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Abstract

Linguistic ambiguities arising from changes in entities in action flows are a key challenge in instructional cooking videos. In particular, temporally evolving entities present rich and to date understudied challenges for anaphora resolution. For example “oil” mixed with “salt” is later referred to as a “mixture”. In this paper we propose novel annotation guidelines to annotate recipes for the anaphora resolution task, reflecting change in entities. Moreover, we present experimental results for end-to-end multimodal anaphora resolution with the new annotation scheme and propose the use of temporal features for performance improvement.

1 Introduction

Anaphora resolution is the task of identifying the antecedent of an anaphor, i.e., find a language expression that a given entity refers to. For example, in the sentence take a potato and wash it, the pronoun it is an anaphor that refers to the antecedent a potato. This is a challenging NLP task which has been attracting much attention (Poesio et al., 2018; Fang et al., 2021, 2022). Different types of anaphoric relations have been identified and described in the scientific literature, e.g., identity (Poesio and Artstein, 2008), near-identity (Recasens et al., 2011; Hovy et al., 2013), and bridging (Asher and Lascarides, 1998).

Recipes provide a rich source for referring expressions (Kiddon et al., 2015) of transformed entities, and offer a challenge for anaphora resolution tasks. Fang et al. (2022) use written recipes with anaphora annotations to trace the temporal change of entities. While the ingredients undergo physical or chemical change in the action flow, they can be still referred to in the same way. For example, an egg before and after it is boiled can be referred to with the same noun egg. Compared to text recipes, instructional cooking videos raise additional challenges for anaphora resolution owing to their intrinsic multimodality (Huang et al., 2016).

Krishnaswamy and Pustejovsky (2019) point to various “channels of information” in the transmission of each modality. A “shared reference of entities” is introduced when two modalities refer to the same description (Krishnaswamy and Pustejovsky, 2020). As presented in cooking instructions of videos when two modalities refer to the same entity, the use of a referring expression is affected by both modalities. For example, the cubes is used in Figure 1a to denote the bread pieces in the text modality because the instruction chop the bread shaped them into cubes in the video modality. The choice of referring expressions might also differ with respect to the changes of the entities. In Figure 1b the same nominal phrase refers to a different...
object (the whole salmon piece; and then one of the
halves) whereas in Figure 1c a coreferential pron-
oun is used although the object has changed. Fig-
ure 1c is in fact the most well-behaved in terms of
keeping the language expressions consistent across
instructions and with the entities being referred to.
Figure 1d shows the use of null arguments: the sec-
ond instruction cook in the oven does not explicitly
mention what to cook, whereas the image of the
instruction displays it.

The main contributions of this paper are as
follows: (i) We propose an anaphora annotation
scheme for instructional cooking videos that allows
us to address linguistic ambiguities in anaphora res-
olution. In particular, we define different types of
anaphoric relations to keep track of spatio-temporal
changes of entities. We also provide a clear def-
nition of “identity of reference” and specify cate-
gories that make an essential change resulting in a
different entity. (ii) We annotate the YouCookII
dataset (Zhou et al., 2018b,a) according to our
scheme and make it publicly available.1 (iii) Null
anaphors, e.g., mix in the bowl, are included in
the annotation thanks to cooking videos that of-
fer the precise visual observation of null anaphors
to annotators. (iv) We provide a baseline multi-
modal anaphora resolution model for this dataset.
In particular, we adapt an end-to-end (Lee et al.,
2017) coreference model for the anaphora resolu-
tion task. (v) We offer a novel method to improve
anaphora resolution models for instructional lan-
guage by leveraging temporal features capturing
temporal order of instructions instead of using the
token distance as Lee et al. (2017) and Yu and Poe-
sio (2020).

2 Related Work

Reference Resolution The reference resolution
task addresses the linguistic ambiguities in state
changes of entity mentions by linking the entities
to their corresponding instructions (Kiddon et al.,
2015; Huang et al., 2016, 2018), e.g., the mashed
potato and the fork refer to the instruction mash the
potatoes with a fork. We depart from this type of
approaches, as they rely on unsound ontological as-
sumptions (actions/events and entities are different
objects) and they introduce unnecessary semantic
ambiguities (by linking different entity mentions to
the same instruction).

