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## Word embedding - Definition

- The term word embedding indicates a set of techniques in Natural Language Processing (NLP) where words or phrases from the vocabulary are mapped to dense vectors of real numbers.
- Conceptually, it involves a mathematical embedding from a vector space with many dimensions per word to a vector space with a much lower dimension.
- Models to generate this mapping include:
- Count-based models (Distributed semantic models)
- Predictive models (Neural network models)


## BACKGROUND

Text representation

## Representing DOCUMENTS as vectors

- Each document is represented by a vector of words.
- Option 1: Binary representation.



## Representing DOCUMENTS as vectors

- Each document is represented by a vector of words.
- Option 2: Raw frequency representation.

|  | $d_{1}$ | $d_{2}$ | $d_{3}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bear | 85 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cat | 0 | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |
| frog | 0 | 0 | 44 |  |  |  |
| $d_{1}=[85$ |  |  |  |  | 0, | 0 |$] \quad$|  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $d_{3}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}0, & 0, & 44\end{array}\right]$ |

## Representing DOCUMENTS as vectors

- Each document is represented by a vector of words.
- Option 3: Weighted representation.
- Weighted term frequency (different possibilities)
- tf-idf

|  | $d_{1}$ | $d_{2}$ | $d_{3}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bear | 0.48 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cat | 0 | 0.48 | 0 |  |  |  |
| frog | 0 | 0 | 0.48 |  |  |  |
| $d_{1}=[0.48$ |  |  |  |  | 0, | 0 |$] \quad d_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}0, & 0.48, & 0\end{array}\right]$

## Similarity of DOCUMENTS

|  | As You Like It | Twelfth Night | Julius <br> Caesar | Henry V |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| battle | 11 | 10 | 7 | 13 |
| good | 1114 | 80 | 62 | 89 |
| fool | I 36 | 158 | 1 | 4 |
| wit | ) 20 | I 15 | 2 | 3 |

- Vectors of the two comedies are similar. They are different with respect to the history plays.
- Comedies have more "fools" and "wits" and fewer "battles".
- The vector representation of documents is at the basis of Information Retrieval $\rightarrow$ Vector Space Model


## Visualizing similarity of DOCUMENTS



## WORDS can be represented as vectors too



- In the term-document matrix representation, a possible interpretation could be:
- battle is "the kind of word that occurs history plays, in Julius Caesar and Henry V especially".
- fool is "the kind of word that occurs in comedies, especially Twelfth Night".


## In-document features

Seattle


Seahawks


Denver


Broncos

(a)"In-documents" features

## Similarity of WORDS

- Usually, the similarity of words is NOT computed by using the term-document representation.
- Two words are similar if their «context vectors» are similar.
- We are going to detail this concept in the next slides.
- The employed matrix representation, in this case, has words on both rows and columns.
- Different representations and meanings.
- Next slides.


## Representing WORDS as vectors 1. Local representation

- Each word is represented by a vector of words.
- Option 1: each element represents a different word.
- Also known as "1-hot" or "1-of-V" or local representation.

$V\left\{\right.$|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | bear | cat | frog |  |
| bear | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| cat | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| frog | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |

$$
\text { bear }=[1,0,0] \quad \text { cat }=[0,1,0] \quad \text { frog }=[0,0,1]
$$

## 1-hot vectors

- 1-hot vectors tell us very little.
- We need a separate dimension for every word we want to represent (the base vectors in a vector space).



## 1-hot vectors

Few problems with the one-hot approach for encoding:

- The number of dimensions (the columns) increases linearly as we add words to the vocabulary.
- For a vocabulary of 50,000 words, each word is represented with 49,999 zeros, and a single "one" value in the correct location. As such, memory use is prohibitively large.
- The matrix is very sparse, mainly made up of zeros.
- There is no shared information between words and no commonalities between similar words.


## 1-hot vectors

- There is no shared information between words and no commonalities between similar words.


