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ABSTRACT

Contextualized language models have emerged as a de facto standard in natural language processing due to the vast amount of knowledge they acquire during pretraining. Nonetheless, their ability to solve tasks that require reasoning over this knowledge is limited. Certain tasks can be improved by analogical reasoning over concepts, e.g., understanding the underlying relations in “Man is to Woman as King is to Queen”. In this work, we propose a way to formulate target sense verification as an analogy detection task, by transforming the input data into quadruples. We present AB4TSV (Analogy and BERT for TSV), a model that uses BERT to represent the objects in these quadruples combined with a convolutional neural network to decide whether they constitute valid analogies. We test our system on the WiC-TSV evaluation benchmark, and show that it can outperform existing approaches. Our empirical study shows the importance of the input encoding for BERT. This dependence gets alleviated by integrating the axiomatic properties of analogies during training, while preserving performance and improving interpretability.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Recent efforts have focused in understanding how semantic and syntactic knowledge could be encoded in pretrained language models (PLMs) [1–5]. Despite their great success in a plethora of downstream tasks, the ability of these models to perform reasoning is limited and understudied [6, 7]. Designing PLMs that are able to reason over the knowledge they possess may not necessarily translate into better performance, however it is a prerequisite for interpretability [8]. The type of reasoning varies depending on the task at hand, e.g., answering chronological questions and summarizing events (temporal reasoning), selecting the most plausible explanation given a set of observations and hypotheses (abductive reasoning), understanding whether the meaning of a given text entails that of another (semantic inference), or finding common relations between pairs of words or phrases (analogical reasoning).

Analogical reasoning is one of the most used inference approaches in everyday life since it can be easily adapted to many commonsense applications involving reasoning: problem solving, modeling, planification, etc. Analogies also constitute a natural approach to modeling medical reasoning as practiced by physicians and medical staff. Further applications are found in natural language processing in tasks such as machine translation [9], visual question-answering [10], semantic [11] and morphological [12] problems.

Solving analogy-based problems requires the system to learn how to reason over relations of the form \( A : B :: C : D \), which we read as “\( A \) is to \( B \) as \( C \) is to \( D \)”. Following the axiomatization from [13], a quaternary relation constitutes an analogical proportion if the following properties hold true: \( A, B, C, D \),

(1) \( A : B :: C : D \Rightarrow C : D :: A : B \) (symmetry)

(2) \( A : B :: C : D \Rightarrow A : C :: B : D \) (central permutation)

Analogies combined with data-driven methods were proven to be beneficial in a variety of tasks ranging from transfer learning to data augmentation and explainable AI [14–18]. However, to the best of our knowledge, they have not been applied to word sense disambiguation (WSD) tasks.

Target Sense Verification (TSV) [19] is a WSD task in which the system is provided with a target word in context on the one hand and a definition and a set of hyponyms of that word on the other hand, and it must decide whether their senses match or not. Consider for instance the context “home is where the heart is”, the definition “where you live at a particular time” and the set
of hypernyms "residence, abode", all corresponding to the target word home, as shown in Figure 1. To disambiguate the meaning of home in that specific context, one must compare and reason about the underlying relations between these concepts, e.g., infer that home in this context refers to an environment rather than a place as conveyed by the definition and the hypernyms.

Although TSV is not originally viewed as an analogy problem, analogical reasoning can be applied to solve it. To illustrate this we focus on two contexts - in one the target word home matches the target sense given by the definition and the hypernyms, whereas in the other it does not (Figure 1). Observe that the definition and the hypernyms always correspond to the same sense $S_T$ (target sense). We denote this relation by $R'$. Solving TSV requires us to find whether the sense of home in context $S_I$ (intended sense) corresponds to $S_T$. Let $R$ be the relation that home points to $S_I$ and hypernyms\(^1\) point to $S_T$. We can now reformulate the problem in the form of analogical proportions such as, e.g., home : hypernyms $\propto$ definition : hypernyms, and check whether it constitutes a valid analogy in each context or not (analogy detection). If $R$ is approximately the same as $R'$, then their senses match and we output True, otherwise we output False. This modification essentially allows us to reuse PLMs that are suitable for solving TSV, and at the same time it gives access to existing tools for tackling analogies. This way we can test if the combination of both is beneficial in terms of performance on the task and in terms of interpretability of the hybrid model. Furthermore, we focus on TSV because it is more complex than classical word analogy or lexical relation classification tasks [16]. Indeed, TSV does not compare isolated words but words in context, lists of words and full sentences.

