



**HAL**  
open science

## Building Thesaurus from Manual Sources and Automatic Scanned Texts

Jean-Pierre Chevallet

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Pierre Chevallet. Building Thesaurus from Manual Sources and Automatic Scanned Texts. The 2nd International Conference Adaptive Hypermedia and Adaptive Web Based Systems, 2002, Malaga, Spain. pp.95–104. hal-00954141

**HAL Id: hal-00954141**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-00954141v1>**

Submitted on 28 Feb 2014

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Building Thesaurus from Manual Sources and Automatic Scanned Texts

Jean-Pierre Chevallet

Laboratoire CLIPS-IMAG  
385 avenue de la Bibliotheque  
B.P. 53 38041 Grenoble Cedex 9, France  
Jean-Pierre.Chevallet@imag.fr

**Abstract.** This paper describes the work done in the TIPS project about the construction of a thesaurus base. This construction is a merge from a thesaurus manually built and one automatically extracted from large text corpora. Several manually built thesaurus have been semi-formatted to be merged in a consistent common base. The automatic extraction is based on both syntax and statistics. We present in this paper the way thesaurus are built and the results on Scientific corpus in the context of the TIPS project.

## 1 Introduction

The TIPS project aims to offer an integrated tool in order to manage scientific documents. This system provides a searching tool that retrieves documents from a query proposed by a user. The IRA module (Information Retrieval assistant), proposes to guide the user in improving the retrieval results. The Terminological Tool is a part of the IRA module. The first aim of this tool is to provide help for the user at search time using a terminological database. An other goal is to improve the building of the query. For that we propose to the user an interface that enable to browse among a structured set of terms where some are indexing terms. Finally, browsing among a set of terms extracted from the actual set of documents, enables a perception of its content. In fact, it can improve the perception of the system answer to the user; because, in this way, browsing the set of extracted terms look like browsing summarization of the all corpus content. In this paper we present the building stage that leads to the construction of the terminological database with some links : we then have a semi structured thesaurus.

## 2 Thesaurus and indexing

By definition, "thesaurus" is the study of term usage in given domains associated to a human activity. There are thesaurus for medical domain, mathematics, computer science, etc. A term is a sequence of words used in a given domain and which makes sense in this domain. Terms then refer to concepts of this domain.

The "Quebec Terminological Base" (Base terminologique du Quebec, also known as "Grand Dictionnaire"), or WorldNet are a good example of general thesaurus. Therefore, thesaurus is on the domain knowledge side and it is used for domain description. A thesaurus is often a human manual activity because it requires human domain expertise. In technical and scientific domain, terms are often composed probably because it is the simple way to build new terms. We can also notice that a multi-term is less ambiguous than a single term. A thesaurus is a sort of terminological base: it is a collection of terms, plus a set of relations among them. In some ways a thesaurus can be a bridge from a terminological base to document indexing. It can be used as a normalization of indexing terms. An index term is used for document description. It is therefore on the document side if it is automatically built, or on the user side if manually chosen by librarian. To sum up, terms of a thesaurus are used to describe a domain, whereas index terms are about the description of document content. The role of an index term is also to discriminate documents in order to retrieve them using a term-built query.

As we can see, a term that belongs to Thesaurus seems very different from a term that is used for an indexing process. Nevertheless, in this project, we propose to use terms from Terminological base and from Thesaurus, in order to help document access.

In the following, we present the way we use thesaurus in the TIPS project. In the rest of this paper we use the word Thesaurus instead of Terminological base because we are not only interested by terms, but also by relations among them.

