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I. INTRODUCTION

Sentence completion and prediction, which refers to the capability of filling missing words in an incomplete sentence, is one of the keys to reading comprehension. In this paper, we focus on modeling, training and recall techniques for automatic sentence completion using unsupervised machine learning. Automatic sentence completion can have many important applications. It can be used to predict and complete a sentence to reduce the user keystrokes. It can be used to improve the accuracy of Optical Character Recognition (OCR) by providing semantic information. With careful design, a sentence completion test can provide quantitative measurement of the quality of the knowledge base accrued during unsupervised machine reading.

To complete a sentence, it requires not only the appropriate vocabulary, but also the ability to analyze the given sentence and identify the structural and semantic clues that determines the meaning and nature of the missing words. Therefore, a large vocabulary, the prior knowledge in semantic connections of words as well as a good language sense are important to accomplish this task. These must be obtained from extensive reading and training.

Many of the previous works in sentence completion aim at providing a “tab-complete” editing assistance. In [1], an “interactive keyboard” is proposed that predicts the most likely keystrokes based on the past sequence. References [2]–[4] propose techniques to predict the next user command in a Unix system. The problem of natural language sentence completion is considered in some typing assistance tools for apraxic [5] and dyslexic [6]. They provide a list of possible word completions for users to choose from. The authors of [7] propose an interactive word-completion algorithm based on integrated semantic knowledge and n-gram probabilities. The authors of [8] propose an information retrieval approach for sentence completion. It is further improved in [9] by using an n-gram language model [12].

In this work we focus on the general sentence completion problem. The input of our problem is a sentence fragment with missing words at random locations. We are interested in filling in the missing words so as to create a syntactically correct and semantically coherent sentence. The sequence analysis techniques in [1]–[4] are not applicable to our problem since there is no relative past information. The n-gram language model analyzes the sentence and predicts words in a sequential order from left to right. It may not be effective to the general sentence completion problem where the missing words can locate in the middle or at the beginning of a sentence.

In this paper, we adopt the cogent confabulation model [10] to solve the sentence completion problem. Cogent confabulation is a bio-inspired model that mimics the human information processing. It is an unsupervised machine learning algorithm that extracts posterior probabilities among objects at the symbol level. In this work, we apply cogent confabulation to extract the relations among words in a sentence. A knowledge base (KB) is obtained by reading an extensive body of literature. When given an incomplete sentence, the most appropriate words will be selected based on the knowledge base. The selection procedure is an analogy to the activation of the human neurological system. Each word (or phrase) is analogy to a set of neurons and the posterior probabilities among words/phrases are analogy to the weight of the synapses connecting the neurons. The neurons with the highest excitation will be activated and further excite other neurons. When this procedure converges, the neurons (i.e. words or phrases) with the highest excitation will be selected.
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In the rest of the paper, we refer to the procedure of knowledge base construction as the training process and refer to the procedure of words selection and sentence completion as the recall process. The characteristics of the proposed sentence completion technique can be summarized as the follows:

1. It is based on the cogent confabulation model, which captures the posterior probability among words and phrases in a sentence. Therefore, our technique completes the sentence in a way such that the likelihood of the observed part is maximized. In contrast, the n-gram model maximizes the likelihood of the missing words. Although there is no definite advantage of one approach over another, they sometimes give different results.

2. Our knowledge base provides the relations between all words or word pairs in the sentence. This enables the software to fill in the missing words at the beginning of the sentence based on the information provided later.

3. The recall function mimics the information processing in the human neurology system, where neurons are exciting and being excited at the same time. Therefore, when multiple entries are missing, the selections of these entries evolve simultaneously.

4. Comparing to the original confabulation model proposed in [10], our model achieves better performance as we allow multiple symbols to be excited at the same time and hence has a larger search space. Our training function adopts a 2-level hash table, which significantly improves the training speed, so that we can extract knowledge from a larger training corpus in relatively short time. This enables the system to perform extensive reading while still maintaining a high quality knowledge base.

The rest of the paper is organized as the follows. The background of the cogent confabulation model is provided in Section II. The detailed discussion of our knowledge model and our training/recall algorithms are provided in Section III. Section IV presents the experimental results and Section V gives the conclusions and our vision on future works.

II. BACKGROUND

Cogent confabulation [10] is an emerging computation model that mimics the Hebbian learning, the information storage and inter-relation of symbolic concepts, and the recall operations of the brain. Based on the theory, the cognitive information process consists of two steps: learning and recall. During the learning step, the knowledge links are established and strengthened as symbols are co-activated. During recall, a neuron receives excitations from other activated neurons. A “winner-takes-all” strategy takes place within each lexicon. Only the neurons (in a lexicon) that represent the winning symbol will be activated and the winner neurons will activate other neurons through knowledge links. At the same time, those neurons that did not win in this procedure will be suppressed.

