICE	200	4,539	107,130	13,128	8.160	0.386	2.154
SciEvents	2,508	16,048	439,890	24,381	18.042	0.395	3.120

*Basic Information.* We compare four widely used event datasets in Table 1 and conclude the following findings:

SciEvents exhibits characteristics of a high-density dataset. This conclusion is drawn from the last three columns of the table. Firstly, the *Tokens/Events* ratio at 18.042 suggests a higher event density compared to other datasets, indicating that, on average, fewer tokens trigger an event. Secondly, the proportion of document tokens belonging to nuggets (*NugProp*) is 0.395, a substantial figure showing a high density of nuggets within the document and significantly larger than that of other datasets. Finally, the average number of tokens in an argument (*ArgToken*) is 3.12, indicating that the arguments in events are comparably dense. It is noticeable that the clinical dataset DICE has a lower *Tokens/Events* ratio, due to the succinct medical diagnostic content, where brief statements densely convey patient conditions.

Domain specificity is evident within the datasets presented. ACE2005 and RAMS fall under the news domain, WIKIEVENTS is categorized as general domain, DICE belongs to clinical domain, and SciEvents is a scientific domain dataset. On the one hand, the statistics for ACE2005, RAMS, and WIKIEVENTS are relatively similar to each other because they all include real events. On the other hand, DICE and SciEvents are datasets with more condensed textual content. This similarity within domain groups emphasizes how domain characteristics influence dataset statistics.

The above statistics and findings confirm that SciEvents is a large-scale dense dataset. Therefore, the extraction on SciEvents requires additional consideration of dense nuggets and events, and focusing on individual events would ignore the density characteristic. In METHOD section, we will perform multi-event document-level event extraction by modeling all events and nuggets of a document into a grid matrix to exploit the interaction among dense nuggets and events.


*Event Types Distribution.* Figure 3 shows the distribution of event types in SciEvents. We analyze it from the perspective of the aforementioned environments and get the following three findings:

Firstly, the segmentation of event types into four distinct environments reflects practical considerations in scientific writing. Typically, authors allocate more space in scientific literature abstracts to methodology (Method.), followed by experimental results (Exp.), related works (Related.), and background (Back.). This prioritization is corroborated by SciEvents, which indicates a higher number of event instances associated with methodology than any other environment.

Secondly, *RelatedWorkStep* (RWS) events have the fewest instances amongst all categories. This trend aligns with common practice in scientific literature abstracts where authors seldom discuss the steps of other methods. Instead, there is a tendency to highlight the flaws in other methods, which is reflected in SciEvents by a relatively larger number of *RelatedWorkFault* (RWF) instances.

Thirdly, excluding the *Purpose* (PUR) event classified as a general environment event, *WorkStatement* (WKS), *MethodStep* (MDS) and *OutcomeFact* (FAC) are more prevalent. WKS and MDS primarily describe the specific content of the work and detailed steps of the methods, respectively, while FAC pertains to the factual conclusions derived from experiments. These three events are indeed more prominent in abstracts, which is supported by their higher instance counts in the dataset.

These findings suggest a strong correlation between the event type distribution of SciEvents and the typical structure and content emphasis found in scientific abstracts. The analysis substantiates the assumption that methodology, experimental results, and factual outcomes are given more prominence in scientific literature abstracts, while detailed discussion of related work steps is less common.



**Figure 3: Distribution of Event Types in SciEvents**

*Argument Types Distribution.* Figure 4 shows the distribution of argument types in SciEvents. We offer insights into the argument types frequency and possible interpretations:

At first, the argument *Aim* and *Target*, which represent the purpose, have a relatively high instance count among all argument types, which indicates that authors commonly state the research purpose in abstracts. The emphasis on *Aim* and *Target* aligns with the norm of highlighting the objectives of the study early on in the abstract to provide readers with a clear understanding of the research direction. Also, *Content* is another argument type with a significant number of instances. This reflects the tendency of authors to elaborate on the substance of their work, which is a central aspect of the summary presented in the abstract.

Additionally, the argument *Condition* and *Dataset*, which can be regarded as another kind of condition, also show high instance counts, suggesting that conditions under which the studies were conducted and the datasets used are frequently mentioned. These details are crucial for reproducibility and contextual understanding of the research.

However, the argument *Reason* has the least instances among the argument types. This may imply that authors are less inclined to discuss the underlying reasons behind their findings in the abstract, possibly due to space constraints or the preference to focus on objectives and results.

As for the moderately represented arguments, we take *Proposer* as an example, indicating that the abstracts do provide information about the individuals or entities proposing the research, but these are not as prevalent as other argument types.

The above analysis indicates that scientific abstracts tend to prioritize the articulation of research aims, conditions, datasets, and content. These elements form the cornerstone of informative abstracts, allowing readers to quickly grasp the what, how, and with what of the research. The lesser focus on reasons or detailed arguments underscores the concise nature of abstracts, which aim to communicate the most salient aspects of the work.