## 2.1 Using a Thesaurus in IR

A Thesaurus can be used in the indexing process. We have already tested this approach in TREC test collections (see [6]). The idea is to enhance the precision of indexing using precise multi-terms. There are major difficulties underlying this approach: the use of single and multi-term together raise a counting problem, because single terms are included in multi-terms. As index weighting is grounded on frequency measure, the discrepancy between the frequency of single and multi-term must be solved in a consistent way. Using multi-terms crosses the frontier between Statistical Text Analysis and Natural Language Processing. It is not possible and even not desirable to take into account all natural language phenomenon for IR purposes. On the other hand, it seems important to us to take into account syntactical variation (ex: "detector", "neutrino detector" "underground detector", "deep underground detector", "deep underground neutrino detector", etc), and to take into account also references and elliptical expressions (ex: "We uses a deep underground detector...", "this detector...", "it is used for neutrino") because it changes the way frequency has to be computed.

On the other side, thesaurus can be used at retrieval time. This thesaurus is presented to the user so he can choose terms among it. If these terms are extracted from the actual corpus, they can be used into the query. Structuring the thesaurus can help the user finding the right term in a given domain. The

drawback is of course information overload : user will have to browse among a huge set of terms. An other drawback is the discrepancy between available data through the thesaurus and the actual data stored in the index. In that situation, user could chose terms in the thesaurus that do not exist as index terms either because it is not a good index term (from the system point of view) or because the thesaurus does not cover the same domain as the one covered by the documents of the corpus. An other important reason is the inevitable increase of the term set : specially in scientific domain, every rise of new concept, every breakthrough in the technology is the occasion of new terms creation. At the same time, some terms tend to disappear as technology changes. A thesaurus has to follow this natural evolution. The better choice is to follow it from the sources which are scientific publications.

In the TIPS approach, we have decided not to use thesaurus at indexing time: indexing aspects are not fundamental in this project, and classical single term indexing has been chosen.

The TIPS portal proposes a thesaurus allowing to select possible query terms, and also to perceive the domain covered by the indexed corpus by browsing its content. This is possible because a lot of terms are directly extracted from inline document content.

Before going into details of the thesaurus construction in TIPS, we just mention some general facts about thesaurus construction.

## 2.2 Thesaurus construction

Manual thesaurus building is a hard task but in this way, one can guarantee a good quality of the collected terms. So we can present these data to the end user for browsing. Maintaining such a thesaurus up to date is also costly. On the other hand, automatic Thesaurus building is quite human costless but the quality is not guaranteed. It relies on the content of document sources and also on the Natural Language treatment implemented. Our goal in this project is to combine both approaches. We will compile manually-built data, and extract terminological knowledge from documents, and finally merge these two sets into a final structure that will be proposed for browsing. Our building steps are then the following:

**Extract** a terminological base from documents by means of automatic full text analysis;

**Compile** existing accessible thesaurus and terminological sources;

**Validate and filtering** automatically obtained terms by confrontation with manual thesaurus and by limited manual inspection;

**Merge** both data sources. In this step, one can propagate some information from manual thesaurus to automatic thesaurus like the known domain of a term.

**Structuring** the term set using and propagating extracted links from existing thesaurus, and by the computation of syntax variations.

**Integrate** the final thesaurus into TIPS portal through the Information Retrieval Assistant.

In the next section we go through these steps in detail.

### 3 Automatic thesaurus construction in TIPS

Thesaurus is extracted from full text by means of syntax analysis. In this part we detail terms extraction and structuring steps that define the automatic thesaurus construction. In this thesaurus, we have a generic relation based on syntactic variation. We also obtain a non typed relation (a sort of "see also") based on conditional concurrence probability which are known as Knowledge Discovery in Text techniques (KDT) [2]. We will not develop this aspect in this article as we don't have yet the results.

#### 3.1 Term extraction

We have used our IOTA system for all tasks except the first one: the full corpus tagging using a part of speech tagger. We have used the Brill tagger [1] because our IOTA system accepts only French texts as input. Thus we have had to develop a coder from Brill tagger to our IOTA format in order to use the rest of our system for all of the other text treatments.

The second step is term extraction. It is based on part of speech templates. These templates are used to extract noun phrases. In English as in French, most of these phrases are about 2 or 3 full words long. Full words are nouns or adjectives. Longer terms are less frequent and are less numerous. It is useful to extract longer terms if we take into account term variation. If not, we then have two different terms that are synonym in the sentence context. In fact long terms (noun phrases) usually appears once and rather at the beginning of texts. Shorter version then appears in texts as variations of longer terms.