$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { bear }=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1, & 0, & 0] \\
\text { frog }=[0, & 1, & 0] \\
\text { cat }=[0, & 0, & 1]
\end{array} \text { [ } 0,\right.
\end{align*}
$$

## Representing WORDS as vectors 2. Distributed representation

- Each word is represented by a vector of words.
- Option 2: IDEA: to each word of the vocabulary are associated $k$ "context dimensions" that represent "properties" associated with the words of the vocabulary.
- Also known as distributed representation.
$V\left\{\begin{array}{l|c|c|c|}\hline & \text { furry } & \text { dangerous } & \text { mammal } \\ \hline \text { bear } & 0.9 & 0.85 & 1 \\ \hline \text { cat } & 0.85 & 0.15 & 1 \\ \hline \text { frog } & 0 & 0.05 & 0 \\ \hline\end{array}\right.$


## Distributed representation

- "Distributed vectors" allow to group similar words/objects together, depending on the considered context.


|  | furry | dangerous |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| bear | 0.9 | 0.85 |
| cat | 0.85 | 0.15 |
| cobra | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| lion | 0.85 | 0.9 |
| dog | 0.8 | 0.15 |

## Distributed representation

- For simple scenarios, we can create a $\boldsymbol{k}$-dimensional mapping for a simple example vocabulary by manually choosing contextual dimensions that make sense.

Vocabulary:
Man, woman, boy, girl, prince, princess, queen, king, monarch


Each word gets a $1 \times 3$ vector

Similar words... similar vectors

## Relationships between words

- In a well-defined distributed representation model, calculations such as:

$$
\begin{gathered}
{[\text { king }]-[\text { man }]+[\text { woman }]=[\text { queen }]} \\
{[\text { Paris }]-[\text { France }]+[\text { Germany }]=[\text { Berlin }]}
\end{gathered}
$$

(where $[x]$ denotes the vector for the word $x$ ) will actually work out!

$$
\begin{gathered}
{[\text { king }]-[\text { man }]+[\text { woman }]=[\text { queen }]} \\
{[0,0,1]-[0,0,0]+[1,0,0]=[1,0,1]}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Distributed representation: Advantages

Some well-known advantages:

- Each word is represented with a $\boldsymbol{k}$-dimensional vector
- Optimal representations are those with $\boldsymbol{k} \ll|V|$.
- Similar words have similar vectors
- There's a smaller distance between vector representation for "girl" and "princess", than from "girl" to "prince".

To be continued...

## Distributed representation: Advantages

... cont'd

- The resulting matrix is much less sparse (less empty space), and we could potentially add further words to the vocabulary without increasing the dimensionality.
- For instance, the word "child" might be represented with [0.5, 1, 0].
- Relationships between words are captured and maintained, e.g., the movement from king to queen, is the same as the movement from boy to girl, and could be represented by $[+1,0,0]$.


## Local VS Distributed representation

banana $\square$
mango
dog $\square$
(a) Local representation

- Local (or one-hot) representation
- Every term in vocabulary $V$ is represented by a binary vector of length $|V|$, where one position in the vector is set to one and the rest to zero.
- Distributed representation
- Every term in vocabulary $V$ is represented by a real-valued vector of length $k$. The vector can be sparse or dense. The vector dimensions may be observed (e.g., hand-crafted features) or latent (e.g., embedding dimensions).


## Extending to larger vocabularies

- Forming $k$-dimensional vectors that capture meaning in the same way that our simple example does, where similar words have similar vectors and relationships between words are maintained, is not a simple task.
- Manual assignment of vectors would be impossibly complex: individual dimensions cannot be directly interpretable.
- As such, various algorithms have been developed, some recently, that can take large corpora of text and create meaningful models.


## Distributional hypothesis

- "Words which are similar in meaning occur in similar contexts".
(Harris, 1954)
- "You shall know a word by the company it keeps".
(Firth, 1957)
- Central idea: represent each word by some context:
- E.g., words co-occurring with the considered word.
- We can use different granularities of contexts: documents, sentences, phrases, $n$-grams.


## Phrase VS sentence

| A phrase is a group of that does not express a complete thought. | A sentence is a group of that expresses a complete thought. |
| :---: | :---: |
| A phrase does not have a subject or predicate or both. | A sentence has both subject and predicate. |
| A phrase does not give complete information about the subject or predicate. | A sentence gives complete information about the subject and the predicate. |
| A phrase does not begin with a capital letter and end with punctuation marks. | A sentence begins with a capital letter and ends with a full stop, question or exclamation mark. |
| Pedian.com |  |

## Phrase VS sentence: Example

- Phrase: "Red apple".
- This is a phrase consisting of two words, "red" and "apple";
- It is not a complete thought on its own but conveys a simple description of an apple's color.
- Sentence: "The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog".
- This is a complete sentence;
- It consists of multiple words and forms a grammatically correct and meaningful expression;
- In this sentence, the subject is "the quick brown fox", the verb is "jumps", and the object is "over the lazy dog";
- The sentence conveys a clear action, where the fox is jumping over the dog.