Figure 4: Distribution of Argument Types in SciEvents

Table 2: Proportions of Complex Nuggets and Events

Forms	Instances	Proportion
Inconsecutive nugget	2,492	0.031
Overlapped nugget	27,229	0.337
Reverse-ordered nugget	819	0.010
Sub-event	6,250	0.256

*Complex Information Forms.* SciEvents provides information in forms that match real-life complex scenarios. As a multi-event document-level dataset, SciEvents provides a hierarchical event structure and complex nugget structures. Regarding the former, we employ a sub-event structure to link up events that may have hierarchical relationships, and include sub-event candidate restriction in the schema. As for the latter, we annotate non-flat nuggets including inconsecutive and overlapped nuggets, and in addition, we include reverse-ordered nuggets to explicitly address the coreference problem in real scenarios.

Table 2 shows the proportion of the above information forms in SciEvents. As for the complex nuggets, the aggregate proportion of non-flat nuggets (inconsecutive, overlapped, and reverse-ordered) exceeds 37%. Overlapped nuggets make up the majority of complex nuggets due to the multi-event nature of SciEvents, where some arguments sharing certain words spread across different events.

The substantial percentage of complex nuggets underscores the complexity of SciEvents and presents a significant challenge to existing research methodologies. Lots of existing approaches focus on the extraction of flat nuggets but struggle to address the nuances of these non-flat nuggets due to their discontinuous, overlapping, or reverse-ordered nature. In METHOD section, we will introduce a feasible method to address these kinds of complex nuggets by modeling the head-tail relationships of each token pair.

As for the complex events, the proportion of sub-events is over 25%, highlighting the rich hierarchical event structure. The significant presence of sub-events suggests the potential for in-depth research into nested event relationships. In METHOD section, we will explicitly model the event hierarchy by linking the two triggers of events with a hierarchical relationship.

### 3.5 Remunerations

At the official annotation stage, we record 364 minutes for an annotator to annotate 19 consecutive documents, an average of 19.1 minutes per document. We pay about 4.5\$ for each piece of data.

## 4 PROBLEM FORMULATION

In domain-specific Event Extraction, there is always a predefined schema  $S = \{ET, AT\}$ , where  $ET, AT$  means an event type set and an argument type set, respectively, and each event type  $et \in ET$  has a distinctive argument type set  $AT(et)$ . Given a document  $D$ , event extraction aims to extract several events  $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_M\}$  in  $D$ , where each event  $e = \{et, t, A\}$  consists of an event type  $et \in ET$ , a trigger  $t$  and several arguments  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\}$ . Each argument  $a = \{at, m\}$  consists of an argument type  $at \in AT(et)$  and an argument mention  $m$ . All the triggers and arguments are treated as nuggets, whose mentions should be combinations of tokens in  $D$ .




Figure 5: The Architecture of EXCEEDS

In SciEvents, we add event correlation task to extract the hierarchy of events. Specifically, the trigger  $t_s$  of sub-event  $e_s = \{et_s, t_s, A_s\}$  will be regarded as an argument of main-event  $e_m = \{et_m, t_m, A_m\}$  with a certain argument type  $at_s$ , i.e.  $\{t_s, at_s\} \in A_m$ .

## 5 METHOD

The architecture of our framework is illustrated in Figure 5. We try to model the event extraction in an end-to-end way, where the events are encoded within a word-word event grid matrix.

### 5.1 Word-Word Event Grid

To effectively capture the complex relationships among nuggets and their token combinations in SciEvents, we employ the relation  $r \in R$  between each token pair  $(x_i, x_j)$  in a document  $D = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_L\}$ , where  $R$  encompasses predefined relations, including NONE, Head-Tail-Link (HTL), Tail-Head-Link (THL), and Event-Argument-Link (EAL).

Similar to [12], NONE indicates that the word pair does not have any relation. HTL denotes the successive relation of a word pair within a nugget, preserving the order in a row-column format.  $THL-nt \in S$  specifies the nugget type, where the word in a certain grid row serves as the tail, and the word in a corresponding column serves as the head. In addition to this, we extend the selection of HTL to the global range of the grid instead of the upper triangular area in [12], enabling the modeling of inverse-order nuggets in SciEvents.

The event-argument relation and event correlation are also modeled in this grid. We employ EAL for encoding if a relation exists between two nuggets, with the former serving as the lead nugget, i.e. trigger in event-argument relation and main-event trigger in event correlation, and the latter serving as the subsequent nugget, i.e. argument in event-argument relation and sub-event trigger in event correlation. Here, the word in a certain grid row acts as the

tail of the lead nugget, and the word in a corresponding column functions as the head of the other nugget.

The benefits of this grid and relation design are threefold. Firstly, it utilizes word-word relation to encode complex nugget structures within a document, including overlapped, inconsecutive, and inverse nuggets. Secondly, it facilitates a unified treatment of event detection and event argument extraction through an end-to-end approach, which ensures that the entire framework can incorporate contextual information and avoid relying on separate models in intermediate pipe-lined steps. Lastly, the design captures hierarchical event relations by encoding correlations between trigger pairs.

