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Abstract:
Alias name is the surnames for a known name. Extracting and validating alias names is an interesting research topic in language processing and has a number of Natural language processing applications like Information extraction, Information retrieval, Sentimental analysis, Question and answering. Alias name validation involves the process of validating whether a name is alias name or not. In this work, seven statistical similarity coefficients were used as features to classify to validate alias names. For each name-alias pair, seven statistical similarity coefficient values were calculated and used as features to train a classifier. The trained classifier is then employed to classify whether a name-alias pair is valid or not. Experiments were conducted using Indian name-alias data that has data for 15 persons containing 35 name-alias pairs. Results show that SVM classifier with Radial Basis Function Kernel outperforms all the other classifiers in terms of overall accuracy.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Alias name extraction and validation involves extracting all the surnames of a person from the web and validating them. In the web, these surnames are scattered in the form of standard lexical patterns like “Name aka Alias name” or as prefix or suffix pattern like “alias name Primary name”, and mostly in non-standard format. Even spelling variant of a primary name is considered as alias name of the person [1]. Alias extraction is closely related to co-reference resolution, where the primary work would be to extract the co-reference chain, which refers to different expressions that refers to an entity [2]. Co-reference resolution can be extended to multiple documents which are referred as cross document co-reference resolution [3]. Since web contains billions of web pages, it makes impossible to implement co-reference resolution. Another closely related problem is known as anaphora resolution. In anaphora resolution, references of pronouns that occurs earlier or later in the discourse is resolved [4]. Web people search has been an important part of web search queries, as around 30% of queries are pertaining to personal names. Due to unstructured nature of the web documents, it has always been difficult in extracting documents of personal names. In the web, two types of name ambiguity are prevalent. A single name may be shared by multiple persons. On the other hand, a person can have more than one name. While the former is called lexical ambiguity, the latter is called referential ambiguity [5]. Solving the former is closely related to co-reference disambiguation and solving the latter is called Alias name extraction.

Named ambiguity arises when information from multiple sources are integrated for a task. Alias names do occur in standard lexical patterns. There are many alias names that are not in standard lexical patterns and difficult to extract. The use of statistical similarity measures for alias validation is based on the notion that primary name and alias name do co-occur in web pages. While this is true in many cases, it is also equally true that alias names do not co-occur. A special case of alias name is previous name, where an entity name that was previously referred by a name is now changed to another name. For example the entity name Chennai was previously referred to as Madras. It is true that both the names of the entity co-occur in many web pages, there are web pages where they do not co-occur. In this case, before the name change Chennai was referred as Madras only and after the change of name, it was referred as Chennai. It is difficult for an Information retrieval system to identify all the alias names for an input primary name and retrieve web pages containing primary name and alias names.

Alias extraction involves two tasks namely alias extraction and alias validation. Alias extraction involves extracting alias names from the web and alias validation involves validating name-alias pairs. Alias validation is a binary classification problem where alias and non-alias are the class labels. The use of statistical similarity coefficients in validating name-alias pair is based on the notion that name and alias frequently co-occurs in a page. So their strength can be measured in terms of similarity coefficients. Based on this idea, in this work different associative measures have been used to validate alias names.

1.1 MOTIVATION AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH

Statistical similarity coefficients have long been used for finding the strength between two entities. Statistical similarity metrics like Dice, Jaccard and cosine coefficients can be used as co-occurrence similarity metrics [6]. Although methods like latent semantic indexing, co-reference resolution may help in extracting alias, the sheer size of web containing billions of pages render it an infeasible job? In this scenario, researchers started focusing on robust cum feasible method for alias extraction. Statistical similarity measures provide a way to find the statistical similarity between any two entities.

Bollegala et al, [5] used 23 features including co-occurrence measures, page count based association measure and frequency of lexical pattern to extract lexically structured alias names from the web. Tomoko Hokama et al, [7] exploited prefix and suffix patterns to extract alias name of a person from the web. It is based on the notion that most of the prefix string and suffix string occurring before and after primary
name and alias name are same. Vinay Bhat et al., [8] used latent semantic analysis (LSA) for finding alias name in a text corpus. They proposed an extended two stage LSA based algorithm that extracts nearest names for an input name than LSA. Paul Hsiung et al., [1] method uses both orthographic similarity measure and semantic similarity measure to find the alias of a known name. They used string edit distance, Normalized string edit distance, discretized and exponential string edit distances as orthographic similarity measures along with semantic similarity measures as features for classification. Hsin-Hsi Chen et al., [9] compared five associative measures namely Dice, Overlap, Jaccard, Cosine and Co-occurrence double check.