Knowing this linguistic fact, it seems then important to compute co-references between terms and also between terms and pronouns. In TIPS, we do not compute these co-reference paths. Our goal is only to extract and structure terms from the all corpus. Moreover ambiguity between two term variations is very rare because size length is a sort of guaranty against term homonymy. Hence we promote the resolution of term variation and then the co-reference phenomenon, not at the sentence level, but at the end of extraction, so at the corpus level. This approach enables us to use frequency term information to choose the right term variation. This is the next treatment detailed in the next part. This choice explains why we extracted full size terms and so why we do not limit ourself to 2 of 3 terms length. Here are some examples of extracted phrases related to the word "algorithm":

```
randomized bidding algorithm ADJQ SUBC SUBC  
optimal randomized bidding algorithm ADJQ ADJQ SUBC SUBC
```

pseudopolynomial time algorithm ADJQ SUBC SUBC  
forward search algorithm ADJQ SUBC SUBC  
algorithm for matrix multiplication SUBC PREP SUBC SUBC  
simple dynamic programming algorithm ADJQ ADJQ SUBC SUBC  
cubic time algorithm ADJQ SUBC SUBC  
iterative algorithm ADJQ SUBC  
simple polynomial time algorithm ADJQ SUBC SUBC SUBC  
algorithm for query evaluation SUBC PREP SUBC SUBC

Terms are followed by the corresponding part of speech. In the next section we present the structuring of this set of terms that leads to the thesaurus.

### 3.2 Term structuring by means of syntax

We used two sorts of term structuring. One is based on syntax and cover the term variation phenomenon, the other is based on global document term concurrence and expresses a more general sort of term relation. There are some attempts to automatically acquire from text a given type of relation, like hyponyms [5]. Some other approaches uses context defined by syntax [3, 4]. The Sextant system, uses syntax dependences between noun/noun, noun/verb, and noun/adjective. The underlying hypothesis used is that terms sharing contextual dependencies are semantically related. This approach is not able to qualify the extracted relation. Other systems like Xtract [7] are only based on co-occurrence statistics computed into a five word windows.

For this project we have chosen the combination of two methods : one based on syntax and term variation, combined with one based on term co-occurrence in document using dependence probability.

The syntax driven structuring deals with the all set of full length extracted terms from the all corpus. The system tries to link terms using variation rules. A variation rule is a couple of two part of speech patterns. The left pattern is the trigger of the rule. A rule is fired if the input term matches the part of speech tag sequence of the pattern. The right pattern is the production part. It produces a shorter term by reordering and reducing the set of tags of the right pattern. Applying a rule produces a short reordered term. The goal of such a rule is to link two term variations: a larger and a smaller variation of terms. Here are some examples of such rules. For each rule, one have an example of derivation and the rule itself.

```
deterministic algorithm -> algorithm  
ADJQ SUBC <VGEN> 2 .
```

This rule expresses the variation from a term without the adjective that qualify the substantive. The right part of the rule is a sequence of part of speech. The left part is the sequence of word that are kept for the associated term. In this rule, we only keep the second word of the term.

positive acceptance probability -> positive probability  
ADJQ SUBC SUBC <VGEN> 1 3 .

This rule illustrates a term variation by insertion of substantive.

probability distributions for sequences of every finite length  
-> probability distributions  
SUBC SUBC PREP SUBC PREP PREP ADJQ SUBC <VGEN> 1 2 .

This last example, shows a term split at a preposition.