### 5.2 Approach

With the word-word event grid, we can extract events in an end-to-end way as illustrated in Figure 5. At first, we apply a transformers-based pre-trained language model (PTM) to encode document  $D$  and get its contextualized representation. Then we add an BiLSTM network to reinforce the contextual relationships in a document:

$$C = \text{PTM}(D),$$

$$L = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\} = \text{BiLSTM}(C).$$

To generate a high-quality representation of grid, we utilize Conditional Layer Normalization (CLN) similar to [18] to conditionally model the head-tail relationship of each token pair. Specifically, for an input hidden state tensor  $x \in L$ , it is normalized by CLN as:

$$x = \text{MLP}_\gamma(L) \cdot \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma + \epsilon} + \text{MLP}_\beta(L),$$

where  $\epsilon$  is the smoothing parameter,  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  are the mean and standard deviation of each hidden layer of  $x$ , respectively.  $\text{MLP}_\gamma$  and  $\text{MLP}_\beta$  are two trainable modules which computed by:

$$\text{MLP}_\gamma(L) = W_\gamma L + b_\gamma,$$

$$\text{MLP}_\beta(L) = W_\beta L + b_\beta,$$

**Table 3: Main Extraction Results of Different Approaches**

Model	TI(%)			TC(%)			AI(%)			AC(%)			EC(%)		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
OneIE	<b>75.45</b>	74.18	74.74	<b>60.50</b>	59.38	59.88	15.66	10.70	12.52	15.02	10.23	11.97	35.27	7.06	11.66
BartGen	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.30	17.46	19.96	21.17	15.88	18.15	12.36	3.98	6.02
UIE	68.50	47.36	56.00	54.60	37.65	44.57	38.10	22.39	28.21	36.03	23.40	26.68	37.43	22.23	27.89
PAIE	—	—	—	—	—	—	41.83	<b>41.97</b>	41.89	39.69	<b>40.01</b>	39.83	<b>44.75</b>	46.95	45.55
EXCEEDS	72.31	<b>79.92</b>	<b>75.92</b>	60.12	<b>66.41</b>	<b>63.11</b>	<b>46.94</b>	41.82	<b>44.23</b>	<b>44.43</b>	39.55	<b>41.85</b>	44.45	<b>51.25</b>	<b>47.60</b>

where  $W_\gamma, W_\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$ ,  $b_\gamma, b_\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times h}$ ,  $h$  is the hidden size of  $x$ . Through CLN, we can get the grid matrix  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l \times h}$ :

$$H = \text{CLN}(L).$$

Considering EAL in the word-word event grid, the connection between the trigger and the argument is explicitly labeled in a row-column way. Therefore, we add a BiAttention module to focus on learning the connection between triggers and arguments as follows:

$$Z_h = \text{Attention}(H_i:Q_h, H_i:K_h, H_i:V_h),$$

$$Z_v = \text{Attention}(H_j:Q_v, H_j:K_v, H_j:V_v),$$

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{h}}\right)V,$$

$$Z = \text{MLP}(Z_h \oplus Z_v),$$

where  $Q_h, K_h, V_h, Q_v, K_v, V_v \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times h}$ ,  $Z_h, Z_v \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l \times h}$ . Through BiAttention,  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l \times s}$  model the trigger-argument relationship of all events in a document.

Following [56], we take Biaffine module to enhance relationships among each token as follows:

$$H_s = \text{MLP}_s(L),$$

$$H_e = \text{MLP}_e(L),$$

$$R = (H_s)^T U H_e + W(H_s \oplus H_e) + b,$$

where  $H_s, H_e \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times h}$ ,  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times s \times h}$ ,  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times 2l}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^s$ ,  $s$  is the number of grid labels. Through the above procedure,  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l \times s}$  model the head-tail relationship of all token pairs in a document.

Finally, we combine the head-tail and the trigger-argument relationships:

$$\text{EXCEEDS}(D) \equiv S = R + Z.$$

### 5.3 Training and Inference

*Loss Function.* We use cross-entropy loss to learn to generate the correct label for each cell  $s_{ij} \in S$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} = - \sum_{i,j} s_{ij} \log \hat{s}_{ij}$$

*Inference.* At first, we apply softmax to get set  $S$ , which contains all grid labels:

$$S = \text{Softmax}(S)$$

Then, we decode the word-word event grid into events by applying 3 heuristic rules on  $S$ : (1) A nugget is discarded if its HTL chain is broken. (2) An argument nugget should depend on a trigger nugget, otherwise the argument nugget will be discarded. (3) A

pair of nuggets linked by EAL must follow the predefined schema, otherwise the subsequent argument nugget will be discarded. With these three rules, we can exclude incomplete nuggets, and extract nuggets and events that follow the schema.

## 6 EXPERIMENT

### 6.1 Experimental Setting

*Evaluation Metrics.* In SciEvents, the nugget serves as the smallest evaluative unit, with a predicted nugget deemed correct if its word set precisely matches that of the golden nugget. Following [45, 57], our evaluation framework encompasses four fundamental criteria: trigger identification (TI) and classification (TC), argument identification (AI) and classification (AC). In recognition of the nuanced structure within SciEvents, which incorporates sub-events, we introduce a supplementary criterion, event correlation (EC), specifically tailored for evaluating the extraction performance of sub-events. Detailed elaboration on these metrics can be found in Appendix B.3.