Anaphoric Relations: identity, near-identity, as-
sociation. Anaphoras mainly come in two forms:
coreference and bridging. Coreference is defined
as language expressions referring to the same entity
(Weischedel et al., 2012), whereas bridging is an
anaphoric phenomenon based on a non-identical
associated antecedent via lexical-semantic, frame-
based, or encyclopedic relations (Asher and Las-
carides, 1998). A coreferring anaphor and its an-
tecedent in a text refer to the same entity (identity
relation), e.g., a black Mercedes and the car, while
in bridging, an anaphor and its antecedent refer to
different entities (non-identity relation), e.g., the
car and the engine in the utterance I saw [a black
Mercedes] parked outside the restaurant. [The car]
belonged to Bill. [The engine] was still running.
(Poesio and Artstein, 2008).

As Rösiger et al. (2018) point out, bridging studies
so far employ various methods to describe bridging
dissimilar to the coreference definition. Neverthe-
less, both the concept of sameness in the corefer-
cence definition and the bridging associations ne-
glect the changes referents may undergo. There-
fore, the concept of near-identity was introduced
by Recasens et al. (2010, 2012) as a middle ground
between coreference and bridging. It addresses
spatio-temporal changes of entities, e.g., the en-
tity Postville in the text: On homecoming night
[Postville] feels like Hometown, . . . it’s become a
miniature Ellis Island . . . For those who prefer [the
old Postville], Mayor John Hyman has a simple . . . .
This sample exemplifies the referential ambiguity,
 arising from two language expressions referring to
“almost” the same entity, i.e., Postville and the
old Postville (Recasens et al., 2010). Rösiger et al.
(2018) and Poesio et al. (2018) claim that the in-
troduction of the additional near-identity category
in between coreference and bridging introduces
more uncertainty. Nevertheless, we consider the
near-identity relationship suitable because spatio-
temporal changes are essential in recipes and the
information they convey describes the visual con-
tent.

Coreference and Bridging Annotations. Coref-
ERENCE is a well studied and clearly defined concept
with some noticeable exceptions. In recent years
several annotated corpora with different corefer-
ce guidelines have been released. OntoNotes
v5.0 (Weischedel et al., 2012) exclusively focus
on coreference using a schema similar to CoNLL-
2012 (Pradhan et al., 2012) and WikiCoref (Ghad-
1https://github.com/OguzCennet/
Recipe-Anaphora-Resolution
The extraction of the mentions and the use of prepositions in mentions are crucial questions for coreference annotation (Rösiger et al., 2018; Poesio et al., 2018). There are many extant hypotheses explaining how bridging relations function with different annotation schemes for bridging (Hou et al., 2018). The ARRAU corpus (Poesio et al., 2018) consists of general language annotated with bridging relations of noun phrases (such as set membership, subset, possession and unrestricted.) Markert et al. (2012) present ISnotes derived from OntoNotes with unrestricted bridging relations in addition to OntoNotes coreferences. The BASHI corpus (Rösiger, 2018) is based on OntoNotes content and the bridging relations in the BASHI corpus restrict the bridging anaphors to be truly anaphoric, i.e., not interpretable without an antecedent.

All aforementioned annotation studies focus solely on the anaphoric relation between two discourse entities and neglect the change of entities over time. Instructional language raises a novel question in anaphora resolution: the definition of anaphoric relations based on the change of language with entities that undergo change. Therefore, RecipeRef (Fang et al., 2022) considers the state changes for preparing the annotation guideline for recipe text based on the ChEMU-Ref (Fang et al., 2021) anaphora annotation on chemistry patent documents. RecipeRef annotation was applied to the RecipeDB data (Batra et al., 2020) that was aggregated from recipe websites and each recipe was divided into two parts, the ingredients section, and the cooking instructions. The cooking instructions of RecipeDB contains only textual instructions without any visual content. The state changes are addressed in RecipeRef as a subtype of bridging relation, even though bridging is clearly defined as an associative relation in the literature (Clark, 1975; Asher and Lascarides, 1998; Poesio and Artstein, 2008; Poesio et al., 2018). Besides, null anaphors are not included in the annotation of RecipeRef, despite their frequent use in recipes.