Figure 1 shows an example of lexicons, symbols and knowledge links. The three columns in Figure 1 represent three lexicons for the concept of shape, object and color with each box representing a neuron. Different combinations of neurons represent different symbols. For example, as shown in Figure 1, the pink neurons in lexicon I represent the cylinder shape, the orange and yellow neurons in lexicon II represent a fire extinguisher and a cup, while the red neurons in lexicon III represent the red color. When a cylinder shaped object is perceived, the neurons that represent the concepts “fire extinguisher” and “cup” will be excited. However, if a cylinder shape and a red color are both perceived, the neurons associated with “fire extinguisher” receives more excitation and become activated while the neurons associated with the concept “cup” will be suppressed. At the same time, the neurons associated with “fire extinguisher” will further excite the neurons associated with its corresponding shape and color and eventually make those symbols stand out from other symbols in lexicon I and III.
value of \( P(s_t \mid t) \). The parameter \( B \) is a positive global constant called the bandgap. The purpose of introducing \( B \) in the function is to ensure that a symbol receiving \( N \) active knowledge links will always have a higher excitation level than a symbol receiving \((N-1)\) active knowledge links, regardless of the strength of the knowledge links.

III. CONFABULATION BASED SENTENCE COMPLETION

In this section, we will present the knowledge base (KB) model for the sentence completion software followed by the training and recall algorithms.

A. Knowledge Base Model

Similar to [10], in this work, we assume that the maximum length of a sentence is 20 words. Any sentence that is longer than 20 words will be truncated. We also assume that the empty space is a word. Any sentence that is shorter than 20 words will be padded with empty spaces.

A total of 39 lexicons are constructed for a sentence. They are divided into 2 groups. Lexicons 0 through 19 belong to the first group. Each group 1 lexicon associates to a single word in the sentence. The \( i \)th lexicon represents the \( i \)th word. Lexicons 20–38 belong to the second group. Each group 2 lexicon associates to a pair of adjacent words. The lexicon labeled \((20+i)\) represents the pair of words in the \((i+1)\)th and \((i+2)\)th location. Associated to each lexicon is a collection of symbols. A symbol is a word or a pair of words that appears in the corresponding location. We use \( S_A \) to denote the set of symbols associated to lexicon \( A \).

A knowledge link (KL) from lexicon \( A \) to \( B \) is an \( M \times N \) matrix, where \( M \) and \( N \) are the cardinalities of symbol sets \( S_A \) and \( S_B \). The \((i, j)\)th entry of the knowledge link gives the conditional probability \( P(i|j) \), where \( i \in S_A \) and \( j \in S_B \). Symbols \( i \) and \( j \) are referred as source symbol and target symbol.

For our sentence completion system, between any two lexicons there is a knowledge link. If we consider the lexicons as vertices and knowledge links as directed edges between the vertices, then they form a complete graph.

B. Training Algorithm Using Hash Technique

The training of the confabulation model is the procedure to construct the probability matrix between source symbols and target symbols. Figure 2 gives a simple algorithm for the construction of the knowledge base. First the program scans through the training corpus and count the number of co-occurrences of symbols in different lexicons. Then for each symbol pair it calculates their posterior probability.

Although computationally simple, the challenge of this training algorithm is its memory complexity. For example, the English version of the book “Round the Moon” has about \( 47 \times 10^3 \) words. Our analysis shows that it has \( 23 \times 10^3 \) distinguished symbols (i.e. words and word pairs). Figure 3 shows how the symbols are distributed over different lexicons. As we mentioned earlier, each knowledge link is an \( M \times N \) matrix, where \( M \) and \( N \) are the symbol size of the source and target lexicons. Without any compression, the trained knowledge base will have \( 2.3 \times 10^9 \) entries which are equivalent to be 9.2 GBytes.

Fortunately, the knowledge links are sparse matrices. Only less than 0.1% of the matrix has non-zero values. Therefore, an option to reduce the memory cost is to store the knowledge using the list of list (LIL) or the Yale format, which have been widely used for sparse matrix storage. However, this leads to the second problem. As the size of the training corpus grows, the number of symbols of each lexicon can easily go up to hundreds of thousands. Even with the best search algorithm, the time to locate the entry in the compressed matrix grows logarithmically and soon the algorithm will become prohibitively slow. Furthermore, each symbol is a string of characters (i.e. word or word pair). Therefore, the search procedure consists of a sequence of string comparisons, which will further slow it down.