*Baseline.* We benchmark the performance of state-of-the-art and recent EE models including:

**OneIE**[17]: a joint EE model trained with global features<sup>2</sup>;

**BartGen**[14]: a document-level event argument extraction (EAE) model which formulates the task as conditional generation following event templates;

**UIE**[25]: a unified text-to-structure generation framework;

**PAIE**[28]: an EAE method that utilizes prompt tuning for extractive objectives.

For BartGen and PAIE, we apply a word-word relation classification model [12] as the Event Detection (ED) module when inference.

*Implementation Details.* We divide SciEvents into train, validation, and test set according to 80%/10%/10% split. We employ BERT as the encoder model. We adopt AdamW [22] optimizer with a learning rate of 1e-5 for BERT and 1e-3 for the other modules. The batch size is 1 and the hidden size is 1024. We train our model with 30 epochs. All the hyper-parameters are tuned on the development set. The results are obtained from the average of at least three experiments.

### 6.2 Main Results

Table 3 presents the main extraction results on SciEvents. Our method outperforms all compared methods on all F1 metrics. It

<sup>2</sup>Additional entity annotation is used during training, while it is not used in other models.

**Table 4: F1 score (%) on Complex Nuggets and Events, ‘-’ indicates that the method cannot be tested.**

Model	INCONSECUTIVE		Overlapped		Reverse-ordered		Sub-event		
	TC	AC	TC	AC	TC	AC	TC	AC	EC
OneIE	—	—	10.28	1.45	—	—	1.74	0.44	1.06
UIE	—	—	7.17	3.30	—	—	34.98	22.52	25.48
PAIE	—	—	29.74	16.12	—	—	54.47	35.33	43.17
EXCEEDS	25.34	17.51	25.39	16.34	18.54	10.86	57.74	39.56	46.12

**Table 5: Model Ablation Studies (F1 values)**

	TI	TC	AI	AC	EC
<b>EXCEEDS</b>	75.92	63.11	44.23	41.85	47.60
w/o Biaffine	74.85	61.64	41.73	39.00	42.59
w/o BiAttention	75.67	62.54	43.70	41.51	47.25

maintains a high level of performance not only in the identification and classification of event triggers and arguments but also in event correlation which is essential for extracting hierarchical event structures.

While OneIE, a state-of-the-art globally extractive model, shows strong performance in TI and TC tasks, its effectiveness markedly decreases for AI and AC tasks, which involve complex nuggets. This sharp decline suggests that traditional extractive models are limited to handling complex nuggets.

As for the newly introduced metric EC, which measures the model’s ability to extract hierarchical structures or sub-events, our model achieves EC F1 score of 51.25 and shows a pronounced advantage in recall of EC, emphasizing its capability to recognize and correlate events with potential hierarchical relationships effectively.

### 6.3 Results on Complex Nuggets and Events Scenario

To investigate the performance of baseline models across intricate nugget types, we selected four specific scenarios from the entire test dataset. These scenarios are labeled as *Inconsecutive Nugget*, *Reverse-ordered Nugget*, *Consecutive Nugget*, and *Sub-event* for detailed analysis. Both TC and AC metrics are evaluated across all scenarios. However, EC is assessed exclusively in the *Sub-event* scenario, as the computation of this metric is pertinent only to sub-events. The experimental outcomes, presented in Table 4, elucidate several crucial insights into the efficacy of various event extraction methodologies.

Firstly, our model demonstrates superior performance in handling complex nuggets and events. This is evident in the consistently higher F1 scores across all categories of complex information forms. Specifically, our model achieves significantly higher F1 scores for *Sub-event* than other methods. This underlines the effectiveness of EXCEEDS in capturing the hierarchical relationships in sub-events.

Secondly, it suggests that *Inconsecutive Nugget* and *Reverse-ordered Nugget* present more severe challenges in SciEvents, as indicated by the lower F1 scores for these categories. For example, our method exhibits the highest EC F1 scores of 15.79 for *Inconsecutive Nugget*

among the compared methods, which still indicates difficulty in processing it. This challenge might be related to the lower frequency of such complex nuggets within SciEvents. Further research and development are warranted to improve the handling of these less frequent but highly complex nuggets.

### 6.4 Ablation Study

We ablate two core modules of our model as shown in Table 5. At first, biaffine module is employed to strengthen the head-tail relationship for each token pair, crucial for recognizing nuggets. Without biaffine module, the model experienced a 1.07 and 2.50 decrease in TI and AI, respectively, highlighting the importance of precise token pair relationships in SciEvents. Furthermore, biattention module is designed to focus on the relationship between events and their arguments. The removal of biattention module resulted in a 0.34 drop in AC, underscoring its utility in capturing the event-argument relationship.

