**Beer Sheva Campus**

**Summary Evaluation Platform**

**Master's Degree Final Project Report**

**Submitted in the Department of Software Engineering**

**Sami Shamoon College of Engineering**

**Name: Sergey Mordeev**

**ID: 321175879**

**Project Leader: Dr. Marina Litvak**

Contents

[Abstract 4](#_Toc13549084)

[1. Introduction 4](#_Toc13549085)

[2. Text Summarization Task 6](#_Toc13549086)

[3. Project Scope 7](#_Toc13549087)

[3.1. Summary Evaluation 7](#_Toc13549088)

[3.2. Evaluation Analysis 8](#_Toc13549089)

[4. Summary Evaluation Metrics 9](#_Toc13549090)

[4.1 Metrics Overview 9](#_Toc13549091)

[4.2. Text Similarity Metrics 9](#_Toc13549092)

[4.2.1. Rouge 11](#_Toc13549093)

[4.2.2. AutoSummENG 13](#_Toc13549094)

[4.3. Readability Metrics 14](#_Toc13549095)

[5. Statistical Analysis 16](#_Toc13549096)

[5.1 Overview 16](#_Toc13549097)

[5.2. Visual Statistics 16](#_Toc13549098)

[5.3. Analysis of Variance 19](#_Toc13549099)

[6. Implementation 20](#_Toc13549100)

[6.1. Implementation Forewords 20](#_Toc13549101)

[6.2. Programming Languages 20](#_Toc13549102)

[6.3. Chosen Approach 21](#_Toc13549103)

[6.4. Domain-Specific Language 25](#_Toc13549104)

[6.5. DI and IoC 34](#_Toc13549105)

[6.6. High Level Architecture 38](#_Toc13549106)

[6.6.1. Concurrency 38](#_Toc13549107)

[6.6.2. Immutability 40](#_Toc13549108)

[6.6.3. Convention 43](#_Toc13549109)

[6.7. Platform as Library 46](#_Toc13549110)

[7. Analyzing Metric Results 47](#_Toc13549111)

[7.1. Overview 47](#_Toc13549112)

[7.2. System Section 48](#_Toc13549113)

[7.3. Notched Box Plot 53](#_Toc13549114)

[7.4. Topics Section 56](#_Toc13549115)

[7.5. Metric Heat 56](#_Toc13549116)

[8. Experiments 58](#_Toc13549117)

[8.1. Description 58](#_Toc13549118)

[8.2. ROUGE Results 60](#_Toc13549119)

[8.2.1. ROUGE N1 - Precision 60](#_Toc13549120)

[8.2.2. ROUGE N2 – Precision 62](#_Toc13549121)

[8.2.3. ROUGE W – Precision 64](#_Toc13549122)

[8.2.4. ROUGE SU4 – Precision 66](#_Toc13549123)

[8.2.5. ROUGE N1, N2, W, SU4 – All Averages 68](#_Toc13549124)

[8.2.6. High Level Conclusions 68](#_Toc13549125)

[8.3. AutoSummENG 69](#_Toc13549126)

[8.3.1. Char Overall Similarity 69](#_Toc13549127)

[8.3.2. ROUGE N1, N2, W, SU4, AutoSummENG Char Overall Similarity – All Averages 70](#_Toc13549128)

[8.3.3. High Level Conclusions 70](#_Toc13549129)

[8.4. Readability 71](#_Toc13549130)

[8.4.1. All Averages Metric Heat 71](#_Toc13549131)

[8.4.3. Deeper Metric Heat Analysis 71](#_Toc13549132)

[8.4.4. High Level Conclusion 71](#_Toc13549133)

[9. Conclusions 73](#_Toc13549134)

[References 75](#_Toc13549135)

[Appendix A 77](#_Toc13549136)

­­­­­­­­­

# Abstract

We present here a platform for summary evaluation metrics. The purpose of such platform is to be a useful tool for the researchers in the field of text summarization. The platform combines different metrics for automatic text summary evaluation. Combining of different metrics depicts the fact that summary evaluation process is not a simple one. From the one hand, there are exist automatic metrics and appropriate tools for evaluation of the text summarization. From the other hand, each tool measures specific aspect of a text summary. For instance, ROUGE metrics rely on statistical analysis of word n-grams cooccurrences. Thus, a person who would like to measure a text summary will get a reduced view how good a summary or automatic summarizer in general. It is needless to say that attracting human power for summary judgment is a very expensive and slow process. The amount of over-information crossed the threshold of human abilities for such activity and therefore automatic evaluation is unavoidable. In addition to conventional automatic summary evaluation metrics, we have added readability metrics since we think that a good summary is not only one that has, for example, a good statistical indicator but also easy to read. A tool that only combines different metrics could be not useful without result analyzing. The platform also has abilities for metric analyzing. Among standard analyzing stuffs as tables, charts and plots we have extended the notched box plots with jittered scatter plot and HSD Tukey test information. Such extension can significantly help with data analysis since it compresses many data aspects in one place. As well, we extend standard table with coloring for readability comparison. Although summary evaluation metrics come with appropriate tools (scripts) and the result could be analyzed within different data manipulation tools as Microsoft Excel or even with languages as R but taking the evaluation process under one umbrella will simplify, automate and, the more important, reduce a time for the analysis of the summary systems by our believing.

# 1. Introduction

For a person working within some field the time has a crucial meaning. No one of us wants spending a time on the same tasks again and again. The purpose of many systems is to automate such the process. For instance, no one expects that bank teller will run SQL queries to update the deposit. As well, no one expects from us working only with command line while solving our problems on computer. Today we have a plenty of tools for automating different kinds of tasks. We believe that researchers in text summarization should not be an exception. Thus, a tool for automating researcher tasks could help her for the better understanding and evaluating the results.

We present a platform for automatic summary evaluation. This platforms from the one hand combines different summary evaluation metrics, from the other hand the platform allows data analysis of for summary evaluation metrics. Combining different metrics caused by the fact that no metric gives objective view. A summary evaluation metric measures just one aspect of the text. For instance, as it is mentioned in (Giannakopoulos, 2008) ROUGE family metrics measure statistical cooccurrence of word n-gram. The intuition behind such metrics is that for two text having the similar meaning, texts should share the same words or phrases. However, one can reasonably critique the approach since it neither considers semantic context nor, for example, used synonyms. However, there exists a correlation between a human judgment of summary and such statistical measurement. Therefore, considering this facet of narrow focus for the concrete metric (or even a metric family), one should take a couple of metrics for objective judgement. The possibility of total human summary evaluation seems to be unreasonable because of cost and slowness of the process. It is also should be mentioned that human evaluation is highly subjective of what good summary is.

The word “platform” in software world has different meanings. The word “platform” in software is highly context dependent and overloaded. To make things less ambiguous, the “platform” in our case should be defined. When we say platform, we mean:

1. Concrete GUI application that evaluates several metrics for the text summaries
2. A software library that could be used by 3rd parties

Honestly speaking, the project had started as the library in mind and latter it morphed into much more massive GUI application. We believe that it was a good migration since the library and the API were tested and used by ourselves. However, it is neither just a standalone application nor just a library. As a result, we prefer word “platform” to reflect these aspects. We cannot argue that the core library for metric evaluation is one of the best. However, we can argue that for us it was a right vision both for the code management and modeling the process of evaluation itself. The core library will be explained within this project report for those who would like to use the platform as the library.

The project report will be divided into a couple of parts. The first part will describe the task of summary evaluation and statistical analysis in general (chapters 3, 4 and 5). The second part will give the overview of the program internally (chapter 6). The third part will explain visual GUI features for analysis (chapter 7). Although we are trying to not make the interdependencies within these parts but for better understanding of the system reading it in novel form give the better picture.

# 2. Text Summarization Task

The purpose of this section is to give an overview of what summarization process is from the bird’s-eye perspective. Such need exists because the platform has been developed under several assumptions. No software in the world exists without taking assumptions. This piece of software should not be an exception too. From the one hand each of us wants software for all possible case in life. From the other hand, the practice says that not taking assumptions can finally bring the programming task either to the never-ending story or since it is unclear what restrictions are the software becomes bloated; program features are unclear; the code base in pursuit of generalization becomes unmaintainable and full of bugs. Thus, restrictions and/or assumptions should be taken to produce a valuable software within a given time limit.

Text summarization task depicts itself as taking a summary from the given source(s). More formally the summary could be defined as a *text that is produced from one or more texts, that contains a significant portion of the information in the original text(s), and that is no longer than half of the original text(s)* and text summarization as *the process of distilling the most important information from a source (or sources) to produce an abridged version for a particular user (or user) and task (or tasks)* (Elena Lloret, 2008). Text summarization in general could be divided into the single document or multi document. As well, the language should be considered too when we are talking about automatic text summarization (i.e. produced by machines) (Elena Lloret, 2008). It is also important to understand what formats automatic summarizer can produce and consume. These facts are important since they directly influence on the summary evaluation.

It should be mentioned that summarization task is vital in current over-information (Giannakopoulos, 2008). For instance, the development of World Wide Web brings us to state where for the person it is not possible to read every page completely (Elena Lloret, 2008). Today “simple” search in web search engine will result in short summary, see Figure 1. (It seems that it is a simplest possible summary, but it is a summary. For Google Scholar it looks like it takes an abstract of an article)



Figure 1.

As it is already said in this section those details are reflected as assumptions and crystalized as requirements in the developed platform directly. For instance, the platform expects that all documents either an original document(s) or the summary itself are a simple text encoded by UTF-8 and separated each one in its file. From the one hand it may require the preprocessing and/or after the summarization but from the other hand simplicity matters. Processing XML or other marked up format will require additional complication even for the end user to prepare documents in the needed format. As well, UTF-8 today is the de-facto standard for simple text. Our opinion that more exotic as marked up language or those that based on text script processing as PDF or office documents (or even rare Unicode encodings) bring complexity both for the end user and text processing.

# 3. Project Scope

## 3.1. Summary Evaluation

In broad term of thinking summary evaluation could be a difficult problem because of human subjectivity about what good summary is. As the result it leads to disagreement whether one summary is better than another (Giannakopoulos, 2008). From the other hand, human judgment is the best possible judgment about the summary since humans eventually should read those summaries and have an idea what they are about.

As in many science fields, the evaluation is a score which is given to the object and the method which gives such score is called a metric. From mathematical point of view, it could be represented as a function from text domains (with or without additional parameters) to ℝ domain:

(1)

In many cases score range is restricted to be or normalized to have such range.

It highly depends on the nature of the metric what expectations are. For the metrics which try to show how a summary “good” or “bad”, it is expected that these metrics are statistically correlated to the human judgments for those summaries. For instance, it could be a Pearson’s correlation (Lin, 2004). However, one might be interested not only how good or bad a summary is but, say, how good a summarizer is. For us as humans, it is not only important how well the information compressed into summary, but it is also important how this information is presented. Manner and matter for us have a meaning. If it is very hard to read a summary such summary might be useless eventually. Thus, we could be interested in the readability of those summaries. In (Elena Lloret, 2019) such question is raised, and it is implemented by our software platform. The readability metrics’ results are useless without any reference and as a reference for readability metrics of the original documents.

## 3.2. Evaluation Analysis

Summary evaluation by itself gives no more than numeric result. However, concluding something only based on numeric results could be a difficult task. Therefore, one of the project visions has been allowing data analysis of evaluated summary metrics (the GUI part of the project is divided into two parts, one for evaluating summary, the other one for analysis).

In general, there are many different ways for data analysis. We have chosen from the one hand very basics tools, from the other hand those tools may allow to get a deep conclusion about metric data. For instance, the tool set includes:

* Simple tables for different sub-metric’s averages (By sub-metric we mean a concrete numeric value. For example, any of concrete ROUGE metric has 3 numeric values: precision, recall and F1 measure, each of which expressed as a number from )
* Visual comparisons of sub-metrics averages of concrete summarizing system in Bar Chart
* Detailed analysis of sub-metric data distribution by extended version of Notched Box Plot
* Visual analysis of all summarizing system by “heat” coloring for differences of readability metrics

We need to mention that we have not tried to have as much as visualizing tools, our thoughts are to extend existing to express as much as possible information by compressing it in one place. In addition to its original functionality, extended notched box plot allows seeing, within the plot itself, a data distribution expressed as jittered scatter plot and pretty-tabulated grouping of Tukey HSD test. “Heat” table is a good tool since it allows a conclusion about summarizing system in one glance.

# 4. Summary Evaluation Metrics

## 4.1 Metrics Overview

When we are speaking about summary evaluation metrics, we should mention that we can virtually divide them into two categories. The first category is for measuring summary informativeness. The second category is a summary surface measurement. For example, readability is a surface metric since it does not relate to the content of a summary itself but only surface readability measurements. However, we think that readability should be involved in total judgement of how good or bad the summary or, more specifically, the automatic summarizer. Table 1 visualize our metric categorization.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metric Category | Concrete Implemented Metrics |
| Informativeness | * Rouge Metrics Family * AutoSummENG Metrics |
| Surface | * Various Readability Metrics |

Table 1.

## 4.2. Text Similarity Metrics

It is already mentioned that a text metric could thought about as a function (1) from text domain to ℝ. However, metrics that should decide how much a summary is similar, are built on the pattern of comparisons between two texts. Although the text comparison task is interesting, but it is hard and has many applications in Natural Language Processing (Leonidas Tsekouras, 2017). The common pattern requires representing text in intermediate form, Figure 2.



Figure 2.

The first text in case of summary evaluation is a text gotten by the concrete summarizing system. The second text of comparison is a human summary. Such summaries are called ‘ideal’ or ‘model’ summaries. Furthermore, because of the subjectivity of what good summary is, several summaries should be considered. As well, it should be considered what the strategy is for the multiple comparisons. For the ROUGE metric(s) (Lin, 2004) there are two strategies: either the average is taken, or the best result is taken. By our observations, the best result is not so popular. Therefore, the only strategy implemented by the evaluation platform is the average among all comparisons.

The real art of those comparisons is the intermediate form and the following algorithms based on these forms. Strictly speaking, the algorithm defines (requires the usage of) such form. Thus, for the platform it has been obligated to define a way to hold and produce various forms in generic manner.

On the other hand, obviously, the automatic summary text comparison with ideal summary is not only the way to have a metric for summary. For example, the platform also proposes variety of readability metrics for automatic summaries. Thus, one can have an overview how much considered system influences on readability. For the platform it was chosen to reflect the difference (i.e. mathematical minus) between the original text metric value and generated summary text metric value. A combination of such simplest form with some visualization techniques gives us truly beautiful results for grasping analysis without deep dive into results.

The next sections will give a brief overview of the chosen metrics for implementation by our platform. The one might wish as much as possible metrics; however, such effort would require much time with negative consequences on other planned features.

### 4.2.1. Rouge

Since it has seen the light, the ROUGE metrics have a wide acceptance in the community due to it statistical correlation with human judgements. The ROUGE methods use statistical measures of similarity based on n-gram of words. The intuition behind the metric is that if two text considered having the similar meaning then they must share similar words or phrases (Giannakopoulos, 2008). One can find detailed explanation of the metrics in (Chin-Yew Lin, 2003). From our side, we should mention that all these metrics share the same “score” structure. Each metric has a precision, recall and F-measure. What precision and recall exactly meant by each metric to be the reader can find also in (Chin-Yew Lin, 2003).

For example, for the ROUGE-N metric between two text the number of common occurrences of n-grams (which tokenized words) is calculated:

**int** nGramHits(Map<String, Integer> peerGrams, Map<String, Integer> modelGrams) {  
 **int** hits = 0;  
 **for** (String modelGramToken : modelGrams.keySet()) {  
 **if** (!**"\_cn\_"**.equals(modelGramToken) && peerGrams.get(modelGramToken) != **null**) {  
 **int** peerHits = peerGrams.get(modelGramToken);  
 **int** modelHits = modelGrams.get(modelGramToken);  
 hits += Math.*min*(peerHits, modelHits);  
 }  
 }  
 **return** hits;  
}

Where peerGrams dictionary is the token n-gram against the number of its occurrences in the peer (i.e. automated summary generated by some system). Analogously, modelGrams is the n-grams against the number of its occurrences of the model. The model in this context is the human summary. Thus, the calculated value is the number of n-gram tokens shared by two texts. (The “\_cn\_” token in both mappings is an internal token indicating the total number per text on n-grams.) In order to calculate the precision, we need to divide the number of shared n-grams on the number of tokens in the peer (automated summary). Accordingly, the recall is the number of shared occurrences divided by total number of n-grams in model (human summary).

(2)

(3)

As well, by default the platform (and original the ROUGE metrics) produce the harmonic mean, i.e. the measure. It is defined as (4) with .

, (4)

Internally, the platform uses the α-based measure (Sasaki, 2007). I.e. . The equation (4) becomes:

(5)

Thus, if one wishes to calculate different F-measures she should give an appropriate α. For instance, for β=0 (, i.e. precision) α=1; for β=2 () α=0.2, etc. However, the ability to change the α parameter is only available when the platform is used as a library.

We will not go over other ROUGE metrics in details but will give a high-level overview of how they are built internally.

ROUGE-S has an idea of comparing skip-bigrams for two texts. Skip-bigram is a pair of words allowing an arbitrary gap. For example, for the text “the quick brown fox”, there will be following skip-bigrams: “the quick”, “the brown”, “the fox”, “quick brown”, “quick fox”, “brown fox”. Such bigrams (their statistical occurrences as with ROUGE-N) are compared to other text bigrams. I.e. the numerator is the number of common skip-bigrams. The denominator is the number of skip-bigrams either of a summary (for precision) or a reference (for recall). ROUGE-SU is an extension of ROUGE-S metrics where occurrences of unigrams are also calculated.

ROUGE-L for metric calculation uses common longest subsequence length of two texts. Precision is calculated as longest common subsequence divided by total word grams’ number in summary. In turn, recall is the longest common subsequence divided by the word grams of reference model.

ROUGE-W in some sense is very similar to ROUGE-L. The issue with ROUGE-L is that the distance of the common subsequence is not considered. Suppose we have a sequence:

: [A B C D E F G]

There are also two additional sequences:

: [A B C D J K L]

: [A J B K C L D]

While comparing and ) the common longest subsequence length will be the same in both cases (i.e. 4; thus, and ) will be the same). However, it is logically to assume that should be preferable since the internal sequence is denser. To achieve such effect, the distance of LCS tokens is accumulated though the weight function. That is, a model match is extracted from the dynamic programming matrix (Thomas H. Cormen, 2002) of LCS and the results of weight function of distance between tokens are accumulated. The weight function should have a property . As well, the weight function should have an ability for simple calculation of its inverse version (i.e. ). Thus, the weight function for the original Perl implementation is defined as and (more precise, ). Precision is defined to be

(6)

In recall the denominator has , similarly to other ROUGE metrics.

We should mention that we have ported all ROUGE metrics to the Java language: ROUGE-N, ROUGE-S, ROUGE-W, ROUGE-L. As we said before, we believe it will have good consequences either for the people that will want to integrate ROUGE metric with the code written in Java that have much wider community or to understand not only the formulas but the concrete implementation. At least for us, it was not a trivial approach to understand the Perl code. As well, one can even change the reference implementation to produce her metric with less effort because of having the sources. For instance, it was done in (Marina Litvak, 2015) to extend the ROUGE-S to get weighed version of ROUGE-S.

### 4.2.2. AutoSummENG

Apart the ROUGE metrics we have decided to have an implementation of the AutoSummENG metrics which are based on the n-gram graph text representation. The reason for such inclusion is based on the following: there are some desired characteristics that should co-exists within a single method. More specifically:

* Language neutrality. That is, a method should not require language dependent resources and applied directly to various languages.
* Full automation. A method should not require human interception except the golden summaries.
* Context sensitivity. A method should consider contextual information, the well-formedness of the text. Random word sequences lack this quality.

The AutoSummENG method holds all these properties. As well, it has a high correlation with human judgements (George Giannakopoulos, 2009).

The idea of what n-gram graph is fully explained in (Giannakopoulos, 2008), (George Giannakopoulos, 2009) and (Leonidas Tsekouras, 2017). We will not come back to those explanations. One willing to know the exact details could refer these sources.

Originally, AutoSummENG implemented upon the toolkit called JINSECT (<https://github.com/ggianna/JInsect>) which allows the generation of the n-gram graphs that are either word n-grams or character n-grams as well as the further comparison of these graphs.

It should be also mentioned that JINSECT toolkit is implemented in Java language. That is, it allowed us using the toolkit as a library without any additional complication.

## 4.3. Readability Metrics

We decided to include the readability metrics into the platform since as with AutoSummENG we believe that context sensitivity matters. That is, an automatic summarization system may produce a text with poor sematic while having good statistical measures. This issue is considered in (Elena Lloret, 2019). As the consequences, the above work proposes to use automatic readability metrics. We, in turn, implement discussed in the work metrics.

* Flesch Reading Ease (FRE)

(7)

The idea of this metric is that the long sentences and/or long words are hard to read.

* Word Variation Index (OVIX)

(8)

It is assumed that the metric could measure the idea of the text.

* Proper Noun Ration (PNR)

(9)

The reason for this measurement is that the number of proper nouns should increase the readability.

* Unique Proper Noun Ratio (distPNR)

(10)

The variation of PNR.

* Average Word Length (AWL)

(11)

The intuition behind this is that words with fewer characters are more readable.

* Average Sentence Length (ASL)

(12)

Long sentences depict harder text for understanding.

* Noun Ration (NR)

(13)

The idea is that noun massive text is harder for understanding.

* Pronoun Ratio (PR)

(14)

As more a text contains pronouns as less it is clear.

We should mention that in our platform we have decided to normalize FRE, OVIX, AWL, ASL into interval. The normalization is done by linear interpolation into the interval by taking the maximal value within all metric results and minimal value within all metric results. I.e. suppose we evaluate original texts with N automatic summarization systems. We find the maximum and minimum value with all these resources (original texts and all summaries).

(15)

The reason for doing this, is firstly while doing experiments we found that FRE could give negative results in systems which produce very long sentences. In addition, we believe that values that in [0,1] range are much preferable for the researcher. Knowing that an average sentence length is, for example, 5.42 does not say a much without comparing it to other values. Working with [0,1] range values seems for us a more standard way.

It is also should be said that not all metrics are considered better with higher values. Table 2 explains whether the higher metric value is better, or it is the opposite.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metric | Is higher value better? |
| FRE | Yes |
| OVIX | Yes |
| PNR | Yes |
| distPNR | Yes |
| AWL | Opposite |
| ASL | Opposite |
| NR | Opposite |
| PR | Opposite |

Table 2.

We have needed to add POS (part of speech) tagging. It has done with Stanford CoreNLP package (Stanford, 2019) as well as sentence recognition. Recalling that POS tagger is identifying what the concrete word stands for (noun, pronoun, proper noun, etc.). Syllables counting is done with MorphAdorner package (NIUT, 2013) as in the source article (Elena Lloret, 2019). Both are written in Java language therefore the integration with them was smooth. However, the MorphAdorner package seems to be limited to English language. Thus, FRE for non-English texts is inaccurate.