The main contributions of this work are the following:

- we reformulate TSV problem as an analogy detection problem,
- we propose AB4TSV, a hybrid approach for solving TSV,
- we optimize the input encodings for AB4TSV,
- we demonstrate that AB4TSV achieves competitive performance on the WiC-TSV evaluation benchmark,
- we show empirically that enforcing the axiomatic properties of analogies during training yields a more interpretable model.

The paper is organized as follows. We discuss related work in Section 2. The model architecture is described in Section 3, and the experimental setup in Section 4. In Section 5 we analyze the results, and we discuss conclusions and perspectives for future work in Section 6.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Approaches for solving TSV

Breit et al. [19] propose an architecture for TSV that consists of BERT followed by a fully-connected, binary classifier layer. The classifier uses the embeddings of the [CLS] token, the target word, and the definition and/or the hypernyms as inputs. The authors tested both its base and large versions referred to as BERT-B and BERT-L, respectively. They compare these with FastText embeddings and two unsupervised baselines based on BERT (U-BERT) and DistilBERT (U-dBERT). Similarly, Moreno et al. [21] fine-tune two distinct BERT models on the hypernyms and the definition, using the [CLS] token embedding for classification, and they aggregate the two classifier outputs at inference time. Vandebussche et al. [22] ran an extensive study of BERT for TSV, including data augmentation, freezing the model parameters during fine-tuning, applying different pooling strategies to obtain the classifier input, and masking the target word in the context. Liu et al. proposed a more generic approach called MIRROWIC [23] and tested it on various lexical semantic tasks including TSV. This fully unsupervised approach based on contrastive learning aims to extract improved word embeddings from PLMs such as BERT. Specifically, they create positive and negative pairs for a target word by making use of augmentation, masking and dropout techniques, as well as raw samples from Wikipedia. Then, they train the embeddings such that positive pairs are pulled closer, while negative pairs are pushed apart. To evaluate their method on TSV, they constructed manual templates involving the target word, the definition and/or the hypernyms, and compared the cosine similarities of the target word embeddings in the original context and the template.

2.2 Embedding systems for detecting analogies

Analogical reasoning with distributional word embeddings was first discussed by Mikolov et al. [24]. They showed that such vectors can model relations in the data through vector differences such that if $A$, $B$, $C$, $D$ are in analogical proportion, then the differences of their respective embeddings\(^2\) ($B - A$) and ($D - C$) ought to be similar. More recently, Ushio et al. distilled relation embeddings between word pairs directly from BERT [16]. To that end, they fine-tuned

\[^{1}\text{The definition can also be used but for the sake of this example we use the hypernyms.}\]

\[^{2}\text{We denote by boldface A the embedding of object A.}\]
3 AB4TSV Architecture

Following [11, 12] we make use of a CNN classifier that explicitly models the relations “is to” and “as” in the analogy, as an interpretable alternative to the black-box classifier of [19]. The architecture of the model is composed of two main parts. First, we encode the words or phrases to be compared (target word, context, definition, hypernyms, etc.) into 4 embeddings A, B, C, D using the final encoder layer of BERT. Then we stack them into an n x 4 matrix, where n is the embedding size. This matrix serves as input to a CNN classifier that consists of the following layers:

- A convolutional layer with 128 filters of size 1 x 2 with stride (1, 2) followed by a ReLU activation. The output of this operation is an 128 x n x 2 matrix. Intuitively, this layer models “is to” in “A is to B” and “C is to D”.
- A convolutional layer with 64 filters of size 2 x 2 with stride (2, 2) followed by a ReLU activation. The output of this operation is flattened into a vector of length 64 x (n - 1). Intuitively, this layer models the relation “as” in “A is to B as C is to D”.
- A fully-connected layer followed by a sigmoid activation with a scalar output.

The main difference with [11, 12] is the shifting from static to contextualized embeddings. While they use pre-trained GloVe vectors or train a character-based CNN to extract word representations, we utilize BERT to extract A, B, C, D. This, together with our input encoding optimization (Section 3.2), allows us to efficiently compare objects of different structure such as words, list of words, full sentences and/or their combinations, rather than just isolated words. The proposed AB4TSV architecture is depicted in Figure 2.

