

(پلی تکنیک تهران)

Information Retrieval Course

Fall 2023

IR-HW02

Koorosh Khavari Moghaddam

koorosh.k@aut.ac.ir

koorosh.khavari.m@gmail.com

Student ID: 401131023

Contents

٣	Preprocessing Data
٣	TF Information
٤	Information Retrieval using Unigram Model
٤	Information Retrieval using Bigram Model
٥	Information Retreival using Word2Vec Model
٦	Information Retreival using BERT model
٧	
٧	Ranking Evaluation using P@K

Preprocessing Data

```
Preprocessing Document Dataset

1  # preprocessing: tokenization, lower case, stop-word removal
2  term_doc = {}
3  doc_term = {}
4  for index, row in docs.iterrows():
5   term_doc[row['doc_id']] = []
6   tokens_list = re.split(r'\s+', re.sub(r'[^\w\s]',' ',row['document'].lower()))
7  for token in tokens_list:
8   if token in doc_term:
9   doc_term[token] += [row['doc_id']]
10  elif (((len(token)>=2) and any(not char.isdigit() for char in token)) or (len(token)>=4)) and (token not in stops):
11   doc_term[token] = [row['doc_id']]
12   else: continue
13   term_doc[row['doc_id']] += [token]
```

[6,10] All punctuations and irrelevant numbers sequences (length lower than 4) are removed from the text and the text is converted to lowercase, tokenization is performed by [6] splitting the text based on white spaces. Also, [6] all the stop words are removed from the corpus, the list of the stop words is imported as a raw text file.

TF Information

TF vectors of the words in the documents and queries are calculated similar to the problem set 1, we only kept Term Frequencies [22,47] as an estimate of probability of word given document distribution. The dimensionality of the vectors is 10k to achieve perfect result. This choice may represent other approaches superior to the BERT model in the evaluation part, but keep in mind that those results are happened given we have perfect information about the data and are not reliable.

```
3 DIC_LENGTH = 10
4 NUM_RELATD = 10
     5 EPSILON = 1e-10
# make dictionary-term fr-idf matrix for docs

# this operation will result the DT matrix of shape(1000,750), which is 750 doc vectors in dictionary space

TD = np.zeros((len(dictionary),len(term_doc)))

of orindex,(doc,terms) in enumerate(term_doc.items()):

doc_in_dict = {

for term in terms:

if term in dictionary

To the form of the for
                                           if term in dictionary:
    if term in doc_in_dict:
        doc_in_dict[term] += 1
    else:
                                                                          doc in dict[term] = 1

    # make dictionary.term tf-idf matrix for queries
    # this operation will result the DT matrix of shape(1000,50), which is 50 query vectors in dictionary space

               query_term = {}
term_query = {}
for index, row in queries.iterrows():
                              term_query[row['query_id']] = []
tokens_list = re.split(r'\s*', re.sub(r'\[^\w\s]',' ',row['query'].lower()))
for token in tokens_list:
    if token in dictionary:
                                                      if token in query_term:
    query_term[token] += [row['query_id']]
else:
                                                                           query_term[token] = [row['query_id']]
                                                        term_query[row['query_id']] += [token]
              TQ = np.zeros((len(dictionary),queries.shape[0])
               for index,(query,terms) in enumerate(term_query.items()):
    query_in_dict = {}
    for term in terms:
        if term in query_in_dict:
                                                            query_in_dict[term] += 1
                                       else:
 query_in_dict[term] = 1
for term in query_in_dict.keys():
TQ[dictionary[term],index] = (query_in_dict[term]/len(query_in_dict))
```

Information Retrieval using Unigram Model

```
1 # Jelinek-Mercer smoothing : given λ, will calculate and return smoothed TD vector
2 def JMS(TD=TD, λ=0.2): return λ*(TD/(np.sum(TD,axis=0)+EPSILON)) + (1-λ)*(np.sum(TD,axis=1)/np.sum(TD)).reshape(-1,1)
3 # Unigrams assumes independence of query words given document model
4 def Unigram(TD=TD,TQ=TQ, λ=0.2): return np.argsort(-np.exp(np.einsum("ij,ik->jk",np.log(JMS(TD=TD, λ=λ)),TQ/np.sum(TQ,axis=0))),axis=0).T[:, :NNM_RELATD]
```

