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- Word embeddings: word vectors are derived from subword vectors
- SoA on many benchmarks especially RareWord
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- Able to estimate distributions of unseen words

- High semantic quality for rare words via root sharing

|  | Spearman Correlation | FastText | PFT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sp <br> on RareWord dataset | $\mathbf{0 . 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 9}$ |

- disentangled meanings

| Word |  | Component | Nearest neighbors (cosine similarity) |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| rock | 0 | rocks:0, rocky:0, mudrock:0, rockscape:0 |  |
| rock | 1 | punk:0, punk-rock:0, indie:0, pop-rock:0 |  |

## PROBABILISTIC FASTTEXT



Spearman Correlation on RareWord dataset

| w2gm | FastText | PFT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.43 | 0.48 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 9}$ |

- disentangled meanings

| Word |  | Component |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | Nearest neighbors (cosine similarity) \(~\left(\begin{array}{cc|l|}\hline rock \& 0 \& rocks:0, rocky:0, mudrock:0, rockscape:0 <br>

rock \& 1 \& punk:0, punk-rock:0, indie:0, pop-rock:0\end{array}\right.\)

- Applicable to foreign languages without any changes in model hyperparameters!

| Word | Component / <br> Meaning | Nearest neighbors (English Translation) |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| secondo | $0 / 2$ nd | Secondo (2nd), terzo (3rd), quinto (5th), primo (first) |
| secondo | $1 /$ according to | conformit (compliance), attenendosi (following), cui (which) |
| 0 |  |  |

## VECTOR EMBEDDINGS \& FASTTEXT

## WORD EMBEDDINGS



- word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013)
- GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014)
vectors


## DENSE REPRESENTATION OF WORDS

Meaningful nearest neighbors


## Relationship deduction from vector arithmetic


i.e.

China - Beijing ~ Japan - Tokyo

## CHAR-MODEL: SUBWORD

 REPRESENTATION$$
\vec{\rho}_{w}=\frac{1}{\left|N G_{w}\right|+1}\left(\vec{v}_{w}+\sum_{g \in N G_{w}} \vec{z}_{g}\right)
$$

FastText (P Bojanowski, 2017)

- representation = average of n-gram vectors
- automatic semantic extraction of stems/prefixes/suffices
w = <abnormal>

$$
\operatorname{N-grams}(w) \ni\{\langle a b, a b n, \ldots,\langle a b n, a b n o r, \ldots,\}
$$



## CHAR-MODEL: SUBWORD

 REPRESENTATION FastText(P Bojanowski, 2017)$$
\vec{\rho}_{w}=\frac{1}{\left|N G_{w}\right|+1}\left(\vec{v}_{w}+\sum_{g \in N G_{w}} \vec{z}_{g}\right)
$$

- representation $=$ average of $n$-gram vectors
- automatic semantic extraction of stems/prefixes/suffices
w = <abnormal>
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{grams}(w) \ni\{\langle a b, a b n, \ldots,\langle a b n, a b n o r, \ldots\}$,

cosine similarity between vector and n -gram vectors


## SUBWORD CONTRIBUTION TO OVERALL SEMANTICS

## FASTTEXT WITH WORD2GM



- Augment Gaussian mixture representation with character-structure (FastText)
- Promote independence: using dictionary-level vectors for other components


## SIMILARITY SCORE (ENERGY) BETWEEN DISTRIBUTIONS

vector space

$$
\begin{aligned}
s(u, v) & =\langle\vec{u}, \vec{v}\rangle \\
& =\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v}
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
\begin{aligned}
s(u, v) & =\langle u, v\rangle_{L_{2}} \\
& =\int u(x) v(x) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