In this work, we propose to store the knowledge base using a hash table and speed up the search using a 2-level hash technique. Figure 4 gives the architecture of a hash table. The hash function maps each identifying value (i.e. key) to a bucket in an array. Hash collisions occur when multiple keys map to the same entry. Each entry’s keys are maintained in a linked list. Each entry in the array and the collision list is associated with a number that gives the location of the key in the storage table. If the key is neither in the array list nor the collision list, then it is a new key and a new entry will be allocated for it.
Our training function maintains two levels of hash tables. At the upper level, there is one large hash table with $2^{11}$ buckets. Its function is to encode each unique word or word pair to an identifying number, which is referred as source/target symbol. At the lower level, there are $38 \times 39 = 1482$ smaller hash tables. Each one of them has $2^{15}$ buckets. The second level hash tables transform the pair of symbols in the source and target lexicon to a number that identifies the location of their corresponding knowledge link entry. Figure 5 gives an example of the 2-level hash function.

The average size of our training file is 358 Kbyte. On average, each training file has $64 \times 10^3$ words and $35 \times 10^3$ distinguished words and word pairs. Our experimental results show that the average collision number of the first level hash table is 0.02. This means that, to search the symbol value of a string, we need 1.02 read accesses in average. Compared to a binary search technique which requires $log_2(35 \times 10^3) \approx 15$ read accesses, the hash table provides almost 15 times speed up. More experimental results on the performance of the hash based training function will be presented in Section IV.

At the end of training, the knowledge base will be written to a file. The first part of the file is the symbol encoding of all the unique words and word pairs that have been encountered in the training corpus. The second part of the file gives the content of the knowledge links. Each knowledge link is a sorted LIL. Each element in the LIL specifies the source and target symbol of the corresponding entry in the knowledge link matrix as well as the strength of this link (i.e. the posterior probability between the source and target).

C. Incremental learning

To enable extensive reading, the training algorithm should be able to read and learn continuously. Each time after a new book or article is read, the knowledge learned must be added into the existing knowledge base, which is referred as main knowledge base, and we refer this as incremental learning. It is the procedure of merging two knowledge bases together.

Figure 6 shows the work flow of incremental learning. It consists of 2 steps, reading and merging. The former is to generate a new KB from the given training file and the latter is to combine the new KB with the main KB.

Figure 7 gives the algorithm of knowledge base merging. Because the new knowledge base and the main knowledge base are trained at different times, they encode the word and word pairs in different ways. Therefore, the first step to merge two knowledge bases is to unify their symbolic representation. After that, for each knowledge link, we load the main KB and new KB and store them as a list of list (LIL). The knowledge links from main KB and new KB are denoted as KL1 and KL2 respectively. Note that both knowledge links are sorted however based on their own symbol encoding scheme. We keep the KL1 and sort the KL2 based on the new symbol encoding scheme. After that, we merge the two together.

Although the size of the knowledge base can easily go up to several Gigabytes, during the merging, only 2 knowledge links are maintained in the memory, therefore, the memory complexity of the merging algorithm is well controlled. The computation complexity of merging two sorted lists is linear with respect to the size of the list. Therefore, the computation complexity of the algorithm is bounded by the complexity to sort KL2, which is $O(n\log n)$, where $n$ is the size of KL2. Note
that KL2 is one of the knowledge links in the new KB, which is obtained after reading one training file, while KL1 is one of the knowledge links in the main KB, which is the combination of multiple KBs. It is obviously more efficient to sort KL2 instead of KL1 because |KL1| > |KL2|.

D. Recall Algorithm

for each lexicon whose content is known{
    encode the word/word pair to its symbol representation;
    set the symbol to be active;
}
for (N = MAX_AMBIGUOUS; N > 0; N--) {
    converged = FALSE;
    iter = 0;
    while(!converged) {
        for each lexicon whose content is unknown{
            for each symbol i associated to the lexicon {
                calculate the excitation level of i;
            }
            select the N highest excited symbols and set them to be active;
        }
        iter ++;
        if (the activation set does not changesince the last iteration)
            then converged = TRUE;
        if (iter >= MAX_ITERATION)
            then converged = TRUE;
    }
}

Figure 8. Sentence completion: recall.