Several important questions remain open regarding anaphora resolution, and RecipeRef annotation, including: (1) interpretation of the state changes of entities over time; (2) addressing the referring expression in anaphora resolution with data that has different modalities; (3) obtaining the sequence of state changes by annotating the null entities in recipes; (4) the judgement of anaphoric relations of state changes and different semantic relations such as identity, non-identity, near-identity, and association.

### 3 Corpus

We use the YouCookII dataset (Zhou et al., 2018a) that includes manually provided descriptions (i.e., instructions) of actions in the cooking videos. The dataset contains 2,000 unconstrained instructional videos from 89 cooking recipes. The videos provide a visual input of the corresponding objects to observe the changes clearly. To obtain a variety of ingredients and their state changes, we choose at least three random samples for each the 89 cooking recipes for the training set and one sample for the test set. There is no intersection between training and test recipe samples. In total, we have 264 training documents and 89 test documents as shown in Table 1.

#### Recipe

A recipe is text containing a list of cooking instructions with a list of ingredients, see Figure 2. Here, we use the YouCookII annotation, all instructions for each video are manually annotated with temporal boundaries and described by imperative English sentences. Since the video inputs show the entities and actions clearly, the use of referring expressions and null entities is very common contrary to textual recipes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coreference</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyponym</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Identity</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-member</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>2,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipe</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>5,669</td>
<td>1,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null Entity</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun Entity</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Statistics of annotated data with the number of annotated samples with anaphoric relations.
4 Annotation Categories and Guidelines

In this section, we explain our strategy of mention selection and the use of our annotation schema on the YouCookII data.

4.1 Mention Selection

In our work, we segment multiple-action instructions, e.g., put the chickpeas into the processor and blend all the ingredients, into single-action instructions put the chickpeas into the processor and blend all the ingredients while preserving the order of actions. Each recipe instruction contains one predicate and 0 to 8 entities. Null arguments and ellipses are extremely common in recipes (Kiddon et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2016), since some objects are not verbally expressed, but deduced from the context of the remaining elements or videos. For example stir for 5 minutes does not explicitly mention the entity to be stirred. Nominal phrases with (in)definite noun phrases and pronouns are also used to mention the objects of recipes as in the following instruction: coat the pork in the marinade and place it in the oven. Therefore, we consider null arguments (i.e., null anaphors) and nominal phrases to define mentions. Contrary to ONTONOTES (Weischedel et al., 2012), we include expressions that do not refer to any other mention as singletons in the annotation.

4.2 Anaphoric Relations and Entity Change

In this section, we explain how we define anaphoric relations occurring in the recipes with state changes of entities, see Figure 2. It is worth noting that the recipe videos are exploited to judge the “sameness” of entities after an action (e.g., wash, cut, etc.) was applied. Thus, the visual features from cooking videos clarify the state change of entities in the instructions and our annotation does not rely only on the mental image of entities based on text only settings as in other coreference datasets (Weischedel et al., 2012; Pradhan et al., 2012) and anaphora datasets (Roesiger, 2016; Poesio and Artstein, 2008; Fang et al., 2021, 2022).

4.2.1 Coreference

The anaphor and the antecedent are identical and point to the same entity. Some actions such as washing or transferring the result to another container preserve the properties of the entity involved. For example, a tomato is the same tomato after washing, or a piece of meat is the same amount of meat after putting it in a pan.

4.2.2 Hyponymy

The hyponymy relation was considered as bridging by Poesio and Vieira (1998), however Baumann and Riester (2012) use the term not as context-dependent but as “lexical accessibility” to define the hyponymy relation between words as corefer-
ence, as Rösiger et al. (2018). For example the herb refers to the entities mint and parsley in the instruction Wash mint and parsley. Here again the anaphor may refer to a group of entities as the corresponding antecedent.