# 5. Statistical Analysis

## 5.1 Overview

Within our system we decided to implement a few statistics. In platform we implemented both descriptive and inferential statistics. In addition, the system has graphical data analysis methods. The implemented set of statistics by our opinion is enough to make some initial surface conclusions about behavior of automatic summarization systems. For instance, we did not implement Pearson correlation between either automatic summarization systems or humans’ judgment. The reason to not implement correlation procedures is that such kind of task in summarization is needed mainly when a researcher rather invents a new metric than checks behavior of summarizers which is the main purpose of the task. From the other hand, we have implemented Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Tukey post hoc Honestly Significance Difference test (Tukey HSD test). By these inferential statistics one can conclude whether two or more automatic summarization systems have similar characteristics. As well, a researcher can conclude what summarization systems belong to similar groups. We implemented a visual comparison of difference of averages between the readability metrics (“Metric Heat”), but we do not implement inferential statistics for those comparisons (i.e. for instance, there are either no correlation procedures with original text readability metrics or ANOVA). This is because we do not want the tool to be overloaded. All metric calculation results are saved during platform evaluating metrics. If a researcher wants to run more specific statistical analysis on the metrics’ results she can use a special purpose statistical software. We think that the set of statistical tools exposed by the platform is powerful and enough to make some conclusion about summarizers behavior. However, we did not try to replace the statistical software for deeper analysis.

## 5.2. Visual Statistics

Possibly, human brain is one of the best available statistics’ tools ever developed. We (humans) can understand the common patterns in data without any additional help. Although from the mathematical point of view this does not prove anything but once we have data and visual representation we can in easy manner choose the direction of what we are going to prove. For example, one can look on Figure 12. Despite of what the bar chart shows, it is hard not to see the tendency in the bar chart (i.e. the bars in the graph are “definitely” correlated). Without such initial analysis for a researcher it is hard to predict a direction for further conclusion on inferential statistics. Although it is out of scope for the platform but, being more precise, this example bar chart “predicts” that there is a correlation among the metrics. The fact on which all text similarity metrics are based – there should be a correlation between the metric and human judgement. That is, first, if a metric is correlated with human judgment such metric is considered a good one. Second, if they are correlated with human judgement we can logically assume that metrics will be correlated with themselves. Suppose a researcher is about to invent a new metric for some reason, a graphical tool can reasonably help with initial understanding whether there is a correlation. However, one should understand that graphical tools do not exist per se. They are developed on statistics’ basis. These can be descriptive and/or inferential statistics. For instance, a presented bar chart is based on descriptive statistic of sample mean. However, some graphical tools present more statistics. For example, box plots show three main quantiles (first, second and third quantile, i.e. 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles) as well as the outliers of considered data sample (see Figure 16 for a reference, red dots are outliers). These statistics give to a researcher an immediate feeling about data distribution. In addition, the overall picture of box within the dashed lines (how stretched the tails of a distribution) gives an impression about data symmetry. Surely, graphical tools are not limited by descriptive statistics. For example, we extended the notched box plot is extended by inferential statistics information as HSD groups.

For our platform we implemented several graphical tools as well as extended existing to help a researcher for better understanding the behavior of the automatic summarizing systems. Thus, for a researcher the following graphical tools are available: table of averages grouped by concrete metrics, bar charts displaying those averages, notched box plots. As well we extended notched box plot with jittered scatter plot and ANOVA post hoc Tukey HSD test groups. The notched box plot by itself gives an impression about data distribution which is explained recently in this paragraph (i.e. the raw box plot with no notches). Notches added to the box plot are used for comparison in between two samples: *if two notches overlap, then we fail to reject the null hypothesis (true medians are equal) with (approximate) 95% confidence. Alternatively, the difference between the medians could be described as “statistically significant at the 0.05 level”* (John M. Chambers, 1983). We need to warn one about results interpretation. First, notched boxes comparison does not replace the need for significance test (i.e. t-test – the null hypothesis whether two samples averages are equals or not). The notched box comparison gives an impression whether they are likely to be significantly different or not. With the same manner the bar chart does not proves statistical correlation – it only gives possibly a right direction. The second important thing is that multiple comparisons of notched boxes could not be considered as a correct one. That is, if all notches of boxes overlap that does not mean that medians are equal at the 95% of confidence (the reason why it is not true will be explained further).

Notched box plots give an almost comprehensive information about data distribution in general. However, they do not give an impression how raw data “look like”. Notched box plot “compacts” an information by quantiles usage (the box is drawn by three quantiles calculated from the sample and “spread” by usage of some constants: where the notches should be drawn and where outliers start). We think, that raw data displaying is a vital feature to see the behavior of the distribution. For example, if the raw data for a metric by some summarizer look like a uniform distribution at least it might show a suspicion that the behavior of the summarizer is not somewhat good (the why behind is that summarizer should be able to produce more or less the same score around its average, but producing the uniform distribution may point on randomness of the sample which in turn points out randomness of the summary quality). Thus, we need to have an ability to show the raw data. We extend the notched box plot by jittered scatter plot. The scatter plot by itself only draws dots in one dimension, jittered scatter plot randomly spread around the sample data in the second dimension. Namely, it gives an impression of clouds of dots. Figure 18 depicts the said: first, jittered scatter plot is shown by clouds of (blue) dots within the sample. Second, system #10 has a suspicion of behaving too randomly – its scores look too spread. Without scatter plot it could be hard to see.

As a step further, we decided to implement an inferential statistic of post hoc HSD test of ANOVA built-in in the notched box plot. As we explained earlier notched box plots are used for sample distribution comparison, but they have a limitation of being used only for two samples. However, it is more than likely that not only two will be checked by our developed platform. Thus, we see a need to implement inferential statistic of comparing more than two systems simultaneously (i.e. whether all systems samples averages are equal). However, this information is limited too. Suppose, we can say that all systems behave similar. In context of developing automatic summarizers it could be a positive as well as a negative treatment. The positive context could lie in fact that the developed system is not worse than others. The negative context lies in the fact that the developed system is not better than others. However, what if we reject the null hypothesis that all systems are equal? We need to have a procedure that will show exact pairwise comparisons. The direct case of extracting pairwise comparison is not a suitable one. First, we cannot embed the information about pairwise comparisons directly to the notched box plots. The best we can do (“brute force” displaying) is to give a triangular matrix (since comparison is a commutative operation) with no diagonal (since it does not have a meaning to compare a sample with itself). This representation will not give a feeling whether samples are in the same group. If we could combine pairwise comparisons into groups, it will be much easier information to grasp by a researcher. Even better, if we could draw such groups in continuous manner within samples of data it would be much easier for a researcher. Thus, we extended the notched box plots by (pretty) tabulated printouts with the data samples. The example of such groups’ printouts could be seen in Figure 17 and Figure 18 (The rule belonging to one groups is that if a sample shares with another group a similar letter they belong to one group). One that is interested what does mean non-pretty tabulated groups can have a look here: <https://stats.stackexchange.com/a/31774>. Summarizing the discussion of notched box plots we need to mention that we are not aware about existence of pretty-tabulated groups displaying component for (notched) box plots. That is, why we called it “a step further” in the beginning of the paragraph.

In addition, gathering data about the readability of texts could be useless without inferring something. As a graphical method for analysis of the we give a tool that we called “metric heat” (the name is inspired by “heat maps”). I.e. we show the overall behavior of the system by drawing the differences of samples by palette. As much a system gives more increases the values of a readability metric as greener the result is drawn. In the similar manner as much the system worsens a metric as redder it gets. Figure 20 shows an example of the said. Yet again, we need to warn: the “metric heat” by itself does not prove anything. It gives a direction of what null hypothesis is (or what our impression about the summarizing system, whether a system increase, decrease or it is neutral about readability aspects). For more sophisticated analysis more formal methods as t-test, ANOVA or correlation methods should be used by external systems.

## 5.3. Analysis of Variance

As it has been already mentioned with multiple notched box plots comparisons that deciding that three or more groups are similar is not correct (on chosen confidence interval) if we retain each pairwise comparison at some confidence interval. For the notched box plots it is not correct partially because notched box plots comparisons cannot be considered as any proof by themselves, but the main reason lies in the fact that for multiple comparisons shorten the confidence interval. The same is about t-test. That is, while performing multiple t-tests the overall confidence interval shortens. The reason behind the shortening is in “simple” probability. Suppose we are about to check n summarizing systems. There overall pairwise comparisons are (triangular matrix of minus diagonal as already mentioned). The probability to get Type I error is – that is, we reject the null hypothesis while the null hypothesis holds true. Thus, the probability to get an error in comparisons is (“the probability that at least one comparison contains an error – i.e. minus the probability that no one contains error”). That is, for example for the confidence interval of 95% and 3 groups we get that (which is the greater than 0.05). For, say, five groups this probability already becomes (which is much greater than 0.05). To answer this issue, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used by the platform with 0.95 confidence interval. That is, the null hypothesis is: all systems behave similar (i.e. all metric samples have the same sample average) with a confidence interval 95%. If that holds true ANOVA test retains the null hypothesis otherwise rejects. In case of null hypothesis rejection, the work is still not done – we need to run post hoc test to say what group is significantly different from what group.

# 6. Implementation

## 6.1. Implementation Forewords

Software engineering is known to be a hard and challenging task. There are many aspects of software engineering. For instance, it would be a time management, a development methodology, system analysis, requirement analysis, system design, code design and so on. While developing a software many properties should be considered to produce well behaving product. However, according to (Standish Group, 2014) canceled project statistics for small companies is 21.6%, medium companies 37.1% and 29.5% in large companies. That is, 29.4% in average a company produce no (planed) software at all. We present those value to highlight the fact that the chances that some software will see the light in general is about . We do not claim but we think it is logically to assume that in those project that are delivered on time and budget, the situation of post-delivery stage is not so rainbow if it would be measured. What we are trying to say is that a software after delivery is still alive. It requires a maintenance, adding features, reusability. We assume that if project success measurement would include these parameters the success factor could be less.

We think that it is clear that maintenance, adding of features and reusability are highly dependent on software design. We also think that software design is a broad term. Different sources define it with a different meaning (Paul Ralph, 2009). When we say ‘software design’ we mean internal software structure. Although one could not agree with us because she can also consider the chosen technologies (for example, a programming language), data storages (variety of data bases, file systems, etc.) and so on; but comparing to these adjacent software properties, internal software structure may become a bottleneck – for new features, maintenance and reusability – much earlier. For instance, (Grady Booch, 2007) takes the approach of internal program structuring interchangeably with design. Such conclusion comes up because Object Oriented Design by our opinion is no more than an internal program structuring based on modeling by objects and reflecting it as a code.

## 6.2. Programming Languages

Within our platform we decided to implement several metrics for summary evaluation. Among them there are ROUGE metrics. Originally, ROUGE metrics were implemented in Perl language.

We decided to code our platform in Java language. Specifically, it is of version 1.8. The decision was dictated firstly due to high popularity of this language. Java has a highest popularity among programming languages on the time of writing this project according to TIOBE index (TIOBE, 2019). As well, according to TIOBE index as well, this language is a leadership for almost two decades.

The second reason for choosing the Java language has been a fluent knowledge of it by authors because of professional activity for a long time. The third reason is that used by authors NLP libraries are written in Java. More specifically, for NLP processing it was chosen Stanford CoreNLP (Stanford, 2019). Fourthly, despite of common believing about the slowness of this languages, today this language (specifically, HotSpot JVM (Oracle, 2019)) is the one of fastest available choices (Debian, 2019).

Thus, the platform almost completely written in Java language. As it was mentioned, the reference implementation of ROUGE metrics is written in Perl. Therefore, we needed to decide how to integrate it within the platform. The decision might have seen non-standard, but we decided to port it to Java language. From the one hand it seems time consuming and, maybe, even useless. From the other hand, many NLP projects today start with Java or even when they do not start with, integrate it with Java is not an issue because of huge availability of integration tools and large community. Additionally, we think that Perl by today standards is outdated language. Understanding the Perl code is known to be an issue by itself. We believe that the port will help for future researchers/implementors better understanding of the source code of ROUGE metrics.

Furthermore, possibly it does not seem to be an issue, but Perl is times slower than Java (Debian, 2019). One might say that it is not an issue for today’s machines (according to (Debian, 2019) it has similar measurements to the Python language). However, we still believe that time matters, and faster solutions are better.

With all said above, we assume that the reader is familiar with one of C derived modern language as Java, C#, etc. If it will be required, the code snippets will be written in Java language.

It should be added that some functionality of the platform depends on R language. However, it is not the main programming language. Only the part of statistical analysis requires the R language. More precisely, R language is required when user requests statistical ANOVA test with further HSD Tukey test either directly (i.e. there is a button on GUI part) or indirectly – user requests a notched box plot with HSD Tukey test groups.

## 6.3. Chosen Approach

There are many approaches for modeling a program. For instance, it should not be new for one that today we have a raise of functional programming approach. The more or less similar processes were with object-oriented programming (OOP) two decades ago. There are benefits of using one modeling or another as well as its weakness.

By our opinion, for example, the strongest OOP design is for ‘static’ world knowledge. The word static used in sense of ‘no or almost no changes during the software lifecycle’. That is, if we take such field as modeling of mathematics, GUI libraries or game programming. Each of these examples could be modeled with OOP almost natively. For instance, if we want to model mathematical set, we know the finite sets of its operators. It should be union, intersect, difference, cartesian product. Sure, the operators themselves could be programmed in variety of ways. It could be either hash or tree-based structures with an appropriate find, add and remove operators. However, the strongest part of such modeling is that the operators’ set is static. It is close to impossible that one will invent a new operator which is impossible to express within the provided operators. The same could be valid for linear algebra modeling (which is heavily used in graphics) or whatever else mathematical field. GUI libraries also share the same properties. We could predict what exactly operator set is needed for GUI widgets library. It could have a common methods’ set as getting/changing size, color, font, background, etc. It is also very understood how to build a hierarchy of such objects. For instance, a toggle button will just extend a button (i.e. it is ‘is a’ relationship/inheritance). Games fall in the ‘easy to model with OOP’ approach since the game behavior and object interaction has a limited and predicted set of methods. For example, if an arcade game is being developed such set could be: ‘find’, ‘detect collision’, ‘draw self’ and so on. Each character will have almost the same methods with different implementation (which one will put in ‘game character’ class). All these objects will be orchestrated in ‘game’ object.

We assume that the situation is different with modeling a world when it has fuzzy method set. Such assumption is based on some experience in the field that we will talk about. Fuzzy method set we define as unpredictable set (i.e. a developer cannot predict what exactly operator set could be for the object class). The first example we wish to consider is a ‘string’ class. Although any person having a minimalistic experience with programming sees this entity within modern OOP languages modeled as a class, but it is only a first approximation. For instance, Java language ‘String’ class has several methods exposed. There are two questions. First, one could ask herself whether this set is enough. The second question whether this set is orthogonal (i.e. minimalistic number of operations such that other methods could be derived from minimalistic set). The answer is no for both. If the set were enough it was not required to use utility functions for string either written by 3rd parties or in-house. The set is also non-orthogonal. We think that it is obvious that minimalistic set of methods for class ‘String’ could be only getting character at some position or getting character in a stream manner. Class ‘String’ in Java language in order to be ‘extended’ provides the method ‘charAt(int i)’ where the ‘i’ is a position of requested character. The conclusions of all said above are such that, first, it is understood that ‘String’ cannot provide all possible variety of required operators. Simply because it is impossible to include all of them under one hood; for example, what if we want to compute longest common subsequence of two strings, should or should not such method be exposed by ‘String’ class? If all possible methods would be included into class ‘String’ it would be hard to say what exactly the responsibility of it. Second, if we would model the ‘String’ class with minimalistic number of methods, does it stay a class? Such modeled class is a reduction to a character list with or without random access. This, in turn, violates the main principle of information hiding proposed by OOP. However, the fact stays the fact that in all modern object-oriented languages ‘string’ is a class (or whatever similar entity as with prototype-based languages, but this changes nothing eventually). We leave the ‘String’ entity modeling question for further researches whether the taken approach is suitable if at all.

The second example of fuzzy method set could be business application programming. By business application we mean applications that mimic business processes within an enterprise. For instance, one can imagine CRM, Bank or bookkeeping application. This kind of applications requires a storage of many entities with many parameters for an entity with many rules connecting these entities which could even produce some artificial entities (for example, modeling ‘salary’ as some number property on ‘employee’ could be wrong since salary should have a date, bonuses and so on and, thus, has to be reflected as a separate entity). The ‘sad’ thing about modeling this kind of software by object-oriented techniques is that no one can predict all fluctuations. For instance, one would like to model a virtual enterprise. She takes the current snapshot of some existing enterprise. First, she creates an ‘employee’ class. The next thing that looks logically for her is to model the enterprise hierarchy. She creates following classes: ‘factory worker’, ‘manager’, ‘bookkeeper’, ‘cleaner’, ‘security guard’. For her it seems consistent since ‘factory worker’ *is* ‘employee’. A ‘manager’ *is* an ‘employee’ too, and so on. What exactly methods an ‘employee’ should have? Say, we want to model a payroll. Sure, it seems indisputably to put the payroll method on ‘employee’ since all employees will receive a salary (i.e. it could be an abstract method ‘payroll’). She even thinks that for new positions new classes will be created. What she does not consider is that she took only the *current snapshot*. Maybe such mental model has chances to exist for a period. However, there is probability that the enterprise will evolve. What if the enterprise does not want ‘bookkeeper’ being the direct worker but a contractor company? This enterprise decision breaks the mental model based on the OOP approach. For example, could the ‘payroll’ method be the part of employee? No, since contractor company pays salary for its workers. She can even try to fix it by splitting the ‘employee’ to ‘direct employee’ and ‘contractor’ having the ‘payroll’ method on ‘direct employee’ only. Though, it will fit only for the given time snapshot. Each time an enterprise will move workers to pay directly or indirectly by contractor the code will require changes. We assume that most will agree that the discussed kind of modeling is not suitable for a library code because of unpredictable code changes. As well, one should grasp that it is only one example of change. Other changes could break the following OOP based approach in a similar manner.

Some people can argue that, first, our synthetic example is not so correct since ‘factory worker’, ‘manager’, ‘bookkeeper’, ‘cleaner’, ‘security guard’ look more like the concrete objects than classes and they should be distinguishable by an inner ‘employee’ indicator. The counter question, where does the demarcation lie? With the same argument we can say that ‘employee’ is no more than ‘person’. ‘Customer’ is a ‘person’ too. Thus, we can reduce all participating humans to ‘person’. However, we think it is unnatural since while modeling an enterprise we agree that they have very different roles*. Thus, we argue that finding a demarcation between class and object is not trivial for modeling. Within some types of software, it may lead to fragile class hierarchy that will require fixing the code on even small context change. The preferable solution could be modeling the processes based on generic data structures than nouns with operations on them*. Yes, in some cases it requires a data redundancy. For instance, all employees will have ‘reporters’ while only ‘manager’ has a meaning of this property. *However, when processes involving entities are unclear it will lead to less changes over the time and these changes will be more concentrated*. That is, for our artificial example, ‘payroll’ becomes a ‘payroll service’. ‘Direct employee’ entity does not need to exist. Instead, before ‘payroll service’ is about to execute, ‘employees’ should go through ‘direct employee filter’ (employee considered to be direct or indirect by indicator).

The shown above approach is different for modeling. Surely, one might say that it is functional approach and will be right. The verbosity of the above approach explanation is to give a feeling that library code writing is not trivial. The library code should be generic. On the other hand, the generalization should adopt the modeled domain and the domain itself dictates the more suitable form. Object-oriented modeling should be taken carefully.

Thus, the chosen by us approach to model a platform is rather functional than object-oriented. We think even that when one imagines the platform for summary evaluation, she imagines it as a functional pipeline. In general, what we need to do is to present a way to map from one domain (for example, a text) to another and have comparing mechanism for result domain. While modeling a platform for evaluation it is not only difficult to predict methods for the entities but also it is not always possible to predict the data structures. That is, there are infinitely many ways and results that we can produce from a text. For example, we want to present a text as word n-grams with number of occurrences for an n-gram (which eventually word n-gram histogram). We can directly write a function that will just split words and calculate such histogram. We can also firstly preprocess the text to have some intermediate form as list of tokens and then calculate a histogram. Such histogram we might wish to reuse in calculations later or immediately compute some score of evaluation. Having put the text into some object-oriented class (for example, it would be ‘document’) will require continuously changes in this and derived classes.

For example, suppose we have modeled it in object-oriented way. We have a ‘document’ that expect to get a text as a string. We can have on this ‘compute histogram’ method. We can also have a ‘convert to token list’ method. Since we want work with token list as with ‘document’, how do we represent it as a document too? We can either put a list to be a member of a document or to have a ‘document’ that will hold a list of tokens. If we put it to be a member, how do we distinct whether we want ‘compute histogram’ to be from the string or from tokens? If we create another entity as ‘document for tokens’ list’, how do we create a class hierarchy? I.e. how do we care not to have a ‘convert to token list’ method? Do we treat a histogram as a ‘document’ too? Thus, to answer these questions we present in a next section a generic and robust way to handle variety of cases.

## 6.4. Domain-Specific Language

From the ancient ages, humanity tries to pass information and ideas through specific languages. Despite of speaking, reading and writing abilities of the native language of a person, today it is impossible to imagine that the person is not exposed to specific languages. For instance, when one learns mathematics, in addition to learn abstract ideas what number is, what set is, etc. he also learns how to express those ideas within mathematical notation. The mathematical notation is no more than a specific language to pass those ideas. We think that everyone agrees that without math notation language, passing those ideas within only the reading, writing and speaking his native language would be hard, even impossible.

With varying degrees of success, the idea of domain-specific languages periodically appears in software engineering (the word ‘domain’ is used in context of humanity knowledge domain; e.g. typesetting domain has its own set of meanings and rules therefore). For instance, Unix has a long tradition having small languages for specific purpose. It is gratefully covered in ‘Minilanguages’ (Eric S. Raymond, 2003). For instance, utilities *troff, eqn, tbl* and *pic* are used for typesetting; *awk, sed* and *dc* are for shell and text processing. As well, there are minilanguages for software development and so on. Strictly speaking, it is a part of Unix philosophy having small strict utilities passing among them a text data.

Although following Unix philosophy of small languages could give truly wonderful results but it has its drawbacks as masterly possession of the compiler/interpreter writing. As well, while writing a code within a chosen programing language one does not want to mix numerous languages and ‘jumping’ across languages boundaries. (Honestly speaking, in Unix shell scripting is ‘invented’ to allow gluing together those ‘minilanguages’. However, most people exposed to shell programing could agree that it is a cumbersome matter) Thus, the second way of domain-specific language creation is so called ‘internal domain-specific languages’. The topic is covered in (Martin Fowler, 2010). The idea is to use a programming language for somehow expressing the modeled language (there is no strict way how to do it). One of the well-known patterns for language modeling is so called *fluent interface*. The idea of this pattern is very simple: an object method should return the reference to itself or one of language modeled tokens. It will allow a chaining of the modeled operators.

