From Natural Language Specifications to Program Input Parsers

Tao Lei,

Fan Long, Regina Barzilay, Martin Rinard

CSAIL, MIT



Translating Natural Language to Input Parser

Input Specification:

Defines the format of input data

- The input starts with a line containing two integers n and r.

- This is followed by n lines, each containing two integers xi, yi, giving the coordinates of the polygon vertices.

Two Input Examples:

36	4 10
04	-8 2
00	8 14
51	0 14
	06

Input Parser:

Part of a program that reads and stores data

```
int n, r, x[], y[];
```

```
Scanner scanner = new
Scanner(new File("input.txt"));
```

```
n = scanner.nextInt();
r = scanner.nextInt();
```

```
\Gamma = \text{Scaller.nexcift}(),
```

```
x = new int[n];
y = new int[n];
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    x[i] = scanner.nextInt();
    y[i] = scanner.nextInt();
}
```

Translating Natural Language to Input Parser



Defines the format of input data

- The input starts with a line containing two integers n and r.

- This is followed by n lines, each containing two integers xi, yi, giving the coordinates of the polygon vertices.

0 **1**

 Two Input Examples:

 3 6
 4 10

Input Parser:

Part of a program that reads and stores data

```
int n, r, x[], y[];
```

```
Scanner scanner = new
Scanner(new File("input.txt"));
```

```
n = scanner.nextInt();
```

```
r = scanner.nextInt();
```

```
x = new int[n];
y = new int[n];
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    x[i] = scanner.nextInt();
    y[i] = scanner.nextInt();
}
```

Goal: generating input parser by reading natural language

Motivation

- Reading and processing data is a common task
- Writing input parsers is mechanical, tedious and time-consuming

		MST dependency data format)				POS tagg data form	ger nat
John NN SUBJ 2	ate VB RO 0	e OT	an DT MOD 4	appl NN OBJ 2	e			This is a shor	ť	DT VBZ DT JJ	
The DT	do NN				CO	NLL dat	depei a forn	nden nat	су		
MOD 2	SU 3	1 2 3 4 5	Cathy zag hen wild	Cathy zie hen wild	N V Pi Ai	ron dj	N V Pron Adj	 	2 0 2 5 2	su ROOT obj1 mod	
		6			Pi	unc	Punc	•••	2	punct	

Motivation

- Reading and processing data is a common task
- Writing input parsers is mechanical, tedious and time-consuming



Motivation

- Reading and processing data is a common task
- Writing input parsers is mechanical, tedious and time-consuming



Advantage: reducing programming effort and the chance of making code mistakes



Input E	Example:		
John	ate	an	apple
NN	VB	DT	NN
SUBJ	ROOT	MOD	OBJ
2	0	4	2
The	dog	barks	
DT	NN	VB	
MOD	SUBJ	ROOT	
2	3	0	
•••			

• Need an abstraction that connects NL and input parser

Input E	xample:		
John	ate	an	apple
NN	VB	DT	NN
SUBJ	ROOT	MOD	OBJ
2	0	4	2
The	dog	barks	
DT	NN	VB	
MOD	SUBJ	ROOT	
2	3	0	

Input

Input E	xample:		
John	ate	an	apple
NN	VB	DT	NN
SUBJ	ROOT	MOD	OBJ
2	0	4	2
The	dog	barks	
DT	NN	VB	
MOD	SUBJ	ROOT	
2	3	0	





Input E	xample:				
John	ate	an	apple		Input
NN	VB	DT	NN		\downarrow
SUBJ 2	ROOT 0	MOD 4	OBJ 2		Sentences
The	dog	barks		Words	POS
DT	NN	VB			Tokens
MOD	SUBJ	ROOT			
2	3	0			
•••					





- Need an abstraction that connects NL and input parser
- Specification tree of nested input formats



- Need an abstraction that connects NL and input parser
- Specification tree of nested input formats



- Need an abstraction that connects NL and input parser
- Specification tree of nested input formats



Focus: translating input specifications into specification trees

How to Translate NL to Specification Tree?