3.1 Choice of Analogical Relation

Tackling TSV based on analogical reasoning requires us to select the appropriate A, B, C, D ∈ S such that the relation A : B :: C : D yields good classification performance. Let S = {cls, tgt, ctx, def, hyps, descr} be the set of tokens that can be obtained from BERT. The selection of tgt, ctx, def, hyps as possible candidates for A, B, C, D is essential, since these are the main components that carry the senses to be compared according to the task. Additionally, the embedding of cls can generally be seen as a representation of the whole input, therefore it may capture key information both from context, and definition/hypernyms. Finally, inspired by the authors of WiC-TSV [19] we also test for descr, which essentially treats definition and hypernyms as a whole rather than separate units. This selection of S allows us to compare relevant instances of different structure (special tokens, words in context, list of words, full sentences or their combinations), and thus, makes the task more challenging than typical word analogy or lexical relation classification.

3.2 Input Encoding Selection

The order in which the context, definition, and hypernyms are fed into BERT, has a direct impact on the embeddings of the A, B, C, D candidates in S. Preliminary experiments using the (context, definition-hypernyms) input encoding format illustrated in Figure 2, have shown that most relations seem to work except when hyps is included. This may be due to the way hypernyms are encoded: they are simply a set of words separated by commas, appended to the definition. BERT was originally trained on syntactically correct sentences. Moreover, as shown by [29] part of the properties of candidates in S. Preliminary experiments using the (context, definition-hypernyms) input encoding format illustrated in Figure 2, have shown that most relations seem to work except when hyps is included. This may be due to the way hypernyms are encoded: they are simply a set of words separated by commas, appended to the definition. BERT was originally trained on syntactically correct sentences. Moreover, as shown by [29] part of the properties of

Following (19) we always apply fc to the target word in the context. The use of focus characters/entity markers works as a form of weak supervision, pointing out important terms in the sentence [28, 29]. This does not directly address the syntactic correctness issue caused by the hypernyms, however, it instructs BERT to treat them in a special way. That is, all hypernyms will now share a common characteristic in the data that will, ideally, alter their embeddings in such a way that they become more meaningful for solving the task. Moreover, as shown by [29] part of the properties of employing such strategies, can be captured in the embeddings of the focus characters/entity markers themselves. Therefore, we include them in the computation of hyps, as a means to explicitly transfer these properties directly to the representation of hypernyms.

Based on these three operations, we tested the following 6 input encodings:

---

3cls embedding of the [CLS] token
tgt embedding of the target word
txt: average of the embeddings of all words in the context
def: average of the embeddings of all words in the definition
descr: average of the embeddings of all words in the definition and all hypernyms.
Figure 2: Overview of AB4TSV. In this example we want to test whether $A : B :: C : D$ is a valid analogy when $A =$ target, $B =$ definition, $C =$ context and $D =$ hypernyms. The inputs are patched into a pair of sentences (context, definition-hypernyms) and fed into BERT. The embeddings of $A$, $B$, $C$, $D$ extracted from the last encoder layer of BERT are stacked into an $n \times 4$ matrix and input to the CNN classifier. Here, the classifier outputs True since the output value $s = 0.95 > \delta$, where the decision threshold $\delta$ is set to 0.5.
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4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP
In this section, we first present the data used to train and evaluate our system. Then, we describe the experimental procedure along with some technical details concerning implementation, evaluation and baselines for comparison.

4.1 Data
We use the Words-in-Context-TSV (WiC-TSV) dataset, which was designed specifically for TSV [19]. The data are pairs of context and definition-hypernyms, where the definition and hypernyms correspond to the same sense of the target word. General-domain instances are extracted from WordNet and Wiktionary (WNT/WKT). Domain-specific instances for Cocktails (CLT) and Medical Subjects (MSH) were taken from “All about cock-tails”4 and MeSH5 thesauri respectively, while Computer Science (CPS) examples were manually constructed. The training and development sets include general-domain sentences only, while the test set includes domain-specific sentences too (see Tables 1 & 2). The task is divided into three sub-problems taking into account only the definition (sub-task 1), only the hypernyms (sub-task 2), or both (sub-task 3). In the following we focus on sub-task 3 only.