In order not to be unfounded, we will present a small language example modeled within a fluent interface. It will give a feeling and one can grasp the idea behind it. Suppose we need to write a calculator program. (Say we want to have a linear algebra modeled. Surely, one exposed to programming in C++ language can model it with operator overloading, but it is a synthetic example which only should show the ability of different modeling approach. As well, operator overloading is not a case for many languages, particularly for Java. Moreover, because of the explanation reason the values will be float point numbers for simplicity.) If we would model directly with class and methods approach, then complex expressions would be hard to understand because they will be split to many unrelated pieces (lines). To not overcomplicate the example with operator precedence, it is also chosen that the calculator will be built on top reverse polish notation (RPN). Thus, the code could look like:

**public class** SmallRPNCalculator {  
  
 **private final** Deque<Double> **stack** = **new** ArrayDeque<>();  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator push(**double** val) {  
 **stack**.push(val);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator dup() {  
 **double** val = **stack**.peek();  
 **stack**.push(val);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public double** pop() {  
 **return stack**.pop();  
 }  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator add() {  
 **double** left = **stack**.pop();  
 **double** right = **stack**.pop();  
 **stack**.push(left + right);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator sub() {  
 **double** left = **stack**.pop();  
 **double** right = **stack**.pop();  
 **stack**.push(left - right);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator mul() {  
 **double** left = **stack**.pop();  
 **double** right = **stack**.pop();  
 **stack**.push(left \* right);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator div() {  
 **double** left = **stack**.pop();  
 **double** right = **stack**.pop();  
 **stack**.push(left / right);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** SmallRPNCalculator sqrt() {  
 **double** val = **stack**.pop();  
 **stack**.push(Math.*sqrt*(val));  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public static void** main(String[] args) {  
 SmallRPNCalculator smallRPNCalculator = **new** SmallRPNCalculator();  
 **double** a = 1, b = 1, c = -6;  
 **double** sqrtDet = smallRPNCalculator  
 .push(b)  
 .dup()  
 .mul()  
 .push(-4)  
 .push(a)  
 .push(c)  
 .mul()  
 .mul()  
 .add()  
 .sqrt()  
 .pop();  
 System.***out***.println(sqrtDet);  
 }  
}

As we can see almost all methods of RPN calculator except the ‘pop’ return the reference to itself. Thereby, it allows us to chain the methods. The example in the main static method is calculation of the square root of square equation determinant. More specifically, it is and the calculation is .

One could say that the same effect she could achieve if she will make all those methods to have a ‘void’ type. We might reply that yes; the effect of calculations will be the same. However, it will have much more *syntactic noise* because it will be required (at least) to repeat the variable of the calculator object. The most important thing is that *it looks like an expression for human eye* but method invocation on the object does not look so. It is not occasionally that, for example, Java models the *higher-order functions* of *functional programming* primitives (from Java version 8) for collections exactly in the same way (‘Stream API’). Strictly speaking, Java 8 Steam API only mimics the functional programming primitives by using of fluent interfaces. Additionally, we would like to add that by our experience once a person is exposed to domain-specific language programming, *the code written with domain-specific languages becomes almost self-documented since once the domain is correctly modeled within a language additional comments add no more than a noise.* Again, introducing functional programming higher-order primitives for collections in almost all modern languages in last decade is due to fact that *the code is much more readable and maintainable* because *we say what happens* to collection and not write the for-if loops which should be explained (for-if loops say how it should happen).

As one could already guess we use the domain-specific language. Especially we use it for the pipeline definition of *what* should happen to text to get a final form for comparison. Expressing the text transformations as a pipeline gives an ability to reuse the pipeline fully or partially in different places in the code. We think that it also gives an ability to extend the pipeline much simpler way than it would be modeled and coded with a ‘pure’ object-oriented approach. We are going to explain a conceptual part of such pipeline. Although it could be possible to give UML class diagrams, but we think that it will not give any benefits and even confuse. Eventually, usage of diagrams here will not give an idea since we do not model objects and classes, but it is a language. However, a given code will be reduced only for understanding and not fully copied from the code-base.

Thus, the first entity is Text. It is defined as:

**public class** Text<T> {  
  
 **private final** String **textId**;  
 **private final** T **textData**;  
  
 **public** String getTextId() {}  
  
 **public** T getTextData() {}  
  
}

The overall idea of this entity is to represent a form or derived form (generic T type) of the text with an id. The identifier could be any string that somehow distinct a text from another. Within the platform the text id is the absolute file name.

The next entity is a ‘text processor’. It is defined as:

**public interface** TextProcessor<X, Y> {  
  
 Text<Y> process(Text<X> data);  
  
}

The purpose of this entity is to be a mapping function to change a form of text. I.e. X is the domain type and Y is codomain type of the text form.

One possible example of ‘text processor’ could be a processor that maps from string to list of tokens. In code it looks so:

**public class** TextToTokensProcessor **implements** TextProcessor<String, List<String>> {  
  
 @Override  
 **public** Text<List<String>> process(Text<String> data) {  
 String text = data.getTextData();  
 String[] split = text.split(**"\\s+"**);  
 List<String> tokens = Arrays.*asList*(split);  
  
 **return new** Text<>(data.getTextId(), tokens);  
 }  
}

More interesting and special example is a gluing of two text processing. That is, we want to have a processor that maps from domain X to domain Z while passing the domain Y (i.e. ). The code of such entity looks like:

**public class** PipelineProcessor<X, Y, Z> **implements** TextProcessor<X, Z> {  
  
 **private final** TextProcessor<X, Y> **first**;  
 **private final** TextProcessor<Y, Z> **second**;  
  
 **public** PipelineProcessor(TextProcessor<X, Y> first, TextProcessor<Y, Z> second) {  
 **this**.**first** = first;  
 **this**.**second** = second;  
 }  
  
 @Override  
 **public** Text<Z> process(Text<X> data) {  
 Text<Y> firstProcessed = **first**.process(data);  
 **return second**.process(firstProcessed);  
 }  
}

While looking into the code there are two interesting things. First, ‘pipeline processor’ has three generic types. Java type safety mechanism will not allow to use an object constructor if the first type of second processor is different from second type of the first processor. The second interesting thing is that after all transformations it is still a processor from (look at the ‘implements’ part and the ‘process’ method itself).

Additional processor that has a special meaning as pipeline processor is a caching processor. Caching is a vital component of the system. Many transformations while working with text should be only really processed once and then just retrieved from the cache. For instance, running Core NLP is a heavy operation. It is much better to cache the result of execution somehow and then just retrieve the processed result. Another essential application of caching is in the comparison itself. For example, in ROUGE we compare a summary to a same set of human summaries. There is no any reason to get human summaries reprocessed for every machine summary. *However, if it would be programmed ‘directly’ it is an issue how do we decide what exactly cache type we want, and how we do control its execution. By our experience in most cases caching mechanics is threaded into the code itself which makes the usage and understanding cumbersome*. (The people familiar with programming know how much the problem of caching is not trivial. The when, why and how in many cases lead to salad in code) Decoupling of caching mechanics from the code itself could be considered as an achievement or benefit. In code the place responsible for caching is defined as:

**public abstract class** AbstractCacheTextProcessor<X, Y> **implements** TextProcessor<X, Y> {  
  
 **private final** TextProcessor<X, Y> **textProcessor**;  
  
 **public** AbstractCacheTextProcessor(TextProcessor<X, Y> textProcessor) {  
 **this**.**textProcessor** = textProcessor;  
 }  
  
 @Override  
 **public** Text<Y> process(Text<X> data) {  
 Text<Y> result = getCached(data);  
 **if** (result != **null**) {  
 **return** result;  
 }  
 result = **textProcessor**.process(data);  
  
 setToCache(result);  
 **return** result;  
 }  
  
 **protected abstract** Text<Y> getCached(Text<X> data);  
  
 **protected abstract void** setToCache(Text<Y> computed);  
  
}

The code only defines sufficient self-documented micrologic for the caching mechanics. All derived entities should define its logic of how and where store and retrieve requested text forms. This, in turn, abstracts the underlying details of what cache is. For instance, it could be a memory, filesystem or even a database. For now, there are two concrete available implementations for the caching in the platform. One is responsible to store in memory and the second uses filesystem.

Filesystem cache expects that the stored/retrieved object will be of Java type java.io.Serializable and uses the standard mechanism of Java marshaling (serialization). As the key it uses the text key. As it was already mentioned the key itself is the absolute file location of originally loaded text. Thus, there should be some mechanism that will use an absolute file location as a key. The solution for this is to compute cryptographic hash (specifically, SHA-256) of the key (absolute file name) and store it as a directory on file system (more specifically it is Base-64 encoding of the key where ‘/’ is replaced to ‘-’).

In general, it is enough to have those entities to express any text pipeline. However, it is much better to move further to a language that will glue together processors and the result will look like an expression. That is, eventually we have come to a domain-specific language defining a text pipelining:

**public class** TextPipeline<X, Y> {  
  
 **private final** TextProcessor<X, Y> **current**;  
  
 **public** TextPipeline(TextProcessor<X, Y> textProcessor) {  
 **this**.**current** = textProcessor;  
 }  
  
 **public** <Z> TextPipeline<X, Z> pipe(TextProcessor<Y, Z> next) {  
 PipelineProcessor<X, Y, Z> pipedProcessors = **new** PipelineProcessor<>(**current**, next);  
 **return new** TextPipeline<>(pipedProcessors);  
 }  
  
 **public** TextPipeline<X,Y> pipeIf(**boolean** condition, TextProcessor<Y, Y> next) {  
 **if** (condition) {  
 PipelineProcessor<X, Y, Y> pipedProcessors = **new** PipelineProcessor<>(**current**, next);  
 **return new** TextPipeline<>(pipedProcessors);  
 }  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** TextPipeline<X, Y> extract(TextPipelineExtractor<X, Y> extractor) {  
 extractor.setTextProcessor(**current**);  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** TextPipeline<X, Y> cacheIn(Function<TextProcessor<X, Y>, AbstractCacheTextProcessor<X, Y>> cacheProducer) {  
 AbstractCacheTextProcessor<X, Y> cache = cacheProducer.apply(**current**);  
 **return new** TextPipeline<>(cache);  
 }  
  
}

The language has only 4 operators: pipe, pipe if, cache in and extract. However, this set of operators is enough to have the pipeline as expression. We will comment on ‘extract’ and ‘cache in’ operators. To understand what ‘extract’ method is, one should come to example of RPN calculator previously described in this chapter. There is a ‘pop’ method there. The issue with pop method is that it breaks the fluent interface. The example is written so to not overcomplicate it. However, within real life we might want to continue the fluent interface while having the intermediate result extracted. This is the purpose of this method – we can define long pipeline however part of this should be used in different places. The second operator required to be commented is the ‘cache in’. The issue is that when we describe what should happen, we do not want the code being executed. It does not exist in the system but say, we want to have a database as a storage system. It will require a preparation to use a database. Where this code should be stored? To avoid confusions and decouple the cache initialization from the caching processor it was decided that this block should come in functional closure. For the simple scenarios it does not add overhead too as it will be shown.

Following examples will show code snippets how it is used. The first example is the initial pipeline both for ROUGE and AutoSummENG processing:

TextPipeline<String, List<String>> initialPipeline = **new** TextPipeline<>(**new** FileToStringProcessor())  
 .pipe(**new** TextToTokensProcessor())  
 .pipeIf(filters.contains(Constants.***LOWER\_CASE\_FILTER***), **new** LowerCaseFilterProcessor())  
 .pipeIf(filters.contains(Constants.***PUNCTUATION\_FILTER***), **new** PunctuationFilterProcessor())  
 .pipeIf(filters.contains(Constants.***STOP\_WORDS\_REMOVAL\_FILTER***), **new** StopwordsRemovalFilterProcessor())  
 .pipeIf(filters.contains(Constants.***PORTER\_STEMMER\_FILTER***), **new** PorterStemmerFilterProcessor())  
 .cacheIn(CacheMemoryTextProcessor::**new**)  
 .extract(tokensExtractor);

This is as simple as it seems. However, it allowed to us setup caching in ‘cherry picking’ manner. Once the initial pipeline is calculated, the needed by us result is cached in memory. (The result is a list of token – please take a look on the second generic parameter of the text pipeline) We might be able to set even file loading to cache after the first processor (which is defined in the constructor of the text pipeline) but it is redundant in the given circumstance since what we really want is a list of tokens.

This initial pipeline is used later in the code in the following manner in ROUGE-N:

initialPipeline.pipe(**new** NGramTextProcessor(rougeNParam))  
 .cacheIn(CacheMemoryTextProcessor::**new**)  
 .extract(rougeNGramXExtractor);

For ROUGE-S the pipeline is continued too:

initialPipeline.pipe(**new** SGramTextProcessor(useUnigrams, skipDistance))  
 .cacheIn(CacheMemoryTextProcessor::**new**)  
 .extract(rougeSGramExtractor);

One should understand that the above DSL is only for the pipeline definition. For example, if lower case and punctuation filters are false but stop words removal and Porter Stemming are true then the described pipelines will look like (Figure 3):




Figure 3.

Summarizing this and partially the previous chapter we want to have a philosophical retreat on the shown above code. While working in industry for a while it is not a secret for software engineers that some ideas are overengineered while others are poorly or completely not engineered. The KISS principle is discussed and suggested in many articles and books. However, what exactly meant is staying unclear for many software engineers (for example, it is mentioned in chapter one (Eric S. Raymond, 2003), but today one can find tons of information on the Internet). For instance, if we take the text pipeline modeling it is clearly understood for one that it is a kind of functional pipeline. Let us try to model it with regular Java methods (functions). We think that when following KISS principle people may come to more or less same design which could be expressed as Java-like pseudocode. In the first part we need tokens:

String loadFile(File file) {}

List<String> tokenize(String text) {}

List<String> convertToLowerCase(List<String> tokens) {}

List<String> applyPunctuation(List<String> tokens) {}

List<String> removeStopWord(List<String> tokens) {}

List<String> applyPorterStemming(List<String> tokens) {}

List<String> getInitialTokens(boolean lowerCaseEnabled, boolean punctuationEnabled,

boolean stopWordsEnabled, boolean porterStemmingEnabled) {

String fileText = loadFile(file);

List<String> tokens = tokenize(fileText);

if (lowerCaseEnabled) {

tokens = convertToLowerCase(tokens);

}

if (punctuationEnabled) {

tokens = applyPunctuation(tokens);

}

if (stopWordsEnabled) {

tokens = removeStopWord(tokens);

}

if (porterStemmingEnabled) {

tokens = applyPorterStemming(tokens);

}

return tokens;

}

Thus, now we need to somehow write design calculations of n-gram and skip-grams. One might suggest that those functions should look like:

Map<String, Integer> calculateNGrams(List<String> tokens, int nGramLength) {}

Map<String, Integer> calculateSGrams(List<String> tokens, boolean useUnigrams, int skipDistance) {}

The dilemma is whether these functions are written correctly. From the one hand they are standalone and just expect tokens as an input. From the other hand how do we express the calculation of the initial tokens before and then run functions that calculate n-grams and skip-grams? We think that design with passing only the tokens is preferable because it decouples n-gram/skip-gram calculations from how tokens are generated. However, even so, we are obligated to have some functions before that will calculate the initial tokens and pass token further. The most interesting part is, first, we should pass the context (all Boolean variables) to these wrapping functions. Second, if we will need to add some addition processing for initial tokens, it, in turn, will require changing of the wrapping functions. Third, where do we put the caching exactly? In n-gram calculation itself, in the wrapping functions? How do we change the caching type smoothly? Even if we are going to externalize the caching, we will have to either pass it as a function parameter or a wrapping context (say, we can put all this code into classes). Eventually, such design will lead to inconsistent spaghetti code in which each change will require additional changes over the codebase (one will put caching in s-gram function, someone else will put it in wrapping functions, etc.). However, one should understand that *this code having a vision of function pipeline* maybe fine as a code for closed system but as a library code ‘it has no chances to live’. The *design within domain-specific language has the same vision of functional pipeline* but it allows dynamicity being straightforward. *The KISS principle says about having non-overengineered code, but it does not propose non-engineered solutions which we tried to avoid*.

## 6.5. DI and IoC

These acronyms stay for Dependency Injection and Inversion of Control respectively. We have given acronyms not by occasion since today one may hear more often about those things in this form than fully pronounced. These principles are de-facto standard of the (software) industry in general. A good description of them could be found in (Martin Fowler, 2005). We will have their brief overview and then will explain how them related to code.

While we (and not only) are saying that they are principle the most important thing it means is that principles do not have strictly defined rules and forms (that is, they are not engineering patterns which have a concrete form, for example). By a set of external signs, we might say whether those principles are followed or not.

We think that various forms of DI principle have been existing from the programming appearing as a human activity. However, intentional and comprehended usage could give truly wonderful results as self-contained, decoupled, testable and independent code pieces. We will use several examples for giving a feeling of what DI is to have better understanding of the chosen approach.

The first example we will take is a C language approach of programming. The C compiler has an ability to split source files into two types: headers and source code. This distinction is not by occasion. In header file we can only declare the set of used functions and/or ‘extern’ variables. However, the concrete implementation can be various. Thus, when linking the final executable file, we can choose what implementation we will use. The dependency (functions or variables) injection (we do not really care how functions implemented) in this case is expressed by linker. The second example we will take from the world of functional programming. While working with higher order functions for collections, higher order function expected to get a function for one element processing. For the higher order function, the function for one element processing is an injected dependency (for instance, map, filter, reduce work exactly in the same way expecting a function as input). Third, and last, example is factory method pattern. While asking factory method pattern by concrete identifier we do not care about how exactly concrete object instance programmed. For code using factory method pattern produced entity is an injected dependency. There are myriads of such examples. *The main principle could be expressed as a pluggable piece of code that could be changed simply*.

Inversion of Control is a form of dependency injection. As well, we will give a couple of examples to give a filling of this principle. Suppose we have an interface for string utility functions (the example assumes the Java language).

public interface StringUtils {

int len(String s);

int isAlphaNumeric(String s);

int[][] calculateLongestCommonSequenceDPmatrix(String s1, String s2);

...

}

public class A {

void someMethod() {

StringUtils stringUtils = new StringUtilsVendorX();

...

}

}

public class B {

void someMethod() {

StringUtils stringUtils = (StringUtils) ServiceLocator.get("veryFastStringUtils");

...

}

}

public class C {

private final StringUtils stringUtils;

public C (final StringUtils stringUtils) {

this.stringUtils = stringUtils;

}

void someMethod() {

...

}

}

Class A in this example cannot be considered a code that follows dependency injection principle (in general). This is because once we would like to change the concrete usage of ‘string utilities’ we will be obligated to change the source code using it. The class B in the example can be considered as a dependency injection entity since actual string utility implementation is externally controlled (service locator pattern is a ‘brother’ of factory with the only difference that service locator does not require returning a concrete type). The class C also follows the dependency injection, but it is also an example of inversion of control. The huge difference between C and B is that B ‘pulls’ actual instance while C is ‘pushed’ by an actual instance. *This is exactly the meaning of inversion of control, i.e. the client code does not control the actual instance – the code just expects that it somehow gets the working instance*.

The design with concrete instances requires code changes on if the dependent code changes. The design with factories and/or service locators has the benefit of being decupled from the concrete implementation. However, it has drawbacks of being dependent on the factory/service locator and asking for the concrete instance. That is, suppose two entities B1 and B2 are dependent on an artifact via a service locator. *For B1 and B2 being able to work service locator must exists*. For testing or composition, it will require either mocking or separating service locators (which in turn brings to ‘monstrous’ constructions as factories of factories or locators of locators that sure do not make a code more maintainable/scalable). As well, if B1 and B2 are dependent on the same artifact separating artifacts for B1 and B2 will require code changes of B1 and B2. Suppose, C1 and C2 are dependent on an artifact but this artifact is injected externally (i.e. control is inversed for C1 and C2). Within inversion of control, C1 and C2, firstly, do not dependent on intermediate entities. Thus, no mocking or factories of factories are required. The separation of the common dependency does not require direct code intervention for C1 and C2. However, the drawbacks of the approach are that it supposes an upper entity that will care about composition. The second issue is that if the code should be dynamically requested the C class solution does not meet the requirements (though, such cases are rare in general, but vital in some type of applications, for example, compiler writing require different behavior for different tokens type).

The example of class C is the basis for the modern frameworks for inversion of control dependency injection. For instance, both Spring Framework (<https://spring.io>) and more lightweight as Google Guice (<https://github.com/google/guice>).

The chosen by us approach is similar to those frameworks since DI IoC philosophy has many benefits as it was discussed (testing, granularity and overall application high-level viewing). However, by our opinion the dependency on the framework might be redundant in the library code. The solution for it is simply to define a place a code place as a ‘building kit’.

Such place is a Container abstract class:

**public abstract class** Container {  
  
 **private final** Map<String, Object> **container** = **new** ConcurrentHashMap<>();  
  
 **public** Object getBean(String beanKey) {  
 **return container**.get(beanKey);  
 }  
  
 **protected void** setBean(String beanKey, Object bean) {  
 **container**.put(beanKey, bean);  
 }  
  
 **public abstract void** build();  
 **public abstract void** setConfiguration(Configuration configuration);  
 **public abstract** Configuration getConfiguration();  
}

The class defines three main entities: some storage for the inner entities (‘container’ class field), configuration and the building of container. The purpose of the ‘container’ field is to behave like as service locator. The purpose of configuration is to have some external configuration while building the container. As by now, there is only one concrete instance of container. Though, one can define its own container (actually, this is a purpose of this chapter to explain a flexibility of such replacement).

The second very important class of the platform is the ‘main algorithm’ entity:

**public interface** MainAlgo **extends** Runnable {  
  
 **void** setContainer(Container container);  
 Container getContainer();  
}

Since the interface is a descendant of runnable, it expects to get a container and run the main logic based on this container within the ‘run’ method of Runnable. The run method expected to get some executable instance which could be retrieved through the ‘get bean’ method and executed. (As for today, each metric is exposed as some executable ‘reporter’ entity (i.e. multiple entry points). The why behind is a historical reason. Broadly speaking, it is possible to combine the execution of the container by adding it an executable method. From the other hand the solution will be tightly coupled with the execution)

## 6.6. High Level Architecture

Eventually we have come to the high-level architecture and one that wish to extend the system might be able to do with less effort.




Figure 4.

Figure 4 represents the design of the container and main algorithm described in previous sections. Each reporter is a class that programmed to process one metric. A reporter expects to get:

* Text processors which explained in domain-specific language.
* Score calculators – entities to perform actual comparisons.
* Thread pool to post the score calculation.

### 6.6.1. Concurrency

Although it is possible to have a reporter that will work in single-threaded mode (which within current architecture is pretty straightforward) but one of our vision has been performance of the platform. To achieve this goal, we need to have concurrent calculations – we assume that today the platform will run on multicore CPUs and concurrency is an obvious way for performance. However, we should choose a granularity of each concurrent task. We think the most natural granularity for the platform is each comparison that may return a score to be expressed as a chunk of work. For example, using a reporter as a working chunk could be coarse grained solution. What happens if we want to run just one metric? Although having a granularity less than just one score calculation is possible, but we think it will lead to inconsistency and will be hard for understanding and maintaining.