The recall algorithm fills in the blank spaces in an incomplete sentence. For those lexicons whose content is given, we first encode the string to its symbolic representation. The symbol is labeled as “active”. Then for each lexicon whose content is unknown, we calculate the excitation level of its symbols. The excitation level of a symbol i in lexicon B is defined as:

$$EL_B[i] = \sum_{A=0}^{A} \sum_{j=\{active\ symbols\ in\ A\}} k_{LA}[j][i],$$

where $k_{LA}[j][i]$ is the knowledge value from symbol j in lexicon A to symbol i in lexicon B. The N highest excited symbols in this lexicon are set to be active. These symbols will further excite other symbols in other unknown lexicons. This procedure will continue until the activated symbols in all lexicons do not change anymore. If the convergence cannot be reached after a given number of iterations, then we will force the procedure to converge. After that, we will reduce the value of N and repeat the above procedure. The entire recall procedure will stop when N is reduced to zero.

Experimental results show that increasing the value of N helps to give more meaningful sentence completion results; however, it also increases the runtime exponentially.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we provide experimental results for the performance of the training algorithm and the quality of the recall algorithm.

A. Performance of the training function

Figure 9. Size of the training corpus.

Figure 10. Performance of level 1 hash function.

Figure 11. Performance of level 2 hash function for KL #400.

Our training corpus consists of 73 classic literatures, including the works from Aesop, Louisa May Alcott, James Matthew Barrie, and the Bronte sisters, et al. Each book is used as a separate training file. To avoid extremely long sentences, we assume that all punctuations except ‘’ and ‘’ indicate an end of a sentence. Figure 9 shows the number of words and the number of distinguished words/word pairs in the training corpus. As we can see, the variance in the number of distinguished words/word pairs is much smaller than the variance of the sizes of the training files.

In the first setup, incremental training is used in the experiment. Each time after a book is trained, the new knowledge base will be merged to the main knowledge base. Figure 10 shows the performance of the first level hash function by comparing its complexity to the complexity of
binary search. In average, to find the symbol encoding of a string, the average number of read access is 1.02 and 14.9 using the hash table and the binary search respectively. Therefore, using the hash technique provides almost 15X speed up in performance.

Figure 11 shows the similar results for the 2nd level hash function. There are $38 \times 39 = 1482$ hash tables in the second level. Here we only report the result for the one which corresponds to the knowledge link #400. As we can see from the figure, the average number of read access to locate a knowledge entry in the knowledge link matrix is 1.3 using hash table, and it is 12.8 using binary search.

Figure 12 shows the distribution of the number of collisions of the hash table for knowledge link #400. The training file for this data is L. M. Alcott’s “Little Woman”. The largest collision is 4, which happens to only 1 entry in the knowledge link matrix while the vast majority of the entries have no collision.

![Figure 12. The distribution of the number of collisions in the second level hash table for KL #400. (training file: “Little Woman” by L. M. Alcott)](image)

Figure 13 shows the performance of our incremental learning algorithm. In the figure, we report the overall accumulated learning time, as well as the accumulated reading time and the accumulated merging time. As we can see, the times to merge the two knowledge bases dominate the computation cost of the incremental learning. We also concatenated all the training files and training them together. The result is reported as “One shot training time” in the figure. As we can see, the training time of the concatenated files is almost the same as the accumulated training time when these files are trained separately. This is because, due to the help of the hash function, the time to locate a knowledge entry remains almost constant even though the size of the knowledge base increases. However, because the “one shot” training has to maintain the entire KB in the memory, it soon exceeds the memory limit, which is set to be 500,000 entries per knowledge link. Therefore, it can train at most 31 books. In contrast, the incremental training only has to keep just one knowledge link in the new KB and the main KB. Therefore, its performance is sustainable.

### B. Quality of sentence completion outputs

In the first setup, we use the recall function to complete some trained sentences. We arbitrarily selected 69 sentences from the training text and randomly remove words with 0.3 probabilities. Table 1 gives the quality of the recall when the MAX_AMBIGUITY varies from 1 to 20. We categorize the result of the recall into 3 groups. A perfect recall refers to the cases when the exact test sentences are recalled. A correct recall refers to the cases when the recall function does not give the exact test sentence; however gives another sentence in the test corpus. Although the result is not exactly what we asked for, it is still correct. A wrong recall refers to the cases when a sentence not in the training text has been confabulated. Our results show that, when MAX_AMBIGUITY is greater than or equal to 5, all sentences are recalled correctly. Otherwise, about 3% of the sentences cannot be correctly recalled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAX_AMBIGUITY</th>
<th>Perfect recall</th>
<th>Correct recall</th>
<th>Wrong recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second setup, we evaluate the algorithm with simple sentence completion tests extracted from a Kindergarten workbook. Table 2 gives the list of input sentences and sentences completed by our program. None of the sentences have been read during the training. The answers that are not reasonable are highlighted in bold. As we can see, 10 of the 15 sentences are completed correctly.