Whole algorithm can be described in two lines. As for the Jelinek-Mercer smoothing part which is described in [2], we simply added up weighted sum of the term frequencies inside the document and the term frequencies inside the whole collection. The unigram probabilities then can be calculated as shown in [4] by a simple trick of rescaling the data. The unigram model can be described as $P(Q|D) = \prod_{q \in Q} P(q|D)^{TF_{q,Q}}$ (refer to IR_Lec5, page 17). We estimated the $P(q|D) \sim \frac{TF_{q,D}}{|D|}$ and we also know the value for the $TF_{q,Q}$ in the term frequency tensors. Therefor simple by representing the P(q|D) in the logarithm space and perform Einstein sum on this tensor and $TF_{q,Q}$ and then transform it back with exponential as in [4], we can exactly describe the P(Q|D).

As for the optimal value for λ parameter, we can examine the results of our evaluation part:

```
[Unigram λ=0.1
[Unigram_λ=0.2
[Unigram_λ=0.3
                                                                                                                                                                  [Unigram_λ=0.2 P@10]: 0.49
                                                      [Unigram_λ=0.2 MAP]: 0.49
[Unigram_λ=0.3 MAP]: 0.48
[Unigram_λ=0.4 MAP]: 0.46
                                                                                                              [Unigram_λ=0.2
[Unigram_λ=0.3
                     MRR]: 0.74
                                                                                                                                                                    [Unigram λ=0.3
[Unigram_λ=0.4
[Unigram_λ=0.5
                    MRR1: 0.74
                                                                                                             [Unigram_λ=0.4 P@5]: 0.55
[Unigram_λ=0.5 P@5]: 0.55
                                                                                                                                                                   [Unigram_λ=0.4 P@10]: 0.46
                                                                                                                                                                   [Unigram_λ=0.5 P@10]: 0.45
                                                       [Unigram_λ=0.5 MAP]: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.6 MAP]: 0.45
[Unigram λ=0.6
                                                                                                              [Unigram_λ=0.6
                                                                                                                                                                    [Unigram_λ=0.6 P@10]: 0.45
                                                                                                                                                                   [Unigram_\lambda=0.7
                                                                                                             [Unigram λ=0.7
                                                       [Unigram λ=0.7 MAP1: 0.45
                                                      [Unigram_λ=0.8 MAP]: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.9 MAP]: 0.45
                                                                                                              [Unigram λ=0.8 P@5]: 0.53
                                                                                                                                                                   [Unigram λ=0.8 P@10]: 0.45
                                                                                                                                                                   [Unigram_λ=0.9 P@10]: 0.45
                                                                                                             [Unigram_λ=0.9 P@5]: 0.53
```

As shown in the above figure, the joint vote of the evaluation metrics is $\lambda=0.2$. Result of the ranking with the said parameter is shown below:

```
[Query]: what is the origin of COVID-19
[RELATED DOCS INDECES]: [637 696 668 389 425 557 435 748 669 278]
[RELATED DOCS INDECES]: [637 696 668 389 425 557 435 748 669 278]
[RELATED DOCS INS]: ['1]$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\frac{1}{2}$\
```

Information Retrieval using Bigram Model

```
1 # JeLinek-Mercer smoothing: given \lambda_1, \lambda_2, will calculate and return smoothed TTD vector
2 def DNG(TTD-TTD, TD-TD, \lambda_1=0.2, \lambda_2=0.2): return \lambda_1*TTD+ (\lambda_2*(TD/(np.sum(TD,axis=0)+EPSILON))+ (1-\lambda_1-\lambda_2)*(np.sum(TD,axis=1)/(np.sum(TD)+EPSILON)). reshape(-1,1)). reshape((DIC_LENGTH,1,-1))
3 # Bigrams assumes independence of query words given document model and one previous term if exists
4 def Bigram(TTD-TTD, TTQ-TTD, TD-TD, TQ-TD, \lambda_1=0.2, \lambda_2=0.2): return np.argsort(-np.einsum('ijd,ijq-xdq',np.log(XD(TTD-TTD, TD-TD, \lambda_1-\lambda_1, \lambda_2=\lambda_2)=1e-12),TTQ), axis=0).T[:, :NMM_RELATD]
```