One of the first things defined in Container are thread pool and ‘arbiter’. Both entities are passed to underlying reporters. The idea of using thread pool is simple:

* Each score calculation is wrapped in reporter as work chunk (AsyncScoreCalculator class in code) and submitted to a thread pool.
* Such submit produce a ‘future’ (an entity that will block until the result of work is not available – the regular Java thread pool implementation)
* All reporter’s futures are collected to list.
* The list is submitted to a thread pool via additional chunk of work – AsyncPeerAllResultsProcessor/AsyncAllResultsProcessor in code (this is done so in order not to block next reporter).
* After all scores of a reporter is processed, it signalizes about its finish via ‘arbiter’

The ‘arbiter’ entity is a kind of mutex which waits till all registered on its entities are done. The idea behind this entity is to know when all reporters are done. The need of this is dictated by the fact that we need to process some results to calculate something based on the all metrics (or part of them). For example, as it mentioned earlier some readability metrics might not have values in interval (FRE, for example). Normalization can be done in many ways, but it is better to have all values of a metric to be normalized. For instance, if we normalize separately readability metrics of topics (i.e. original texts) and metrics produced by machine summarizers we will not be able to compare those normalized values. That is, we need to normalize by all results we get for a specific metric. The step after all metrics are done is called *reducer* (the name is inspired by functional programming – there is a ‘reduce’/ ‘fold’ function there which reduces the list to a one value). As one can guess, reducers are defined in container itself and used in the algorithm after all reporters are done.

We would like to say a note about chosen approach in general. Originally, we would like to use so called ‘stealing pool’. The idea of stealing pool is that it knows about work chunks and some threads, instead of doing nothing, steal the work chunks. We know that it sounds too fuzzy, let us introduce an example to clarify the said. One who has carefully read the last paragraph maybe noticed that reporters’ list of futures is submitted to the same thread pool. Why to do so? Why cannot we just wait on till one reporter is done and then starting the next reporter? This is done to avoid thread pool starvation on the finishing of this list. In the end, we will wait till the last job of the pool is done but other threads will do nothing. Moreover, we need to process the result in some manner – we need to combine all results and save to disk, the thread pool is idle in this time too. Thus, if we post combining and further processing of the results, we avoid the pool starvation. However, the issue with such approach is that the thread pool should be bigger than the number of reporters because it is possible to have a deadlock (if all thread pool threads are busy by ‘finishers’ there is no place to get the actual job done – the thread pool is blocked forever). Naturally, we are not first who have been thinking about this. More general approach is to have a Fork/Join pool. This is a stealing pool which recursively forking the jobs and joining the results together after all results processed. The idea of stealing here is on the join phase – that is, the joining thread instead of waiting steals jobs from others. The beauty about this pool is in word recursively. If in our case the design is still flat (only reporters fork the task into jobs), Fork/Join pool allows a nested level of fork/join operation. One who is curious enough can look here (Doug Lea, 2000). Java from the version 7 has built-in fork/join pool. The reason why we would not take this approach lies in the implementation details. The huge practical problem that breaks the rainbow theory lies in the fact that Java Virtual Machine is still not an Operating System. How exactly join phase steals the jobs? It should create/use an addition thread to *simulate* stealing. All JVM implementations have a threading model built on top of the real OS threads. Context switching is out of scope of a JVM. However, *the correct implementation requires context switching being a part of the fork/join mechanics*. More on this one can read here (Edward Harned, 2016). It has a big list of reference for one who want to extend her knowledge on the subject. For us, in practice, while trying to implement concurrency within fork/join mechanics the journey ended up by uncontrolled number of threads. This is, in turn, hard to maintain, debug and understand. As well, this may even slow the execution since threads are OS Kernel primitives which are not so lightweight by our opinion and their creation maybe much heavy than a processing of metric comparison. We do not claim that it is totally useless, but we have preferred a manually controlled solution from the above reasons.

### 6.6.2. Immutability

One of issues while going into concurrency is data consistency. From the one hand thread pools almost eliminate explicit control of execution through the synchronization primitives (in case of Java it is either built-in synchronization on monitors – binary semaphores (each of which lives in every object in Java and controlled by ‘synchronized’ keyword) or ‘java.util.concurrent’ package that defines more primitives and constructions). From the other hand, nothing/nobody but programmer controls the data consistency in the program.

More specifically, within wide spreading of multi-core CPU how do we guaranty that one thread on one CPU core will use the correct data of another CPU core? Suppose we had prepared a chunk of work and submitted it into our thread pool. How do we guaranty that a processing thread from the thread pool will get the right prepared data? This is not a fantastic scenario. There could be situation when other thread will get inconsistent data. The issue is fully described in (Brian Goetz, 2006). *One of possible solution is to use immutable data structures. Immutable data structures (following their name) must not change after creation. The new state of object is a new object. As well, designed correctly they should be safe for inter-thread communication*. The overall design is described in (Joshua Bloch, 2018).

For example, let us look on the Score class of ROUGE metrics. Partially it looks so:

**public class** Score **implements** Serializable, ReportedProperties {  
  
 **private final double precision**;  
 **private final double recall**;  
 **private final double alpha**;  
 **private final** Double **f1**;  
  
 **public** Score(**double** alpha, **double** precision, **double** recall) {  
 **this**.**alpha** = alpha;  
 **this**.**precision** = precision;  
 **this**.**recall** = recall;  
 **double** factor = (1 - alpha) \* precision + alpha \* recall;  
 **if** (factor > 0) {  
 **f1** = (precision \* recall) / factor;  
 } **else** {  
 **f1** = **null**;  
 }  
 }  
  
 **public** Score(**double** precision, **double** recall) {  
 **this**(***DEFAULT\_ALPHA***, precision, recall);  
 }  
  
 **public double** getAlpha() {}  
  
 **public double** getPrecision() {}  
  
 **public double** getRecall() {}  
  
 **public** Double getF1Measure() {}  
}

This class fulfills requirement of being immutable. No member of the class instance can mutate after its initialization. As well, ‘final’ keyword on class members forces immutability within the object itself (‘final’ keyword has a special meaning in JMM – Java Memory Model in general that really makes the object immutable for cross-core CPU passing. One interested on subject could look for more information for so called ‘memory barriers’).

Although the pattern for immutable objects in Java is simple, from the consumer perspective their usage is not so comfortable. Immutable object should be initialized completely by the object constructor. One can see the first object constructor. It expects three double parameters. Within real development remembering of what all of them are could be cumbersome, especially when the number of parameters is not a trivial list. From the other hand having setter methods on the object is impossible (as with Java beans). The solution for that in Java is defining additional layer of abstraction – the Builder pattern. More information is available in (Joshua Bloch, 2018). In two words it is a fluent interface which already discussed which is not immutable but build the immutable object (regularly, this class is an inner class of immutable class). For instance, for the discussed Score it is defined as:

**public static class** Builder {  
  
 **private** Double **precision**;  
  
 **private** Double **recall**;  
  
 **private** Double **alpha**;  
  
 **public** Builder precision(**double** precision) {  
 **this**.**precision** = precision;  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** Builder recall(**double** recall) {  
 **this**.**recall** = recall;  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** Builder alpha(**double** alpha) {  
 **this**.**alpha** = alpha;  
 **return this**;  
 }  
  
 **public** Score build() {  
 **if** (**precision** == **null** || **recall** == **null**) {  
 **throw new** IllegalArgumentException(**"Either precision or recall is not provided."** +  
 **" Both should be provided"**);  
 }  
 **if** (**alpha** == **null**) {  
 **return new** Score(**precision**, **recall**);  
 }  
 **return new** Score(**precision**, **recall**, **alpha**);  
 }  
}

Its usage may look so:

Score score = **new** Score.Builder()  
 .precision(precision)  
 .recall(recall)  
 .build();

For a big list of parameters, it could be a benefit of using Builders.

Summing up this section, we should mention that immutable objects have many benefits and, in many cases, have cross-system influence. For instance, even designing mutable abstract data types with assumption that inner objects will be immutable is much painless and memory consuming than assuming that inner data could change. For instance, all Java collection framework has a weak requirement that it works with immutable types (weak since this check is not forced but assumed). If one pass into, say, Hash Set an object which is mutable and do not care about not changing the object further will have bugs since the object sits in certain bucket of the hash set. Once the object is changed it is (could be) already not belonging to the bucket it settled in, and the hash set will be corrupted. The same is about tree-based data structures. Changing the object which is settled in the tree will not force for tree reconciliation. A tree will be corrupted. Assuming mutability within abstract data types will require either deep cloning or another exotic strategy. By the way, cloning for immutable data types absolutely has no meaning since two objects with identical state are identical. Within some circumstances, equality of two objects can be checked only by checking the object reference identificatory. More information could be found in already mentioned (Joshua Bloch, 2018). The more advanced topics can be found here (Chris Okasaki, 1999) which explains how to construct abstract immutable data structures. I.e. how, for instance, do we construct immutable list? Simple copy strategy for new list state is a naïve strategy. However, one designing a program solution should be careful to not overcomplicate the logic with immutability. Designing a picture pixel matrix with immutable object is an overkill.

### 6.6.3. Convention

By our opinion the topic of convention is underestimated in software engineering. By convention we mean a set of rules/agreements that one should follow. We think that the subject is not so popular in academic researches. However, there is some (weak by us) attention in open source and commercial product worlds. Although one could say for instance object-oriented patterns are convention and have well acceptance even in academic word, but patterns are not convention in broad terms of speaking. If you follow OOP patterns as they are suggested (maybe) you will get an elegant solution for your problem, but it is only your problem and your part. Others are free not to solve their solutions in the same way. Here, by convention we mean almost an ‘obligation’ to follow the same agreements in overall project.

It is not by occasion that we have not call this section ‘code convention’. Although code conventions are important part of the code but by code convention, it is regularly assumed the agreements of how to give names for types, variables, constants, starting code blocks, etc. For the Java language it is strange if the variable contains underscore as word delimiters, but no official code guideline exists as far as we know (The Python language goes further and has an official Python Enhancement Proposal – PEP, which defines the language style – PEP 8). There is a work (Michael Smith, 2011) that proposes following (Java) code conventions as a metric for measuring maintainability.

We think that following common conventions not only in code but in overall structure helps, first, in reducing ‘entropy’. The, second, more important by us thing is to create similarity within all part of the system. *We think that human cognitive properties as repeatability if used properly should reduce the learning curve as well help with understanding*. For example, Java today has almost completely switched to declarative build systems as Maven/Gradle. The heart of those systems is a slogan ‘convention over configuration’. In the simplest form it means the common directory structure for the projects: ‘src/’ for sources and ‘target/’ for binaries output. As well, source directory is structured in the following way: ‘src/main/java/’, ‘src/main/resources/’, ‘src/test/java/’, ‘src/test/resources/’. *Such a small mental shift to convention instead of procedural builds saves now tons of time because whoever familiar with one project in this structure exactly knows what to expect in another project without any need to learn the actual build pipeline*.

We have taken it is a good practice. The source code packages are defined in the same structure. The project source code is split into two parts: ‘core/’ and ‘concrete\_metric/’. Core contains (abstract) entities which already discussed as processors, reporters, etc. It also contains other things for GUI, statistics and so on. Concrete metrics contain the metric related implementations of discussed entities. Figure 5 shows the high-level package structure.




Figure 5.

Figure 6 shows the structure of core sub package.




Figure 6.

The most things are already familiar to one who has read previous section. Utilities directory is an unavoidable directory which either contains some common functionality that should be used by concrete topic or an entity that hard to decide about classification.

On Figure 7, one can observe the ‘proof’ of said – concrete metrics are mimicking the core. If one in a future would like to extend the library. We suggest him to follow the convention. (‘elena’ sub package stays with that name because of historical reasons. This package is responsible for readability metrics implementation)




Figure 7.

In the end of this section we want to suggest a book (Donald A. Norman, 2013) that is not related to programming. It is related to design of things in general. The design of source code in many aspects more an art and experience than science (a computer does not care about directory structures – this information helps people). The design of surrounding us things in many cases can be an inspiration for the code design (at least reducing the number of strange, sometimes even scary or ridiculous places in code).

## 6.7. Platform as Library

The project has the open source code. The amount of the source code has a nontrivial volume. Instead of trying to have every feature and class to be described we have given a conceptual overview for chosen design. We think that a one willing to use the project as a library or even to extend it in some manner will be able to do so with almost no effort because of explanations given above. We think that the project has a straightforward design. The pipeline definition of domain-specific language either allows the definition of custom pipelines in comfortable and easy manner or, if somebody would like to define additional operators she could do it easily too. We also think that IoC approach allows to see overall code structure in one place and it should not be an issue to understand how inner parts work. As well, concurrency and immutability should not scare away since they are explained too. After all, the convention principle that we tried to follow should allow faster understanding of different parts of the system. Eventually, we tried to describe the design of foundation that will allow easy navigation and understanding of source code which by our opinion is not hard to understand and extend because of chosen design principles. With all said above, one can follow the container definition of the platform and follow the steps described in project report to use the platform as library.

# 7. Analyzing Metric Results

## 7.1. Overview

Although the full explanation about platform usage is available in the user manual, but one of the valuable features of the platform which cannot be bypassed in project report by our opinion is result analyzing of metric evaluation. This feature is vital in the platform and allows graphic visualizations and table representation for further data understanding and analysis.

Figures 8 and 9 show the screen for result analyzing.




Figure 8.




Figure 9.

As one can see the internal area is divided into three categories.

* System
* Topics
* Result Actions

Each section is a logical set of features. “System” section is responsible for analyzing results for summaries generated by summarizing systems. “Topics” section is responsible for analyzing metrics related to topics (i.e. original documents) themselves (currently there are only readability metrics). “Result Actions” section is a utility section that allows saving metrics in more programming language friendly format.

## 7.2. System Section

System section is divided into selection of concrete metric from a metric family, sections of output configurations and the desired output type selections.

*The platform does not require to select only metrics from the one metric family*. For instance, one can select part of metrics from ROUGE, readability and/or AutoSummENG for further investigation.

There are four available output types:

* Table
* Bar Chart
* Statistics
* Notched Box

Each output button opens a non-modal dialogue window (non-modal means not blocking the main window – it is a design decision to allow multiple window with data being available on the screen).

Suppose, we have selected metrics as it shown on Figure 10. The table output will be shown as a dialogue window as it appears on Figure 11. The bar chart for selection is presented on Figure 12. For table it is possible to sort data for each column and/or move columns to desired location. However, *the resolution for table and bar chart is the average value for concrete metric of all summaries per system*. For deeper resolution and statistical analysis there are “Statistics” and “Notched Boxes” views.

We think it could be useful feature for a researcher to save both bar charts and notched boxes in graphic files. In order to be not dependent on pixel resolution the platform can save both in vector file format. We think, the wide available option today for vector graphics format is the SVG format. Thus, one can save it via letting the mandatory fields for the file “Chart/Graph to File” subsection on the screen. Figure 13 shows the possible configuration when the Figure 14 shows the result in Chrome browser used as an SVG file viewer.

‘Statistics’ and ‘Notched Box’ are primarily designed to allow a deeper statistical analysis of one concrete metric. However, it is possible to use select number of metrics. No validation on multiple metric selection exists. We think sometimes it is even useful to see comparison for the metrics in one place (especially within notched boxes, there will be an example further).

‘Statistics’ button performs:

1. Calculating the one-way ANOVA test with level for Studentized Range Distribution.
2. Further Tukey HSD test in order to find significantly different means and grouping them.

HSD Test compares two meaning of set of values and shows whether two sets are significantly different from each other or not. Thus, one can imagine that all comparisons could be represented as triangular binary matrix with zero value if two meanings are significantly different and 1 as the opposite. However, looking on such representation is very hard for humans to understand the overall picture of grouping. *Grouping with the letter representation gives an immediate view whether two sets are not significantly different if they share the same letter*. However, this ‘small’ detail of converting the binary matrix to letter representation is not a trivial task. There is a work that explains an algorithm how to transform the discussed matrix into letter representation (Jens Gramm, 2006). We have done a deep research, but we were not able to get the pretty-tabulated letter groups as it shown on Figure 15. According to our research (which for sure is incomplete) the only library that can do that is ‘agricolae’ which is available only in R language. Thus, because of our wishes to have such pretty-tabulated groups we were obligated to create an interoperability with the R language. For one which is interested in how to transform the matrix to pretty-tabulated groups it could be a useful task to understand and document this transformation. It is a real lack of information to understand the underlying mechanics.




Figure 10.




Figure 11.




Figure 12.




Figure 13.




Figure 14.




Figure 15.

## 7.3. Notched Box Plot

Notched box plots are widely used technique to display data sets. As one of our challenges to provide a useful tool for a researcher we would like to combine the pretty-tabulated groups for Tukey HSD test. There is a library in R language called ‘glht’ which can render letter groups within notched box plot however those groups are not pretty-tabulated. We are not aware about existence of the tool that can render groups with the notched boxes. Thus, for us it was an opportunity for one step forward to allow such analysis. As well, researcher can use the graphical output to avoid duplication of notched boxes and table output. The resolution of the notched boxes is almost the same as tables – it has first quantile, median, second quantile and null hypothesis test with approximate 95% confidence.

As well, we would like to combine the notched box plots with one dimensional jittered scatter plot. One dimensional jittered scatter plot nicely shows the data distribution. Combination with notched box plots (and HSD Test letter groups) might give a good statistical tool.

The notched box plot is rendered by pressing ‘Notched Boxes’ button. Configuration of notched box output is available through the ‘Notched Box Configuration’ section. Figure 16 shows notched boxes without jittered scatter plot and letter groups (red big dots are notched box outliers). Figure 17 is the same metric drawing but with groups enabled. On Figure 18 jittered scatter plot is added. When more than one metric is added to notched boxes (to see overall metrics correlation) it is useful to distinct what metric are. This can be achieved by selecting ‘Full Metric Legend’. The example is shown on Figure 19.




Figure 16.




Figure 17.




Figure 18.




Figure 19.

## 7.4. Topics Section

The topics section is for metrics that use the original documents as a source for comparison. As it was mentioned by now those are only readability metrics since the idea is to see how much readability is affected by the concrete automatic summarizer. Maybe a summarizer even improves readability which definitely could be considered as a benefit. The section as with ‘System’ is split into three parts: metric selection, output configuration and output options (buttons) as on Figure 9. In ‘Topics Readability’ a user should select interested metric. In ‘System’ sub section she needs to select an appropriate system for comparison for this metric. ‘Table’ and ‘Topic vs. System Summary’ has almost the same meaning as ‘Table’ and ‘Bar Chart’ in ‘System’ section. The difference is that original average value of source documents is always added. Bar chart from ‘Topic vs. System Summary’ can be saved as an SVG file in the same manner as it is for ‘System’ section.

## 7.5. Metric Heat

To see the overall picture of how a summarizing system behaves user can use the ‘All Metrics Avg Heat’ (user may select nothing, since it is an overall picture). As the result, the table with colored cells shown, Figure 20. Each cell is colored proportionally to difference from average of summarizing system to an average value of topic (i.e. ). The proportion is mapped in calculated in the next way:

1. According to Table 2 it is decided how to consider the concrete metric difference.
2. The green color is treated as improvement. The red color is treated as degradation. As much a color closer to white color as less difference it has from the topic (original document) value.
3. The ‘most’ green/red color is getting to most far (max/min) value for the concrete metric value (for example, noun ratio). That is, the color palette is calculated per each row in the table.

If it is desired to know the difference in deeper level – how a summarizing system behaves per concrete document, user can use the ‘Metric Heat’ output (but one concrete metric should be selected). Figure 21 shows the possible result (Normalized average sentence length is selected. Last Avg row is identical to row of all average results).




Figure 20.



Figure 21.

# 8. Experiments

## 8.1. Description

As an experiment we decided to run the platform on DUC 2002 (Document Understanding Conference) dataset for single document summary extraction with word length of 100 words. There are 3 real summary systems and 1 is dummy. The first one is a MUSE system (Marina Litvak M. L., 2011). The second system is POLYTOPE (Marina Litvak N. V., 2012) and (Litvak Marina, 2013). The third system is OCCAMS (Sashka T. Davis, 2012). The dummy system is limited number of random words. Following are configuration of the systems.

* MUSE
  + Word limit: 100
  + NER Tagging: No
  + Anaphora Resolution: No
  + Used model: Training is done on DUC 2002 dataset
  + Selected features: All
* POLYTOPE
  + Word Limit: 100
  + NER Tagging: No
  + Anaphora Resolution: No
  + Used Function:
    - Maximal Weighted Term Sum (), POS\_F
  + Compression: No
* OCCAMS
  + Word Limit: 100
  + Weight of Terms: k = 200
* Random Words:
  + Word Limit: 100

Platform configuration:

* Text Preprocessing
  + Punctuation
  + Stop words
  + Porter Stemming
* ROUGE
  + ROUGE N: N grams of length 1, 2 and 3
  + ROUGE S: Skip distance of length 4 + Unigrams
  + ROUGE L
  + ROUGE W
* Readability: Both peers and topics
* AutoSummENG:
  + Words (Min: 1, Max: 4, Distance: 2)
  + Chars (Min: 1, Max: 4, Distance: 2)

We will not present all variety of results produced by the platform. In general, we will present a graphical information given by the platform and will give some high-level conclusion.

## 8.2. ROUGE Results

### 8.2.1. ROUGE N1 - Precision




Figure 22.




Figure 23.

### 8.2.2. ROUGE N2 – Precision




Figure 24.




Figure 25.

### 8.2.3. ROUGE W – Precision




Figure 26.




Figure 27.

### 8.2.4. ROUGE SU4 – Precision




Figure 28.




Figure 29.

### 8.2.5. ROUGE N1, N2, W, SU4 – All Averages




Figure 30.

### 8.2.6. High Level Conclusions

Since the main goal of this report is not a deep research of an automatic summarizer but rather just a giving an overview that the developed by us platform is valuable for the research in general, we will give conclusions from the point of view of the platform features and only touch some obvious results about the summarizing systems themselves.

The first conclusion that we want to mention is that the extended notched box is very valuable feature because data distribution and grouping are immediately seen from a plot. As well, it was not mentioned in the document itself but jittered plot on the shown pictures points that the distribution of the data is a normal distribution (as it already was mentioned graphical tools do not prove anything, they are just give an impression for the right direction – jittered scatter plot do not prove the normal distribution of the data, but human eye can definitely determine such tendency). The second impression about normality of the data is that averages are almost similar to median of the data (median is the inner line of box plot – in notched box plot it is line where notches come from). The overall averages per summarizing system give an impression how systems behave within multiple metrics.

The conclusions about the system themselves are following. First, OCCAMS, MUSE and POLYTOPE do not produce random data. It is directly seen from the groups in notched box plot. Although for the ROUGE N1, POLYTOPE is concluded to be in the same group as random words, but we think that the ROUGE N1 is problematic measurement in such comparison because it shows the number of co-occurrences of a single word. ROUGE N2 results directly depicts the assumption – immediate drop of random words’ result. Additionally, it may be concluded that OCCAMS, MUSE and POLYTOPE are different. We do not try to claim what system is better, the advantage of such immediate grouping is that it shows that systems are not same.