Their experiments show that co-occurrence double check achieves better co relation coefficient compared to other coefficients. William Cohen et al., [10] compared different string similarity metrics or string similarity. They found that among token based distance measure, hybrid distance that combines TF-IDF and Jaro-Winkler performs slightly better than other measures. Tarique Anwar et al., [11] used Association score, Dice score and Similarity score to find the strength of association between name and alias name. These scores were aggregated and the name-alias pair whose aggregated score was higher was considered as valid name-alias pair. Coefficient similarity measures like Jaccard coefficient [12] and Overlap coefficient [13] have been used to find the relationships between personal names on the Web.

Among the various existing statistical similarity coefficients, it is observed from the literature survey that Dice, Jaccard, PMI, Overlap, Cosine distance measures are used to find similarity between entities. It is also expected that combining these similarity metrics with Google distance and Associative score can be used to effectively validate alias names in the web. Justified by this fact, seven aforementioned statistical similarity metrics were used to validate alias names in the web.

1.2 OUTLINE OF THE PAPER

The proposed method for alias extraction using similarity coefficients is shown in the Fig.1. Query “Name” AND “Alias name” is given to search engine and snippets are retrieved. The number of web pages containing the “Primary name” and “Alias name” can be known by the hit count for the query. The count value is used to find the similarity coefficient values. The coefficient values are then used as feature vectors for training the classifier. The trained classifier is then used to classify between alias and non-alias names.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE PAPER

The second section gives a detailed description of different statistical similarity coefficients and classifiers used for alias name validation. The third section describes experimental setup, experimental data, performance metric, experiments and results. Fourth section concludes the paper.

2. METHOD

2.1 CO-OCCURRENCE SIMILARITY METRICS

Bollegala et al., [14] used Web Jaccard, web overlap, Web dice and Web Pmi coefficient similarity measures for finding semantic similarity between words. They used these coefficients along with lexical patterns extracted from web pages as features for SVM, which classifies words pairs into synonymous and non-synonymous word pairs.

2.1.1 Web Jaccard:

The Jaccard similarity, [14] is used to find binary differences between two or more objects. It is also called jaccard index. The Web Jaccard coefficient of Name and alias can be defined as,

\[
\text{Web Jaccard}(name, alias) = \frac{H(name \cap alias)}{H(name) + H(alias) - H(name \cap alias)}
\]

where, \(H(name \cap alias)\) refers to Hit count returned for the conjunctive query “Name” AND “Alias” given to the search engine, \(H(name)\) is Hit count returned for the query “Name” and \(H(alias)\) is Hit count returned for the query “alias”.

2.1.2 Web Overlap:

Web Overlap is a modified form of Overlap coefficient. Web Overlap, [14] of name and alias is defined as follows,

\[
\text{Web Overlap}(name, alias) = \frac{H(name \cap alias)}{\min(H(name), H(alias))}
\]

2.1.3 Web Dice:

D. Bollegala et al., [15] used this score for calculating similarity between “name” and “alias”. It can be calculated as below,

\[
\text{DiceScore}(name, alias) = \frac{2 \times \text{hits}(name \text{ AND alias})}{\text{hits}(name) + \text{hits}(alias)}
\]

2.1.4 Web PMI:

Point wise mutual information (PMI) is a coefficient inspired by information theory [16]. Web PMI, [14] of name and alias can be calculated as below,

\[
\text{Web Pmi}(name, alias) = \log_2 \frac{L \cdot \text{Hits}(\text{name AND alias})}{\text{Hits}(name) \cdot \text{Hits}(alias)}
\]
2.1.5 Normalized Google Distance:

Cilibrasi et al. [17] proposed Google similarity distance that gives the semantic distance between any two words based on the appearance of these words in the World Wide Web.

\[
NGD(name, alias) = \max\left\{\log f(name), \log f(alias)\right\} - \log f(name, alias)
\]

\[
\log M - \min\left\{\log f(name), \log f(alias)\right\}
\]

\(M\) is the total number of web pages searched by Google. \(f(name)\) and \(f(alias)\) are the counts for search terms “name” and “alias” respectively. \(f(name, alias)\) is the number of web pages found on which both “name” and “alias” occur.

2.1.6 Cosine:

Cosine angle between any two objects gives the degree of similarity between those objects in a vector space.

\[
\text{Cosine}(name, alias) = \frac{H(name \cap alias)}{\sqrt{H(name)H(alias)}}
\]

2.1.7 Associative score:

Tariq anwar et al. [11] used Associative score as one of three score used to validate alias names. AssoScore is calculated by summing up of multiplied values of \(f\) score pattern value in Table.1 with the number of times that frequency occurs when issuing appropriate query.

\[
\text{AssoScore} = \sum_i (F - \text{Score}(P_i) \times \text{freq}(P_i))
\]

where, \(P_i\) is the pattern with \(i\) values ranging from 1 to 5 as in Table.1. The value obtained is then normalized to the range of 0 to 1.

