# Model-Based Word Embeddings from Decompositions of Count Matrices

Karl Stratos

Joint work with Michael Collins and Daniel Hsu

Columbia University

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Motivation: WORD2VEC as Matrix Decomposition

► WORD2VEC (Mikolov et al., 2013) trains word/context

embeddings by maximizing some objective:

$$(v_w, v_c) = \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{u,v} J(u, v)$$

Recently cast as a low-rank decomposition of transformed

co-occurrence counts (Levy and Goldberg, 2014):

$$v_w^\top v_c = f(\mathsf{count}(w,c))$$

Q. Are there other count transformations whose low-rank decompositions yield effective word embeddings?

## This Work

- 1. Count transformation under canonical correlation analysis (CCA) (Hotelling, 1936)
  - Model-based interpretation that permits a variance-stabilizing transformation
- 2. Unifies a number of existing spectral methods for inducing word embeddings
- 3. Empirically competitive with other popular methods such as WORD2VEC and GLOVE

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Overview

### Canonical Correlation Analysis

Variational Characterization

Count Transformation for Word Embeddings Model-Based Interpretation

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Template for Spectral Word Embeddings

Experiments

## **Correlation Coefficient**

• Correlation coefficient between random variables  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\operatorname{Cor}(X,Y) := \frac{\mathbf{E}[XY] - \mathbf{E}[X]\mathbf{E}[Y]}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{E}[X^2] - \mathbf{E}[X]^2) \times (\mathbf{E}[Y^2] - \mathbf{E}[Y]^2)}}$$

 $\operatorname{Cor}(X,Y) \approx 1$ 

Degree of linear relationship  $\left[-1,1\right]$ 



## Optimization Problem Underlying CCA

Input:

1.  $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  // two "views" of an object 2.  $m \leq \min(d, d')$  // number of projection vectors **Output**:  $(a_1, b_1) \dots (a_m, b_m) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  such that

• 
$$(a_1, b_1)$$
 is the solution of

$$\underset{a,b}{\operatorname{arg\,max}} \operatorname{Cor}\left(\boldsymbol{a}^{\top}\boldsymbol{X}, \ \boldsymbol{b}^{\top}\boldsymbol{Y}\right) \qquad (1)$$

For  $i = 2 \dots m$ :  $(a_i, b_i)$  is the solution of (1) subject to:

$$\operatorname{Cor} \left( \mathbf{a}^{\top} X, \ a_{j}^{\top} X \right) = 0 \qquad \forall j < i$$
$$\operatorname{Cor} \left( \mathbf{b}^{\top} Y, \ b_{j}^{\top} Y \right) = 0 \qquad \forall j < i$$

## Exact Solution via Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)

**Theorem.** (Hotelling, 1936) Define correlation matrix  $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}$ :

$$\Omega := \left( \mathbf{E}[XX^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[X]\mathbf{E}[X]^{\top} \right)^{-1/2} \\ \left( \mathbf{E}[XY^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[X]\mathbf{E}[Y]^{\top} \right) \\ \left( \mathbf{E}[YY^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[Y]\mathbf{E}[Y]^{\top} \right)^{-1/2}$$

Let  $(u_i, v_i)$  be the left/right singular vectors of  $\Omega$  corresponding to the *i*-th largest singular value. Then

$$a_i = \left(\mathbf{E}[XX^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[X]\mathbf{E}[X]^{\top}\right)^{-1/2} u_i$$
  
$$b_i = \left(\mathbf{E}[YY^{\top}] - \mathbf{E}[Y]\mathbf{E}[Y]^{\top}\right)^{-1/2} v_i$$

## New Representation under CCA

▶ Induce new *m*-dimensional representation  $(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$  of (X, Y):

$$\underline{X}_i = a_i^\top X$$
$$\underline{Y}_i = b_i^\top Y$$

for  $i = 1 \dots m$ 

 Idea: remove ambient dimensions by projecting to a subspace containing most correlation

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

## Overview

### Canonical Correlation Analysis

Variational Characterization Count Transformation for Word Embeddings Model-Based Interpretation

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Template for Spectral Word Embeddings