## 8.3. AutoSummENG

### 8.3.1. Char Overall Similarity




Figure 31.

### 8.3.2. ROUGE N1, N2, W, SU4, AutoSummENG Char Overall Similarity – All Averages




Figure 32.

### 8.3.3. High Level Conclusions

As with ROUGE the AutoSummENG shows the similar result while dividing the distributions into groups. That is, all the automatic summarizers are in different groups (i.e. it shows that they behave differently). As well, Figure 32 gives an impression about correlation among the results in general, i.e. there is a correlation among the distribution (to prove that one should perform a statistical correlation, however it is proved in related articles about these metrics – AutoSummENG is correlated to ROUGE and ROUGE is correlated to human judgements; this has been explained in section 4.2). We would like to give some note about the notched box plot and jittered scatter plot together – although, it is weakly related to the project report itself but since there are many data results for each distribution () it becomes clear what outliers mean in the notched box plot (big red dots on the plot). These outliers show (give impression) what results are out of normal distribution. We think that it is immediately seen for human eye in Figure 31.

## 8.4. Readability

### 8.4.1. All Averages Metric Heat

| Metric | MUSEPERDOC100 | OCCAMS100 | POLYTOPEPERDOC100 | RNDWRDPERDOC100 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| averageSentenceLength | 7.1687 | -4.2205 | -1.328 | -2.0826 |
| averageSentenceLengthNormalized | 0.0293 | -0.0172 | -0.0054 | -0.0085 |
| averageWordLength | 0.0632 | -0.1043 | 0.0063 | 0.0145 |
| averageWordLengthNormalized | 0.0087 | -0.0144 | 0.0009 | 0.002 |
| fleschReadingEase | -10.1753 | 4.8483 | 2.9347 | 1.34 |
| fleschReadingEaseNormalized | -0.0264 | 0.0126 | 0.0076 | 0.0035 |
| nounRatio | 0.0155 | 0.0086 | 0.0058 | 0.0059 |
| pronounRatio | -0.0051 | -0.0069 | 0.0056 | -0.0017 |
| properNounRatio | 0.0091 | 0.0041 | 0.0134 | -0.0038 |
| uniqueProperNounsRatio | 0.0341 | 0.026 | 0.029 | 0.0264 |
| wordVariationIndex | 13.2423 | 4.4511 | 5.0901 | 18.1546 |
| wordVariationIndexNormalized | 0.0713 | 0.024 | 0.0274 | 0.0978 |

Table 3.

### 8.4.3. Deeper Metric Heat Analysis

In Appendix A we present results for 3 selected readability metrics for deeper analysis. By deeper analysis we mean the ability to get the right direction for the further statistical analysis.

### 8.4.4. High Level Conclusion

Looking on Table 3 one can see that the readability of MUSE is somewhat suffers while extracting a summary (again, we do not try to give any judgement for the concrete system – we want to show that it is possible when using the platform to understand the common tendency of the system in somewhat quick manner). On the other hand, POLYTOPE improves readability in 5 metrics out of 8. OCCAMS, in turn, shows the best result in our opinion. We do not consider random words because it does not have a much meaning, since the results are random and by our assumption are not repeatable (i.e. in the next experiments it can show other results, while the real systems become stable).

While experimenting with readability metrics we think that it is not only useful for just concluding whether readability improved or suffers within a selected automatic summarizer, but also it can show the tendency of the summarizer in general if underlying mechanics of the metric is understood.

For instance, we took the Flesch Reading Ease metric. First, the metric average does not really show the common tendency of the summarizer. While looking on the table for the metric in Appendix A it is clearly shows the tendency of MUSE summarizer to produce summaries with worse results than original texts (one can see that almost all summaries are “red” – the FRE is decreased). However, the underlying mechanics of the FRE include two parameters within the metric (section 4.3). Both word length and sentence length are considered. Thus, we can assume that MUSE prefers to select longer words as well as constructing and/or selecting longer sentences. While looking on metrics for average word length and average sentence length it gives an impression to be true even without deep diving into results for original texts (without publishing these results, MUSE average sentence length looks the same “red” as for sentence length).

Another tendency of MUSE that could be seen from Appendix A for noun ratio metric is that it extracts more nouns than in original texts. However, the situation is not simple, because while looking on the results of proper nouns ratio – it has an impression that MUSE prefers the proper nouns than just nouns. We think, it is a good sign for the automatic summarizer since higher proper nouns ratio says that the MUSE compresses the main idea well. The same could be said about POLYTOPE system that has even greater average (0.0134) than MUSE (0.0091). As well both systems demonstrate good results for unique proper nouns (depicted in Table 3 averages). Thus, it may be concluded that systems make the main idea of the texts even more compressed and understood in average (since unique proper nouns give an impression about the described event in text). However, although OCCAMS shows good results in general, but the average ratio of proper nouns is minimal within all systems (0.0041).

While continuing thinking about relation between nouns and proper nouns, we think that OVIX metric (word variation index) should be also considered when talking about measuring automatic summarizers. As it already mentioned in 4.1, the reason of this metric is how much the idea is compressed in a text. Thus, it is vital for a summarizer having this metric higher than original text. One could see that MUSE system has a highest value among the systems (13.2423) while POLYTOPE (5.0901) and OCCAMS (4.4511) are somewhat similar (however, the better value for comparisons are the normalized values which one can extract from Table 3.). Thus, despite of the tendency of MUSE for long words and long sentences it has a high idea compression in general (OVIX and proper nouns versus nouns).

Anyways, as we already have mentioned, one should be careful to have conclusion just based on the metrics’ heat because it may point on the further direction of a conclusion and proof but not being the proof. More statistical analysis is needed to make conclusion. However, we think, as a tool that could help even realize what conclusions a researcher could come to, metric heats and overall surface analysis for readability are very valuable.

# 9. Conclusions

Today computers have come to almost every field of human activity. However, there are still many too specific and special fields in which automation is not the case. Of course, it is possible achieve all the discussed above by using the more generic tools and programming languages, but we think the time has a crucial meaning. Preparing even tens of scripts and integrating among them require a much time and skills. Clearly, that the person who is interested today in summarization is exposed to programming in some level, but even for her, writing these scripts is not a main goal eventually.

We have tried to create a tool which will be a short cut to achieve the main goal. We have tried to create a platform which will not look inside as a ‘spaghetti’ code and it will be hard to understand relation among the components with further extension. By our opinion, not only the final result but the code itself has a meaning allowing easy reuse and extensions. Therefore, a big part of entire report is related to code internal structure and design. However, we are not able to describe all the code. Many things are omitted. All GUI related code stuffs are not presented. We have given a direction in which the code is written. As well, we think that the code design fundamentals are orthogonal and have relatively short learning curve.

From the high-level perspective – user GUI program use, we provide a tool that helps for understanding summarizing systems’ behavior and quality without being too overloaded. Although it is possible to use more charts and outputs, but we think that we have achieved a goal when user can have a comparison, understanding a data set dynamic and having statistical tests. Thus, a researcher can have an idea about summarizing systems with less effort and may easily save these results for further usage.

As the section of experiments shows it is possible to have directions of what a researcher may want to prove just basing herself on visual analysis. As well, statistical analysis of HSD groups directly shows whether systems behave similarly or not within extended notched box plot. Additionally, surface readability metrics show their viability while analyzing a concrete system. They do not only show whether the text is improved or not but what is more important they show the common tendency of an automatic summarizer how good it expresses the main idea of the text – metrics based on text comparison simply do not give such resolution.

The platform, being a solution, is not a product in broad sense. We understand that it is incomplete in many aspects. We understand that the number of metrics is somewhat poor. More metrics are required. The GUI part by our opinion is too much coupled with current metrics and needs to have pluggable architecture. The codebase should be separated to modules (for example, notched box plot has nothing common with ROUGE metrics, but it exists in the same codebase). More chart and plots are required, and they should have a scriptable manner as R language ‘ggplot2’ library.

Having critique ourselves, we still believe that even a small step as some solution is better than nothing, but for further development to become a mature product in its niche more research and work are required.

# References

Brian Goetz, T. P. (2006). *Java Concurrency in Practice.* Addison-Wesley Professional.

Chin-Yew Lin, E. H. (2003). Automatic Evaluation of Summaries Using N-gram.

Chris Okasaki. (1999). *Purely functional data structures.* Cambridge University Press.

Debian. (2019). *The Computer Language Benchmar Game*. (Debian) Retrieved March 2019, from https://benchmarksgame-team.pages.debian.net/benchmarksgame/

Donald A. Norman. (2013). *The Design of Everyday Things: Revised and Expanded Edition.* Basic Books.

Doug Lea. (2000). A Java fork/join framework. *Java Grandle*, 36-43.

Edward Harned. (2016, July). *A Java Fork-Join Calamity*. Retrieved from http://coopsoft.com/ar/CalamityArticle.html

Elena Lloret. (2008). *Text summarization: an overview.*

Elena Lloret, T. V. (2019). Are Better Summaries also Easier to Understand? Analyzing Text Complexity in Automatic Summarization. In *Multilingual Text Analysis: Challenges, Models And Approaches* (pp. 337-371). World Scientific.

Eric S. Raymond. (2003). *The Art of UNIX Programming.* Addison-Wesley.

George Giannakopoulos, V. K. (2009). N-gram Graphs: Representing Documents and Document Sets in Summary System Evaluation.

Giannakopoulos, G. K. (2008). Summarization System Evaluation Revisited: N-Gram Graphs.

Grady Booch, R. A. (2007). *Object-Oriented Analysis and Design with Applications, Third Edition.* Addison-Wesley.

Jens Gramm, J. G.-P. (2006). Algorithms for Compact Letter Displays:Comparison and Evaluation.

John M. Chambers, W. S. (1983). *Graphical Methods for Data Analysis.* Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Joshua Bloch. (2018). *Effective Java, 3rd Edition.* Addison-Wesley Professional.

Leonidas Tsekouras, I. V. (2017). A Graph-based Text Similarity Measure That Employs Named Entity Information.

Lin, C.-Y. (2004). ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries.

Litvak Marina, N. V. (2013). Multilingual multi-document summarization with poly2. *Proceedings of the MultiLing 2013 Workshop on Multilingual Multi-document Summarization*, 45-49.

Marina Litvak, C. A. (2015). HEADS: Headline Generation as Sequence Prediction Using an Abstract Feature-Rich Space.

Marina Litvak, M. L. (2011). A new approach to improving multilingual summarization using a genetic algorithm. *Proceedings of the 48th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, (pp. 927-936).

Marina Litvak, N. V. (2012). Polytope model for extractive summarization. *KDIR*, 281-286.

Martin Fowler. (2005, June 26). *InversionOfControl*. Retrieved from https://martinfowler.com/bliki/InversionOfControl.html

Martin Fowler, R. P. (2010). *Domain-Specific Languages.* Addison-Wesley Professional.

Michael Smith, B. G. (2011). Code Convention Adherence in Evolving Software. *27th IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM)*, (pp. 504-507).

NIUT. (2013, September). *MorphAdorner*. Retrieved from http://morphadorner.northwestern.edu/morphadorner/

Oracle. (2019). *Java SE HotSpot at a Glance*. (Oracle) Retrieved March 2019, from https://www.oracle.com/technetwork/java/javase/tech/index-jsp-136373.html

Paul Ralph, Y. W. (2009). A Proposal for a Formal Definition of the Design Concept. In L. P. Lyytinen K., *Design Requirements Engineering: A Ten-Year Perspective, vol 14.* Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Sasaki, Y. (2007). The truth of the F-measure.

Sashka T. Davis, J. M. (2012). OCCAMS--an optimal combinatorial covering algorithm for multi-document summarization. *2012 IEEE 12th International Conference on Data Mining Workshop*, 454-463.

Standish Group. (2014). *CHAOS Report*. Retrieved from Project Smart: https://www.projectsmart.co.uk/white-papers/chaos-report.pdf

Stanford. (2019). *Stanford CoreNLP*. (Stanford) Retrieved March 2019, from https://stanfordnlp.github.io/CoreNLP/

Thomas H. Cormen, C. E. (2002). Introduction to Algorithms, Second Edition. In *Introduction to Algorithms* (pp. 350-356). The MIT Press, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

TIOBE. (2019). *TIOBE Index*. (TIOBE) Retrieved March 2019, from https://www.tiobe.com/tiobe-index/