## Word-level $n$-grams



## Character-level $n$-grams

Character-level unigrams

| Text | Token Sequence |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Token Value |  |  |
| Dogs | 1 |  | D |
| DOgs | 2 |  | 0 |
| Dogs | 3 | g |  |
| DogS | 4 | s |  |

Character-level bigrams

| Text | Token Sequence |  | Token Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | Do |  |
| Dogs | 2 |  | og |
| Dogs | 3 | gs |  |

Character-level trigrams

| Text | Token Sequence | Token Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dogs | 1 | Dog |
| Dogs | 2 | ogs |

## A simple example (Neighbouring terms)

Word
I enjoyed eating some pizza at the restaurant


Context

## Neighbouring terms features



## COUNTING

 CO-OCCURRING WORDS
## Window-based Co-occurrence Matrix

- In this method, given a text corpus, we count the number of times each (context) word co-occurs:
- inside a window of a particular size,
- with the word of interest (i.e., target word).
- The resulting matrix is also known as (window-based)
- Word-word co-occurrence Matrix
- Term-context Matrix
- Count Matrix
- Each word is represented by a so-called Count Vector.


## A simple example

- One way of creating a vector for a word:
- Let's count how often a (context) word co-occurs together with specific other words.
- He is reading a magazine
- This magazine published my story
- She buys a magazine every month
- I was reading a newspaper
- The newspaper published an article
- He buys this newspaper every day

The considered text corpus

## A simple example

- One way of creating a vector for a word:
- Let's count how often a (context) word co-occurs together with specific other words.
- He is reading a magazine
- This magazine published my story
- She buys a magazine every month
- I was reading a newspaper
- The newspaper published an article
- He buys this newspaper every day

The considered target words, i.e., magazine and newspaper

## A simple example

- One way of creating a vector for a word:
- Let's count how often a (context) word co-occurs together with specific other words.
- He is reading a magazine
- This magazine published my story
- She buys a magazine every month
- I was reading a newspaper
- The newspaper published an article
- He buys this newspaper every day

We select a window of size 2
with respect to the considered target words

## A simple example

- One way of creating a vector for a word:
- Let's count how often a (context) word co-occurs together with specific other words.
- He is reading a magazine
- This magazine published my
- She buys a magazine every month
- I was reading a newspaper
- The newspaper published an article
- He buys this newspaper every day

We build the window-based co-occurrence matrix

|  | reading | a | this | published | my | buys | the | an | every | month | day |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| magazine | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| newspaper | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

## A simple example

- One way of creating a vector for a word:
- Let's count how often a (context) word co-occurs together with specific other words.
- He is reading a magazine
- This magazine published my story
- She buys a magazine every month
- I was reading a newspaper
- The newspaper published an article

He buys this newspaper every day
context words


## How does this work in general?

- We calculate this count not only for specific target words, but for all the words in the text corpus.
- Let our corpus contain just three sentences and the window size be 1 :

1. I enjoy flying
2. I like NLP
3. I like deep learning

- The resulting co-occurrence matrix will then be?
- EXERCISE


## Exercise




## Solution

I enjoy flying I like NLP<br>I like deep learning

$X=$| I |
| :---: |
| $I$ |
| like |
| likjoy |
| enjoy |
| deep |
| learning |
| NLP |
| flying |\(\left[\begin{array}{ccccccc}0 \& 2 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>

\& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
<br>
\& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
<br>
\& \& \& \& \& \end{array}\right]\)

## Solution

I enjoy flying I like NLP<br>I like deep learning

$X=$| I |
| :---: |
| I |
| like |
| enjoy |
| deep |
| learning |
| NLP |
| flying |\(\left[\begin{array}{ccccccc}like \& enjoy \& deep \& learning \& NLP \& flying <br>

0 \& 2 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
2 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 <br>
0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0\end{array}\right]\)

## To recap

Using a (Window-based) Word-word Co-occurrence Matrix representation for large text corpora:

- Generates a $|V| \times|V|$ co-occurrence matrix $X$.
- The distinction between a target word and a context word is arbitrary and that we are free to exchange the two roles.


## Raw frequency is a bad representation

- Frequency is clearly useful; if sugar appears a lot near apricot, that's useful information.
- But overly frequent words like the, it, or they are not very informative about the context.
- More frequent words dominate the vectors.
- Need a way that resolves this frequency paradox!
- Can use a weighting scheme like:
- TF-IDF (already seen in detail).
- Pointwise Mutual Information (PMI).