Table 1. F-Scores for various patterns [15]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Id</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>F-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>SearchQuery(realName, aka, *)</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>SearchQuery(*, aka, realName)</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>SearchQuery(realName, better known as, *)</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>SearchQuery(realName, alias, *)</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>SearchQuery(realName, also known as, *)</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 CLASSIFIERS

2.2.1 Naïve Bayes:

Naïve Bayes, [18] is based on Bayes rule and it assumes that attributes are independent of each other. The working principle of naïve Bayes classifier is as follows:

1. Training step: Using the training data, the method estimates the parameters of a probability distribution, assuming predictors are conditionally independent given the class.

2. Prediction step: For any unseen test data, the method computes the posterior probability of that sample belonging to each class. The method then classifies the test data according to the largest posterior probability.

2.2.2 SVM:

SVM is non-probabilistic binary linear classifier considered to be the most robust and accurate. It has a sound theoretical foundation, requires only a dozen examples for training, and is insensitive to the number of dimensions [19]. SVM constructs hyperplanes in multidimensional space which is used to classify dataset.

The working principle of SVM classifier is as follows:

1. Project the training data set in feature space.
2. Project the testing data set in the same features space.
3. Find a hyperplane such that it should maximize the distance between the closest data point.

2.2.3 KNN Classifier:

KNN classifier, [19] is a lazy learner algorithm, which memorizes the entire training data and performs classification of the test data based on the training data. The working principle of KNN classifier is given below:

1. Extract Training features from the training data set and train the classifier.
2. Extract Testing features from the testing data set.
3. Find the distance of each test sample with \(k\)-nearest training samples.
4. Assign the class label for test sample, the class labels of majority of \(k\)-nearest neighbors.

2.2.4 Decision tree – C 4.5:

Weka provides J48 a java implementation of C 4.5 decision tree [20]. C 4.5 is an extension of earlier ID3 algorithm. The working principle of C 4.5 Decision tree classifier is given below:

1. If all the data set belongs to the same class, then tree is labeled with that class.
2. If there are more than one class, calculate the normalized information gain for each attribute for best splitting
3. Create a decision node that best splits attribute
4. Repeat the above steps to construct the tree until no more attribute is left to divide.

2.2.5 Logistical regression:

Logistical regression, [21] is a probabilistic classification model that can be used to classify data. Logistical regression can be binomial or multinomial where, binominal can be for binary classification problems and multinomial for multi class problems.

The working principle of Logistical regression classifier is given below:

1. From the training data, a logistic regression probability model is first estimated that is composed of a list of vectors and their corresponding categories.
2. Test data values are coded as dense vector instances, and the outputs are a category number with a probability. The conditional probability about how likely the class fits is then calculated.

2.2.6 Simple perceptron

Perceptron, [20] is a supervised linear classification algorithm that works online. Thus instead of considering the entire dataset, it operates one data after another.

1. Initialize the weights and threshold to small random numbers
2. For each training sample, compute output and update weights.
3. Repeat the above steps for all the training data set.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 DATA SET

Since there is no standard name-alias data set for Indian names to the best of authors’ knowledge, a list of Indian name-alias pair were collected from the web with the help of informative web pages like Wikipedia. The information is collected from the web, keeping in view that if the alias name is not prevalent in the web, then even a robust alias extraction method may fail to extract it. For this work, fifteen Indians containing 35 name-alias pairs were collected from the web and were used as data set for the experiments. The Table.2 shows list of Indian name-alias data set used for the experiments.

Table.2. Indian name-alias data set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Alias Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rajinikanth</td>
<td>Shivaji Rao Gaekwad, Thalaivar, Superstar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sachin Tendulkar</td>
<td>Sachin Ramesh Tendulkar(SRT), The Little Master, Master Blaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sonia Gandhi</td>
<td>Antonia Maino, Sonia Maino, Madam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mother Teresa</td>
<td>Agnes Gonxha Bojaxhiu, The Saint of the Gutters, Teresa of Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mahendra Singh Dhoni</td>
<td>Mahi, MS Dhoni, Captain Cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mahesh Babu</td>
<td>Mahesh, Prince, Superstar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Viswanathan Anand</td>
<td>Vishy, lightning kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Abhishek Bachchan</td>
<td>Junior B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Narendra Modi</td>
<td>NaMo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P. T. Usha</td>
<td>Golden Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mamata Banerjee</td>
<td>Didi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Salman Khan | Sallubhai, Chulbul Pandey, Abdul Rashid Salim Salman
13. Saurav Ganguly | Dada, Bengal tiger, Prince of Kolkata
14. Virender Sehwag | Nawab of Najafgarh, viru
15. Mahatma Gandhi | The Father of the Nation, Bapu, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi

3.2 PERFORMANCE METRICS

The efficiency of a search engine can well be evaluated using precision and recall [22]. Each statistical similarity coefficient is measured in terms of precision, recall and f-score.

\[
\text{Overall Accuracy} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n} \text{Number of Alias Validated}}{\text{Total number of Aliases in the dataset}} \quad (8)
\]

3.3 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

For each name-alias pair in the data set, appropriate query to calculate statistical similarity coefficient is given to the Google search engine. For example queries “Primary name”, “Alias name”, “Primary name” AND “Alias name” is issued to search engine and the hit counts that refers to the number of web pages containing the appropriate word is obtained. A word inside the quotes refers to the fact that we need an exact match of the primary or alias name and not the spelling variant names.