In order to avoid combinatory explosion and production of meaningless terms, the system only attempts to link actually existing corpus extracted terms. Hence, in this approach we have to first extract all possible terms from all documents before the application of these rules. All these rules have been proposed if we have at least one good example of term variation. A set of derivation rule is then language dependent. Here is an example of linked terms produced in this way.

optimal randomized bidding algorithm for the case of multiple bidders  
-> optimal randomized bidding algorithm  
-> randomized bidding algorithm  
-> bidding algorithm  
-> algorithm

known optimal algorithm  
-> optimal algorithm  
-> algorithms

In case of two rules that can be fired simultaneously, we have a preference for the one producing the most frequent term. If both possible terms have the same frequency in text, we produce them both.

## 4 Results

In this part, we present some information about thesaurus and documents that have been treated in this project. First the list of available online thesaurus that have been treated and merged and then, some data about documents that have been analysed.

### 4.1 List of treated thesaurus

We have treated a list of seven thesaurus. These thesaurus have been chosen because they are related to domains that are present in the ArXiv document base, and second, because there where available on the web. We have extracted from them four relation types:

**Generic** is hierarchic relation. A term  $a$  is a generic of a term  $b$  if the meaning of  $a$  includes the meaning of  $b$ . Hence  $b$  is a specific term of  $a$ .

**Synonym** is used when a term  $a$  can be used in place of a term  $b$ .

**Context** is a relation that express that a term can be used in the context of an other term.

**see** is a general relation without a precise meaning. It is often called "seealso".

The table 1 sum up the results. We have found very few synonyms : in only one thesaurus. The context relation is also not very frequent (two thesaurus). The more common relation is generic and after the "see also". The set of term after merging is 13 809. Only 5% of terms are common. Finally, we have obtain an average of 2 relations per terms, which not very important.

Here is the list of thesaurus treated:

**aa0** This Astronomy thesaurus is very important. It is composed of 2 846 terms. (<http://darmstadt.gmd.de/lutes/thesalpha.html>)

**arxiv** ArXiv is the organisation of the document repository. It is not really a thesaurus but rather a classification scheme for clustering documents in the base. We used 440 terms. (<http://arxiv.org/archive/>)

**jhep** is a very short list of terms on High Energy Physics (<http://jhep.sissa.it/JOURNAL/keywords.html>)

**msc** MCS is a thesaurus dedicated to mathematics. It is structured in three sub levels. (<http://www.ams.org/msc/>)

**pacs** PACS thesaurus is about physic and astronomy. It contains 4324 terms related to condensed matter physics, material science and microelectronics. We only used these sections of the PACS thesaurus. (<http://www.aip.org/pubservs/pacs.html>)

**schlagw** The SCHLAGW thesaurus is more a list of recommended indexing terms than a real thesaurus. We have extracted 1552 terms from it. (<http://www-library.desy.de/schlagw.txt>)

**spires** SPIRES is an important thesaurus. We used only the physics part. (<http://www.slac.stanford.edu/spires>)

We sum up in table 1 some figures about the treatment of the manual sources.

## 4.2 About the analysed documents

We have analysed quite all content of the ArXiv content. This base has been indexed for the TIPS portal demonstration. We have analysed about 300,000 English documents in latex format. All theses documents are splitted into 40 categories and sub categories (see the ArXiv thesaurus above). In the table 4.2 we present some figures obtained on some of them. This table shows the following information:

**Doc nb** is the number of treated documents in the sub category. We can notice that some categories have very few documents compared to others.

**Voc size** is the number of single terms found in the collection of documents. We can notice this number is not directly related to the number of documents.



**Table 1.** Treated thesaurus

Thesaurus	Theme	See	Generic	Context	Syn	relation	term
AAO	astronomy	8 111	2 432	429	0	11 972	2 846
ARXIV	high energy physic	0	440	0	0	440	115
JHEP	high energy physic	0	124	0	0	124	126
MSC	mathematiques	1 450	4 971	0	0	6 421	4 810
PACS	astronomy, physic	488	3 836	0	0	4 324	3 912
SCHLAGW	physic	1 228	964	186	64	2 142	1572
SPIRES	physic	1 198	343	0	0	1 541	1 191
Total		12 475	12 810	615	64	26 964	14 572
Total	After Merging					26 964	13 809

**Term nb** is the total number of full length terms found. We can see the impressive amount of different terms found. These figures show that word combination produces between 5 and 6 times composed terms more than single terms. In fact it is not such a quantity as we know lot of terms are more than 3 words long.

