

Retrofitting Contextualized Word Embeddings with Paraphrases

Weijia Shi^{1*}, **Muhao Chen^{1*}**, Pei Zhou², Kai-Wei Chang¹ ¹University of California, Los Angeles ²University of Southern California





Contextualized Word Embeddings

Representations that considers the **difference of lexical semantics** under **different linguistic contexts**



Such representations have become the backbone of many StoA NLU systems for

• Sentence classification, textual inference, QA, EDL, NMT, SRL, ...



Contextualized Word Embeddings

Aggregating context information in a word vector with a pre-trained deep neural language model.

Key benefits:

- More refined semantic representations of lexemes
- Automatically capturing polysemy
 - Apples have been grown for thousands of years in Asia and Europe.



• With that market capacity, *Apple* is worth over 1% of the world's GDP.

The Paraphrased Context Problem

Paraphrases



The pre-trained language models are not aware of the semantic relatedness of contexts

The same word can be represented more differently than opposite words in unrelated contexts

Contexts	L2 distance by ELMo
How can I make bigger my arms? How do I make my arms bigger?	6.42
Some people believe earth is flat , why? Why do people still believe in flat earth?	7.59
It is a very small window. I have a large suitcase.	5.44

The Paraphrased Context Problem



Consider ELMo distances of the same words (**excluding stop words**) in paraphrased sentence pairs from MRPC:





Outline

- Background
- Paraphrase-aware retrofitting
- Evaluation
- Future Work



Paraphrase-aware Retrofitting (PAR)

Method

An orthogonal transformation M to retrofit the input space
Minimizing the variance of word representations on paraphrased contexts
Without compromising the varying representations on unrelated contexts

Orthogonal constraint:

$$L_O = \| \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{M} \|_F,$$

Keeping the relative distance of raw embeddings before contextualization





Paraphrase-aware Retrofitting (PAR)

Learning objective



Input:

Paraphrase 1: What is prison **life** like?

Paraphrase 2: How is **life** in prison?

Negative sample: I have life insurance.

Loss Function:

Orthogonal constraint

$$L = \sum_{(S_1, S_2) \in P} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in S_1 \cap S_2} \left[d_{S_1, S_2}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}) + \gamma - d_{\widehat{S_1}, \widehat{S_2}}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}) \right]_+ + \lambda L_0$$

$$d_{S_1,S_2}(\mathbf{w}) = \| E(\mathbf{w},S_1) - E(\mathbf{w},S_2) \|_2.$$



Experiment Settings

Paraphrase pair datasets

- The positive training cases of MRPC (2,753 pairs)
- Sampled Quora (20,000 pairs) and PAN (5,000 pairs)

Tasks

- Sentence classification: MPQA, MR, CR, SST-2
- Textual inference: MRPC, SICK-E
- Sentence relatedness scoring: SICK-R, STS-15, STS-16, STS-Benchmark
- Adversarial SQuAD

* The first three categories of tasks follow the settings in **SentEval** [Conneau et al, 2018].



Text Classification/Inference/Relatedness Tasks

PAR leads to performance improvement of ELMo by

- **2.59-4.21%** in accuracy on sentence classification tasks
- 2.60-3.30% in accuracy on textual inference tasks
- 3-5% in Pearson correlation in text similarity tasks



Adversarial SQuAD



Bi-Directional Attention Flow (BiDAF) [Seo et al. 2017] on two challenge settings

- AddOneSent: add one human-paraphrased sentence
- AddvSent: add one adversarial example sentence that is semantically similar to the question





Word Representations

Average distances of shared words in MRPC test set sentence pairs before and after applying PAR



PAR minimizes the differences of a word's representations in paraphrased contexts and preserves the differences in non-paraphrased contexts.



Future Work

Applying PAR on other contextualized embedding models

To modify contextualized word embeddings linguistic knowledge

- Context simplicity aware embeddings
- Incorporating lexical definitions in the word contextualization process



Thank You