The number of results returned by the search engine for queries (Hit count) is then used to calculate seven similarity coefficients values. The calculated seven similarity coefficient values are then used as feature vector for the subsequent classification process. The performance of different classifiers in alias name validation is then compared. The Table.3 shows the Hit count for queries used to calculate coefficient similarity values.

Table.3. Hit counts returned by Google search engine for “sachin Tendulkar” and “Master blaster” queries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Query</th>
<th>Hit Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Sachin tendulkar”</td>
<td>1,47,00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Sachin tendulkar” AND “master blaster”</td>
<td>3,61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Master blaster”</td>
<td>6,78,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the hit count that primary name (Sachin Tendulkar) occurs in majority of web pages compared to alias names. Alias name (Master blaster) occurs in relatively less pages than primary name. Primary name and alias name co-occurs in relatively lesser web pages than primary and alias names alone. The hit count then used to calculate seven different similarity coefficients for each name-alias pair. Similarity coefficients for the name-alias pair “Rajinikanth-Superstar” calculated is tabulated in Table.4. These similarity coefficients serves as feature vectors for alias names and are fed to classifier for alias name validation.
Table 4. Various similarity coefficients values between Rajinikanth and Superstar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Similarity coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Web Jaccard</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Web Overlap</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Web Dice</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Web PMI</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Normalized Google Distance</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cosine</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AssoScore</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Seven similarity coefficients were used as feature vectors for each name-alias pair and are given as test data to a trained classifier. Then the performance of each classifier in classifying name-alias pair is noted. The performance of different classifiers in classifying between alias and non-alias names is tabulated in Table 5.

Table 5. Average co-occurrence similarity values for name-alias data set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Number of correctly classified aliases</th>
<th>Number of Misclassified aliases</th>
<th>Overall Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decision tree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>K-Nearest neighbour</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Naïve Bayes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Simpler Perceptron</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The output of the classifier is discrete values i.e “alias” or “non-alias”. The results show that, Support vector machine classifier achieves higher overall accuracy rate compared to logistical regression and decision tree. The accuracy of logistical regression and decision tree is more or less similar.

In order to further evaluate the efficiency of SVM classifier, the experiment was repeated by changing the kernels of SVM classifier. The number of alias names correctly validated using different kernels of SVM classifier is shown in the Fig.2. The performance accuracy of RBF Kernel was 0.60, linear and polynomial kernel is 0.57, and sigmoid kernel was 0.51.

The Table 6 shows the validated name-alias pairs using SVM classifier. Since majority of name-alias pairs in the name-alias data set are in lexically structured format in web pages, the accuracy of these classifiers is good. It should be noted that many alias names in the web pages are not lexically structured and are difficult to extract.

All the alias names need not co-occur with primary names. This means that co-occurrence similarity measures alone are not sufficient enough to validate name-alias pairs.

4. CONCLUSION

Extracting alias name for a known name is an interesting problem in Information Extraction. In this work, seven different statistical similarity coefficients were used as features in classifier to validate alias names. Experiments were conducted using Indian name-alias data set for fifteen Indian names containing 35 name-alias pairs. Results show that Support vector Machine classifier achieves high precision rate compared to other classifiers. Since a name-alias pair may not always co-occur in a web page, usage of other metrics along with this is advisable. An interesting future extension of this work includes changing features for classification and proposing techniques for alias extraction. The use of alias names in Question and answering, Sentimental analysis and in many other Natural language processing tasks is also interesting.

Table 6. Classified alias names by the SVM classifier with RBF kernel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Correctly classified Aliases</th>
<th>Incorrectly classified Aliases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rajinikanth</td>
<td>Shivaji Rao Gaekwad, Superstar</td>
<td>Thalaivar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sachin Tendulkar</td>
<td>Sachin Ramesh Tendulkar, The Little Master,</td>
<td>Master Blaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sonia Gandhi</td>
<td>Antonia Maino, Madam</td>
<td>Sonia Maino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mother Teresa</td>
<td>Agnes GonxhaBjoaxhiu,The Saint of the Gutter</td>
<td>Teresa of Calcutta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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