The whole bigram algorithm is exactly like the unigram one with one simple caveat which is the estimation of P(Q|D), for the simplicity of the implementation, I just used the ordered conditional probabilities $P(w_i|w_{i-1},D)$ and dropped the first

term unigram. In order to estimated the ordred conditional prbability term, we are going to sacrifice the precision slightly in order to achive code simplicity, instead of a dictionary with the size of 10k, I used a 700 entry dictionary, given this simplification, we can represent the ordered conditinal probability terms in documents and queries as a tensors of the shapes (700,700,750) and (700,700,50) respectively, the first two dimensions are the size of the dictionary and the third one is the total number of the documents and queries. Again given the simplified formula $P(Q|D) = \prod_{q \in Q} P(q_i|q_{i-1},D)^{TF}q_iq_{i-1}Q$ we can estimate the conditional

[Bigram, $\lambda_1=0.6$, $\lambda_2=0.1$	MRR]: 0.65	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.1	MAP]: 0.39	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.1	P@5]: 0.44	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.1	P@10]: 0.39
[Bigram, λ 1=0.6, λ 2=0.2	MRR]: 0.69	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.2	MAP]: 0.40	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.2	P@5]: 0.48	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.2	P@10]: 0.40
[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.3	MRR]: 0.71	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.3	MAP]: 0.40	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.3	P@5]: 0.51	[Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.3	P@10]: 0.40
[Bigram, $\lambda_{1}=0.7$, $\lambda_{2}=0.1$	MRR]: 0.66	[Bigram, λ_1=0.7, λ_2=0.1	MAP]: 0.39	[Bigram, λ_1=0.7, λ_2=0.1	P@5]: 0.45	[Bigram, λ_1=0.7, λ_2=0.1	P@10]: 0.39
[Bigram, $\lambda_1=0.7$, $\lambda_2=0.2$	MRR]: 0.70	Bigram, λ_1=0.7, λ_2=0.2	MAP]: 0.40			[Bigram, $\lambda_1=0.7$, $\lambda_2=0.2$	P@10]: 0.40
[Bigram, $\lambda_{1}=0.8$, $\lambda_{2}=0.1$	MRR]: 0.66	[Bigram, λ_1=0.8, λ_2=0.1	MAP]: 0.39	[Bigram, $\lambda_{1}=0.8$, $\lambda_{2}=0.1$	P@5]: 0.45	[Bigram, λ_1=0.8, λ_2=0.1	P@10]: 0.39
[Bigram, λ 1=0.9, λ 2=0.1	MRR]: 0.66	[Bigram, λ 1=0.9, λ 2=0.1	MAP1: 0.38	[Bigram, λ 1=0.9, λ 2=0.1	P@5]: 0.44	[Bigram. λ 1=0.9. λ 2=0.1	P@101: 0.38

probability as shown in [4]. As for the smoothing part, it's performed in [2] as instructed in the problem.

Like the previous part, by comparing different values for λ_1 and λ_2 , all the metrics suggest that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 = 0.6, 0.3$ yeild better performance compared to other condiddates.

Information Retreival using Word2Vec Model

```
1 from gensim.models import Word2Vec(list(term_doc.values())+iist(term_query.values()), min_count-1, sg-1, vector_size-280, epochs-28)
3 # Arithmatic Hearn vectors
4 doc_vec = np.array([np.array([model.wv[term] for term in terms]).mean(axis-0) for (doc,terms) in term_doc.items()])
5 query_vec = np.array([np.array([model.wv[term] for term in terms]).mean(axis-0) for (query,terms) in term_query.items()])
6 # Meighted Mean vectors
8 weighted_doc_vec = np.array([np.array([model.wv[term]*TD[dictionary[term],index] for term in terms]).mean(axis-0) for index,(doc,terms) in enumerate(term_doc.items())])
9 weighted_doc_vec = np.array([np.array([model.wv[term]*TD[dictionary[term],index] for term in terms]).mean(axis-0) for index,(query,terms) in enumerate(term_doc.items())])
10 MAZV = np.argsort(-np.einsum("qi,di->qd",query_vec,doc_vec)/(np.linalg.norm(query_vec, axis-1).reshape((-1,1))*np.linalg.norm(doc_vec, axis-1).reshape((1,-1))), axis-1[;, :NMM_RELATD]
12 MAZV = np.argsort(-np.einsum("qi,di->qd",weighted_query_vec,weighted_doc_vec)/(np.linalg.norm(weighted_query_vec, axis-1).reshape((-1,1))*np.linalg.norm(weighted_doc_vec, axis-1).reshape((1,-1))), axis-1[;, :NMM_RELATD]
14 check_results(0, NM2V)
```

