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A complex annotation type

- annotation guidelines:
  - 29 relation types
  - approx. 50 pages
- counter-intuitive decisions

→ **decompose** the complexity of the task [Fort et al., 2012], not simplify it!
http://zombilingo.org/
Overview of the game

ZombiLingo

---

**Mes Duels**
- Duels gagnés : 4
- Matchs nuls : 8
- Duels perdus : 5

**Mes Ennemis**

**Challenge**
- Points : 5
- Points Total : 630
- Points Total : 218934

**Statistiques**

1. NOCOZOMB : 323393
2. CHOUCHEU : 307339
3. METHOSSE : 290255
4. LIOCO : 143157
5. MARLIEBO : 45390
6. FIREY : 18932
7. LULU66 : 16300
8. YEONWOO : 16182
9. RDE : 14930
10. KAREN : 14634
11. NEWK : 14406

**News**

Les Pokémon se cachent aussi chez les Zombis ! Depuis ce matin, nous v... lise la suite...

**Mon Compte**

Modifier mon mot de passe.
Envoi des emails.
Supprimer mon compte.

Parties gagnées : 171
Parties parfaites : 118
Nombre d'objets trouvés : 159
Overview of the game ZombiLingo
Trouve le complément (objet indirect introduit par "à") du verbe indiqué!

10%

Très jeune, il a fait preuve d'initiative et de courage pour participer à un sauvetage lors d'inondations.
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General features

Bring the fun through:

- zombie design
- use of (crazy) objects
- regular challenges (specific corpus and design) on a trendy topic:
  - Star Wars (when the movie was playing)
  - soccer (during the Euro)
  - Pokemon (well...)
LeaderboardS (for achievers)

Criteria:

- number of annotations or points
- in total, during the month, during the challenge
Hidden features (for explorers)

- appearing randomly
- with different effects: objects, other game, etc.
Duels (for socializers (and killers?))

- select an enemy
- challenge them on a specific type of relation
Badges (?) (for collectors)

- play all the sentences for a relation type, for a corpus
- play all the sentences from a corpus
1 Overview of the game

2 Motivating players

3 Behind the curtain
   • Preprocessing
   • Ensuring quality

4 Obtained results [Guillaume et al., 2016]

5 Conclusion and future plans
Preprocessing data (freely available corpora)

Pre-annotation with two parsers:

1. a statistical parser: Talismane [Urieli, 2013]
2. a symbolic parser, based on graph rewriting: FrDep-Parse [Guillaume and Perrier, 2015]

→ play the items for which the two parsers give different annotations
### Training, control and evaluation

Reference: 3,099 sentences of the Sequoia corpus [Candito and Seddah, 2012]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF\textsubscript{Train&amp;Control}</th>
<th>REF\textsubscript{Eval}</th>
<th>Unused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,549 sentences</td>
<td>776 sentences</td>
<td>774 sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- REF\textsubscript{Train\&Control} is used to train the players
- REF\textsubscript{Eval} is used like a raw corpus, to evaluate the produced annotations
Training the players
Compulsory for each dependency relation

- sentences are taken from the REF $\text{Train} \& \text{Control}$ corpus
- a feedback is given in case of error
Dealing with cognitive fatigue and long-term players

Control mechanism

Sentences from the $\text{REF}_{Train\&Control}$ corpus are proposed regularly:

- if the player fails to find the right answer, a feedback with the solution is given
- after a given number of failures on the same relation, the player cannot play anymore and has to redo the corresponding training

$\rightarrow$ we deduce a level of confidence for the player on this relation
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Production: game corpus size
compared to other existing French dependency syntax corpora

As of July 10, 2016:
- 647 players
- who produced 107,719 annotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sequoia 7.0</th>
<th>UD-French 1.3</th>
<th>FTB-UC</th>
<th>FTB-SPMRL</th>
<th>Game</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>16,448</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>18,535</td>
<td>5,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>67,038</td>
<td>401,960</td>
<td>350,947</td>
<td>557,149</td>
<td>128,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens/sent.</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Production: game corpus size
compared to other existing French dependency syntax corpora

As of July 10, 2016:
- 647 players
- who produced 107,719 annotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sequoia 7.0 free</th>
<th>UD-French 1.3 free</th>
<th>FTB-UC not free</th>
<th>FTB-SPMRL not free</th>
<th>Game free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>16,448</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>18,535</td>
<td>5,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>67,038</td>
<td>401,960</td>
<td>350,947</td>
<td>557,149</td>
<td>128,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens/sent.</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Production: game corpus size
compared to other existing French dependency syntax corpora

As of July 10, 2016:

- 647 players
- who produced 107,719 annotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sequoia 7.0</th>
<th>UD-French 1.3</th>
<th>FTB-UC</th>
<th>FTB-SPMRL</th>
<th>Game</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>not free</td>
<td>not free</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>validated</td>
<td>errors</td>
<td>validated</td>
<td>validated</td>
<td>validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>16,448</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>18,535</td>
<td>5,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>67,038</td>
<td>401,960</td>
<td>350,947</td>
<td>557,149</td>
<td>128,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens/sent.</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ (ever)growing resource!
Evaluating quality

on the REF\textsubscript{Eval} corpus

NB: left part of the figure = density of annotation $> 1$
Annotation density

on the REF$_{Eval}$ corpus

→ need **more** annotations on some relations
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Improving gamification

Give more to:
- explore and collect
- build a real story
- build a sense of community
Improving the exported resource

Test the influence of:

- the pre-annotation score
- the level of the player in the game
- the confidence we have in the player for the relation type at hand
Expand to new languages and new annotation types

New languages:
- English
- less-resourced languages

New annotation types:
- POS,
- corpus gathering, etc.

Alice Millour (PhD student)
Building a Community

GWAPs for research should form a network, to:

- attract more players,
- share them,
- share the burden of communication
Thanks!

Nicolas Lefèvre (engineer)
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