### 4.2.3 Near-Identity

Some actions alter either the physical or chemical properties of the entities involved. For instance, boiling a potato or an egg changes their chemical properties whereas cutting a potato or an egg changes their physical properties. Here, anaphor and antecedent entities are neither identical nor associated, they are partially the same entity sharing many crucial commonalities, but differing in at least one crucial dimension. For this type of anaphoric relation, Recasens et al. (2010) propose the near-identity relation to describe the spatio-temporal changes of the entities as a middle ground between coreference and bridging. Even though Rösiger et al. (2018) claim that additional categories between coreference and bridging introduce further uncertainty which makes the annotation process more arduous, we consider the near identity relationship more suitable because spatio-temporal changes are essential in recipes and the information they convey describes the visual content. Therefore, if they are not the same entity, the antecedent is not reduced to its parts for the anaphor, and the antecedent is not mixed with other entities to produce a new entity for the anaphor, then we define such entities as near-identical. For example, an egg or a potato are accepted as near-identical entities before and after boiling.

### 4.2.4 Bridging

In bridging, the antecedent is related and not identical; in contrast to coreference the anaphor is also not interchangeable with the given antecedent. As mentioned in Section 2, various phenomena are identified as bridging, resulting in diverse guidelines for bridging annotations. In accordance with the variety of associations, we assign different anaphora relations in our annotation schema.

**PRODUCED:** We define PRODUCED as the relationship when the anaphor refers to an antecedent producing the anaphor. The antecedent is always an instruction with predicates and given ingredients. Here, the anaphor may refer to a group of instructions as the corresponding antecedent. For example, the dough is produced by the instruction mix water and flour or dressing is produced by the instruction mix yogurt and pepper.

**REDUCED:** We define REDUCED as the bridging relation linking an entity. The anaphor might be a number expression (e.g., to the whole entity), an indefinite pronoun (some), or an indefinite noun phrase (e.g., one piece). We use REDUCED in cases when the anaphor means a part of the corresponding antecedent, provided no mereological relation exists. For example one slice is reduced from a bread by the instruction slice the bread into pieces.

**SET-MEMBER:** In a recipe, SET-MEMBER refers to a relation between a group of entities and its definite subset. In other words, this relation defines a bridge from a subset or element to the whole collection. For example, cucumber, tomato, and lettuce is an antecedent of the anaphor ingredients in cut the ingredients.

**PART-OF:** The antecedent may associate in a mereological relationship with the anaphor, and cannot be captured well by pre-defined lexical relations. For example, the antecedent lemon in the instruction cut the lemon relates to the anaphor seeds in take the seeds out.

### 4.3 Inter-annotator Agreement

50 randomly selected recipes have been annotated by two Computational Linguists, a PhD candidate and a final year Master student in Computational Linguistics. Five rounds of annotation training were completed prior to beginning the official annotation. In each round, the two annotators individually annotated the same 5 recipes (different across each round of annotation), and compared their annotations; annotation guidelines were then refined based on discussion. Finally, We achieved a high inter-annotator agreement of Krippendorff’s $\alpha = 0.99$ for the creation of a new entity and reference, $\alpha = 0.95$ for the selection of the antecedent and $\alpha = 0.93$ for selection of anaphoric relations.

### 5 Method

In this section, we present our end-to-end multimodal anaphora resolution model. Figure 3 shows our joint neural model similar to Yu and Poesio (2020) and Fang et al. (2021), adapted from Lee et al. (2017). We extend the model with novel temporal features, see Section 5.3.
5.1 Task

In linguistics, the term Anaphora Resolution refers to the method of identifying the antecedent for an anaphor. To achieve anaphora resolution on cooking instructions, we propose two different sub-tasks: recognizing mentions, and finding the anaphor-antecedent pairs. Additionally, relation classification is used to find the relation between each anaphor and its antecedent.

We adopt the following notations. Each recipe $R$ consists of $T$ tokens $w_1, \ldots, w_T$ and $n \geq 1$ instructions $a_i$ such that $R = a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Each instruction $a_i = (p_i, e_i)$, e.g., *pour olive oil on the Italian bread cubes*, contains one action predicate $p_i$ and an entity list $e_i$. The entity list consists of zero or more entities $e_i = \emptyset$ or $e_i = \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ where $\emptyset$ denotes null entities which are extremely common in recipe instructions (Kiddon et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2017) and $e_i$ indicates entities such as the Italian bread cubes.