Table 1: Statistics of the WiC-TSV dataset. The $P_+$ column refers to the percentage of positive examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$P_+$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train WNT/WKT</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev WNT/WKT</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test WNT/WKT</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain-specific</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSH</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4http://vocabulary.semantic-web.at/cocktails
5https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html
Table 2: WiC-TSV samples taken from the development set. The target word in the context is highlighted in bold. Notice that in some examples the meaning of the target word can be easily disambiguated solely from the context, whereas in others the definition and/or hypernyms are necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Hypernyms</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A marriage of ideas.</td>
<td>A close and intimate union.</td>
<td>union, unification</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fight broke out at the hockey game.</td>
<td>The act of fighting; any contest or struggle.</td>
<td>conflict, struggle, battle</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighbor was the lead role in last year’s village play.</td>
<td>The actions and activities assigned to or required or expected of a person or group.</td>
<td>duty</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They went bankrupt during the economic crisis.</td>
<td>A crucial stage or turning point in the course of something.</td>
<td>juncture, occasion</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Analogical Proportions Optimization

Regarding the number of combinations of \(A, B, C, D \in S\), there are \(|S|^4 = 6^4 = 1,296\) possible relations in total. To ensure that we test whether the intended sense of the target word in the context corresponds to the target sense in the definition/hypernyms, we first distinguish between two sets: \(S_1 = \{\text{els, tgd, ctx}\}\) and \(S_2 = \{\text{els, def, hyps, descr}\}\) where \(S_1 \cup S_2 = S\). The former set includes embeddings which primarily contain information coming from the context, while the latter involves embeddings which reflect the information found in the definition-hypernyms. \(\text{els}\) belongs to both since it represents the whole input. Next, we define the following rules:

\[
A \neq B \lor C \neq D
\]

\[
\neg \left[ \left( A \in S_1 \setminus S_2 \right) \lor \left( B, C, D \in S_1 \right) \right] \lor \left[ \left( A \in S_2 \setminus S_1 \right) \land \left( B, C, D \in S_2 \right) \right]
\]

The first rule ensures that we avoid relations where embeddings on either side are identical, e.g., \(A\) is to \(A\) as \(C\) is to \(D\). The second rule makes sure that each relation contains embeddings from both sources of information. In other words, \(A, B, C, D\) cannot be instantiated from \(S_1\) or \(S_2\) exclusively. These rules reduce the number of relations to be tested to 768. For each choice of input encoding and relation, we train our system 4 times using different random seeds, resulting in \(6 \times 768 \times 4 = 18,432\) runs. A single run takes approximately 35 minutes on 1 Nvidia GTX 1080 Ti 11GB.

4.3 Assessing and Enforcing Invariance to the Permutations of Analogical Proportions

A key part of our experiments is to employ the permutation properties of analogical proportions (see Section 1) to assess (i) whether analogical reasoning is beneficial in terms of performance on the task, and (ii) whether the model naturally learns to be invariant to these permutations or they must be explicitly enforced at training time. To assess whether the model is invariant, we compute the embeddings \(A, B, C, D\) of the given relation to be tested, and simply compare the performance achieved when feeding the initial relation vs. the relations obtained by permuting analogical proportions to the classifier. To enforce permutation invariance at training time, we include both the initial and the permuted relations in each mini-batch. Note that reflexivity \((A : B :: A : B)\) is discarded since it does not take \(C, D\) into account. We distinguish training without/with permutation invariance by adding a subscript \(pi\), i.e., AB4TSV and AB4TSV\(_{pi}\), respectively.

4.4 Technical Details

As baselines we consider the BERT variants published by [19], namely HyperBertCLS and HyperBert3. Both models are composed of BERT with a linear layer on top as a classifier. The key difference between them is that the former takes the embedding of the [CLS] token as input to the classifier, while the latter takes not only the embedding of [CLS] but also the embedding of the target word and the average of all words in the definition and all hypernyms.

Performance is measured in terms of accuracy and F1-score. Unless otherwise stated, all tables report statistics (mean and standard deviations) of these two measures over several independent runs. Since the test set labels of WiC-TSV are not publicly available, all reported scores on the test set are computed by the organizers [19].

The WiC-TSV data, scripts for training/evaluating AB4TSV and the baseline models, and source code for reproducing our experimental results are available at our GitHub repository.

5 RESULTS

In this section we present the results obtained from the optimization of the input encoding and the analogical relation, compare those with the baselines on the development set, and with existing approaches on the test set. Next, we discuss the effects of utilizing (or not) the analogical properties explicitly during the training process.