Using the genism library as suggested in the homework, Word2Vec model trained using 20 epochs and a dimension of 200 for representing the words inside the corpus consisting of documents and queries [2]. After that, as instructed in the problem, we calculate two representations of the documents and queries in the vector space, first one without any prior knowledge (or arithmetic case in the first section of the problem) [4,5] and the other with the prior knowledge TF-IDF for words (or the weighted case in the second section of the problem) [8,9]. As we will see in the result section, assuming a precise prior for the word2vec model will results in an incredibly accurate model which surpasses the BERT at least for the case of limited documents and queries. In order to calculate the cosine similarities in the vector space, just like the vector space in problem set 1, we calculate dot product of vectors normalized by their norm production [11,12]

Result of arithmetic Word2Vec is shown below:

Result of weighted Word2Vec is shown below:

Information Retreival using BERT model

```
1 tokenizer = BertTokenizer.from pretrained('bert-base-uncased')
2 model = BertModel.from pretrained('bert-base-uncased')
 3 doc_ids = [torch.tensor([tokenizer.encode(sentence, add_special_tokens=True)])[:, :512] for sentence in list(docs['document'])]
 4 query_ids = [torch.tensor([tokenizer.encode(sentence, add_special_tokens=True)])[:, :512] for sentence in list(queries['query'])]
5 with torch.no_grad():
       for doc_id in tqdm(doc_ids):
          try: results += [model(doc_id).last_hidden_state.mean(dim=1).squeeze()]
            except: print(f"[error] : {doc_id}")
10
       doc_vec = torch.stack(results)
11
       results = []
       for query_id in tqdm(query_ids):
           try: results += [model(query_id).last_hidden_state.mean(dim=1).squeeze()]
except: print(f"[error] : {query_id}")
14
       query vec = torch.stack(results)
16 import pickle
17 with open ("bert vectors.pth", "wb") as f:
       pickle.dump((doc_vec, query_vec), f)
```

Small pretrained BERT model is used to represent the documents and queries in vector space of shape (768,) [1-15]. The result vectors are stored in a pickle file for the convenience [17-18], just load and use them in case of verifying the result.

```
1 DIC_LENGTH = 10000
2 NUM_RELATD = 10
3 EPSILON = 1e-10
4 BERTR = torch.argsort(-torch.einsum("qi,di->qd",query_vec,doc_vec)/(torch.norm(query_vec, dim=1).reshape((-1,1))*torch.norm(doc_vec, dim=1).reshape((1,-1))), axis=1)[:, :NUM_RELATD].numpy()
5 check_results(1, BERTR)
```

We calculate the cosine similarities like all other previous parts, by normalizing the dot product of vector representation with respect to their norm product.

BERT ranking results are shown below:

Ranking Evaluation using MRR

Mean Reciprocal Ranking Evaluation metric is calculated as specified by its algorithm. We used this evaluation alongside the other three to find optimal value for the λ parameter. As can be seen, the weighted word2vec can will suggest the relevant document "sooner" than the other models. The result of untrained BERT is in par with the basic proablistic models in the previous problem set which shows the models robustness. The other metrics non the less show the same trend as the MRR, therfor we only show them wihtout specific discriptions.

Ranking Evaluation using MAP

Mean Average Precision of the methods. All the evaluation methods used in this problem set are exactly like the previous one!