# Appendix A

Experiments – Flesch Metric Heat

| topic | MUSEPERDOC100 | OCCAMS100 | POLYTOPEPERDOC100 | RNDWRDPERDOC100 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AP880217-0100 | -8.0797 | -2.6585 | 3.4878 | -3.2588 |
| AP880228-0013 | -8.0457 | 7.6412 | -3.0163 | 12.0861 |
| AP880228-0097 | -10.3993 | 7.2715 | 6.5577 | -1.6581 |
| AP880310-0062 | -5.1154 | -2.7051 | 4.5676 | 4.4152 |
| AP880314-0110 | -19.3286 | 8.0054 | -4.908 | -0.8304 |
| AP880324-0193 | -20.8582 | 17.8286 | -4.2608 | 0.7879 |
| AP880325-0239 | 2.5217 | -8.4024 | -0.7906 | -11.2205 |
| AP880328-0206 | -11.859 | -10.0973 | 33.7623 | 10.4661 |
| AP880428-0041 | -11.6345 | 25.3132 | 12.3641 | 4.7001 |
| AP880508-0070 | -14.5715 | -14.5631 | -0.2978 | 1.0464 |
| AP880512-0096 | -4.3519 | 8.0703 | 7.6635 | -7.1588 |
| AP880512-0157 | -11.6954 | 4.218 | -0.8925 | 4.5033 |
| AP880521-0088 | -5.8859 | -3.5465 | 17.9416 | -3.7126 |
| AP880622-0184 | -10.6969 | 3.2171 | -2.8662 | 9.2573 |
| AP880625-0142 | -14.5502 | -5.8687 | -2.0669 | -16.1099 |
| AP880711-0056 | -9.0052 | -0.0711 | -13.2274 | -9.0505 |
| AP880711-0221 | 4.1398 | -3.3654 | -2.2502 | -7.1955 |
| AP880713-0121 | -15.5224 | 0.1016 | -2.0518 | 11.965 |
| AP880714-0085 | -7.3508 | -5.5429 | -10.432 | -6.5709 |
| AP880714-0156 | -7.7367 | 0.6899 | -2.9341 | -5.4936 |
| AP880715-0065 | -4.9144 | 7.6169 | -7.5153 | 8.7033 |
| AP880720-0262 | -2.1565 | 1.0259 | 3.7087 | 1.3963 |
| AP880729-0155 | -4.8112 | 3.2575 | 3.2988 | -35.0637 |
| AP880808-0039 | -20.0451 | 7.422 | 7.6394 | 5.3139 |
| AP880808-0040 | -5.4592 | -6.3833 | 4.2541 | -6.6001 |
| AP880816-0135 | -0.7583 | 6.2884 | -10.0633 | -7.7105 |
| AP880817-0040 | -20.0014 | 14.4602 | 8.0037 | 8.0127 |
| AP880817-0124 | -20.7137 | -6.6003 | -9.2523 | -4.0414 |
| AP880818-0023 | -17.0659 | -0.9983 | 10.8282 | 1.9617 |
| AP880818-0088 | -18.2854 | 6.1626 | -5.1788 | 13.2913 |
| AP880818-0226 | -21.7835 | -12.3009 | 3.932 | 8.8152 |
| AP880819-0023 | -21.2696 | 2.3742 | 18.2845 | 10.6628 |
| AP880821-0008 | -5.1109 | 6.822 | -5.5264 | 15.2416 |
| AP880821-0010 | -3.0712 | -0.1192 | 0.8492 | 7.0099 |
| AP880822-0075 | -6.7078 | 11.2479 | 10.7197 | 1.0903 |
| AP880823-0059 | -13.8437 | 20.0552 | 2.2898 | -2.7862 |
| AP880823-0127 | -3.4065 | 11.4626 | 6.5841 | 11.4091 |
| AP880824-0050 | -11.2493 | 1.9065 | -3.7859 | 2.262 |
| AP880824-0139 | -7.2336 | 5.777 | 1.1594 | -2.2246 |
| AP880825-0147 | -12.8869 | 8.5836 | 1.3947 | -2.6595 |
| AP880826-0161 | -18.4392 | 10.6024 | 13.6015 | 4.7944 |
| AP880826-0226 | 0.4605 | -16.179 | 11.1776 | -35.4538 |
| AP880829-0222 | 6.6042 | 2.6073 | 9.4084 | 10.8003 |
| AP880911-0016 | -22.271 | 16.8088 | 10.3985 | -0.2153 |
| AP880912-0095 | -9.5095 | 10.6102 | 2.6213 | -5.2695 |
| AP880912-0137 | -5.1298 | 7.1808 | 7.494 | -29.9746 |
| AP880913-0070 | -9.4863 | 13.0716 | 2.2383 | -0.8188 |
| AP880914-0004 | -21.1231 | 21.1143 | -7.3461 | -0.1348 |
| AP880914-0027 | -12.9706 | 7.6708 | 4.6793 | 1.8401 |
| AP880914-0131 | -7.8314 | 8.675 | -6.6309 | -15.1047 |
| AP880915-0003 | -14.633 | 21.1923 | -7.5001 | 3.7293 |
| AP880915-0066 | -15.7566 | -8.5668 | 4.1038 | -21.0495 |
| AP880915-0142 | -13.2333 | 14.9413 | 9.5822 | -17.0741 |
| AP880916-0025 | -0.8108 | 11.8775 | -2.9994 | -8.8963 |
| AP880916-0060 | -19.8644 | 6.3407 | 8.5858 | -2.1133 |
| AP880917-0095 | -31.4006 | 6.4754 | -11.1535 | 6.9004 |
| AP880917-0096 | -7.9155 | 2.7089 | 6.0062 | -5.6485 |
| AP880917-0157 | -5.9012 | -11.8238 | 6.3179 | 11.4071 |
| AP880921-0201 | -21.1439 | 12.4509 | 6.2909 | 11.5482 |
| AP880929-0042 | -2.8162 | 13.5437 | 7.8525 | 5.462 |
| AP881001-0104 | -20.4607 | -11.3294 | 6.1852 | 1.4496 |
| AP881002-0048 | -12.8423 | 6.9072 | 13.3854 | -11.2412 |
| AP881003-0066 | 4.4438 | 5.252 | -1.5235 | 6.945 |
| AP881020-0157 | -0.3331 | -3.5478 | -2.3507 | 10.6447 |
| AP881025-0196 | -13.1864 | -1.7009 | 9.8524 | 16.9871 |
| AP881027-0051 | -1.7824 | 6.7382 | 1.3456 | 3.9348 |
| AP881106-0062 | -19.1202 | -9.0879 | 9.5096 | 5.6122 |
| AP881109-0161 | 0.1374 | 9.8961 | -1.9973 | 13.9557 |
| AP881110-0227 | 3.5634 | 7.8952 | 8.8202 | 7.3997 |
| AP881113-0007 | -2.2694 | -3.4626 | -3.1436 | 4.2909 |
| AP881114-0006 | -31.9574 | -3.9474 | 7.8509 | -0.136 |
| AP881115-0011 | -23.9369 | 3.7519 | 4.6026 | 13.2855 |
| AP881115-0113 | -25.0607 | 1.9631 | 9.8469 | 14.8329 |
| AP881118-0104 | 0.1132 | -3.9965 | 12.062 | 5.0619 |
| AP881218-0007 | -12.7596 | -14.2578 | 2.4081 | -0.4328 |
| AP890102-0076 | -0.8619 | -0.9754 | 9.6493 | 4.1266 |
| AP890103-0029 | -18.5046 | 0.9481 | 0.8725 | -3.2368 |
| AP890105-0224 | -8.9331 | -7.8571 | -5.9891 | -8.1036 |
| AP890107-0016 | -16.3871 | 4.619 | -5.4906 | 7.9004 |
| AP890107-0039 | -27.1036 | -2.0978 | 7.5235 | 9.6247 |
| AP890107-0119 | -14.9122 | -7.0444 | 11.3924 | -20.7352 |
| AP890112-0071 | -27.9961 | 7.78 | -14.9 | 17.9919 |
| AP890115-0014 | -10.3004 | -8.1784 | 11.1466 | -8.8949 |
| AP890117-0004 | -15.9636 | -3.7171 | -2.7182 | -4.1535 |
| AP890117-0160 | -6.4807 | -4.4425 | 4.9241 | 7.8699 |
| AP890118-0013 | 6.2708 | 11.1709 | 1.7931 | -10.0211 |
| AP890118-0051 | -5.6166 | -5.8586 | 21.5762 | -14.2429 |
| AP890118-0094 | -10.724 | -14.2136 | 12.3206 | 5.4442 |
| AP890118-0100 | -9.7036 | 1.3985 | -4.6982 | 2.2552 |
| AP890119-0266 | -20.598 | 4.2762 | -0.554 | -9.4904 |
| AP890121-0050 | -1.829 | 10.7045 | 6.8761 | 12.0459 |
| AP890121-0123 | -0.1191 | 3.8774 | 3.3027 | 0.1224 |
| AP890122-0087 | -2.923 | -1.97 | 0.0667 | 4.8853 |
| AP890125-0099 | -14.6499 | 3.6898 | 1.3248 | 8.6532 |
| AP890201-0043 | -12.7655 | 5.1085 | -9.1277 | 8.0011 |
| AP890203-0164 | -7.4321 | -9.133 | 0.7757 | 1.3387 |
| AP890211-0110 | -16.8961 | 10.9482 | 24.6567 | 5.7655 |
| AP890224-0003 | 0.3514 | 20.8548 | -0.559 | 5.4161 |
| AP890228-0146 | -18.0767 | 11.9083 | -1.2468 | -4.693 |
| AP890309-0143 | -18.4055 | -6.939 | 15.095 | 4.547 |
| AP890316-0012 | -17.4878 | 9.4428 | 8.7329 | -19.9075 |
| AP890320-0158 | -6.7279 | 6.7174 | -3.0137 | 8.8508 |
| AP890323-0218 | 9.2939 | 5.762 | 15.637 | -27.9123 |
| AP890323-0234 | -20.2203 | 18.0103 | 11.2759 | -7.8829 |
| AP890324-0014 | -14.5979 | -11.3647 | 11.6755 | -16.7851 |
| AP890330-0123 | -11.3229 | -2.9665 | -2.1666 | -6.6441 |
| AP890417-0189 | -0.9764 | 1.9503 | -2.1645 | -0.3628 |
| AP890420-0176 | -6.4113 | 10.2567 | 4.9778 | -5.085 |
| AP890421-0013 | -24.0439 | 9.8046 | 16.1898 | 22.551 |
| AP890421-0062 | -6.3375 | -4.4108 | 19.1395 | 7.5973 |
| AP890421-0186 | -19.1866 | 8.6661 | 5.8426 | 10.6952 |
| AP890422-0035 | -18.094 | -16.4538 | 18.8523 | -3.1375 |
| AP890423-0090 | -1.3592 | 4.0764 | 3.5464 | 8.0496 |
| AP890424-0026 | -11.7789 | 2.4155 | 6.4654 | 2.0673 |
| AP890425-0013 | -11.7949 | 10.4863 | 13.0769 | -1.2563 |
| AP890426-0123 | -25.663 | 3.6658 | 8.4069 | -3.1145 |
| AP890426-0126 | -11.0569 | -7.5681 | 15.8184 | -16.4072 |
| AP890426-0160 | -0.3515 | -4.0832 | 13.7592 | 5.5637 |
| AP890426-0185 | -15.7373 | 3.3844 | 7.1835 | -3.2137 |
| AP890426-0204 | -23.7847 | -11.9064 | 9.1426 | 8.2975 |
| AP890427-0052 | 4.3006 | -5.6747 | 19.3719 | 11.5814 |
| AP890427-0098 | -25.3856 | 10.5567 | 11.3228 | 1.412 |
| AP890509-0040 | 4.2156 | 11.1821 | 9.4533 | 6.7484 |
| AP890517-0106 | -20.9534 | 9.9092 | -6.7068 | 7.392 |
| AP890519-0060 | -14.9518 | -8.9222 | 2.7278 | -13.5605 |
| AP890519-0117 | -13.9873 | 1.4983 | -9.5948 | 14.2585 |
| AP890603-0103 | 2.8762 | 22.5423 | -4.421 | 6.3694 |
| AP890603-0108 | -16.2135 | 11.2017 | 16.6307 | 7.5129 |
| AP890603-0122 | -8.0365 | 6.0586 | 8.2211 | 5.1499 |
| AP890603-0126 | -18.6913 | 5.3706 | 10.9849 | 3.0937 |
| AP890607-0067 | -14.6221 | 16.817 | 8.2229 | -4.6016 |
| AP890609-0036 | -17.8992 | -6.0628 | 1.0044 | 6.3065 |
| AP890609-0094 | -9.6593 | -2.6555 | -0.5557 | 1.0744 |
| AP890613-0125 | -18.1965 | -2.9315 | 9.6143 | 0.4071 |
| AP890615-0263 | -14.8248 | 0.7878 | 15.1885 | 13.2716 |
| AP890616-0230 | -19.2305 | -14.9597 | 2.9006 | 2.5888 |
| AP890622-0157 | -24.7084 | 19.0849 | -9.1641 | -14.8682 |
| AP890710-0170 | -3.8527 | 10.2227 | -0.5048 | 8.5591 |
| AP890711-0223 | -5.3534 | -3.5781 | 15.2594 | -8.4845 |
| AP890715-0076 | -33.1827 | 17.6074 | 22.1893 | -3.0713 |
| AP890717-0149 | 2.4933 | 14.0291 | -8.4692 | 10.2243 |
| AP890719-0248 | 2.343 | -7.2855 | -0.2305 | 7.6191 |
| AP890720-0075 | -3.3804 | -4.9301 | -3.1545 | 2.2604 |
| AP890721-0091 | -4.7696 | 8.3284 | -1.18 | 8.3911 |
| AP890801-0134 | -9.7817 | 12.4273 | 10.0664 | -3.7806 |
| AP890820-0068 | -12.9828 | -5.7703 | -9.3998 | 6.2067 |
| AP890821-0100 | 0.7746 | 8.0348 | -4.1552 | 3.8678 |
| AP890913-0253 | -19.06 | 4.5494 | 9.1334 | -10.2505 |
| AP890922-0007 | -2.5632 | 1.3388 | -7.5305 | -3.3622 |
| AP890922-0049 | 2.5788 | 21.1289 | 3.4444 | 5.9009 |
| AP890922-0071 | -1.2426 | 14.4901 | -0.4765 | -37.375 |
| AP890922-0072 | -34.0909 | 9.8371 | 29.7025 | -7.9556 |
| AP890922-0103 | -16.6523 | -15.8561 | 7.4006 | 2.1714 |
| AP890922-0117 | -5.7843 | 17.9212 | 3.7802 | 6.3264 |
| AP890922-0119 | -6.8391 | -3.5259 | 4.9501 | -10.7583 |
| AP890922-0167 | -18.8771 | -1.7246 | 16.5785 | 7.1331 |
| AP890922-0224 | -2.5972 | -2.9419 | -3.8018 | -9.0442 |
| AP890923-0012 | -17.2112 | -15.6359 | 13.2562 | 12.1332 |
| AP890923-0035 | -18.6728 | -24.1977 | 7.9503 | -5.3443 |
| AP890923-0091 | -12.086 | -10.4547 | 26.0163 | -2.6268 |
| AP890924-0025 | -18.2599 | -7.9788 | 18.4866 | -3.2696 |
| AP890925-0009 | -8.9305 | 20.7668 | 18.4211 | 5.3413 |
| AP890925-0054 | -17.8201 | 3.7806 | 12.9952 | 6.7895 |
| AP890925-0124 | -3.3727 | -8.5705 | 3.0936 | -3.2984 |
| AP890928-0099 | -3.3919 | -9.0949 | 5.3836 | 5.194 |
| AP891017-0195 | -9.143 | 9.6672 | 3.4585 | -18.4557 |
| AP891017-0199 | -18.0224 | 11.7361 | 8.9615 | -2.4958 |
| AP891017-0204 | -15.0043 | 9.2325 | 7.3656 | 1.4703 |
| AP891018-0084 | -15.2513 | -3.976 | 4.0978 | 1.8662 |
| AP891018-0301 | -28.7392 | 1.4166 | -22.1384 | -3.6881 |
| AP891019-0037 | -10.3698 | -1.6504 | -7.5037 | -6.557 |
| AP891026-0208 | -9.0277 | -3.3576 | -6.8231 | -2.3492 |
| AP891103-0200 | -8.5153 | -0.588 | 6.7056 | 1.3216 |
| AP891106-0072 | 0.5865 | 0.6106 | 15.3323 | -36.9839 |
| AP891110-0043 | -17.4489 | 6.6082 | -7.5599 | 4.5376 |
| AP891111-0064 | -15.4829 | 17.0266 | -6.3712 | 12.5957 |
| AP891115-0199 | -5.3848 | 9.3005 | 0.7295 | -37.2495 |
| AP891116-0035 | 2.5019 | -4.5314 | 19.0534 | 6.7253 |
| AP891116-0115 | -0.6141 | 6.9251 | -13.745 | 16.2601 |
| AP891116-0133 | -19.9769 | 7.8404 | 15.9302 | 8.8145 |
| AP891116-0184 | -15.2607 | 0.3718 | -4.0634 | -6.6547 |
| AP891116-0198 | -8.4377 | 12.6044 | -16.5364 | -1.7276 |
| AP891117-0002 | -16.4875 | 12.4995 | 9.6547 | -6.6136 |
| AP891117-0248 | -3.8033 | 6.6041 | -7.0249 | 7.7516 |
| AP891118-0136 | -17.7891 | -8.6564 | 9.3298 | 0.2811 |
| AP891202-0154 | -12.6961 | 0.853 | -4.3123 | 14.6689 |
| AP891207-0158 | -7.1453 | 3.9878 | -7.8679 | 13.7061 |
| AP891212-0062 | -7.9752 | 0.1724 | 8.1523 | -7.403 |
| AP891213-0164 | 1.8905 | -7.9221 | -13.9579 | -13.2607 |
| AP891216-0037 | -14.532 | -3.8402 | 15.8572 | 2.9027 |
| AP891217-0053 | -9.7375 | -8.4418 | -0.6538 | 9.242 |
| AP900102-0114 | -5.2161 | -4.1808 | -3.1702 | -2.565 |
| AP900103-0077 | -14.5087 | -1.3454 | 3.5545 | 11.3665 |
| AP900117-0193 | -11.7828 | 9.4192 | 6.345 | 13.7799 |
| AP900118-0029 | -11.0335 | -4.349 | 4.9507 | -16.9666 |
| AP900118-0183 | 2.4386 | 2.2498 | -15.0362 | -8.055 |
| AP900118-0190 | -14.9793 | 1.1493 | 7.3254 | 8.5262 |
| AP900119-0024 | -35.039 | -13.3522 | 32.6458 | 12.9917 |
| AP900119-0041 | -2.0491 | 1.1064 | 7.5585 | 3.024 |
| AP900119-0051 | -21.8255 | 3.3032 | 23.8153 | -1.3557 |
| AP900121-0039 | -18.7538 | 5.4988 | 18.0664 | -3.8089 |
| AP900128-0063 | -9.604 | -3.8185 | -8.3132 | 0.9754 |
| AP900129-0036 | -7.1038 | -5.2465 | -2.7504 | -4.9627 |
| AP900129-0071 | -3.97 | 3.0464 | -3.7218 | 6.4269 |
| AP900130-0010 | 8.6634 | 10.2195 | 5.7561 | -0.2617 |
| AP900130-0113 | -13.9115 | 30.2324 | 14.2516 | 6.4168 |
| AP900130-0202 | -19.9093 | 9.3795 | -3.2767 | -13.0651 |
| AP900131-0068 | -2.8827 | 5.0743 | 5.3173 | 15.3323 |
| AP900131-0200 | -4.2087 | 8.3429 | 12.0009 | -1.7596 |
| AP900208-0116 | -9.6433 | -13.3751 | -8.5757 | 2.3203 |
| AP900210-0106 | -13.2766 | -1.4689 | 1.7486 | 5.6875 |
| AP900212-0061 | -21.6128 | -19.2823 | 7.8479 | 4.4522 |
| AP900214-0157 | 10.605 | 7.2119 | -11.3206 | 10.6392 |
| AP900215-0013 | -19.4411 | 3.2762 | 1.9689 | 4.3975 |
| AP900220-0065 | -20.616 | 8.7123 | 7.0578 | -0.1557 |
| AP900220-0089 | -17.412 | -1.8595 | 14.5773 | -4.2479 |
| AP900224-0094 | -6.0824 | -3.6075 | -11.2759 | -1.8113 |
| AP900307-0146 | -17.3324 | 0.8849 | -1.4718 | 14.4954 |
| AP900321-0057 | -14.0485 | -14.3372 | -7.2255 | 13.8899 |
| AP900322-0112 | -4.8401 | -9.0851 | 15.738 | -3.4417 |
| AP900324-0081 | -20.5002 | -4.9053 | -0.2508 | 5.1446 |
| AP900328-0128 | -4.0366 | -12.9322 | 11.7103 | 6.1696 |
| AP900330-0086 | -9.7142 | -1.5135 | -0.1626 | 6.9737 |
| AP900406-0164 | -6.0736 | 2.0066 | 0.7065 | 4.1171 |
| AP900408-0059 | -3.7856 | 7.4544 | 2.5381 | -3.7966 |
| AP900420-0006 | -23.6706 | 2.6635 | 6.2339 | -24.0257 |
| AP900421-0075 | 2.7402 | 20.4445 | -3.7961 | 20.3998 |
| AP900422-0032 | 2.732 | 11.245 | 6.4667 | 3.5999 |
| AP900424-0048 | -5.6613 | 17.0071 | -5.5192 | -15.8979 |
| AP900424-0081 | -17.7011 | -12.372 | 2.1883 | 6.9212 |
| AP900424-0096 | -1.2119 | 1.662 | -5.8236 | -10.9648 |
| AP900425-0013 | -3.0734 | -6.5552 | 12.1979 | 2.2774 |
| AP900425-0146 | -16.0634 | 17.7747 | 6.4113 | -2.2032 |
| AP900425-0198 | -6.0419 | 10.7532 | 7.5667 | 10.877 |
| AP900426-0135 | -4.4431 | 5.3917 | 12.1217 | 13.6888 |
| AP900426-0185 | -12.0356 | 5.1161 | 18.0561 | 11.0699 |
| AP900427-0083 | -14.9515 | 4.0339 | 18.3269 | 1.9905 |
| AP900427-0146 | 7.0061 | -1.4549 | 23.7848 | 6.7815 |
| AP900428-0022 | -6.05 | 1.1753 | -5.2932 | -16.2756 |
| AP900428-0050 | -19.1507 | 9.8574 | -0.8046 | -0.848 |
| AP900505-0127 | -4.8631 | -4.8144 | 16.8981 | 5.6181 |
| AP900507-0207 | -1.2962 | 19.0595 | -4.8175 | 15.2238 |
| AP900510-0029 | -14.9885 | 2.0494 | 4.4263 | 11.0928 |
| AP900524-0130 | -8.0549 | 0.5277 | -0.5114 | 5.2381 |
| AP900609-0040 | 1.4275 | -3.1546 | 3.2023 | -0.0843 |
| AP900613-0195 | -3.5182 | -0.2293 | 6.5654 | 3.2916 |
| AP900615-0115 | -2.4004 | 6.8083 | 15.7168 | -0.0544 |
| AP900615-0164 | -12.6386 | -16.0982 | -7.5526 | 9.2373 |
| AP900616-0032 | -22.1051 | -8.4535 | 9.6705 | -14.9183 |
| AP900616-0123 | 0.5619 | 1.5741 | 9.6781 | -5.9733 |
| AP900618-0018 | 4.9649 | 2.461 | 12.7303 | 11.4467 |
| AP900618-0069 | -7.0805 | 9.9142 | -4.4232 | -3.8486 |
| AP900621-0186 | -4.8406 | 13.074 | 0.2998 | -10.4129 |
| AP900621-0192 | -3.2634 | -7.1896 | -0.6788 | -2.9993 |
| AP900622-0025 | 2.2105 | 15.6423 | -6.0706 | 1.3971 |