## Pointwise Mutual Information (PMI)

- Pointwise Mutual Information:
- Do events $x$ and $y$ co-occur more than if they were independent?

$$
\operatorname{PMI}(x, y)=\log _{2}\left(\frac{P(x, y)}{P(x) P(y)}\right)
$$

- PMI between two words: (Church \& Hanks 1989)
- Do words $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ co-occur more than if they were independent?

$$
\operatorname{PMI}\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)=\log _{2}\left(\frac{P\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)}{P\left(w_{1}\right) P\left(w_{2}\right)}\right)
$$

## Positive PMI (PPMI)

- PMI ranges from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$
- Negative values are problematic:
- Things are co-occurring less than we expect by chance.
- Unreliable without enormous corpora.
- Imagine $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ whose probability is each $10^{-6}$.
- Hard to be sure $P\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)$ is significantly different than $10^{-12}$.
- We just replace negative PMI values by 0 .
- Positive PMI (PPMI) between $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ :

$$
\operatorname{PPMI}\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)=\max \left(\log _{2}\left(\frac{P\left(w_{1}, w_{2}\right)}{P\left(w_{1}\right) P\left(w_{2}\right)}\right), 0\right)
$$

## Computing PPMI

- Let us consider the following term-context matrix $X$ :

| $X$ | $\ldots$ | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar | $\ldots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| apricot | $\ldots$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\ldots$ |
| pineapple | $\ldots$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\ldots$ |
| digital | $\ldots$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\ldots$ |
| information | $\ldots$ | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | $\ldots$ |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |

- Matrix $X$ with $W$ rows (words) and $C$ columns (context words)
- Please remember that $W$ and $C$ can be equal in real scenarios, in particular $W=C=|V|$.


## Computing PPMI

$-\operatorname{PPMI}\left(w_{i}, c_{j}\right)=\max \left(\log _{2}\left(\frac{P\left(w_{i}, c_{j}\right)}{P\left(w_{i}\right) P\left(c_{j}\right)}\right), 0\right)$

- We need to compute:
$P\left(w_{i}, c_{j}\right)=\left(\right.$ Count of co-occurrence of $w_{i}$ and $c_{j}$ in the context) / (Total word count in the context)
$P\left(w_{i}\right)=\left(\right.$ Count of word $w_{i}$ in the context) / (Total word count in the context)
$P\left(c_{j}\right)=$ (Count of word $c_{j}$ w.r.t. target words) / (Total word count in the context)


## Computing PPMI

- $f_{i j}$ is the number of times the word $w_{i}$ and $c_{j}$ co-occur.

$$
\begin{gathered}
P\left(w_{i}, c_{j}\right)=\frac{f_{i j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{W} \sum_{j=1}^{C} f_{i j}} \\
P\left(w_{i}\right)=\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{C} f_{i j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{W} \sum_{j=1}^{C} f_{i j}} \\
P\left(c_{j}\right)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{W} f_{i j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{W} \sum_{j=1}^{C} f_{i j}}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Computing PPMI

## Count(w,context)

 computer data pinch result sugar| apricot | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pineapple | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| digital | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| information | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

- $P(w=$ information, $c=$ data $)=\frac{6}{19}=0.32$
- $P(w=$ information $)=\frac{11}{19}=0.58 \quad P(c=$ data $)=\frac{7}{19}=0.37$


## Computing PPMI

## p(w,context)

p(w)

|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| apricot | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| pineapple | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| digital | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.21 |
| information | 0.05 | $0.32 ;$ | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.58 ; |
|  |  | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.11 |
| p(context) | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

- $P(w=$ information, $c=$ data $)=\frac{6}{19}=10.32$;
- $P(w=$ information $)=\frac{11}{19}=0,0 ; \quad P(c=$ data $)=\frac{7}{19}=0.37$


## Computing PPMI

## p(w,context)

p(w)

|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| apricot | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| pineapple | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| digital | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.21 |
| information | 0.05 | $0.32 ;$ | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 10.58 ; |
|  |  | 0.3, |  |  |  |  |
| p(context) | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.11 |  |

- PPMI (information, data $)=\max \left(\log _{2}\left(\frac{P(\text { information,data })}{P(\text { information }) P(\text { data })}\right), 0\right)$

$$
=\max \left(\log _{2}\left(\frac{0.32}{0.58 * 0.37}\right), 0\right)=\stackrel{1}{1--5.57}
$$