Experiments

Two Views of a Word: Word & Context

Extract samples of (X, Y) := (word, context) from a corpus:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \dots \mbox{ Whatever our souls are made of} & & & \\ & & \downarrow & \\ & & (\mathcal{I}_{souls}, \mathcal{I}_{our}) & (\mathcal{I}_{souls}, \mathcal{I}_{are}) \end{array}$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_i$  is an indicator vector for i

Need to perform singular value decomposition (SVD) on

$$\hat{\Omega} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{E}}[XX^{\top}] - \hat{\mathbf{E}}[X]\hat{\mathbf{E}}[X]^{\top}\right)^{-1/2} \\ \left(\hat{\mathbf{E}}[XY^{\top}] - \hat{\mathbf{E}}[X]\hat{\mathbf{E}}[Y]^{\top}\right) \\ \left(\hat{\mathbf{E}}[YY^{\top}] - \hat{\mathbf{E}}[Y]\hat{\mathbf{E}}[Y]^{\top}\right)^{-1/2}$$

## Simplified Correlation Matrix

When the number of samples is large, the means tend to zero:

$$\hat{\Omega} \approx \hat{\mathbf{\mathsf{E}}} \left[ X X^{\top} \right]^{-1/2} \, \hat{\mathbf{\mathsf{E}}} \left[ X Y^{\top} \right] \, \hat{\mathbf{\mathsf{E}}} \left[ Y Y^{\top} \right]^{-1/2}$$

I.e., decompose the following transformed counts!

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c} = \frac{\operatorname{count}(w,c)}{\sqrt{\operatorname{count}(w) \times \operatorname{count}(c)}}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Previous Work Using CCA for Word Embeddings

 Dhillon et al. (2011, 2012) propose various modifications of CCA, but take the square root of counts,

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c} = \frac{\operatorname{count}(w,c)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{count}(w)^{1/2} \times \operatorname{count}(c)^{1/2}}}$$

- The square root was taken for empirical reasons.
- We now provide a model-based interpretation that naturally admits this extra transformation.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Overview

### Canonical Correlation Analysis

Variational Characterization Count Transformation for Word Embeddings Model-Based Interpretation

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Template for Spectral Word Embeddings

Experiments

### Definition of the "Brown Model" (Brown et al., 1992)

Parameters: same as HMMs

 $\begin{aligned} \pi(h) &= \text{probability of state } h \text{ starting a sequence} \\ t(h'|h) &= \text{probability of transitioning from state } h \text{ to state } h' \\ o(w|h) &= \text{probability of word } w \text{ under state } h \end{aligned}$ 

**Assumption**: every word w has a *single* possible state h

- Define emission matrix O where  $O_{w,h} = o(w|h)$
- ▶ Rows of *O* can be seen as *state-revealing* word embeddings

$$\begin{aligned} O_{\mathsf{smile}} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0.0 \end{bmatrix} & O_{\mathsf{frown}} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.0 & 0.25 \end{bmatrix} \\ O_{\mathsf{grin}} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0.0 \end{bmatrix} & O_{\mathsf{cringe}} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.0 & 0.75 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Using the Scaled, Rotated Rows of O as Word Embeddings

Suppose we had  $\overline{O} := \operatorname{diag}(s_1) O^{\langle a \rangle} \operatorname{diag}(s_2) Q^{\top}$  where

- $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are any positive vectors
- $O^{\langle a \rangle}$  is an element-wise power of O with any  $a \neq 0$
- Q is any orthogonal matrix

Normalized rows of  $\overline{O}$  have the same representational power as normalized rows of O!



・ ロ と ・ ( 雪 と ・ ( 雪 と ・ )

## CCA for Estimating O up to Scaling and Rotation

**Theorem**. Pick any  $a \neq 0$ . Let  $\hat{U}$  be the top m left singular vectors of  $\hat{\Omega}^{\langle a \rangle}$  where

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c}^{\langle a \rangle} = \frac{\operatorname{count}(w,c)^{a}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{count}(w)^{a} \times \operatorname{count}(c)^{a}}}$$

Then as the sample size grows:

$$\hat{U} \to O^{\langle \mathbf{a}/2 \rangle} \mathsf{diag}(s) Q^{\mathsf{T}}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

for some s > 0 and orthogonal Q

Proof. Extension of Stratos et al. (2014)

## Choosing the Value of a

So we can choose any  $a \neq 0$ , what should it be?