## 7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we addressed the crucial role of event extraction in understanding specific domains and identified a significant gap in event extraction research within the scientific domain. To address this gap, we introduced SciEvents, a large-scale multi-event document-level dataset with a refined schema tailored for the scientific domain, and proposed EXCEEDS, a novel end-to-end scientific event extraction framework. We specify the event extraction task on SciEvents. Experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of EXCEEDS on SciEvents, achieving state-of-the-art performances.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Jacqueline Aguilar, Charley Beller, Paul McNamee, Benjamin Van Durme, Stephanie Strassel, Zhiyi Song, and Joe Ellis. 2014. A Comparison of the Events and Relations Across ACE, ERE, TAC-KBP, and FrameNet Annotation Standards. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on EVENTS: Definition, Detection, Coreference, and Representation*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/W14-2907>
- [2] Yunmo Chen, Tongfei Chen, Seth Ebner, Aaron Steven White, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019. Reading the manual: Event extraction as definition comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01586* (2019).
- [3] Xinya Du and Claire Cardie. 2020. Event extraction by answering (almost) natural questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13625* (2020).
- [4] 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 8057–8077. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.718>
- [5] Jun Gao, Huan Zhao, Changlong Yu, and Ruifeng Xu. 2023. Exploring the feasibility of chatgpt for event extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03836* (2023).
- [6] Jun Gao, Huan Zhao, Yice Zhang, Wei Wang, Changlong Yu, and Ruifeng Xu. 2023. Benchmarking Large Language Models with Augmented Instructions for Fine-grained Information Extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05092* (2023).



- [7] Jeremy Getman, Joe Ellis, Stephanie Strassel, Zhiyi Song, and Jennifer Tracey. 2018. Laying the Groundwork for Knowledge Base Population: Nine Years of Linguistic Resources for TAC KBP. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Christopher Cieri, Thierry Declerck, Sara Goggi, Koiti Hasida, Hitoshi Isahara, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, H el ene Mazo, Asuncion Moreno, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, and Takenobu Tokunaga (Eds.). European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Miyazaki, Japan. <https://aclanthology.org/L18-1245>
- [8] Ralph Grishman. 2015. Information Extraction. *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 30, 5 (2015), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2015.68>
- [9] Luis Guzman-Nateras, Viet Lai, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Franck Dernoncourt, and Thien Nguyen. 2022. Event Detection for Suicide Understanding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States, 1952–1961. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-naacl.150>
- [10] Jin-Dong Kim, Yue Wang, Toshihisa Takagi, and Akinori Yonezawa. 2011. Overview of Genia Event Task in BioNLP Shared Task 2011. In *Proceedings of BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Portland, Oregon, USA, 7–15. <https://aclanthology.org/W11-1802>
- [11] Fayuan Li, Weihua Peng, Yuguang Chen, Quan Wang, Lu Pan, Yajuan Lyu, and Yong Zhu. 2020. Event extraction as multi-turn question answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. 829–838.
- [12] Jingye Li, Hao Fei, Jiang Liu, Shengqiong Wu, Meishan Zhang, Chong Teng, Donghong Ji, and Fei Li. 2022. Unified named entity recognition as word-word relation classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 10965–10973.
- [13] Qingquan Li, Qifan Zhang, Junjie Yao, and Yingjie Zhang. 2020. Event Extraction for Criminal Legal Text. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Knowledge Graph (ICKG)*. 573–580. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICKG50248.2020.00086>
- [14] Sha Li, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. 2021. Document-Level Event Argument Extraction by Conditional Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 894–908. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.69>
- [15] Xinyu Li, Fayuan Li, Lu Pan, Yuguang Chen, Weihua Peng, Quan Wang, Yajuan Lyu, and Yong Zhu. 2020. DuEE: a large-scale dataset for Chinese event extraction in real-world scenarios. In *Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing: 9th CCF International Conference, NLPC 2020, Zhengzhou, China, October 14–18, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 9*. Springer, 534–545.
- [16] Xin Liang, Dawei Cheng, Fangzhou Yang, Yifeng Luo, Weining Qian, and Aoying Zhou. 2020. F-HMTC: Detecting Financial Events for Investment Decisions Based on Neural Hierarchical Multi-Label Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-20*, Christian Bessiere (Ed.). International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 4490–4496. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2020/619> Special Track on AI in FinTech.
- [17] 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*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 7999–8009. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.713>
- [18] Ruibo Liu, Jason Wei, Chenyan Jia, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2021. Modulating Language Models with Emotions. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 4332–4339. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.379>
- [19] Xiao Liu, Heyan Huang, Ge Shi, and Bo Wang. 2022. Dynamic Prefix-Tuning for Generative Template-based Event Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 5216–5228. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.358>
- [20] Xiao Liu, Heyan Huang, and Yue Zhang. 2019. Open Domain Event Extraction Using Neural Latent Variable Models. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy, 2860–2871. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1276>
- [21] Xiao Liu, Zhunchen Luo, and Heyan Huang. 2018. Jointly multiple events extraction via attention-based graph information aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09078* (2018).
- [22] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2018. Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [23] Jie Lou, Yaojie Lu, Dai Dai, Wei Jia, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Hua Wu. 2023. Universal Information Extraction as Unified Semantic Matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.03282* (2023).
- [24] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09232* (2021).
- [25] Yaojie Lu, Qing Liu, Dai Dai, Xinyan Xiao, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Hua Wu. 2022. Unified Structure Generation for Universal Information Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 5755–5772. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.395>
- [26] Yaojie Lu, Qing Liu, Dai Dai, Xinyan Xiao, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Hua Wu. 2022. Unified structure generation for universal information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.12277* (2022).
- [27] Mingyu Derek Ma, Alexander Taylor, Wei Wang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. DICE: Data-Efficient Clinical Event Extraction with Generative Models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 15898–15917. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.886>
- [28] Yubo Ma, Zehao Wang, Yixin Cao, Mukai Li, Meiqi Chen, Kun Wang, and Jing Shao. 2022. Prompt for Extraction? PAIE: Prompting Argument Interaction for Event Argument Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 6759–6774. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.466>
- [29] Hieu Man Duc Trong, Duc Trong Le, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Thuat Nguyen, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2020. Introducing a New Dataset for Event Detection in Cybersecurity Texts. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 5381–5390. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.433>
- [30] Claire N edellec, Robert Bossy, Jin-Dong Kim, Jung-jae Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, and Pierre Zweigenbaum. 2013. Overview of BioNLP Shared Task 2013. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2013 Workshop*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Sofia, Bulgaria, 1–7. <https://aclanthology.org/W13-2001>
- [31] Minh Van Nguyen, Viet Dac Lai, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2021. Cross-Task Instance Representation Interactions and Label Dependencies for Joint Information Extraction with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.3>
- [32] 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*. 300–309.
- [33] Tanmay Parekh, I-Hung Hsu, Kuan-Hao Huang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. GENEVA: Benchmarking Generalizability for Event Argument Extraction with Hundreds of Event Types and Argument Roles. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 3664–3686. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.203>
- [34] Hao Peng, Xiaozhi Wang, Feng Yao, Kaisheng Zeng, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Weixing Shen. 2023. The Devil is in the Details: On the Pitfalls of Event Extraction Evaluation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 9206–9227. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.586>
- [35] Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Minh Van Nguyen, Franck Dernoncourt, and Thien Nguyen. 2022. MINION: a Large-Scale and Diverse Dataset for Multilingual Event Detection. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States, 2286–2299. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.166>
- [36] Bhanu Pratap Singh Rawat, Samuel Kovaly, Hong Yu, and Wilfred Pigeon. 2022. ScAN: Suicide Attempt and Ideation Events Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States, 1029–1040. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.75>
- [37] Oscar Sainz, Iker Garc a-Ferrero, Rodrigo Agerri, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, German Rigau, and Eneko Agirre. 2023. GoLLIE: Annotation Guidelines improve Zero-Shot Information-Extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03668* (2023).
- [38] Taneeya Satyapanich, Francis Ferraro, and Tim Finin. 2020. Casie: Extracting cybersecurity event information from text. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 8749–8757.