We define three sub-tasks. The first task is mention detection: it extracts all mentions $e_i$ from $a_i$. The second task is anaphora resolution: it assigns each $e_i$ to an antecedent $y_i \in \{e, a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, e_1, e_i, \ldots, e_{i-1}, e_i\}$, if any. The third task is relation classification: it assigns one of the relation classes \{NO-RELATION, COREFERENCE, NEAR-IDENTITY, BRIDGING\} to each pair $(e_i, y_i)$.

The selection of $e$ as the antecedent collapses two different situations: (1) the span is not an entity, or (2) the span is an entity but it is not referent (Lee et al., 2017). Likewise, if the relation is NO-RELATION for relation classification, this points to two scenarios: (1) the span is not an entity, or (2) the span is an entity but it is not referent and so does not have an anaphoric relation to other entities.

5.2 Baseline

5.2.1 Visual Features

Each video consists of $n$ segments, $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, each corresponding to one instruction. Following Zhou et al. (2018a), we evenly divide each segment into five clips and randomly sample one frame from each clip to capture the temporal features of that segment. Each frame $f_i$ is encoded using the Vision Transformer (ViT) model (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021).

The instruction’s visual feature vector is obtained by concatenating the frame-level feature vectors: $v_i = 
CNN([\text{ViT}(f_1), \ldots, \text{ViT}(f_5)])$.

5.2.2 Mention Detection

For mention detection, following Lee et al. (2017), we consider all continuous tokens with up to $L$ words as a potential span and compute the corresponding span score. BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) is used to extract the contextualised word embeddings $x_i^t = \text{BERT}(w_1, \ldots, w_T)$ where $x_i^t$ refers to the vector representation of the token at time $t$ of $R$. The vector representation $g_i$ of a given span is obtained by concatenating the word vectors of its boundary tokens and its width feature:

$$
g_i = [x_{\text{START}(i)}^t, x_{\text{END}(i)}^t, \phi(i)]$$

$$
\phi(i) = \text{WIDTH(\text{END}(i) - \text{START}(i))}.
$$
START(i) and END(i) represent the starting and ending token indexes for $g_i$, respectively. $\phi(i)$ is the width feature of the span where \textit{WIDTH}() is the embedding function of the predefined bins of $[1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 16]$ as defined by Clark and Manning (2016).

The use of head attention (Lee et al., 2017; Yu and Poesio, 2020; Fang et al., 2021) is very common in coreference/anaphora resolution models. However, we disregard the head representation of spans for two reasons: (1) the common use of null anaphors in our data: instead the instruction $a_i$ of the null anaphor is used for extracting the vector representation, (2) the self-attention mechanism (Vaswani et al., 2017) of the BERT model implicitly captures the mention head word.

The mention score $\text{softmax}(\text{FFNN}(g_i))$ is computed for each span, and the mention model is trained using the cross-entropy loss.

### 5.2.3 Anaphora Resolution

For anaphora resolution, the representation of span pair $g_{ij}$ is obtained by concatenating the two span embeddings $[g_i, g_j]$ and their element-wise multiplication, $g_i \cdot g_j$, among others:

$$g_{ij} = [g_i, g_j, g_i \cdot g_j, v_i \cdot v_j, \phi_{\text{dist}}(i, j)]$$

$$\phi_{\text{dist}}(i, j) = \text{DISTANCE}(\text{START}(j) - \text{START}(i))$$

where the feature vector $\phi_{\text{dist}}(i, j)$ is the distance between the index of span $i$ and span $j$. \text{DISTANCE}() is an embedding function of the predefined bins of $[1, 2, 3, .., 30]$ as defined by Clark and Manning (2016).

For anaphora resolution, we minimize the cross entropy loss for candidate span pairs with sigmoid(\text{FFNN}(g_{ij})).

### 5.2.4 Relation Classification

As shown in Table 1, the number of observed hyponym, reduce, set-member, and part-of instance relations is low. Therefore, we define the anaphoric relations in term of the three main categories: coreference, near-identity, and bridging.

