





	En-It		En-De		En-Fi		En-Es	
	P@1	Time	P@1	Time	P@1	Time	P@1	Time
(Zhang et al., 2017a)†	0	46.6	0	46.0	0.07	44.9	0.07	43.0
(Conneau et al., 2018)†	45.40	46.1	47.27	45.4	1.62	44.4	36.20	45.3
(Artetxe et al., 2018)†	48.53	8.9	48.47	7.3	33.50	12.9	37.60	9.1
G-W	44.4	35.2	37.83	36.7	6.8	15.6	12.5	18.4
G-W + NORMALIZE	49.21	36	46.5	33.2	18.3	42.1	37.60	38.2

## I J

## RESULTS ON DATASET OF DINU ET AL.

Most pairs of languages are somewhat related

Embeddings trained on strongly comparable corpora

The MUSE dataset is unrealistically simple [Artetxe at al., 2018]

We also test our method on the (much harder) dataset of Dinu et al. [2015]







## RESULTS ON DATASET OF DINU ET AL.

- The MUSE dataset is unrealistically simple [Artetxe at al., 2018]
  - Most pairs of languages are somewhat related
  - Embeddings trained on strongly comparable corpora
- We also test our method on the (much harder) dataset of Dinu et al. [2015]

	En-It		En-De		En-Fi		En-Es		
	P@1	Time	P@1	Time	P@1	Time	P@1	Time	
(Zhang et al., 2017a)†	0	46.6	0	46.0	0.07	44.9	0.07	43.0	
(Conneau et al., 2018)†	45.40	46.1	47.27	45.4	1.62	44.4	36.20	45.3	<b>GPU-minutes</b>
(Artetxe et al., 2018)†	48.53	8.9	48.47	7.3	33.50	12.9	37.60	9.1	
G-W	44.4	35.2	37.83	36.7	6.8	15.6	12.5	18.4	CDII minutes
 G-W + NORMALIZE	49.21	36	46.5	33.2	18.3	42.1	37.60	38.2	<b>CPU-minutes</b>





## BONUS: THE GROMOV-WASSERSTEIN LINGUISTIC DISTANCE