- [39] Shirong Shen, Guilin Qi, Zhen Li, Sheng Bi, and Lusheng Wang. 2020. Hierarchical Chinese Legal event extraction via Pedal Attention Mechanism. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain (Online), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.9>
- [40] Matthew Sims, Jong Ho Park, and David Bamman. 2019. Literary Event Detection. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy, 3623–3634. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1353>
- [41] Zhiyi Song, Ann Bies, Stephanie Strassel, Tom Riese, Justin Mott, Joe Ellis, Jonathan Wright, Seth Kulick, Neville Ryant, and Xiaoyi Ma. 2015. From Light to Rich ERE: Annotation of Entities, Relations, and Events. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on EVENTS: Definition, Detection, Coreference, and Representation*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Denver, Colorado, 89–98. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/W15-0812>
- [42] Zhaoyue Sun, Jiazheng Li, Gabriele Pergola, Byron Wallace, Bino John, Nigel Greene, Joseph Kim, and Yulan He. 2022. PHEE: A Dataset for Pharmacovigilance Event Extraction from Text. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 5571–5587. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.376>
- [43] Wei Tang, Benfeng Xu, Yuyue Zhao, Zhendong Mao, Yifeng Liu, Yong Liao, and Haiyong Xie. 2022. UniRel: Unified Representation and Interaction for Joint Relational Triple Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 7087–7099. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.477>
- [44] MeiHan Tong, Bin Xu, Shuai Wang, Meihuan Han, Yixin Cao, Jiangqi Zhu, Siyu Chen, Lei Hou, and Juanzi Li. 2022. DocEE: A Large-Scale and Fine-grained Benchmark for Document-level Event Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States, 3970–3982. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.291>
- [45] David Wadden, Ulme Wennberg, Yi Luan, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Entity, relation, and event extraction with contextualized span representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03546* (2019).
- [46] Christopher Walker, Stephanie Strassel, Julie Medero, and Kazuaki Maeda. 2006. ACE 2005 Multilingual Training Corpus. *Technical report, Linguistic Data Consortium* (2006).
- [47] Bo Wang, Heyan Huang, Xiaochi Wei, Ge Shi, Xiao Liu, Chong Feng, Tong Zhou, Shuaiqiang Wang, and Dawei Yin. 2023. Boosting Event Extraction with Denoised Structure-to-Text Augmentation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 11267–11281. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.716>
- [48] 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 1652–1671. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.129>
- [49] Xiao Wang, Weikang Zhou, Can Zu, Han Xia, Tianze Chen, Yuansen Zhang, Rui Zheng, Junjie Ye, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, et al. 2023. InstructUIE: Multi-task Instruction Tuning for Unified Information Extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08085* (2023).
- [50] Kaiwen Wei, Xian Sun, Zequn Zhang, Jingyuan Zhang, Guo Zhi, and Li Jin. 2021. Trigger is not sufficient: Exploiting frame-aware knowledge for implicit event argument 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)*, 4672–4682.
- [51] Xiang Wei, Xingyu Cui, Ning Cheng, Xiaobin Wang, Xin Zhang, Shen Huang, Pengjun Xie, Jinan Xu, Yufeng Chen, Meishan Zhang, et al. 2023. Zero-shot information extraction via chatting with chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10205* (2023).
- [52] Wei Xiang and Bang Wang. 2019. A Survey of Event Extraction From Text. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 173111–173137. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2956831>
- [53] Hang Yang, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, Yang Xiao, and Jun Zhao. 2018. DCFEE: A Document-level Chinese Financial Event Extraction System based on Automatically Labeled Training Data. In *Proceedings of ACL 2018, System Demonstrations*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-4009>
- [54] 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*, 5284–5294.
- [55] Feng Yao, Chaojun Xiao, Xiaozhi Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, Lei Hou, Cunchao Tu, Juanzi Li, Yun Liu, Weixing Shen, and Maosong Sun. 2022. LEVEN: A Large-Scale Chinese Legal Event Detection Dataset. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 183–201. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.17>
- [56] Juntao Yu, Bernd Bohnet, and Massimo Poesio. 2020. Named Entity Recognition as Dependency Parsing. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 6470–6476. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.577>
- [57] Tongtao Zhang, Heng Ji, and Avirup Sil. 2019. Joint entity and event extraction with generative adversarial imitation learning. *Data Intelligence* 1, 2 (2019), 99–120.
- [58] Shun Zheng, Wei Cao, Wei Xu, and Jiang Bian. 2019. Doc2EDAG: An End-to-End Document-level Framework for Chinese Financial Event Extraction. 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 337–346. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1032>
- [59] Yang Zhou, Yubo Chen, Jun Zhao, Yin Wu, Jiexin Xu, and Jinlong Li. 2021. What the role is vs. what plays the role: Semi-supervised event argument extraction via dual question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35, 14638–14646.