| AP900622-0080 | -20.0782 | 5.5467 | 24.0718 | -4.5888 |
| AP900622-0087 | -7.639 | -2.3625 | 12.5905 | -4.1378 |
| AP900623-0009 | -16.113 | 18.204 | 6.2203 | -5.3044 |
| AP900623-0022 | -5.3495 | 15.3061 | 7.5048 | -5.9449 |
| AP900623-0119 | -8.6496 | 2.6808 | 1.6804 | 2.2858 |
| AP900624-0011 | -4.6407 | 3.7195 | 5.1332 | -8.7325 |
| AP900625-0036 | -8.7757 | 13.9899 | -6.3887 | 2.3804 |
| AP900625-0090 | -8.5413 | -2.2529 | 2.2624 | 6.6167 |
| AP900626-0010 | 2.4464 | 12.5602 | 6.7197 | -5.9036 |
| AP900705-0149 | -14.4385 | -13.45 | 7.8652 | 6.1744 |
| AP900716-0007 | -13.0435 | -4.6738 | 8.2953 | 3.7117 |
| AP900718-0069 | -14.9583 | -2.2047 | 9.7811 | 11.1585 |
| AP900724-0090 | -1.7399 | 16.4381 | -14.6112 | -17.6459 |
| AP900730-0116 | -7.978 | -0.2682 | -2.8534 | 0.5058 |
| AP900731-0113 | -13.1539 | 9.2948 | -2.9059 | 6.2359 |
| AP900801-0004 | -7.257 | 4.0319 | 3.9758 | -5.5361 |
| AP900802-0057 | -18.6519 | -1.0585 | 5.5349 | -4.3748 |
| AP900802-0077 | -16.9679 | 5.1253 | -0.7207 | 0.819 |
| AP900802-0092 | -4.4136 | -11.3785 | 3.97 | 10.126 |
| AP900802-0135 | -12.8727 | -5.3584 | 9.5704 | 3.3958 |
| AP900802-0159 | -18.2001 | -3.269 | 2.737 | -0.7396 |
| AP900802-0164 | -5.4599 | 12.9687 | -1.6306 | -5.2893 |
| AP900802-0180 | 5.4529 | -1.0813 | 4.9062 | 4.6194 |
| AP900803-0004 | -12.6168 | -7.2691 | 3.6877 | -6.4231 |
| AP900803-0008 | -12.1486 | 2.4891 | 5.0687 | -2.8923 |
| AP900804-0057 | 2.5871 | 0.8011 | 3.0609 | 4.2774 |
| AP900804-0067 | 1.0224 | 1.7869 | 1.2217 | -17.301 |
| AP900805-0019 | -17.6684 | 8.7894 | 4.1964 | -11.9799 |
| AP900805-0060 | -18.4142 | 24.2605 | 17.2141 | 5.4612 |
| AP900806-0077 | -4.1723 | -6.0319 | 3.7953 | 3.067 |
| AP900806-0095 | -6.8538 | 2.7917 | -11.9509 | -12.2977 |
| AP900807-0029 | -7.357 | 2.3528 | 0.4351 | 8.0987 |
| AP900807-0093 | -13.7679 | 17.0571 | -12.0854 | 11.1841 |
| AP900808-0030 | -15.6786 | 14.0745 | 5.8445 | 6.0455 |
| AP900810-0120 | -5.5202 | 9.362 | 10.7526 | 1.9961 |
| AP900821-0092 | -15.9154 | -8.1903 | -16.0063 | 5.7077 |
| AP900825-0099 | -13.0902 | -4.7171 | 6.2477 | -0.2948 |
| AP900829-0044 | -7.8547 | 4.5374 | 5.0649 | -1.2924 |
| AP900919-0122 | 1.7471 | 3.8204 | -14.3005 | 6.771 |
| AP901003-0006 | -1.5962 | 8.3815 | 10.0318 | 10.397 |
| AP901006-0037 | -2.5504 | -6.7544 | 5.2106 | 5.3163 |
| AP901008-0136 | -2.1065 | 17.8612 | 5.4702 | 1.9458 |
| AP901008-0174 | -3.3005 | -4.3273 | -9.4519 | -17.1293 |
| AP901009-0072 | -30.6798 | 7.4148 | 17.6175 | -0.8231 |
| AP901009-0148 | -11.3161 | -2.9445 | 7.9688 | 12.9117 |
| AP901009-0186 | -10.0569 | -0.3549 | 0.2517 | 4.1655 |
| AP901010-0030 | -7.9943 | -1.1803 | 10.9916 | -10.8887 |
| AP901016-0097 | -16.9131 | -18.4632 | 6.0037 | 2.6188 |
| AP901016-0112 | -6.5661 | -1.7554 | -3.228 | 9.8774 |
| AP901019-0072 | -20.22 | 8.9617 | 6.2752 | 9.3625 |
| AP901114-0087 | 8.2406 | -7.4926 | -3.6244 | -1.6602 |
| AP901121-0206 | 10.756 | -6.3588 | 7.0864 | 3.2778 |
| AP901121-0207 | -18.2983 | 4.1339 | -6.4934 | -25.6911 |
| AP901122-0100 | -27.2825 | 3.1208 | 22.6668 | 0.4447 |
| AP901123-0002 | -21.1015 | -2.5929 | 4.256 | 1.2187 |
| AP901123-0062 | -5.4548 | 11.8206 | 11.7458 | 9.769 |
| AP901126-0053 | -5.9018 | -4.9779 | -0.9086 | 5.4899 |
| AP901127-0119 | -11.5082 | -7.5251 | 5.3509 | -0.6643 |
| AP901208-0076 | -13.2015 | 3.0664 | 16.7078 | 4.8473 |
| AP901208-0106 | -12.2931 | 8.4659 | -4.0221 | 16.3086 |
| AP901222-0078 | -4.4513 | 7.0761 | -24.8072 | -12.3847 |
| AP901230-0022 | -4.1664 | 0.228 | -2.535 | -4.5322 |
| FBIS3-13911 | -14.8408 | 7.1111 | 2.9992 | 4.0361 |
| FBIS3-1707 | -12.5643 | -3.74 | 6.7171 | 10.6383 |
| FBIS4-18298 | -20.7731 | 6.6338 | 3.7783 | 2.0379 |
| FBIS4-24776 | -1.5606 | 7.1008 | -17.254 | -6.8498 |
| FBIS4-26242 | 6.6702 | 23.1289 | 1.4258 | -2.9399 |
| FBIS4-26245 | -8.6702 | 35.594 | 8.2379 | -43.6763 |
| FBIS4-26327 | -2.1974 | 6.3374 | 2.2412 | -0.1571 |
| FBIS4-26392 | -17.7029 | 31.2079 | -10.4011 | 9.2603 |
| FBIS4-26516 | -10.029 | 24.3405 | -0.9546 | 7.5146 |
| FBIS4-26532 | -0.5377 | -0.0379 | 3.6558 | 12.2406 |
| FBIS4-26604 | -6.2739 | 31.4849 | 0.4777 | -1.9077 |
| FBIS4-26614 | -0.031 | -7.0872 | -3.0712 | -14.5922 |
| FBIS4-26768 | -28.4656 | 9.2777 | 12.7037 | 29.5339 |
| FBIS4-26769 | -5.917 | -3.0029 | 5.807 | 5.2735 |
| FBIS4-40244 | 1.4107 | -1.2391 | 1.6664 | -13.7842 |
| FBIS4-42027 | -14.0213 | -6.467 | 18.173 | 2.5062 |
| FBIS4-42178 | -1.2908 | -4.2405 | 5.3334 | -2.3655 |
| FBIS4-57796 | -7.5154 | -5.3728 | 5.8008 | 15.8704 |
| FBIS4-62505 | -10.7851 | 5.7076 | -5.131 | -15.0597 |
| FT921-4937 | -10.5722 | -0.9439 | -16.9387 | 18.0487 |
| FT921-5959 | 4.4115 | -1.5603 | -3.3301 | 7.1936 |
| FT922-1115 | 6.7831 | 24.3013 | 10.6547 | -6.6239 |
| FT922-14265 | 2.8763 | 6.3587 | -1.9234 | -35.8074 |
| FT922-2972 | -15.1549 | 13.2649 | 8.7962 | -1.0874 |
| FT922-3446 | -22.7976 | 5.682 | -20.9161 | -8.879 |
| FT923-12122 | -17.4139 | 12.0225 | -6.6215 | -2.1518 |
| FT923-13244 | -6.9957 | 8.7718 | -1.6684 | -33.9992 |
| FT923-3822 | -20.0107 | -3.4928 | 15.8267 | -7.1715 |
| FT923-5068 | -10.2972 | 12.6528 | 3.7217 | 12.0766 |
| FT923-5589 | -9.9969 | 5.5299 | -3.3614 | 6.4043 |
| FT923-5797 | 1.7674 | -0.6413 | 1.2584 | -10.7594 |
| FT923-5835 | -32.3188 | -22.7067 | 9.4399 | 9.1598 |
| FT923-6038 | -19.1852 | -4.3449 | -8.6176 | 6.4668 |
| FT923-6110 | 2.1554 | 20.6734 | -9.241 | 19.3198 |
| FT923-6455 | -3.0186 | -2.0857 | -4.2308 | 20.5946 |
| FT923-6509 | -5.6707 | 5.4978 | -11.2693 | -1.5114 |
| FT923-8765 | -11.2703 | -2.6031 | 8.3696 | 14.7406 |
| FT923-8766 | -19.6601 | -2.9428 | 8.3773 | -7.1312 |
| FT924-10185 | -6.6697 | 3.6683 | -14.0118 | 7.794 |
| FT924-12616 | -7.8328 | 2.6665 | -7.9896 | 5.686 |
| FT931-2858 | -3.1838 | 31.9174 | 14.322 | -7.5739 |
| FT931-2981 | -8.2581 | 2.3998 | 13.6707 | 9.291 |
| FT931-3664 | 0.4761 | -1.1598 | 4.1879 | 1.8408 |
| FT931-3764 | -6.1319 | -2.7899 | -0.8487 | 13.0628 |
| FT931-4176 | -13.878 | -19.6962 | 0.3366 | -1.8813 |
| FT932-15960 | -11.6068 | -2.0762 | 14.6991 | 0.4245 |
| FT932-5869 | -4.2189 | -3.1338 | 3.2012 | 6.0905 |
| FT933-10917 | -18.7162 | 12.3764 | 7.983 | 2.4764 |
| FT933-9536 | -8.7625 | -0.6099 | 3.2844 | 8.8015 |
| FT934-2439 | -10.3587 | -0.8512 | 30.3287 | -16.034 |
| FT941-11518 | -6.7237 | -0.1199 | -2.6608 | -0.842 |
| FT942-12054 | -13.8767 | 11.3662 | 16.593 | -4.2678 |
| FT942-6613 | 1.5618 | 1.3258 | 7.5803 | 10.4896 |
| FT943-178 | 4.4591 | 1.4453 | 2.9977 | 6.4406 |
| FT943-3897 | -25.0391 | -11.0436 | -2.8518 | -16.1574 |
| FT943-5106 | -8.5556 | 3.6152 | 17.2976 | 2.631 |
| FT944-12170 | -21.9562 | 17.0031 | 4.2175 | -0.1327 |
| FT944-16774 | -7.082 | 2.2912 | 2.2086 | -2.2019 |
| LA011889-0131 | -21.0636 | -8.3358 | 13.777 | 2.1666 |
| LA011990-0091 | -13.1588 | -7.279 | -16.1486 | 2.9812 |
| LA012090-0110 | -7.2364 | -5.9801 | 12.8653 | 4.3339 |
| LA012189-0060 | -1.403 | -6.0343 | 1.0815 | 16.3361 |
| LA012189-0073 | -22.2068 | 12.4247 | 7.1213 | 1.5068 |
| LA012289-0055 | -4.6205 | -3.2896 | -5.0072 | 5.8443 |
| LA012290-0036 | -20.5104 | 13.6628 | 5.3405 | -2.1123 |
| LA013090-0161 | -25.3425 | -2.9824 | 39.7903 | -16.0309 |
| LA020189-0050 | -5.1087 | -9.4462 | 11.8761 | -4.4929 |
| LA020190-0038 | -13.6356 | 2.8942 | -4.5462 | 2.1396 |
| LA020289-0065 | -4.1399 | 5.2245 | 0.9209 | -10.0967 |
| LA020389-0041 | -13.0216 | 6.4638 | 2.7165 | -1.1561 |
| LA020489-0035 | -22.6843 | -2.9927 | 9.7014 | -1.916 |
| LA020489-0060 | -7.3714 | -2.5632 | 3.3103 | 2.108 |
| LA020890-0197 | 39.1176 | 68.5949 | -254.889 | 52.5239 |
| LA021189-0003 | -27.2013 | 30.0113 | -8.4144 | 4.5958 |
| LA021190-0179 | -5.6498 | -16.6472 | 7.8562 | -3.1726 |
| LA021190-0181 | -8.1054 | -6.8139 | 1.2768 | 4.197 |
| LA021290-0043 | 13.7891 | 9.3689 | 13.9747 | 7.4992 |
| LA030290-0075 | -6.7766 | -9.0561 | -5.4597 | -0.4352 |
| LA033089-0190 | -15.6769 | 12.1683 | 9.5876 | 2.2681 |
| LA033189-0114 | -5.7768 | 9.6686 | -5.5397 | 1 |
| LA040689-0198 | -6.8109 | -2.6921 | 12.2807 | -3.3301 |
| LA040790-0121 | -12.4786 | 8.4387 | -5.1798 | -24.047 |
| LA041989-0141 | -18.5157 | 1.6682 | 13.3727 | -5.3374 |
| LA042290-0160 | 0.8943 | -0.8737 | -1.1402 | 12.6878 |
| LA042389-0098 | -23.8249 | 22.1345 | 6.0835 | 8.3359 |
| LA042489-0051 | -5.6345 | 0.0863 | 1.7564 | -3.8237 |
| LA042590-0135 | -20.8925 | 20.0532 | 7.9287 | -4.9872 |
| LA042590-0152 | -14.0549 | -3.0503 | -0.337 | -7.4689 |
| LA042689-0146 | -23.2134 | 6.6511 | 13.3679 | 8.04 |
| LA042789-0025 | -27.2136 | 1.6655 | -5.0499 | 6.8126 |
| LA042789-0032 | -24.6146 | -4.5999 | 11.6864 | 4.5504 |
| LA042789-0068 | 2.7777 | 6.0419 | 0.3259 | -29.4127 |
| LA051589-0055 | -4.2183 | 7.3595 | 7.0598 | -24.6528 |
| LA052089-0075 | 3.8018 | 5.2899 | 0.6225 | 11.1665 |
| LA060590-0086 | -6.412 | 8.9926 | -3.1109 | 10.0815 |
| LA061590-0176 | -7.7463 | 7.9945 | 14.3051 | -9.291 |
| LA061890-0066 | -5.6551 | 3.1184 | 16.708 | -2.2713 |
| LA062290-0134 | -6.2413 | 2.5304 | -1.353 | -11.2937 |
| LA062290-0169 | -11.5201 | 18.7894 | 2.8275 | -1.7897 |
| LA062290-0172 | 3.0609 | 5.6787 | 3.5389 | 13.7524 |
| LA062390-0001 | -4.6637 | 12.0063 | 2.2875 | -14.6703 |
| LA062390-0068 | -16.3218 | -16.7863 | 7.1983 | 26.1164 |
| LA062490-0172 | -8.5409 | 4.135 | -5.4983 | 1.6952 |
| LA062590-0096 | -6.2553 | -8.6156 | 0.9461 | -5.6332 |
| LA062690-0155 | -15.0262 | -0.9696 | -5.3436 | 2.9007 |
| LA070289-0167 | 4.6398 | -7.3626 | 13.3959 | 4.2551 |
| LA072689-0050 | 1.6587 | -12.1814 | -20.2523 | 4.2371 |
| LA080290-0037 | -13.2692 | 6.4436 | -3.8098 | 3.5964 |
| LA080290-0233 | -5.8708 | -9.5529 | 17.9258 | 5.0698 |
| LA080390-0085 | -21.0548 | 4.3157 | 0.0041 | 7.2069 |
| LA080690-0111 | -16.3276 | -22.5775 | 2.2422 | 4.7587 |
| LA080890-0078 | -9.5364 | 1.6989 | -1.4193 | -3.1853 |
| LA082889-0067 | -15.5926 | -5.5311 | 1.7614 | -28.8386 |
| LA092189-0225 | -17.757 | 10.7851 | 1.7084 | -2.2331 |
| LA092389-0092 | -5.9997 | 10.9364 | 5.1147 | 6.9676 |
| LA092789-0093 | 9.2148 | 11.7506 | -7.3129 | 4.4625 |
| LA101390-0087 | -24.3898 | -0.6257 | 20.7107 | -4.7376 |
| LA101590-0066 | -18.9315 | -6.6971 | -45.6152 | -19.0064 |
| LA101889-0066 | -18.2794 | -2.1285 | -14.4956 | 9.8173 |
| LA101889-0108 | -6.8653 | 8.2706 | 1.1399 | 2.9632 |
| LA101990-0114 | -38.0609 | -2.944 | -2.116 | -1.1645 |
| LA102089-0172 | -3.1336 | -0.7323 | 12.1922 | -2.3264 |
| LA102090-0146 | -11.8699 | 17.9308 | 1.1904 | 15.9354 |
| LA102389-0075 | -7.2177 | 5.009 | 21.2695 | 1.4704 |
| LA102489-0131 | 5.3285 | 0.4901 | 2.8403 | -0.3405 |
| LA102690-0005 | -6.253 | -6.3653 | -4.158 | -13.1659 |
| LA111289-0035 | -0.7377 | 2.9823 | 10.2922 | -36.5354 |
| LA111689-0160 | -8.6849 | 18.3478 | 20.6133 | 9.0015 |
| LA112090-0165 | -14.0975 | 15.536 | -1.0238 | 11.5691 |
| LA112390-0008 | 4.0249 | 11.1599 | 10.6423 | 16.2107 |
| LA112790-0154 | -22.605 | 1.9007 | -22.071 | -8.2197 |
| LA112890-0036 | -7.2644 | 6.3391 | -2.2321 | 6.4769 |
| LA120189-0122 | -23.3559 | 9.8794 | 6.561 | -4.0327 |
| LA120389-0170 | -16.17 | 0.6222 | 20.0714 | -14.8555 |
| LA120890-0055 | -6.6234 | 26.3686 | 5.3749 | 11.8418 |
| LA121090-0095 | -9.5277 | 10.3852 | 10.596 | -13.575 |
| LA121490-0148 | -13.8277 | 9.5906 | 12.0586 | 12.3024 |
| LA121589-0192 | -5.0457 | -8.1606 | 10.1763 | -11.3599 |
| LA122190-0149 | -15.0695 | -11.0179 | 6.3414 | 16.2786 |
| SJMN91-06025182 | -3.3305 | 20.0575 | 8.249 | -4.2127 |
| SJMN91-06025282 | -50.9984 | 44.2979 | 16.2878 | 41.6711 |
| SJMN91-06044329 | 4.5198 | 24.5724 | 7.3216 | 6.2912 |
| SJMN91-06058250 | -8.0396 | 5.5719 | 3.7064 | 18.2888 |
| SJMN91-06064099 | 12.3235 | 109.6462 | 12.3235 | 32.6558 |
| SJMN91-06069108 | 19.5043 | 56.5518 | -28.9718 | 38.6782 |
| SJMN91-06097121 | -40.9604 | 8.8964 | 16.9913 | -0.189 |
| SJMN91-06105230 | 26.9671 | 50.8283 | -47.845 | 3.7934 |
| SJMN91-06140099 | -52.7262 | 12.7623 | -6.2329 | -0.5083 |
| SJMN91-06145218 | -25.0881 | 16.7606 | 10.7796 | 10.8569 |
| SJMN91-06162032 | -1.7637 | 29.34 | 20.9649 | 19.4585 |
| SJMN91-06163112 | 12.1862 | 53.4147 | -1.4236 | -45.9459 |
| SJMN91-06164210 | -18.662 | 3.3838 | 3.0138 | 16.5878 |
| SJMN91-06165048 | 7.772 | 34.9448 | 23.2976 | 6.4207 |
| SJMN91-06167046 | -25.1372 | 58.2189 | 26.6764 | 9.4123 |
| SJMN91-06171237 | -22.4844 | 13.2694 | 14.2691 | -7.8382 |
| SJMN91-06234048 | 5.9651 | -5.0214 | 5.6861 | 12.346 |
| SJMN91-06234109 | 6.6978 | 17.1587 | 0.8577 | 27.0536 |
| SJMN91-06234209 | 2.538 | 24.2291 | 11.6562 | 22.3941 |
| SJMN91-06235097 | -2.5945 | 14.8326 | 9.647 | 15.6141 |
| SJMN91-06235179 | -94.2318 | 30.7299 | 16.7609 | 26.1797 |
| SJMN91-06235187 | -2.0227 | 8.4606 | 12.3193 | 14.209 |
| SJMN91-06236235 | -5.528 | 21.1804 | -20.1698 | 9.5271 |
| SJMN91-06236241 | -21.2985 | 28.6043 | 9.4067 | 26.3251 |
| SJMN91-06237020 | -24.7209 | 18.3558 | 7.2113 | 16.7004 |
| SJMN91-06238185 | 7.8999 | 24.4455 | 7.6955 | 13.9958 |
| SJMN91-06255336 | -112.1828 | 102.483 | -112.1828 | 71.7321 |
| SJMN91-06255421 | -0.7579 | 15.388 | 4.1206 | 3.32 |
| SJMN91-06255434 | 5.2802 | -0.3072 | -5.513 | -30.2827 |
| SJMN91-06256107 | -2.8717 | 22.0765 | -22.5877 | -7.6169 |
| SJMN91-06256124 | -24.9138 | -1.7716 | 11.1024 | 26.3225 |
| SJMN91-06261053 | 1.1422 | 21.2346 | 28.9521 | -20.1777 |
| SJMN91-06311092 | -78.1808 | 11.9018 | -18.0471 | 17.2357 |
| SJMN91-06312120 | -5.8755 | 20.3047 | -1.7163 | -5.7473 |
| SJMN91-06346032 | 2.802 | 20.164 | -2.7231 | 19.5597 |
| SJMN91-06351097 | -15.2369 | 46.8988 | 46.1668 | 49.1207 |
| SJMN91-06351209 | -9.037 | 3.1709 | -2.6218 | -4.4647 |
| SJMN91-06353190 | 3.1085 | 25.6779 | 0.7264 | 16.9801 |
| WSJ870122-0100 | -7.2355 | -0.2157 | 1.3637 | 14.1737 |
| WSJ870220-0106 | -5.2165 | 15.9793 | 20.5581 | 11.0308 |
| WSJ870804-0095 | -16.6951 | -5.7605 | -3.2081 | -3.9887 |
| WSJ871110-0154 | -5.7961 | 14.946 | -0.9969 | -10.6661 |
| WSJ880412-0015 | 3.7056 | 7.8175 | -1.5492 | -11.4321 |
| WSJ880603-0129 | -14.7703 | -1.3664 | -1.7159 | 16.9512 |
| WSJ880912-0064 | 1.4103 | -10.0294 | -9.1639 | -0.2263 |
| WSJ881021-0008 | -12.0454 | 26.993 | 15.5331 | 9.7135 |
| WSJ890726-0004 | -3.0786 | -2.4961 | 4.5346 | 8.9784 |
| WSJ890922-0113 | -9.378 | -1.8615 | -0.0843 | -19.6352 |
| WSJ890927-0018 | -11.2663 | 18.6877 | -1.4513 | -14.6392 |
| WSJ890928-0084 | -15.7412 | -2.3417 | -7.2208 | 7.8501 |
| WSJ891019-0021 | -12.0103 | -5.9724 | 4.9344 | -1.6725 |
| WSJ891019-0086 | 1.0503 | 15.6249 | -9.4704 | -7.3633 |
| WSJ910213-0136 | -7.6511 | 13.7798 | 4.5026 | 3.8489 |
| WSJ910326-0090 | -14.7575 | 10.2299 | 2.1977 | 4.3255 |
| WSJ910418-0105 | 3.9522 | 15.6506 | 6.4504 | 17.0278 |
| WSJ910418-0159 | 3.9922 | 8.8565 | 7.9161 | -2.3422 |
| WSJ920203-0038 | 4.6826 | 4.2396 | -0.1526 | 6.537 |
| Avg | -10.1753 | 4.8483 | 2.9347 | 1.34 |