**Hapax** is the ratio of terms that appears only once in the corpus. This figure is important because we notice that for every corpuses this value is stable. About 80% of composed terms appear only once !

**Max frequency** is the maximum frequency of terms. It means the maximum number of documents in which a term can appear. This value is always 3 or 4 times less than the number of document. This value is interesting because we can suspect a term to be useless if it appears in too many documents.

**Variation** is the number of relations that has been computed. Generally speaking, we notice that we do not have found a lot of relations regarding the number of terms extracted. This is probably due to a reduce set of rules. Theses rules have been set up in incremental and manual ways. We do not know exactly how many rules are useful to cover the maximum of interesting term variations.

**Relation** is the number of terms that are found in the variation relation. Again we note an important loss of terms due probably to a lack of relation rules.

## 5 Conclusion

We have built for this project an important thesaurus related mainly to physics, astronomy and mathematics. We have produced a very huge amount of terms

**Table 2.** Analyzed documents

Theme	doc Nb	voc size	term nb	hapax	max freq	variation	relation
acc-phys	71	5 578	4 912	87.0 %	12	471	609
adapt-org	781	19 729	46 399	85.2 %	171	9 912	11 881
alg-geom	1 913	34 442	103 669	81.0 %	989	22 379	26 467
astro-ph	18 051	232 567	1 234 090	83.0 %	4 014	273 747	315 298
chao-dyn	3 762	58 528	257 239	83.7 %	1 150	59 364	68 624
cond-mat	62 973	388 581	3 426 576	83.0 %	21 568	618 998	712 604
computer	2 500	53 103	158 570	83.0 %	354	4 177	46 525
hep-ph	63 703	323 485	1 851 639	80.8 %	13 747	350 261	403 059
math	28 444	276 423	1 198 857	80.5 %	27 700	233 887	270 127

from the available scientific article of the ArXiv pre-print document base. Hence, we have proven that it is possible and useful to run some simple Natural Language techniques in order to automatically built a very important collection of terms in an automated way. The resulting user interface has not been tested with real users yet. The test done was only on a small set of terms. So we do not know at this moment, the pros and cons brought by the capacity of browsing through such a huge base of terms.

I thank Carole Bergamini for her help in extracting data from existing thesaurus and launching the processing of the latex file for the construction of the automatic built thesaurus. I thank also Christophe Hoang for the development of the part of the IOTA system that computes the syntactic variation and for the code that merge all data into one unique base of term and relation.

## References

- [1] Eric Brill. English tagger. In <http://www.cs.jhu.edu/~brill/>.
- [2] R. Feldman and I. Dagan. Kdt - knowledge discovery in texts. In *Proceeding of the First International Conference on Knowledge Discovery KDD'95*, pages 112–117, August 1995.
- [3] Gregory Grefenstette. Use of syntactic context to produce term association list for text retrieval. In *Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, ACM press Copenhagen, Denmark*, pages 89–97, 1992.
- [4] Gregory Grefenstette. Automatic thesaurus generation from raw text using knowledge-poop techniques. In *Making sense of Words 9th annual Conference of the University of Waterloo Centre for the Oxford English Dictionary and Text Research, Cambridge*, pages –, September 1993.
- [5] Marti Hearst. Automatic acquisition of hyponyms from large text corpora. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Computational Linguistic, Nantes, France*, July 1992.
- [6] Nie Jian-Yun and Chevallet Jean-Pierre. Using terms or words for french information retrieval ? In *Text REtrieval Conference 1997 (TREC-6), Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA*, pages 457–462, November 19–21 1997.

- [7] F. Smadja. Retrieving collocation from text : Xtract. In *Computational Linguistics*, pages 143– 177, 19(1) 1993.