## A SCHEMA OF SCIEVENTS

The schema of SciEvents consists of nugget types and event types. In this section, we will introduce the description of each nugget type and the template of each event type.

### A.1 Nugget Types

There are 10 nugget types as follows:

**Table 6: Nugget Types and Descriptions**

Nugget Type	Description
OG	Researcher Organization or Group
APP	Approach
MOD	Module used in approaches
FEA	Feature used by approaches and modules
TAK	Task
DST	Dataset
LIM	Limitation
STR	Strength
WEA	Weakness
DEG	Degree

### A.2 Event Types

There are 10 event types classified by four different environments as follows:

**General Events.** General events occur in all four environments.

**Table 7: Schema of Purpose (PUR)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Aim	APP / MOD / FEA / DST / STR / WEA / TAK
Condition	LIM
Dataset	DST

Purpose describes *In order to deal with* <Aim:arg1> *under* <Condition:arg2> *circumstance on* <Dataset:arg3> *datasets*.

**Table 8: Schema of IntroduceTarget (ITT)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Target	APP / MOD / FEA / DST / STR / WEA / TAK
Condition	LIM
Dataset	DST

*Background.* There is one kind of event type in background environment as follows:

IntroduceTarget describes *<Target:arg1> is the abstract research target under <Condition:arg2> circumstance on <Dataset:arg3> datasets in this paper.*

*Related Works.* There are two kinds of event types in related works environment as follows:

**Table 9: Schema of RelatedWorkStep (RWS)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Subject	APP / MOD / FEA / DST
BaseComponent	APP / MOD / FEA / DST
TriedComponent	APP / MOD / FEA / DST
Condition	LIM / E-RWS
Dataset	DST
Target	E-PUR / TAK / STR / WEA / APP / FEA / MOD

RelatedWorkStep describes *Previously <Subject:arg1> on <Target:arg2> are mostly based on <BaseComponent:arg3> with <TriedComponent:arg4> under <Condition:arg5> circumstance on <Dataset:arg6> datasets.*

**Table 10: Schema of RelatedWorkFault (RWF)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Concern	APP / FEA / STR / WEA / MOD / DST
Fault	APP / FEA / STR / WEA / MOD / DST
Condition	LIM / E-RWF / E-RWS
Dataset	DST
Target	E-PUR / TAK / STR / WEA
Extent	DEG

RelatedWorkFault describes *Aiming to <Target:arg1>, to <Extent:arg5> degree, <Concern:arg2> has some <Fault:arg6> faults under <Condition:arg3> circumstance on <Dataset:arg4> datasets.*