## Computing PPMI

## PPMI(w,context)

|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| apricot | - | - | 2.25 | - | 2.25 |
| pineapple | - | - | 2.25 | - | 2.25 |
| digital | 1.66 | -0.00 | - | 0.00 | - |
| information | 0.00 | LO.57 | - | 0.47 | - |

## Exercise

## Count(w,context)

 computer data pinch result sugar| apricot | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pineapple | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| digital | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| information | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

- $P(w=$ information, $c=$ result $)=-$
- $P(w=$ information $)=-\quad P(c=$ result $)=-$


## Weighting (P)PMI

- (P)PMI is biased toward infrequent events.
- Very rare words have very high PMI values.

|  | Count(w,context) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PPMI(w,context) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| apricot | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | - | 2.25 | - | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pineapple | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | - | 2.25 | - | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| digital | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1.66 | 0.00 | - | 0.00 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| information | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.57 | - | 0.47 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- Two solutions:

1. Give rare context words slightly higher probabilities.
2. Use add- $k$ smoothing (which has a similar effect).

- We add a value of $k$ to every frequency in the term-context matrix.


## Slightly higher probability to context words

- Raise the context probabilities to $\alpha=0.75(\alpha \in[0,1])$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
P P M I_{\alpha}(w, c)=\max \left(\log _{2} \frac{P(w, c)}{P(w) P_{\alpha}(c)}, 0\right) \\
P_{\alpha}(c)=\frac{\operatorname{count}(c)^{\alpha}}{\sum_{c} \operatorname{count}(c)^{\alpha}}
\end{gathered}
$$

- This helps because $P_{\alpha}(c)>P(c)$ for rare $c$
- Consider two context words, $P(a)=0.99$ and $P(b)=0.01$

$$
\text { - } P_{\alpha}(a)=\frac{0.99^{0.75}}{0.99^{0.75}+0.01^{0.75}}=0.97 \quad P_{\alpha}(b)=\frac{0.01^{0.75}}{0.99^{0.75}+0.01^{0.75}}=0.03
$$

## Add-2 smoothing

## Count(w, context)

|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| apricot | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| pineapple | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| digital | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| information | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Add-2 Smoothed Count(w, context)
computer data pinch result sugar

| apricot | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pineapple | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| digital | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| information | 3 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 2 |

## Add-2 smoothing

Add-2 Smoothed Count(w, context) computer data pinch result sugar
apricot
pineapple digital
information

2
2
4
3
p(w,context) [add-2]
p(w)
computer data pinch result sugar

| apricot | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pineapple | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.20 |
| digital | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.24 |
| information | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.36 |

p(context)
0.19
0.25
$0.17 \quad 0.22$
0.17

## PPMI versus add-2 smoothed PPMI

|  | p(w,context) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar | p(w) |
| apricot | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| pineapple | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| digital | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.21 |
| information | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| p(context) | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.11 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | p(w,context) [add-2] |  | p(w) |  |  |  |
|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |  |
| apricot | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.20 |
| pineapple | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.20 |
| digital | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.24 |
| information | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.36 |
| p(context) | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.17 |  |

## PPMI versus add-2 smoothed PPMI

## PPMI(w,context)

|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| apricot | - | - | 2.25 | - | 2.25 |
| pineapple | - | - | 2.25 | - | 2.25 |
| digital | 1.66 | 0.00 | - | 0.00 | - |
| information | 0.00 | 0.57 | - | 0.47 | - |

PPMI(w,context) [add-2]

|  | computer | data | pinch | result |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| sugar |  |  |  |  |
| apricot | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| 0.56 |  |  |  |  |
| pineapple | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| digital | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| information | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.37 |

## PPMI versus add-2 smoothed PPMI

## Count(w, context)

|  | computer | data | pinch | result | sugar |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| apricot | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| pineapple | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| digital | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| information | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

## PPMI(w,context) [add-2]

|  | computer | data | pinch | result |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | sugar |  |  |  |
| apricot | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| pineapple | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| digital | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| information | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## From sparse to dense vectors

- A Co-occurrence Matrix in reality is constituted by a very large number of words
- For each word, tf-idf and PPMI vectors are:
- long (length $|V|=20,000$ to 50,000);
- sparse (most elements are equal to zero).
- There are techniques to learn lower-dimensional vectors for words, which are:
- short (length = 50 to 1,000 ) (usually around 300);
- dense (most elements are non-zero).
- These dense vectors are called embeddings.