To learn the vectors for each relation of feature vector $g_{ij}$, we apply an FFNN layer:

$$\text{coreference}_{ij} = \text{FFNN}(g_{ij})$$

$$\text{n-identity}_{ij} = \text{FFNN}(g_{ij})$$

$$\text{bridging}_{ij} = \text{FFNN}(g_{ij})$$

Then, we concatenate coreference$_{ij}$, n-identity$_{ij}$, and bridging$_{ij}$ into the relation vector $\text{rel}_{ij}$:

$$\text{rel}_{ij} = [\text{coreference}_{ij}, \text{n-identity}_{ij}, \text{bridging}_{ij}]$$

To classify the anaphoric relation for each input pair, we then compute $\text{softmax}(\text{FFNN}([g_{ij}, \text{rel}_{ij}]))$.

### 5.3 Temporal Features

Recipe instructions are written with an implied temporal order (Jermsurawong and Habash, 2015), and the entities involved go through this temporal order until the cooking is complete. We propose to select the number of instructions (see Figure 2) as the temporal marker of entities instead of token distance $\phi_{\text{dist}}(ij)$ to avoid issues with different instruction and entity lengths. We design our experiments to explain how the temporal stage of entities in action flows influences the pair representation of mentions in cooperation with the anaphora resolution model. Thus, we formulate our temporal features as

$$\phi_{\text{temp}}(i, j) = \text{TEMPORAL}(\#a_j - \#a_i)$$

where \text{TEMPORAL}() is an embedding function that uses the list of bins $[1,2,3,..,30]$. $\#a_i$ refers to the instruction index of span $i$ and $\#a_j$ to the instruction index of span $j$. We concatenate $\phi_{\text{temp}}(i, j)$ in place of $\phi_{\text{dist}}(i, j)$ to obtain the vector representation of a span pair:

$$g_{ij} = [g_i, g_j, g_i \cdot g_j, v_i \cdot v_j, \phi_{\text{temp}}(i, j)]$$

Token distance varies depending on the use of token numbers in instructions and entities. For example, the instruction \text{mix red chili cinnamon stick cloves cumin seeds mustard seeds pepper garlic vinegar sugar and wine} might also be written \text{mix red chili cinnamon stick cloves cumin seeds mustard seeds followed by add pepper garlic vinegar in the bowl and mix with sugar and wine}. Therefore, temporal features are not captured well by token distance in instructional language.

### 6 Experimental Setup

#### 6.1 Input

**Cooking Instructions.** To encode the recipes we use BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), a bidirectional transformer model trained on a masked language modeling task. First, we fine-tune BERT-large-uncased by using the YouCookII dataset (Zhou et al., 2018a) after removing our test recipes. Because of sub word embeddings, there are different...
Table 2: Average evaluation results over 3 runs of the proposed anaphora resolution model on our annotated test data for 200 epochs. w Temporal and w/o Temporal refer to the results with or without temporal features, respectively. Candidate Spans refers to all the possible spans of continuous tokens extracted from the recipes whereas Gold Spans refers to the mentions with nominal phrases, null anaphors, and instructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate Spans</th>
<th>Gold Spans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>w/o Temporal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphora Resolution</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coreference</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-identity</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Relation</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>w Temporal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphora Resolution</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coreference</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-identity</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Relation</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Experiments

**Candidate Spans** Without any pruning, we consider all continuous tokens (Clark and Manning, 2016; Lee et al., 2017) as a potential spans for the training and testing phases.

**Gold Spans** In order to investigate the performance of anaphora resolution and relation classification models without mention detection noise, we also consider gold spans for the training and testing phases.

6.3 Evaluation

Following Hou et al. (2018) and Yu and Poesio (2020), we analyze the performance of our end-to-end anaphora resolution model with its subtasks. For mention detection, anaphora resolution and relation classification we report F1-scores.

To evaluate mention detection, precision is computed as the fraction of correctly detected mentions among all detected mentions whereas recall is the fraction of correctly detected mentions among all gold mentions. The F1-score for anaphora resolution is computed where precision is the result of dividing the number of correctly predicted pairs by the total number of predicted pairs and recall is computed by dividing the number of correctly predicted pairs by the total number of gold pairs.