*Methodology.* There are three kinds of event types in methodology environment as follows:

WorkStatement describes *<Researcher:arg1> report <Content:arg2> under <Condition:arg3> circumstance on <Dataset:arg4> datasets for <Target:arg5>.*

MethodStep describes *Our approach adopt <BaseComponent:arg1> with <TriedComponent:arg2> under <Condition:arg3> circumstance on <Dataset:arg4> datasets for <Target:arg5>.*

Propose describes *In this paper, <Proposer:arg1> propose <Content:arg2> for <Target:arg3>.*

**Table 11: Schema of WorkStatement (WKS)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Researcher	OG
Content	APP / MOD / FEA / DST / STR / WEA / TAK
Condition	LIM
Dataset	DST
Target	E-PUR / TAK / STR / WEA / APP / FEA / MOD

**Table 12: Schema of MethodStep (MDS)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
BaseComponent	APP / MOD / FEA / DST
TriedComponent	APP / MOD / FEA / DST
Condition	LIM / E-MDS
Dataset	DST
Target	E-PUR / TAK / STR / WEA / APP / FEA / MOD

**Table 13: Schema of Propose (PRP)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Proposer	OG
Content	APP / FEA / MOD / DST / TAK
Target	E-PUR / TAK / FEA / WEA

*Experimental Results.* There are three kinds of event types in experimental results environment as follows:

**Table 14: Schema of Finding (FIN)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Finder	OG
Content	E-FAC / E-CMP

Finding describes *In experiments, <Finder:arg1> find or demonstrate findings that <Content:arg2>.*

ExperimentCompare describes *Experimental results show that the <Metrics:arg6> of <Arg1:arg1> is <Extent:arg2> <Result:arg3> than <Arg2:arg4> under <Condition:arg5> circumstance on <Dataset:arg7> datasets.*

OutcomeFact describes *Experimental results show that <Subject:arg1> can <Extent:arg2> provide <Object:arg3> for <Target:arg4> under <Condition:arg5> circumstance on <Dataset:arg6> datasets because <Reason:arg7> reasons.*

**Table 15: Schema of ExperimentCompare (CMP)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Arg1	E-FAC / APP / MOD / FEA / DST
Arg2	E-FAC / APP / MOD / FEA / DST
Condition	LIM / E-FAC
Dataset	DST
Result	STR / WEA
Metrics	TAK
Extent	DEG

**Table 16: Schema of OutcomeFact (FAC)**

Argument Type	Constrained Nugget Types and Event Types
Subject	APP / MOD / FEA / STR / WEA / TAK / DST
Object	APP / MOD / FEA / STR / WEA / TAK / DST
Condition	LIM / E-FAC
Reason	LIM / E-FAC
Dataset	DST
Target	E-PUR / TAK / STR / WEA
Extent	DEG

## B TASK DEFINITION IN SCIEVENTS

### B.1 Document and Nugget

**Document:** In SciEvents, document is an abstract of an academic paper. This abstract contains several scientific events, called a multi-document document.

**Nugget:** In this work, nugget is the smallest granularity unit for evaluation, which is composed of several tokens and their offsets in a document, respectively. Nugget inherits two kinds of event components: Trigger and Argument.

Trigger is the core of an event. It indicates the occurrence of an event and therefore accompanies an event type.

Argument contains a restricted argument type. The restriction constraint is predefined in the schema, which is usually domain related. In SciEvents, argument also contains a restricted nugget type able to assist in the determination of argument types.

### B.2 Results Presenting

In SciEvents, results should be presented as a list containing event dictionaries, in which each dictionary contains several events and each event should be composed of only one trigger and at least one argument.

### B.3 Evaluation and Metrics

In SciEvents, there are 3 tasks and 5 kinds of metrics: (1) Trigger Extraction, also known as Event Detection, includes Trigger Identification (TI) and Trigger Classification (TC). (2) Event Argument Extraction includes Argument Identification (AI) and Argument Classification (AC). (3) Sub-Event Extraction includes Event Correlation Classification.

According to the aforementioned definition, nugget is the smallest granularity unit for evaluation. A predicted nugget is correct if its tokens set is identical to the golden set.

These 5 metrics are calculated by the following table:

**Table 17: Metrics in SciEvents**

Metrics	TI	TC	AI	AC	EC
trigger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
event type		✓	✓	✓	✓
argument			✓	✓	
argument type				✓	
trigger-trigger					✓
trigger-trigger type					✓

Specifically, give an example to describe how to calculate these 5 metrics. Assume that there are two events:

**Table 18: An Illustrative Example**

	Event 1	Event 2
trigger	A	C2
event type	M	N
argument	BT: B	DT: D
argument	CT: C1	

In this example, BT, CT and DT are argument types, B and D are not sub-event trigger, C1=C2. Then, golden results for each metric are as followings:

**Table 19: Extraction Results of the Illustrative Example**

Metric	Results		
TI	A	C2	
TC	A+M	C2+N	
AI	A+M+B	A+M+C1	C2+N+D
AC	A+M+B+BT	A+M+C1+CT	C2+N+D+DT
EC	A+M+C1(=C2)+N+CT		