## CS 6740/IS 6300 A3 data readme

There are two splits of the original data, and one split of the challenge data.

Students with the following initials: AR, EM, HL, and JA should use Lillian's split.

Students with the following initials: JC, JL, VS should use Tianze's split.

File listing:
Lillian's split: the way you can tell you have the new (as of Oct 28) split: there should NOT be the ID 473 twice in original-dev.ids. a.txt. (Thanks very much Hannah for noticing this!!!)
sentences.tsv
original-dev.ids.a.txt (redid on Oct 28)
original-test-ids.a.txt (redid on Oct 28)

## Tianze's split:

original.train.ids
original.dev.ids
original.test.ids

Challenge split (see notes at the end of this page)
challenge.tsv
challenge.train.id-prefixes.txt

Lillian's split of the original data was created as follows.
\% cat sentences.tsv | awk '\{if (\$(NF-1)= "+1") print \$0\}' | perl -MList::
Util=shuffle -e 'print shuffle(<STDIN>);' | head -`echo "dummy" | awk '\{print int(.2*3610)\}' > original20percent.pos.a.txt \% cat sentences.tsv | awk '\{if (\$(NF-1)= "-1") print \$0\}' | perl -MList:: Util=shuffle -e 'print shuffle(<STDIN>);' | head -`echo "dummy" | awk '\{print int(.2*3310)\}" > original20percent.neg.a.txt
\% tail -331 original20percent.neg.a.txt | awk '\{print \$1\}' > original-dev.ids. a.txt
\% tail -361 original20percent.pos.a.txt | awk '\{print \$1\}' >> original-dev.
ids.a.txt
\% head -331 original20percent.neg.a.txt | awk '\{print \$1\}' > original-test.
ids.a.txt
\% head -361 original20percent.pos.a.txt| awk '\{print \$1\}' >> original-test. ids.a.txt

Thus, you have files that specify the sentence ids for the sentences belonging
to the development and test set, respectively; the training set consists of the sentence
IDs that aren't in either original-dev.ids.a.txt or original-test.ids.a.txt
\#\#\#\# Sanity checks
\% cat original-dev.ids.a.txt original-test.ids.a.txt | sort | uniq -c | sort -nr | head

19993 \# so, nothing appears in twice in the concatenation of the "a" files.

Here is a link to a page where you can view "diffs" between any two versions: use the "compare selected versions" feature to highlight precisely what text was added or deleted.

| Version | Published | Changed <br> By | Comment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CURRENT (v. 50ct 29, 2019 13:37 | Lillian <br> Lee | Confirmed that thє |  |
| v. 4 | Oct 28, 2019 12:28 | Lillian <br> Lee | added sanity chec |
| v. 3 | Oct 28, 2019 12:21 | Lillian <br> Lee | Utterly embarrassi |
| v. 2 | Oct 25, 2019 13:16 | Lillian | add explicit diff tra |
| v. 1 | Oct 25, 2019 13:13 | Lee |  |

\% wc -I *ids.a.txt

692 original-dev.ids.a.txt
692 original-test.ids.a.txt
1384 total

Tianze's split of the original data was created as follows.
\% tail -n +2 sentences.tsv.txt | cut -f 1,3 | shuf | grep "+1" | cut -f 1 > original.pos.ids
\% tail -n +2 sentences.tsv.txt | cut -f 1,3 | shuf | grep " $1-1$ " | cut -f 1 > original.neg.ids
\% sed -n '1,"expr 361 \* 8 ' $\mathrm{p}^{\prime}$ original.pos.ids > original.pos.train.ids $\%$ sed $-n$ `expr 361 \* \(^{*} 8+1^{`},{ }^{\prime}\) 'expr 361 \* $^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ p' original.pos.ids $>$ original. pos.dev.ids
\% sed -n `expr 361 \* \(9+1\) ','"expr 361 \* 10 ` p ' original.pos.ids > original.pos.test.ids
$\%$ sed -n '1,"expr 331 \* 8 ' $\mathrm{p}^{\prime}$ original.neg.ids > original.neg.train.ids $\%$ sed $-n$ `expr 331 \} ^ { * } 8 + 1 ^ { \prime } , \text { ,"expr } 3 3 1 \text { \} ^ { * } 9 ^ { \prime } p \text { ' original.neg.ids } > \text { original. } neg.dev.ids \(\%\) sed -n `expr $331 \backslash^{*} 9+1$ ','"expr $331 \backslash^{*} 10^{`} p^{\prime}$ original.neg.ids > original.neg.test.ids
\% for split in train dev test; do (cat original.pos.\$\{split\}.ids original. neg.\$\{split\}.ids > original.\$\{split\}.ids) done
\#\#\#\# Sanity check after generation:
\% cat original.train.ids original.dev.ids original.test.ids | wc -I \% cat original.train.ids original.dev.ids original.test.ids | sort | uniq | wc-1
\#\#\#\# Both gave 6920.

The challenge data split is as follows. This is not what we talked about in class, due to some imbalance in Team4_breaker_test.tsv and the fact that
$10 \%$ of the data being training could be too small to allow interesting variation
in fine-tuning-set size.
\% cat Team\{1,2,3\}_breaker_test.tsv
\# Then some manual editing (including removing:
\# 673_a This quirky, snarky contemporary fairy tale could have been a family blockbuster. -1
\# 673_a This quirky, snarky contemporary fairy tale could have been a family blockbuster. 1
\#)
\# to yield challenge.tsv
\% cut -f1 challenge.tsv | cut -f1 -d'_' | sort | uniq | perl -MList::Util=shuffle -e 'print shuffle(<STDIN>);' | head - -50 > challenge.train.id-prefixes.txt

The first entry in challenge.train.id-prefixes.txt is "850", so, the following two sentences from challenge.tsv should be in the small challenge training set:

Note that there may be "repeated" IDs, as posted about in CampusWire:
Q:
duplicate indices in challenge.tsv \#17
I noticed that there are duplicate indices in challen ge.tsv. For one example, there are two instances of 559_b's from challenge.tsv:

559_a Unfolds with the creepy elegance and carefully calibrated precision of a Dario Argento horror film. 1 559_b Unfolds with all the creepy elegance and carefully calibrated precision of a Jim Carrey comedy film. -1 559_b Unfolds with the creepy elegance and carefully calibrated precision of a Uwe Boll horror film. -1

I am not sure if this was intentional, or the third 559 example was meant to be encoded as something like 559_c. I first assumed there would only be pairs ( $a$ and $b$ ) of similar sentences in the challenge dataset, but the above examples show that there can be either pairs or trios of them.

A: This was a design choice, but good to check! Note that the actual sentences for the two 559_b's are different, although both are "challenges" to the same 559_a. So you will want all three 559s to be in the same split, counting as three different examples. as a design choice, but good to check! Note that the actual sentences for the two 559_b's are different, although both are "challenges" to the same 559_a. So you will want all three 559s to be in the same split, counting as three different examples.
In general, there could be as many as $3 x$ b's,
one per each of the three breaker teams' data.