## ENERGY OF TWO GAUSSIAN MIXTURES

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
f(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_{i} \mathcal{N}\left(x ; \vec{\mu}_{f, i}, \Sigma_{f, i}\right), g(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{K} q_{i} \mathcal{N}\left(x ; \vec{\mu}_{g, i}, \Sigma_{g, i}\right) \\
\langle f, g\rangle_{L_{2}}=\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K} p_{i} q_{j} e^{\xi_{i, j}} & \text { total energy = weighted sum of pairwise partial energies } \\
\xi_{i, j}=-\frac{\alpha}{2}\left\|\mu_{f, i}-\mu_{g, i}\right\|^{2} & \text { closed form! }
\end{array}
$$



## WORD SAMPLING

## I like that rock band



Dataset: ukWac + WackyPedia (3.5 billion tokens)


## LOSS FUNCTION

## Energy-based Max Margin

word: w

word: w
rock
context
word: c
band
negative
context: c'
high E(w,c) $\uparrow$

low $E\left(w, c^{\prime}\right)$

Minimize the objective
$L\left(w, c, c^{\prime}\right)=\max \left(0, m-\log E(w, c)+\log E\left(w, c^{\prime}\right)\right)$

MULTIMODAL REPRESENTATION MIXTURE OF GAUSSIANS

$$
\vec{\rho}_{w}=\frac{1}{\left|N G_{w}\right|+1}\left(\vec{v}_{w}+\sum_{g \in N G_{w}} \vec{z}_{g}\right)
$$

## Model parameters:

dictionary vectors

$$
\left\{\left\{v_{i}^{w}\right\}_{i=1}^{i=K}\right\}_{w}
$$

char n-gram vectors

$$
\left\{z_{g}\right\}
$$

Model hyperparameters:

$$
\alpha, m
$$

(covariance scale, margin)

## TRAINING - ILLUSTRATION

Mixture of Gaussians
Model parameters:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { dictionary vectors } \\
& \qquad\left\{\left\{v_{i}^{w}\right\}_{i=1}^{i=K}\right\}_{w}
\end{aligned}
$$

char n-gram vectors $\left\{z_{g}\right\}$

Train with max margin objective using minibatch SGD (AdaGrad)
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## EVALUATION

## QUALITATIVE EVALUATION - NEAREST NEIGHBORS

basalt

stone


## NEAREST NEIGHBORS



## QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION

| WORD PAIR |  | HUMAN SCORE | EMBEDDING SIMILARITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CUP | COFFEE | 6.58 | S(CUP, COFFEE) $=0.7$ |
| CUP | SUBSTANCE | 1.92 | S(CUP, SUBSTANCE) $=0.2$ |
| STOCK | MARKET | 8.08 | S(STOCK, MARKET) $=0.9$ |
| STOCK | PHONE | 1.62 | S(STOCK, PHONE) $=0.05$ |
| KING | QUEEN | 8.58 | S(KING, QUEEN $)=0.8$ |
| KING | CABBAGE | 0.23 | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{KING}, \mathrm{CABBAGE})=0.2$ |
|  | Spearman correlation coefficient 0: no correlation 1: perfect cłrrelation |  |  |

s(cup, coffee) = similarity between 'cup' and 'coffee'


## SIMILARITY METRIC

s(rock, stone)




Pairwise Maximum Cosine Similarity
$\max _{i, j}\left\langle\vec{\mu}_{\text {rock }, i}, \vec{\mu}_{\text {stone }, j}\right\rangle$

## SPEARMAN CORRELATIONS

| WORD SIM DATASETS | FASTTEXT | W2GM | PFT-GM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SL-999 | 38.03 | 39.62 | 39.60 |
| WS-353 | 78.88 | 79.38 | 76.11 |
| MEN-3K | 76.37 | 78.76 | 79.65 |
| MC-30 | 81.20 | 84.58 | 80.93 |
| RG-65 | 79.98 | 80.95 | 79.81 |
| YP-130 | 53.33 | 47.12 | 54.93 |
| MT-287 | 67.93 | 69.65 | 69.44 |
| MT-771 | 66.89 | 70.36 | 69.68 |
| RW-2K (RAREWORD) | 48.09 | 42.73 | 49.36 |
| AVG. | 49.28 | 49.54 | 51.10 |