One answer: a = 1/2

Why?

- Assume word counts drawn from a multinomial distribution
- Equivalent to drawing from independent Poisson distributions (conditioned on the length of the corpus)
- Square-root is a variance-stabilizing transformation for Poisson random variables (Bartlett, 1936):

 $X \sim \mathsf{Poisson}(np)$   $\mathsf{Var}(X^{1/2}) \to \mathbf{1/4} \qquad \text{ as } n \to \infty$ 

## Why does Variance Stabilization Help?

SVD minimizes unweighted squared-error loss:

$$\min_{u_w, v_c} \sum_{w, c} \left( \Omega_{w, c}^{\langle \boldsymbol{a} \rangle} - u_w^\top v_c \right)^2$$

But minimizing *variance-weighted* squared-error loss is more statistically efficient (Aitken, 1936):

$$\min_{u_w,v_c} \sum_{w,c} \frac{1}{\operatorname{Var}\left(\Omega_{w,c}^{\langle a \rangle}\right)} \left(\Omega_{w,c}^{\langle a \rangle} - u_w^\top v_c\right)^2$$

Generally intractable (Srebro et al., 2003)

Using  $\mathbf{a} = 1/2$  makes  $\operatorname{Var}\left(\Omega_{w,c}^{\langle \mathbf{a} \rangle}\right)$  approximately **constant** and removes the need for explicit variance weighting!

## Overview

### Canonical Correlation Analysis

Variational Characterization Count Transformation for Word Embeddings Model-Based Interpretation

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Template for Spectral Word Embeddings

Experiments

## Template

**Input**: count(w, c), dimension m, transform t, scaling s

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(w) := \sum_c \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(c) := \sum_w \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

**Output**: embedding  $v(w) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for each word w

1. Transform counts

2. Scale counts to construct matrix  $\hat{\Omega}$ 

3. Do rank-*m* SVD on  $\hat{\Omega} \approx \hat{U}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{V}^{\top}$  and let  $v(w) = \hat{U}_w / \left| \left| \hat{U}_w \right| \right|$ 

### Template: No Scaling (Pennington et al., 2014)

**Input**: count(w, c), dimension m,  $t = \log$ , s = --

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(w) := \sum_c \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(c) := \sum_w \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

**Output**: embedding  $v(w) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for each word w

#### 1. Transform counts

 $\operatorname{count}(w,c) \leftarrow \log(1 + \operatorname{count}(w,c))$ 

2. Scale counts to construct matrix  $\hat{\Omega}$ 

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c} = \mathsf{count}(w,c)$$

3. Do rank-*m* SVD on  $\hat{\Omega} \approx \hat{U}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{V}^{\top}$  and let  $v(w) = \hat{U}_w / ||\hat{U}_w||_{\mathcal{U}}$ 

### Template: PPMI (Levy and Goldberg, 2014)

**Input**: count(w, c), dimension m, t = -, s = ppmi

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(w) := \sum_c \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(c) := \sum_w \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

**Output**: embedding  $v(w) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for each word w

1. Transform counts

 $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{count}(w,c) \leftarrow \operatorname{count}(w,c) & \operatorname{count}(w) \leftarrow \operatorname{count}(w) \\ & \operatorname{count}(c) \leftarrow \operatorname{count}(c) \end{array}$ 

2. Scale counts to construct matrix  $\hat{\Omega}$ 

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c} = \max\left(0, \log \frac{\mathsf{count}(w, c) \times \sum_{w,c} \mathsf{count}(w, c)}{\mathsf{count}(w) \times \mathsf{count}(c)}\right)$$

3. Do rank-*m* SVD on  $\hat{\Omega} \approx \hat{U}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{V}^{\top}$  and let  $v(w) = \hat{U}_w / \left| \left| \hat{U}_w \right| \right|_{\mathcal{U}} = \hat{U}_w / \left| \hat{U}_w \right|_{\mathcal{U}}$ 

## Template: CCA (Stratos et al., 2014)

**Input**: count(w, c), dimension m, t = -, s = cca

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(w) := \sum_c \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(c) := \sum_w \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