5.1 Impact of the Input Encoding

Figure 3 shows the mean accuracy achieved across all 4 runs sorted in ascending order for each input encoding and each analogical relation (Section 3.2). Overall, for all input encodings there exist some \(A, B, C, D\) combinations that result in good performances. However, some of them appear to be more sensitive than others to the selection of the analogical relation. In particular, swapping or not the position of the definition and the hypernyms in the sentence (plain lines), results in a large amount of bad accuracies for several \(A, B, C, D\) combinations \((0 \sim 400\) on the x-axis). Taking a closer look at these combinations we observe that all of them have at least one of \(A, B, C, D\) instantiated as hyps. This comes in agreement with our preliminary experiments, demonstrating that BERT is struggling to make sense out of the hypernyms probably because of their structure – a list of words that comes before or after the definition.

6https://github.com/gonconist/ab4tsv
We retrain the AB4TSV models with the best relation for each selected encoding, and report the results over 10 runs, as well as those of the baselines, in Table 3. The results clearly show that our system outperforms the baseline models. This holds true even for one-to-one comparisons on the respective encodings, further demonstrating the importance of the input encoding for BERT. Specifically, exchanging the position of the definition and the hypernyms (swap) and using focus characters/entity markers (fc/em) yields the best performance in terms of accuracy. Note also that cls token is present in all analogical relations: This suggests that the [CLS] token is particularly important for solving this task.

Based on the results of the previous experiment we select the relation that performed best for each encoding, and train AB4TSV model 10 times by enforcing invariance to the permutations of analogical proportions at training time. The results, reported in Table 4, show a slight decrease in performance compared to the systems trained without the permutations of analogical proportions.

Table 3: Accuracy and F1-score achieved on the development set by the proposed method and the two baselines. The Analogy column shows the relation that yielded the best performance for a given encoding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encoding</th>
<th>Analogy</th>
<th>Dev Acc</th>
<th>Dev F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>cls : descr :: cls : ctx</td>
<td>74.5 ± 0.015</td>
<td>77.0 ± 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+fc</td>
<td>cls : def :: ctx : cls</td>
<td>74.9 ± 0.010</td>
<td>77.3 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+em</td>
<td>tgt : descr :: cls : def</td>
<td>75.4 ± 0.027</td>
<td>77.8 ± 0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap</td>
<td>def : cls :: cls : ctx</td>
<td>75.4 ± 0.016</td>
<td>77.0 ± 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+fc</td>
<td>def : ctx :: cls : hyps</td>
<td>75.8 ± 0.013</td>
<td>77.7 ± 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+em</td>
<td>hyps : def :: cls : ctx</td>
<td>75.8 ± 0.017</td>
<td>77.7 ± 0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baselines</th>
<th>Dev Acc</th>
<th>Dev F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>74.4 ± 0.014</td>
<td>77.2 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+fc</td>
<td>73.5 ± 0.027</td>
<td>75.2 ± 0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+em</td>
<td>74.0 ± 0.022</td>
<td>76.1 ± 0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap</td>
<td>72.6 ± 0.028</td>
<td>74.8 ± 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+fc</td>
<td>73.1 ± 0.028</td>
<td>75.2 ± 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+em</td>
<td>74.6 ± 0.024</td>
<td>76.6 ± 0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>74.0 ± 0.014</td>
<td>76.9 ± 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+fc</td>
<td>73.9 ± 0.018</td>
<td>76.3 ± 0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+em</td>
<td>73.1 ± 0.031</td>
<td>75.2 ± 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap</td>
<td>73.8 ± 0.015</td>
<td>76.3 ± 0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+fc</td>
<td>73.5 ± 0.011</td>
<td>75.6 ± 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+em</td>
<td>74.4 ± 0.011</td>
<td>75.7 ± 0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Accuracy and F1-score achieved on the development set by enforcing invariance to the permutations of analogical proportions at training time. The Analogy column shows the relation that yielded the best performance for a given encoding in the previous experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encoding</th>
<th>Analogy</th>
<th>Dev Acc</th>
<th>Dev F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>cls : descr :: cls : ctx</td>
<td>74.3 ± 0.016</td>
<td>76.1 ± 0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+fc</td>
<td>cls : def :: ctx : cls</td>
<td>74.6 ± 0.008</td>
<td>76.6 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default+em</td>
<td>tgt : descr :: cls : def</td>
<td>75.1 ± 0.014</td>
<td>77.3 ± 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap</td>
<td>def : cls :: cls : ctx</td>
<td>74.2 ± 0.010</td>
<td>76.1 ± 0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+fc</td>
<td>def : ctx :: cls : hyps</td>
<td>74.8 ± 0.012</td>
<td>75.9 ± 0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swap+em</td>
<td>hyps : def :: cls : ctx</td>
<td>75.0 ± 0.009</td>
<td>76.4 ± 0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess the generalization capabilities of AB4TSV, we evaluate the performance of the best systems of the previous experiments on the test set. The results in Table 5 show that AB4TSV can outperform previously reported results on WiC-TSV both in accuracy and F1-score, according to whether the axiomatic properties of analogies are enforced at training time or not. This illustrates the usefulness of analogical reasoning to solve the task, even on specific instances that lie outside the training domain. Interestingly,
Table 5: Test set results of our best performing system trained with and without the permutations of analogical proportions, compared to previously reported results. All results are calculated by the authors of WiC-TSV benchmark [19].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Test Acc</th>
<th>Test F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTLR [21]</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandenbussche et al. [22]</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-B [19]</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-L [19]</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FastText [19]</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB4TSV+swap+em</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB4TSV+swap+fc</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB4TSV_{pi}+default+em</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsupervised</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-dBERT [19]</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-BERT [19]</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRRORWIC [23]</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Results on the development set for the swap+fc encoding and the relation def : ctx :: cls : hyps. Permute column refers to enforcing (✓) or not (✗) invariance to the permutations of analogical proportions at training time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Permute</th>
<th>Dev Acc</th>
<th>Dev F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>76.2 ± 1.927</td>
<td>78.0 ± 1.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sym</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>53.2 ± 17.10</td>
<td>61.4 ± 18.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>72.9 ± 3.596</td>
<td>73.4 ± 5.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