Ranking Evaluation using P@K

Percision at K for the k in 5,10 are as follows which confirm both previous results

```
[Unigram λ=0.1
                                                               P@101: 0.48
[Unigram λ=0.1
                  P@5]: 0.55
                                             [Unigram_λ=0.2
                                                               P@101: 0.49
[Unigram_λ=0.2
                  P@5]: 0.56
                                             [Unigram_λ=0.3
                                                               P@101: 0.48
[Unigram λ=0.3
                  P@51: 0.56
                                             [Unigram λ=0.4
                                                               P@101: 0.46
[Unigram λ=0.4
                  P@51: 0.55
                                             [Unigram_λ=0.5
                                                               P@101: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.5
                  P@5]: 0.55
                                             [Unigram_λ=0.6
                                                               P@101: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.6
                  P@5]: 0.53
                                             [Unigram_λ=0.7
                                                               P@101: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.7
                  P@5]: 0.53
                                             [Unigram_λ=0.8
                                                               P@10]: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.8
                  P@5]: 0.53
                                             [Unigram_\lambda=0.9 P@10]: 0.45
[Unigram_\lambda=0.9 P@5]: 0.53
                                             [Bigram, λ_1=0.6, λ_2=0.1
                                                                           P@10]: 0.39
[Bigram, \lambda_1=0.6, \lambda_2=0.1 P@5]: 0.44
                                                                            P@10]: 0.40
                                             [Bigram, \lambda_1=0.6, \lambda_2=0.2
[Bigram, λ 1=0.6, λ 2=0.2 P@5]: 0.48
                                             [Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.6, \lambda_{2}=0.3
                                                                            P@10]: 0.40
[Bigram, λ 1=0.6, λ 2=0.3
                              P@51: 0.51
                                             [Bigram, \lambda_1=0.7, \lambda_2=0.1
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.7, \lambda_{2}=0.1
                              P@51: 0.45
                                                                            P@10]: 0.39
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.7, \lambda_{2}=0.2
                              P@5]: 0.49
                                             [Bigram, \lambda_1=0.7, \lambda_2=0.2
                                                                            P@10]: 0.40
[Bigram, \lambda_1=0.8, \lambda_2=0.1
                                             [Bigram, \lambda_1=0.8, \lambda_2=0.1
                                                                            P@10]: 0.39
                                             [Bigram, λ_1=0.9, λ_2=0.1
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.9, \lambda_{2}=0.1 P@5]: 0.44
                                                                            P@101: 0.38
[Arithmatic W2V P@5]: 0.49
                                             [Arithmatic W2V P@10]: 0.42
[Weighted W2V P@5]: 0.62
                                             [Weighted W2V P@10]: 0.48
[BERT P@5]: 0.18
                                             [BERT P@10]: 0.18
```

```
[Unigram_λ=0.1
                  MRR]: 0.72
[Unigram λ=0.2
                  MRR1: 0.74
[Unigram_λ=0.3
                  MRR]: 0.74
[Unigram_λ=0.4
                  MRR]: 0.74
[Unigram λ=0.5
                  MRR]: 0.74
[Unigram λ=0.6
                  MRR]: 0.73
[Unigram λ=0.7
                  MRR]: 0.73
[Unigram λ=0.8
                  MRR]: 0.73
[Unigram_λ=0.9
                  MRR]: 0.75
[Bigram, \lambda 1=0.6, \lambda 2=0.1
                              MRR]: 0.65
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.6, \lambda_{2}=0.2
                              MRR]: 0.69
[Bigram, \lambda 1=0.6, \lambda 2=0.3
                              MRR]: 0.71
[Bigram, λ_1=0.7, λ_2=0.1
                              MRR]: 0.66
[Bigram, λ_1=0.7, λ_2=0.2
                              MRR]: 0.70
[Bigram, \lambda_1=0.8, \lambda_2=0.1
                              MRR]: 0.66
                               MRR]: 0.66
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.9, \lambda_{2}=0.1
[Arithmatic W2V MRR]: 0.69
[Weighted W2V MRR]: 0.83
[BERT
       MRR]: 0.42
```

```
MAP]: 0.48
[Unigram λ=0.1
[Unigram_λ=0.2
                  MAP]: 0.49
[Unigram_λ=0.3
                  MAP1: 0.48
[Unigram λ=0.4
                  MAP1: 0.46
[Unigram λ=0.5
                  MAP1: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.6
                  MAP1: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.7
[Unigram_λ=0.8
                  MAP]: 0.45
[Unigram_λ=0.9
                  MAP]: 0.45
[Bigram, \lambda_1=0.6, \lambda_2=0.1 MAP]: 0.39
                              MAP1: 0.40
[Bigram, \lambda_1=0.6, \lambda_2=0.2
[Bigram, λ 1=0.6, λ 2=0.3
                              MAP1: 0.40
                              MAP1: 0.39
[Bigram, λ 1=0.7, λ 2=0.1
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.7, \lambda_{2}=0.2
[Bigram, λ_1=0.8, λ_2=0.1
                              MAP]: 0.39
[Bigram, \lambda_{1}=0.9, \lambda_{2}=0.1
                              MAP]: 0.38
[Arithmatic W2V MAP]: 0.42
[Weighted W2V MAP]: 0.48
[BERT MAP]: 0.18
```