To evaluate relation classification we compute the F1-score where precision is computed by dividing the number of correctly predicted relations by the total number of predicted relations and recall is computed by dividing the number of correctly predicted relations by the total number of gold relations.

6.4 Results and Discussion

6.4.1 Overview

We investigate the anaphora resolution and relation classification results of gold and candidate spans comparing the F1-scores with the distance and temporal features. Overall, our results in Table 2 demonstrate that replacing token distance with our temporal features improves anaphora resolution and relation classification for both candidate and gold spans.

The performance of each task is propagated to subsequent tasks due to the sequential structure of the end-to-end system (see Section 5). The difference between the results of candidate and gold spans demonstrates that the mention detection model propagates errors to anaphora resolution and relation classification. For example, temporal features are not predictive features for anaphoric relations, but they are valuable for finding the antecedent of an anaphor, i.e., anaphora resolution. Our observations show that improvements in re-
lation classification are propagated from the preceding anaphora resolution task in the end-to-end system for gold spans.

Additionally, binary mention detection results show a precision of 0.92, a recall of 0.88, and an F1-score of 0.90. However, the differences between the scores in anaphora resolution and relation classification results for the candidate and gold spans (see Table 2) reveal issues in transferring the mention features. We observe the main problem of mention detection in distinguishing the singleton spans.

### 6.4.2 Anaphora Resolution

We detect a significant improvement in anaphora resolution with temporal features, since temporal features often conspire to reduce unwelcome lexical similarity. For example, potato $\rightarrow$ it $\rightarrow$ potato, the first potato is the antecedent of it, and it is the antecedent of the second potato. Temporal features prevent predicting the first potato as an antecedent for the second potato and designate the anaphora link from the second potato to it, because it is in the instruction closer in the temporal line. The improvements with temporal features reveal the issues of contextualized embeddings. While we use contextualized embeddings, the bias of lexical similarity induces complexity to link the anaphor with a correct antecedent; as recurrent in the bacon $\rightarrow$ bacon $\rightarrow$ fried bacon sample in Figure 2. The sliced bacon is predicted as the antecedent of the bacon of instruction 3, and it is also the antecedent of fried bacon of instruction 8. This issue occurs for rare entities and predicates. When we compare the false positives in accordance with temporality, the improvement due to temporal features mainly affects pronoun resolution. Hence, we observe that the antecedents of pronouns are closer to the pronouns. Some anomalies can be observed in the results of anaphora resolution with candidate spans due to the propagated error from mention detection. For example, we have the candidate spans the pizza, pizza dough, and the pizza dough for the mention the pizza dough of instruction 4 with the same temporal features.

### 6.4.3 Relation Classification

Table 2 shows that temporal features significantly improve anaphora resolution results for gold spans. Especially for bridging pairs, a noteworthy benefit of temporal features can also be observed in gold and candidate spans. However, the mistakes can also be observed in the results of near-identity and coreference classification for candidate spans.

Overall, the end-to-end model suffers from mistakes in detecting and resolving null anaphors. Expecting that all instructions contain a null anaphor increases the input noise for candidate spans. Relation classification follows anaphora resolution and mention detection. Therefore, some problems in relation classification originate from mention detection and anaphora resolution errors.

False positive bridging relations are due to singleton spans (non-references) whereas false positive coreference and near-identical relations are due to the preference for surface words with/without state changes. For instance, in the example wash the egg $\rightarrow$ boil the egg $\rightarrow$ crack the egg, the use of the same words for changing entities introduces an immense modelling challenge.

### 7 Conclusion and Future Work

We introduce a novel anaphora annotation scheme including the state changes of entities and near-identical relations. This fresh approach relies on video inputs for visual observation for anaphora annotation. Likewise, we provide baseline anaphora resolution results with novel temporal features on the annotated data. In future work, the mention detection model will be designed to perform with null entities and singleton mentions to improve the performance of the end-to-end model. Additionally, different visual feature extraction methods for single frames, e.g., CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) or for videos, e.g., S3D (Xie et al., 2018) will be investigated to find the best way of learning from cooking videos for anaphora resolution.
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