Task: translation as an NLP problem

Learning Scenario



No human annotation



specification trees
$$\boldsymbol{t} = \{t^1, \dots, t^N\}$$

corresponding input parsers

$$\boldsymbol{t} \sim P(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{w})$$

Learning Scenario



No human annotation

Idea: learning from feedback -- testing input parser on input examples

Key Intuitions



Many input parsers can read the same input

Key Intuitions

a **correct** tree should read all input examples successfully

the **correct** trees should share common features



Bayesian Generative Model



Idea: encode both intuitions in our model

Inference: Gibbs Sampling

$$\boldsymbol{t} \sim P(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{w}) = \int_{\theta} P(\boldsymbol{t}, \theta | \boldsymbol{w})$$



Inference: Gibbs Sampling

$$\boldsymbol{t} \sim P(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{w}) = \int_{\theta} P(\boldsymbol{t}, \theta | \boldsymbol{w})$$



Experiments



test case consists of a single test case. A line contains an integer n indicating the number of molecule types. The second line contains n eight-character strings, each describing a single type of molecule, separated by single spaces. Each string consists of four two-character connector labels Domain:

Programming contest (ACM-ICPC)

Training Data: 106 input specifications 100 input examples for each

Text Statistics:

Sentences:	424
Vocabulary:	781
# of Sent. in Document	1~8
Avg. Sent. Length	17.3
relative clauses in senten	ces 🖌

Evaluation Metrics

Recall:

correct specification trees
input specifications

Precision:

correct specification trees
positive specification trees

F-Score:

 $2 \times Precision \times Recall$

Precision + Recall

Baseline Models

No Learning

Does not learn feature parameters; randomly samples the specification tree until successfully reads all input examples

Aggressive (Clarke et al. 2010)

Trains a discriminative structure learner (SVM^{Struct}) using all "positive" specification trees obtained in previous iteration; uses the learner to find the most plausible trees in the next iteration

Full Model - Oracle

An "oracle" feedback tells our full model whether the specification tree is correct or not

Aggressive - Oracle

Trains SVM using perfect oracle supervision signal

Overall Performance



- Search space is exponential, and is large on difficult specifications
- Cannot distinguish between correct parsers and false-positive parsers

Overall Performance



• Using false-positive parsers to train SVM will hurt the performance

Overall Performance



• Learns from feedback and feature observations in a joint, complementary fashion

Comparison with Oracles



Comparison with Oracles



- Discriminative model is better at learning from strong supervision
- Generative model is itself much more constrained

Learning Curve as a Function of # Input Examples



- May not be possible to obtain so many input examples
- Retains high performance when just **one** example is available

Conclusion

- A new problem in addition to generating database queries or regular expressions from natural language
- Our method can learn to ground natural language descriptions of input data formats

Code and data available at:

http://groups.csail.mit.edu/rbg/code/nl2p

Model	Recall	Precision	F-Score
No Learning	52.0	57.2	54.5
Aggressive	63.2	70.5	66.7
Full Model	72.5	89.3	80.0
Full Model (Oracle)	72.5	100.0	84.1
Aggressive (Oracle)	80.2	100.0	89.0

Your program is supposed to read the input from the standard input and write its output to the standard output.

The first line of the input contains one integer N. N lines follow, the i-th of them contains two real numbers Xi, Yi separated by a single space - the coordinates of the i-th house. Each of the following lines contains four real numbers separated by a single space. These numbers are the coordinates of two different points (X1, Y1) and (X2, Y2), lying on the highway.



The input contains a single integer T that indicates the number of test cases.

Then follow the T cases. Each test case begins with a line contains an integer N, representing the size of wall. The next N lines represent the original wall. Each line contains N characters. The j-th character of the i-th line figures out the color ...





(b) The next N lines of the input file contain the Cartesian coordinates of watchtowers, one pair of coordinates per line.