**Output**: embedding  $v(w) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for each word w

1. Transform counts

 $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{count}(w,c) \leftarrow \operatorname{count}(w,c) & \operatorname{count}(w) \leftarrow \operatorname{count}(w) \\ & \operatorname{count}(c) \leftarrow \operatorname{count}(c) \end{array}$ 

2. Scale counts to construct matrix  $\hat{\Omega}$ 

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c} = \frac{\mathsf{count}(w,c)}{\sqrt{\mathsf{count}(w) \times \mathsf{count}(c)}}$$

3. Do rank-*m* SVD on  $\hat{\Omega} \approx \hat{U}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{V}^{\top}$  and let  $v(w) = \hat{U}_w / \left\| \hat{U}_w \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ 

## Template: CCA with Square-Root (this work)

**Input**: count(w, c), dimension m, t =sqrt, s =cca

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(w) := \sum_c \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

• 
$$\operatorname{count}(c) := \sum_w \operatorname{count}(w, c)$$

**Output**: embedding  $v(w) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for each word w

1. Transform counts

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{count}(w,c) \leftarrow \sqrt{\mathsf{count}(w,c)} & \mathsf{count}(w) \leftarrow \sqrt{\mathsf{count}(w)} \\ & \mathsf{count}(c) \leftarrow \sqrt{\mathsf{count}(c)} \end{array}$ 

2. Scale counts to construct matrix  $\hat{\Omega}$ 

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c} = \frac{\mathsf{count}(w,c)}{\sqrt{\mathsf{count}(w) \times \mathsf{count}(c)}}$$

3. Do rank-*m* SVD on  $\hat{\Omega} \approx \hat{U}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{V}^{\top}$  and let  $v(w) = \hat{U}_w / \left| \left| \hat{U}_w \right| \right|$ 

## Overview

### Canonical Correlation Analysis

Variational Characterization Count Transformation for Word Embeddings Model-Based Interpretation

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Template for Spectral Word Embeddings

Experiments

# Setting

Corpus: pre-processed English Wikipedia (1.4 billion words)

#### Evalution

- Word similarity: correlation with human judgment on ranking similar words, averaged across 3 datasets (AVG-SIM)
- Word analogy: answering analogy questions of form

```
Beijing : China \sim Kampala : ?
```

Syntactic (SYN), syntactic+semantic (MIXED)

 Semi-supervised learning: improving performance of supervised learner

Comparison with GLOVE (Pennington et al., 2014) and CBOW, SGNS (implemented in WORD2VEC) (Mikolov et al., 2013)

Default hyperparameter configuration

Effect of Power Transformation in CCA

Different values of a in

$$\hat{\Omega}_{w,c}^{\langle \mathbf{a} \rangle} = \frac{\operatorname{count}(w,c)^{\mathbf{a}}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{count}(w)^{\mathbf{a}} \times \operatorname{count}(c)^{\mathbf{a}}}}$$

#### 1000 dimensions

a	AVG-SIM	SYN	MIXED
1	0.572	39.68	57.64
2/3	0.650	60.52	74.00
1/2	0.690	65.14	77.70

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

## Word Similarity and Analogy

- LOG: log transform, no scaling
- PPMI: no transform, PPMI scaling
- CCA: square-root transform, CCA scaling

#### 500 dimensions

Method		AVG-SIM	SYN	MIXED
Spectral	LOG	0.652	59.52	67.27
	PPMI	0.628	43.81	58.38
	CCA	0.655	68.38	74.17
Others	GLOVE	0.576	68.30	78.08
	CBOW	0.597	75.79	73.60
	SGNS	0.642	81.08	78.73

# Semi-Supervised Learning

- Features in named-entity recognition (CoNLL 2003)
- RCV1 corpus (205 million words)

30 dimensions

Features	Dev	Test
—	90.04	84.40
BROWN	92.49	88.75
LOG	92.27	88.87
PPMI	92.25	89.27
CCA	92.88	89.28
GLOVE	91.49	87.16
CBOW	92.44	88.34
SGNS	92.63	88.78

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

(BROWN: 1000 Brown clusters (Brown et al., 1992))

# Summary

We developed a new statistical understanding of word embeddings based on transformed counts

CCA transformations: recovery of Brown model

Unified many spectral word embedding methods

Future work includes:

Applying square-root in other SVD applications

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Relaxing Brown model assumption