swap+em that was the most dominant strategy in Figure 3, results in poorer performance compared to other approaches. After inspecting the detailed scores for this model, we observe that this decrease is present both in general and domain-specific examples on the test set: This particular selection of entity markers for the hypernyms does not generalize well on the test set. However, notice that AB4TSV_{pi} using the same entity markers outperforms existing approaches, demonstrating once more that when trained using the axiomatic properties of analogies, AB4TSV becomes invariant to the input encoding selection, and thus more interpretable.

5.3 Invariance to the Permutations of Analogical Proportions

In order to measure the invariance of the model w.r.t. permutations, we focus on the relation that yielded the best accuracy on the analogical proportions optimization experiment (5th row of Table 3). In this case, we compare the performance obtained using the initial and the permuted analogical relations as input to the classifier, depending on whether we explicitly enforce invariance or not. Table 6 reports the results over 4 runs. As expected, the model is invariant to both permutations when we explicitly enforce it during training. Conversely, when we train on a single non-permutated relation, the performance for symmetry degrades a lot at test time, while that of central permutation decreases by a smaller margin. This makes sense for the specific relation (def : ctx :: cls : hyps) since central permutation (def : cls :: ctx : hyps) resembles more the original than symmetry (ctx : hyps :: def : cls).

6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work we proposed an alternative formulation for TSV based on analogical reasoning. More precisely, we compared directly the underlying relations between several components of the input text (target, context, definition, hypernyms), by developing a transformer-based architecture combined with a CNN classifier previously used for detecting analogies. The experimental results demonstrated the importance of the input encoding, suggesting that BERT is better off handling well-structured sentences or text that is specifically marked with special characters. Moreover, enforcing invariance w.r.t. the permutations of analogical proportions during training resulted in a more interpretable system that behaves consistently, irrespective of the input encoding, and performs comparably to its initial version (without the use of the permutations). Both approaches achieved competitive results on the WiC-TSV evaluation benchmark, displaying some generalization capabilities even for domain-specific examples outside of the training data. In the future, we plan to further investigate the usefulness of analogical reasoning on TSV by eliminating the contextualized dependence on the objects of interest, such as target word in context, definition, hypernyms, etc. To do so, we could split the current input into separate sentences and feed them into BERT independently. We also intend to borrow methodologies in natural language generation for solving analogies in the context of TSV, i.e., to generate X in the relation A : B :: C : X.
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