- PFT performs much better on RareWord dataset compared to w2gm, even slightly better than FastText
- Based on the average spearman correlation, PFT-GM performs the best.
- First multi-sense models that achieve high scores on RareWord


## COMPARISON WITH OTHER MULTIPROTOTYPE EMBEDDINGS

| Model | Dim | $\rho \times 100$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| HUANG AVGSim | 50 | 62.8 |
| TIAN MAXSIm | 50 | 63.6 |
| W2GM MAXSIM | 50 | 62.7 |
| NEELAKANTAN AVGSIM | 50 | 64.2 |
| PFT-GM MAXSIM | 50 | 63.7 |
| ChEN-M AvGSim | 200 | 66.2 |
| W2GM MAXSIM | 200 | 65.5 |
| NEELAKANTAN AVGSIM | 300 | $\mathbf{6 7 . 2}$ |
| W2GM MAXSIM | 300 | 66.5 |
| PFT-GM MAXSIM | 300 | $\mathbf{6 7 . 2}$ |

- PFT performs better than other multiprototype embeddings on SCWS, a benchmark for word similarity with multiple meanings.

Table 3: Spearman's Correlation $\rho \times 100$ on word similarity dataset SCWS.

## FOREIGN LANGUAGE EMBEDDINGS

| Word | Meaning | Nearest Neighbors |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| (IT) secondo | 2nd | Secondo (2nd), terzo (3rd), quinto (5th), primo (first), quarto (4th), ultimo (last) |
| (IT) secondo | according to | conformit (compliance), attenendosi (following), cui (which), conformemente (accordance with) |
| (IT) porta | lead, bring | portano (lead), conduce (leads), portano, porter, portando (bring), costringe (forces) |
| (IT) porta | door | porte (doors), finestrella (window), finestra (window), portone (doorway), serratura (door lock) |
| (FR) voile | veil | voiles (veil), voiler (veil), voilent (veil), voilement, foulard (scarf), voils (veils), voilant (veiling) |
| (FR) voile | sail | catamaran (catamaran), driveur (driver), nautiques (water), Voile (sail), driveurs (drivers) |
| (FR) temps | weather | brouillard (fog), orageuses (stormy), nuageux (cloudy) |
| (FR) temps | time | mi-temps (half-time), partiel (partial), Temps (time), annualis (annualized), horaires (schedule) |
| (FR) voler | steal | envoler (fly), voleuse (thief), cambrioler (burgle), voleur (thief), violer (violate), picoler (tipple) |
| (FR) voler | fly | airs (air), vol (flight), volent (fly), envoler (flying), atterrir (land) |

Table 5: Nearest neighbors of polysemies based on our foreign language PFT-GM models.

| Lang. | Evaluation | FASTTEXT | w2g | w2gm | pft-g | pft-gm |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FR | WS353 | 38.2 | 16.73 | 20.09 | 41.0 | $\mathbf{4 1 . 3}$ |
| DE | GUR350 | 70 | 65.01 | 69.26 | 77.6 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 2}$ |
|  | GUR65 | 81 | 74.94 | 76.89 | 81.8 | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2}$ |
| IT | WS353 | 57.1 | 56.02 | 61.09 | 60.2 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5}$ |
|  | SL-999 | 29.3 | 29.44 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 9 1}$ | 29.3 | 33.7 |

Table 4: Word similarity evaluation on foreign languages.

## FUTURE WORK: MULTI-LINGUAL EMBEDDINGS

Literature: align embeddings of many languages after training (Conneau, 2018)


Use disentangled embeddings to disambiguate alignment

## CONCLUSION

- Elegant representation of semantics using multimodal distributions
- Suitable modeling words with multiple meanings
- Model words as character levels
- Better semantics for rare words
- Able to estimate semantics of unseen words


## 