In the third setup, we use the book “Great Expectations” by Charles Dickens, and a children’s story book “Why the Sea is Salt” as our test files. Neither of the books has been read during the training procedure. From each book we randomly picked 100 sentences and then randomly took out 30% of the words from each selected sentence. Some of the decimated sentences and the results produced by our sentence completion software are listed. The underlined texts in italic are completed by the software. We can see that the majority of the confabulated sentences read reasonably well with correct grammar. While a few of them are with minor grammar errors or do not really make sense.
Table 2. Completion of simple sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input sentence</th>
<th>Completed sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I ___ a good idea</td>
<td>I had a good idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 But he has a lot ___ work to do</td>
<td>But he has a lot to work to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 He gets help _ his friends</td>
<td>He gets help _ his friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ___ are many jobs to do</td>
<td>You are many jobs to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 They _ so much work</td>
<td>They do so much work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 the boys work</td>
<td>And the boys work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 They clean _ clean</td>
<td>They clean were clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 That car _ not clean</td>
<td>That car took not clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 There ___ many houses in town</td>
<td>There were many houses in town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cars ___ on the streets</td>
<td>Cars lamps on the streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 He works in ___ store</td>
<td>He works in her store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 He lives _ the house</td>
<td>He lives in the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 A tornado ___ coming</td>
<td>A tornado is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The boy didn’t want the tornado ___ come</td>
<td>The boy didn’t want the tornado to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 No ___ was happy about this</td>
<td>No I was happy about this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input: ___ went out of the 24 output sentences are exactly the same as system; all of them are completed with meaningful output. 11

Output: Where are we ___ to get something to ___.

Input: _ will we celebrate.

Output: When will we celebrate.

Input: He did ___ know what ___ do.

Output: He did not know what to do.

Input: Why ___ come ___?

Output: Why are you come here?

Input: Looking ___ rich man.

Output: Looking at the rich man.

Input: ___ take it to Hiysi.

Output: Will you take it to Hiysi.

Input: ___ lived deep in the ___.

Output: And I have lived deep in the way.

Input: ___ caused ___ Joe reentering the ___ empty handed.

Output: That caused Ned Joe reentering the brook empty handed.

Input: And then ___ stood ___.

Output: And then she stood still.

Input: Opening ___ door ___ spit stiffly ___ high stocks.

Output: Opening the door and spit stiffly enter before high stocks.

Input: I ___ little ___ of my scattered ___.

Output: I went a little out of my scattered to.

Input: ___ am ___ in ___ name ___ the ___.

Output: I am going a tell in the name of the father.

Input: And pray ___ you ___.

Output: And pray circulate them you three influential quarters.

In the last setup, we test the system using the Rotter incomplete sentence test [11]. The Rotter test is usually used to find out the personality and the psychological state of the subject. About 24 incomplete sentences are fed into the system; all of them are completed with meaningful output. 11 out of the 24 output sentences are exactly the same as sentences in the training file. The following is a list of these 11 sentences.

- I feel deeply interested in her.
- I regret that they did not visit us before sailing.
- I am afraid of what may happen if I.
- My father is willing to give you a last chance.
- The future wellbeing of their child.
- My nerves are torn to pieces.
- Girls were made to take care of boys.
- School would be a complete change.
- I need not narrate in detail the further struggles I had.
- I hate anybody to come upon me so unexpectedly.
- I wish these papers did not come in the house.
The other 13 sentences are made up (or “confabulated”) by the program. They are listed in the next.

- Other people are like those stupid hoppers.
- I am best when to be able to do it.
- What bothers me is going to say next before he says it.
- The happiest time is coming when it will take the place.
- I dislike to dwell on the result.
- I failed to see what I did.
- A home is at the end of the gallery opened.
- Boys can be of the greatest assistance to me.
- My mother always on leaving the letter unanswered.
- I suffer matters to take their course.
- Other kids were couched in language which made Michel jump.
- My greatest worry is to love her for her tender sympathy.
- What pains me is to be in the house.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

We have introduced the modeling, training and recall techniques of our confabulation based sentence completion software. The hash based training algorithm supports extensive reading in relatively short time and at the same time maintains a high quality knowledge base. The software can recall sentences in the training files with 100% accuracy. It can also fill in missing words in simple sentences or provide meaningful sentences based on the given initial words. Although it gives promising results, some of the sentences provided by the software are not logically correct. One promising method to improve the results is to incorporate semantic information (such as parts of speech) with the confabulation model and algorithms.
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