Experiments – Noun Ratio

| topic | MUSEPERDOC100 | OCCAMS100 | POLYTOPEPERDOC100 | RNDWRDPERDOC100 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AP880217-0100 | 0.0219 | -0.02 | -0.0626 | -0.0141 |
| AP880228-0013 | 0.0122 | -0.0262 | 0.082 | -0.0092 |
| AP880228-0097 | -0.0334 | -0.0307 | -0.0428 | -0.016 |
| AP880310-0062 | 0.0178 | 0.1029 | -0.0359 | 0.0434 |
| AP880314-0110 | -0.03 | -0.0125 | -0.022 | 0.0069 |
| AP880324-0193 | 0.0488 | -0.0258 | -0.028 | 0.0237 |
| AP880325-0239 | 0.0073 | -0.0335 | 0.1769 | 0.0624 |
| AP880328-0206 | 0.0682 | -0.0644 | 0.0537 | 0.0339 |
| AP880428-0041 | -0.0076 | 0.03 | 0.0808 | -0.0027 |
| AP880508-0070 | 0.0081 | 0.0168 | 0.0123 | 0.0775 |
| AP880512-0096 | 0.0085 | 0.0352 | -0.0531 | 0.0017 |
| AP880512-0157 | 0.0122 | 0.0459 | 0.0574 | 0.0217 |
| AP880521-0088 | 0.04 | 0.0669 | -0.0562 | 0.0124 |
| AP880622-0184 | 0.04 | 0.0008 | 0.0446 | -0.0465 |
| AP880625-0142 | 0.0138 | 0.0398 | -0.0034 | 0.0475 |
| AP880711-0056 | 0.0284 | 0.0194 | 0.0169 | 0.0577 |
| AP880711-0221 | 0.0015 | 0.0568 | -0.0567 | -0.0096 |
| AP880713-0121 | -0.0101 | 0.0208 | -0.0395 | 0.0413 |
| AP880714-0085 | 0.0192 | 0.0439 | 0.0405 | -0.0229 |
| AP880714-0156 | -0.0144 | -0.0042 | 0.025 | 0.0752 |
| AP880715-0065 | -0.005 | -0.0469 | 0.0311 | 0.019 |
| AP880720-0262 | -0.0316 | 0.1019 | 0.0603 | -0.022 |
| AP880729-0155 | -0.0354 | 0.0148 | 0.0674 | 0.1024 |
| AP880808-0039 | 0.0066 | -0.0499 | -0.0806 | 0.0577 |
| AP880808-0040 | -0.0285 | 0.0505 | -0.004 | 0.0237 |
| AP880816-0135 | 0.026 | 0.0175 | 0.0079 | -0.0066 |
| AP880817-0040 | 0.0486 | -0.0378 | 0.0141 | -0.0271 |
| AP880817-0124 | 0.0393 | -0.0054 | 0.0295 | -0.0003 |
| AP880818-0023 | 0.0515 | 0.0269 | 0.0065 | -0.0101 |
| AP880818-0088 | 0.0252 | -0.0303 | 0.0412 | -0.0031 |
| AP880818-0226 | 0.0706 | 0.051 | 0.0816 | 0.0438 |
| AP880819-0023 | 0.0436 | 0.0324 | 0.0273 | 0.0267 |
| AP880821-0008 | 0.0827 | -0.0019 | -0.0007 | -0.0262 |
| AP880821-0010 | -0.0506 | -0.0188 | -0.0003 | -0.0125 |
| AP880822-0075 | 0.0252 | -0.0518 | -0.0365 | 0.0252 |
| AP880823-0059 | 0.0251 | -0.0332 | -0.0132 | 0.0068 |
| AP880823-0127 | 0.0112 | -0.0166 | 0.0557 | -0.0331 |
| AP880824-0050 | 0.0111 | -0.0279 | 0.0362 | -0.0226 |
| AP880824-0139 | 0.0399 | -0.0297 | 0.034 | -0.056 |
| AP880825-0147 | 0.0323 | 0.0254 | 0.0463 | -0.019 |
| AP880826-0161 | 0.0252 | 0.0469 | 0.0427 | 0.0133 |
| AP880826-0226 | 0.0042 | 0.0816 | -0.0084 | 0.0579 |
| AP880829-0222 | -0.026 | 0.0217 | 0.0088 | -0.0153 |
| AP880911-0016 | 0.0253 | 0.0085 | -0.0263 | 0.0137 |
| AP880912-0095 | 0.074 | 0.0847 | -0.0599 | -0.0211 |
| AP880912-0137 | 0.0343 | 0.0089 | -0.0662 | -0.0419 |
| AP880913-0070 | -0.0086 | 0.0474 | -0.0303 | -0.0176 |
| AP880914-0004 | 0.0483 | -0.09 | 0.0126 | -0.0653 |
| AP880914-0027 | 0.0417 | -0.0174 | 0.0076 | 0.0347 |
| AP880914-0131 | 0.0652 | -0.0116 | 0.0194 | -0.0721 |
| AP880915-0003 | -0.0263 | -0.082 | 0.1168 | -0.025 |
| AP880915-0066 | 0.0182 | 0.0281 | -0.028 | -0.0809 |
| AP880915-0142 | -0.0315 | -0.0269 | 0.0379 | 0.0508 |
| AP880916-0025 | 0.0483 | -0.0017 | 0.0695 | -0.0251 |
| AP880916-0060 | 0.0605 | 0.0039 | -0.0467 | -0.0375 |
| AP880917-0095 | 0.025 | -0.0259 | 0.0116 | -0.0614 |
| AP880917-0096 | 0.0086 | -0.0134 | -0.0309 | -0.0705 |
| AP880917-0157 | 0.0275 | -0.0176 | 0.0424 | 0.1049 |
| AP880921-0201 | 0.0882 | 0.0681 | -0.0005 | -0.0611 |
| AP880929-0042 | 0.0103 | -0.0096 | -0.0083 | 0.0113 |
| AP881001-0104 | 0.0197 | 0.0409 | -0.023 | -0.0205 |
| AP881002-0048 | 0.0099 | -0.0107 | 0.0267 | 0.0839 |
| AP881003-0066 | -0.0679 | 0.0264 | 0.0428 | -0.0836 |
| AP881020-0157 | 0.0171 | 0.0505 | 0.0284 | -0.0363 |
| AP881025-0196 | 0.0361 | 0.0533 | -0.0992 | 0.0361 |
| AP881027-0051 | -0.0307 | -0.0019 | 0.0388 | -0.0179 |
| AP881106-0062 | 0.0383 | 0.0629 | -0.0855 | 0.004 |
| AP881109-0161 | 0.0068 | 0.025 | 0.0052 | 0.0332 |
| AP881110-0227 | 0.0362 | 0.0052 | 0.0007 | 0.0008 |
| AP881113-0007 | 0.0339 | -0.0581 | 0.0304 | 0.0302 |
| AP881114-0006 | 0.0659 | 0.0343 | 0.0084 | -0.0036 |
| AP881115-0011 | 0.0961 | -0.0276 | -0.0289 | -0.0641 |
| AP881115-0113 | -0.0103 | 0.0308 | 0.0234 | -0.0228 |
| AP881118-0104 | -0.0125 | -0.0032 | -0.0203 | 0.0635 |
| AP881218-0007 | -0.0014 | 0.0352 | -0.0137 | 0.0613 |
| AP890102-0076 | -0.0726 | -0.0493 | -0.102 | 0.0522 |
| AP890103-0029 | 0.009 | -0.0132 | -0.037 | 0.0052 |
| AP890105-0224 | 0.0033 | 0.0333 | 0.0111 | -0.0359 |
| AP890107-0016 | 0.0387 | 0.0629 | 0.0691 | 0.0206 |
| AP890107-0039 | 0.0754 | -0.0355 | 0.0537 | -0.0053 |
| AP890107-0119 | 0.0363 | 0.0187 | -0.0199 | 0.0122 |
| AP890112-0071 | -0.0021 | 0.0124 | 0.0533 | -0.0155 |
| AP890115-0014 | 0.0379 | 0.0233 | 0.0007 | -0.0137 |
| AP890117-0004 | -0.0717 | -0.0589 | 0.0592 | 0.0913 |
| AP890117-0160 | -0.0074 | -0.0374 | -0.0335 | -0.0413 |
| AP890118-0013 | -0.0142 | -0.0551 | -0.0242 | -0.0147 |
| AP890118-0051 | 0.0415 | 0.0377 | -0.1091 | 0.0188 |
| AP890118-0094 | 0.0358 | 0.1221 | -0.0512 | 0.0012 |
| AP890118-0100 | 0.0821 | 0.0406 | 0.0321 | 0.0099 |
| AP890119-0266 | 0.0092 | -0.0267 | 0.0541 | 0.0029 |
| AP890121-0050 | 0.0552 | 0.0059 | 0.008 | -0.0068 |
| AP890121-0123 | 0.0292 | -0.0198 | -0.0309 | 0.0664 |
| AP890122-0087 | -0.0089 | -0.0079 | 0.0274 | 0.0132 |
| AP890125-0099 | -0.0134 | 0.0246 | -0.0219 | 0.017 |
| AP890201-0043 | 0.0524 | -0.0416 | 0.0388 | 0.0158 |
| AP890203-0164 | 0.0367 | 0.0876 | 0.0626 | 0.0034 |
| AP890211-0110 | -0.0073 | 0.0136 | -0.0554 | 0.0708 |
| AP890224-0003 | -0.0072 | 0.0349 | 0.0035 | -0.0055 |
| AP890228-0146 | 0.0264 | -0.0414 | -0.0312 | 0.0325 |
| AP890309-0143 | 0.0651 | 0.0891 | 0.0306 | -0.0096 |
| AP890316-0012 | 0.0498 | 0.0052 | 0.0035 | -0.0175 |
| AP890320-0158 | 0.0075 | 0.0081 | 0.0006 | 0.0041 |
| AP890323-0218 | 0.0076 | -0.0029 | -0.018 | 0.045 |
| AP890323-0234 | 0.0737 | -0.0031 | 0.0173 | 0.0393 |
| AP890324-0014 | -0.0143 | 0.0109 | -0.0448 | 0.0928 |
| AP890330-0123 | -0.0121 | 0.0039 | 0.0228 | -0.0418 |
| AP890417-0189 | 0.0618 | -0.0298 | -0.0383 | 0.0264 |
| AP890420-0176 | -0.0733 | 0.0164 | -0.0135 | -0.017 |
| AP890421-0013 | 0.0062 | 0.0398 | -0.015 | -0.0182 |
| AP890421-0062 | -0.0189 | -0.0135 | -0.0019 | 0.0105 |
| AP890421-0186 | 0.0515 | -0.0705 | -0.0288 | 0.008 |
| AP890422-0035 | 0.0085 | -0.0046 | -0.1309 | -0.0077 |
| AP890423-0090 | 0.0335 | -0.0139 | 0.024 | -0.0317 |
| AP890424-0026 | 0.0544 | -0.0004 | -0.0048 | -0.0557 |
| AP890425-0013 | 0.0597 | 0.0369 | 0.0135 | -0.035 |
| AP890426-0123 | 0.0566 | 0.003 | 0.0184 | 0.0184 |
| AP890426-0126 | 0.0556 | -0.044 | -0.0852 | 0.0101 |
| AP890426-0160 | 0.0133 | -0.0169 | -0.0472 | -0.0003 |
| AP890426-0185 | -0.0372 | -0.0695 | 0.0182 | 0.0409 |
| AP890426-0204 | 0.0836 | 0.0833 | -0.1058 | -0.0104 |
| AP890427-0052 | 0.0084 | -0.0318 | -0.0552 | 0.0222 |
| AP890427-0098 | 0.0439 | 0.0198 | -0.0791 | 0.0129 |
| AP890509-0040 | -0.0139 | 0.0495 | -0.0019 | 0.0349 |
| AP890517-0106 | 0.0344 | 0.0581 | 0.0405 | -0.0195 |
| AP890519-0060 | 0.0438 | 0.0627 | 0.037 | 0.0013 |
| AP890519-0117 | 0.0845 | 0.0657 | 0.0442 | -0.0713 |
| AP890603-0103 | 0.0061 | -0.0082 | 0.04 | -0.0043 |
| AP890603-0108 | 0.0469 | 0.0225 | 0.0292 | -0.0005 |
| AP890603-0122 | 0.0118 | -0.0153 | -0.0309 | -0.0211 |
| AP890603-0126 | 0.0519 | -0.0243 | -0.1285 | -0.0501 |
| AP890607-0067 | 0.0127 | -0.0431 | 0.0165 | 0.0622 |
| AP890609-0036 | 0.0419 | 0.0254 | 0.0758 | 0.021 |
| AP890609-0094 | 0.0121 | 0.0288 | -0.0298 | -0.0368 |
| AP890613-0125 | -0.0271 | -0.0082 | 0.0204 | -0.0234 |
| AP890615-0263 | 0.0884 | 0.0761 | -0.0547 | -0.0039 |
| AP890616-0230 | 0.0092 | 0.0377 | -0.0253 | 0.0511 |
| AP890622-0157 | 0.0199 | 0.0462 | -0.033 | 0.0636 |
| AP890710-0170 | 0.0141 | 0.0239 | -0.0418 | 0.0289 |
| AP890711-0223 | 0.04 | 0.0499 | -0.0479 | 0.0331 |
| AP890715-0076 | 0.0293 | 0.0692 | 0.0044 | -0.0135 |
| AP890717-0149 | -0.0486 | -0.0124 | 0.1047 | -0.0852 |
| AP890719-0248 | 0.0113 | 0.0163 | 0.0293 | 0.0557 |
| AP890720-0075 | 0.0307 | 0.0254 | 0.0451 | 0.0073 |
| AP890721-0091 | 0.0096 | 0.027 | 0.0611 | -0.0088 |
| AP890801-0134 | 0.0262 | 0.0818 | -0.0162 | -0.0001 |
| AP890820-0068 | 0.0721 | 0.0321 | 0.0813 | 0.0192 |
| AP890821-0100 | -0.0221 | -0.0394 | 0.0244 | 0.0029 |
| AP890913-0253 | -0.023 | 0.0531 | 0.0618 | 0.0509 |
| AP890922-0007 | -0.0454 | 0.0382 | 0.1459 | -0.0396 |
| AP890922-0049 | -0.0555 | -0.039 | -0.0029 | 0.021 |
| AP890922-0071 | 0.0084 | -0.0592 | 0.0128 | -0.0439 |
| AP890922-0072 | 0.0771 | 0.0388 | -0.1211 | 0.0072 |
| AP890922-0103 | 0.024 | 0.0147 | -0.0598 | -0.0941 |
| AP890922-0117 | 0.0129 | -0.0067 | -0.0488 | -0.0657 |
| AP890922-0119 | -0.023 | 0.0333 | -0.0304 | -0.0022 |
| AP890922-0167 | 0.0672 | 0.0087 | -0.0461 | 0.0211 |
| AP890922-0224 | -0.0096 | 0.0076 | 0.0395 | 0.0429 |
| AP890923-0012 | 0.0628 | 0.1206 | -0.0154 | 0.0572 |
| AP890923-0035 | 0.076 | 0.0376 | -0.0424 | -0.0054 |
| AP890923-0091 | 0.0273 | 0.0743 | -0.0137 | 0.0406 |
| AP890924-0025 | 0.1104 | 0.0654 | -0.0397 | 0.06 |
| AP890925-0009 | -0.0308 | 0.0772 | -0.0425 | -0.0483 |
| AP890925-0054 | 0.041 | -0.0311 | -0.0641 | -0.0325 |
| AP890925-0124 | 0.0503 | 0.052 | 0.0161 | -0.0569 |
| AP890928-0099 | -0.1004 | 0.0142 | 0.0417 | 0.0185 |
| AP891017-0195 | 0.0513 | 0.0302 | -0.0679 | 0.0164 |
| AP891017-0199 | 0.0308 | -0.0651 | 0.0256 | -0.018 |
| AP891017-0204 | 0.0772 | 0.0684 | -0.0604 | 0.0163 |
| AP891018-0084 | 0.0117 | -0.0162 | -0.0269 | 0.0077 |
| AP891018-0301 | 0.0549 | -0.0698 | 0.0411 | 0.062 |
| AP891019-0037 | -0.0017 | 0.0701 | 0.0478 | 0.0267 |
| AP891026-0208 | -0.0548 | 0.0149 | 0.0147 | 0.0642 |
| AP891103-0200 | 0.0582 | -0.0227 | 0.0147 | 0.0747 |
| AP891106-0072 | 0.0251 | 0.0177 | -0.0389 | 0.0188 |
| AP891110-0043 | 0.0991 | 0.0039 | 0.0645 | -0.0188 |
| AP891111-0064 | 0.008 | 0.0369 | 0.0113 | 0.0199 |
| AP891115-0199 | -0.0048 | -0.0408 | 0.0766 | 0.0634 |
| AP891116-0035 | 0.0253 | 0.0756 | -0.0935 | -0.0004 |
| AP891116-0115 | -0.027 | 0.0039 | 0.1244 | 0.0003 |
| AP891116-0133 | 0.0334 | 0.0041 | -0.0555 | -0.0218 |
| AP891116-0184 | 0.0434 | 0.0153 | 0.0036 | 0.0178 |
| AP891116-0198 | 0.0441 | 0.0157 | 0.0592 | -0.0353 |
| AP891117-0002 | -0.0082 | 0.0114 | -0.0536 | 0.0755 |
| AP891117-0248 | -0.0654 | 0.0799 | 0.0295 | -0.0028 |
| AP891118-0136 | 0.0596 | -0.0084 | 0.0249 | -0.0082 |
| AP891202-0154 | -0.0259 | 0.0093 | 0.0101 | -0.0316 |
| AP891207-0158 | 0.0218 | -0.0116 | 0.0121 | 0.0388 |
| AP891212-0062 | -0.01 | -0.0088 | 0.0362 | 0.003 |
| AP891213-0164 | -0.0012 | 0.0163 | -0.0003 | -0.0394 |
| AP891216-0037 | 0.0114 | -0.0029 | -0.0808 | 0.0253 |
| AP891217-0053 | -0.0285 | -0.0251 | 0.0149 | 0.0005 |
| AP900102-0114 | 0.0175 | -0.0574 | 0.0081 | 0.0544 |
| AP900103-0077 | 0.0367 | -0.0406 | 0.0646 | -0.0819 |
| AP900117-0193 | -0.0191 | 0.0312 | 0.0065 | -0.0079 |
| AP900118-0029 | 0.0524 | -0 | 0.0154 | 0.0319 |
| AP900118-0183 | -0.0309 | -0.0291 | 0.1097 | 0.0579 |
| AP900118-0190 | 0.0321 | 0.0198 | 0.0213 | -0.0272 |
| AP900119-0024 | 0.048 | 0.0695 | -0.0815 | 0.0253 |
| AP900119-0041 | -0.012 | 0.0574 | -0.0253 | -0.0045 |
| AP900119-0051 | 0.0338 | 0.0151 | -0.1065 | -0.064 |
| AP900121-0039 | 0.0304 | 0.0163 | 0.0182 | -0.0337 |
| AP900128-0063 | 0.0815 | 0.0575 | 0.0635 | 0.0457 |
| AP900129-0036 | 0.0053 | 0.0413 | -0.0068 | 0.0471 |
| AP900129-0071 | 0.0901 | -0.0133 | 0.0111 | -0.061 |
| AP900130-0010 | -0.0208 | 0.0152 | -0.035 | 0.1617 |
| AP900130-0113 | 0.039 | -0.0328 | -0.0168 | -0.0279 |
| AP900130-0202 | 0.0097 | 0.0078 | 0.0007 | -0.0192 |
| AP900131-0068 | -0.0304 | 0.0014 | -0.0001 | -0.031 |
| AP900131-0200 | -0.0746 | -0.0072 | -0.0083 | 0.0008 |
| AP900208-0116 | 0.0224 | 0.0486 | 0.0729 | 0.0426 |
| AP900210-0106 | 0.0127 | 0.0084 | 0.0167 | -0.0365 |
| AP900212-0061 | 0.0634 | 0.0457 | -0.0403 | -0.0054 |
| AP900214-0157 | 0.0516 | 0.0311 | -0.0104 | -0.0043 |
| AP900215-0013 | 0.0377 | -0.0023 | 0.0064 | 0.0701 |
| AP900220-0065 | 0.0786 | -0.0202 | -0.0025 | 0.0193 |
| AP900220-0089 | -0.0072 | -0.0375 | -0.0262 | 0.0262 |
| AP900224-0094 | 0.0356 | 0.0445 | 0.0356 | -0.0461 |
| AP900307-0146 | 0.062 | 0.0217 | 0.0211 | -0.0066 |
| AP900321-0057 | 0.0184 | 0.0099 | 0.041 | -0.0543 |
| AP900322-0112 | 0.0345 | 0.0219 | 0.0031 | 0.0263 |
| AP900324-0081 | 0.0071 | 0.0255 | -0.0004 | -0.0758 |
| AP900328-0128 | 0.0264 | 0.043 | -0.1077 | 0.0185 |
| AP900330-0086 | 0.0396 | 0.0303 | 0.0489 | 0.0949 |
| AP900406-0164 | -0.0109 | -0.0154 | 0.0253 | 0.0208 |
| AP900408-0059 | 0.0049 | -0.0006 | -0.0065 | -0.0352 |
| AP900420-0006 | 0.004 | 0.0011 | -0.0483 | 0.0144 |
| AP900421-0075 | 0.0017 | -0.0325 | 0.0245 | -0.0334 |
| AP900422-0032 | 0.0207 | -0.046 | 0.0879 | -0.022 |
| AP900424-0048 | -0.0486 | -0.0254 | 0.0796 | -0.0419 |
| AP900424-0081 | 0.069 | 0.042 | 0.0031 | 0.0501 |
| AP900424-0096 | 0.0149 | 0.0416 | 0.017 | 0.0934 |
| AP900425-0013 | -0.0229 | 0.066 | 0.0099 | 0.0151 |
| AP900425-0146 | 0.003 | 0.0352 | 0.0144 | 0.0209 |
| AP900425-0198 | 0.0376 | 0.002 | 0.0132 | 0.0098 |
| AP900426-0135 | -0.0282 | 0.0019 | 0.059 | 0.0127 |
| AP900426-0185 | 0.105 | -0.0012 | -0.0719 | -0.0763 |
| AP900427-0083 | -0.0223 | 0.0199 | 0.0114 | -0.0323 |
| AP900427-0146 | 0.0041 | 0.0641 | -0.008 | -0.0608 |
| AP900428-0022 | -0.009 | 0.0265 | 0.0411 | 0.0117 |
| AP900428-0050 | -0.0247 | -0.0692 | -0.0054 | 0.0583 |
| AP900505-0127 | 0.0061 | -0.0231 | -0.0231 | 0.0325 |
| AP900507-0207 | -0.0641 | -0.0253 | 0.0905 | -0.0288 |
| AP900510-0029 | -0.0193 | 0.0759 | 0.0263 | -0.0692 |
| AP900524-0130 | 0.0943 | 0.0089 | -0.0429 | -0.0041 |
| AP900609-0040 | -0.0467 | 0.018 | 0.0445 | 0.0083 |
| AP900613-0195 | 0.0464 | 0.0156 | -0.0441 | 0.0344 |
| AP900615-0115 | -0.0398 | -0.0333 | -0.1237 | 0.0086 |
| AP900615-0164 | -0.0038 | 0.0755 | 0.0376 | 0.0416 |
| AP900616-0032 | 0.0152 | 0.0057 | -0.097 | -0.0074 |
| AP900616-0123 | 0.0308 | -0.0017 | -0.0368 | -0.036 |
| AP900618-0018 | -0.0089 | 0.0535 | -0.021 | -0.0436 |
| AP900618-0069 | -0.0376 | 0.0588 | 0.1222 | 0.0349 |
| AP900621-0186 | 0.057 | 0.0229 | -0.0163 | -0.0167 |
| AP900621-0192 | 0.0239 | 0.0945 | 0.0058 | -0.0949 |
| AP900622-0025 | 0.0067 | 0.0286 | -0.0025 | -0.0029 |
| AP900622-0080 | 0.1207 | -0.0041 | -0.0627 | 0.0616 |
| AP900622-0087 | -0.0166 | 0.0677 | -0.0294 | 0.0664 |
| AP900623-0009 | -0.0029 | -0.058 | -0.0433 | 0.0207 |
| AP900623-0022 | -0.0275 | -0.0384 | -0.0643 | -0.0136 |
| AP900623-0119 | -0.0125 | -0.0114 | 0.0712 | 0.0741 |
| AP900624-0011 | -0.0083 | 0.0231 | -0.0386 | 0.0404 |
| AP900625-0036 | -0.018 | 0.0505 | 0.0783 | 0.0432 |
| AP900625-0090 | 0.0274 | 0.021 | -0.0252 | -0.0162 |
| AP900626-0010 | -0.0297 | -0.0445 | 0.0259 | -0.0124 |
| AP900705-0149 | 0.019 | 0.0242 | -0.0278 | -0.0915 |
| AP900716-0007 | -0.0093 | -0.0076 | 0.046 | 0.0008 |
| AP900718-0069 | -0.0108 | -0.0001 | 0.0065 | 0.0294 |
| AP900724-0090 | -0.0374 | -0.0526 | 0.0186 | 0.0018 |
| AP900730-0116 | -0.0323 | 0.0081 | 0.0153 | 0.0285 |
| AP900731-0113 | 0.0254 | 0.0014 | 0.0099 | 0.0297 |
| AP900801-0004 | 0.0304 | -0.0071 | 0.0016 | 0.0047 |
| AP900802-0057 | 0.0303 | 0.0671 | -0.0063 | -0.018 |
| AP900802-0077 | -0.0028 | -0.0449 | 0.0008 | 0.0181 |
| AP900802-0092 | -0.0478 | 0.0901 | 0.0019 | 0.071 |
| AP900802-0135 | -0.0147 | 0.0612 | 0.0645 | -0.0086 |
| AP900802-0159 | 0.1173 | 0.0048 | 0.0351 | 0.0081 |
| AP900802-0164 | 0.0124 | -0.0175 | -0.0236 | 0.04 |
| AP900802-0180 | 0.031 | 0.0301 | -0.0378 | 0.0005 |
| AP900803-0004 | -0.026 | 0.0051 | 0.0741 | 0.0151 |
| AP900803-0008 | -0.0146 | 0.0276 | -0.0183 | 0.0994 |
| AP900804-0057 | 0.1018 | -0.0345 | 0.0438 | -0.0212 |
| AP900804-0067 | 0.0539 | -0.02 | 0.06 | -0.0007 |
| AP900805-0019 | -0.0573 | 0.0058 | 0.0195 | -0.0179 |
| AP900805-0060 | 0.0196 | -0.0049 | -0.0123 | 0.0386 |
| AP900806-0077 | -0.0202 | 0.002 | -0.0381 | -0.0584 |
| AP900806-0095 | -0.0275 | -0.0207 | 0.0226 | -0.059 |
| AP900807-0029 | 0.0051 | 0.0256 | -0.0195 | -0.0498 |
| AP900807-0093 | 0.0352 | 0.0063 | 0.0407 | 0.009 |
| AP900808-0030 | -0.0425 | 0.0682 | 0.1011 | 0.105 |
| AP900810-0120 | 0.0441 | -0.0055 | -0.0177 | 0.0235 |
| AP900821-0092 | 0.0484 | 0.0138 | 0.0388 | 0.0004 |
| AP900825-0099 | -0.0222 | 0.0033 | 0.0097 | 0.0893 |
| AP900829-0044 | 0.0005 | -0.0195 | -0.0088 | 0.0187 |
| AP900919-0122 | -0.0171 | 0.0543 | 0.0401 | 0.0645 |
| AP901003-0006 | 0.0235 | 0.0556 | 0.0598 | 0.0001 |
| AP901006-0037 | 0.0401 | 0.0199 | 0.0337 | 0.0517 |
| AP901008-0136 | -0.0147 | -0.0474 | 0.034 | 0.0248 |
| AP901008-0174 | -0.0216 | 0.0277 | 0.0645 | 0.0649 |
| AP901009-0072 | -0.0265 | 0.0093 | -0.0712 | 0.0896 |
| AP901009-0148 | -0.0098 | -0.0196 | -0.0196 | -0.0132 |
| AP901009-0186 | -0.0925 | 0.0187 | 0.0799 | 0.0568 |
| AP901010-0030 | 0.069 | -0.0412 | -0.0026 | 0.0483 |
| AP901016-0097 | 0.0319 | 0.0749 | -0.0067 | -0.023 |
| AP901016-0112 | 0.0376 | 0.0055 | 0.1164 | -0.0192 |
| AP901019-0072 | 0.0791 | 0.0812 | -0.0232 | 0.0246 |
| AP901114-0087 | -0.0813 | -0.0203 | -0.0433 | -0.062 |
| AP901121-0206 | -0.0286 | 0.047 | 0.0163 | -0.0113 |
| AP901121-0207 | 0.1188 | 0.0227 | 0.0828 | -0.063 |
| AP901122-0100 | 0.0344 | 0.0877 | -0.0677 | -0.0294 |
| AP901123-0002 | 0.0519 | 0.0467 | 0.0216 | -0.0378 |
| AP901123-0062 | 0.013 | 0.004 | -0.0253 | 0.013 |
| AP901126-0053 | -0.0046 | -0.0034 | 0.0152 | 0.0345 |
| AP901127-0119 | 0.0888 | 0.0756 | 0.0074 | -0.0113 |
| AP901208-0076 | -0.054 | 0.0192 | 0.0127 | -0.0153 |
| AP901208-0106 | 0.0296 | 0.0135 | 0.0815 | -0.0237 |
| AP901222-0078 | 0.0229 | -0.019 | 0.1657 | 0.0306 |
| AP901230-0022 | 0.0053 | -0.0187 | 0.0111 | 0.0151 |
| FBIS3-13911 | 0.0037 | -0.0246 | -0.019 | -0.0201 |
| FBIS3-1707 | -0.0031 | 0.0142 | 0.0137 | 0.0296 |
| FBIS4-18298 | 0.0491 | 0.0243 | 0.033 | -0.0701 |
| FBIS4-24776 | 0.0221 | -0.0194 | 0.0143 | -0.0498 |
| FBIS4-26242 | 0.0367 | -0.061 | 0.0099 | 0.0124 |
| FBIS4-26245 | 0.1073 | -0.0755 | 0.0514 | -0.0496 |
| FBIS4-26327 | -0.0219 | 0.0185 | 0.0011 | 0.0096 |
| FBIS4-26392 | 0.0188 | 0.0457 | 0.0347 | 0.0002 |
| FBIS4-26516 | 0.0215 | 0.0044 | -0.0274 | -0.0019 |
| FBIS4-26532 | 0.047 | -0.0109 | -0.0465 | -0.0403 |
| FBIS4-26604 | 0.0832 | -0.0236 | 0.0634 | -0.0046 |
| FBIS4-26614 | 0.0914 | -0.0544 | 0.0528 | -0.04 |
| FBIS4-26768 | 0.108 | -0.0564 | 0.0229 | -0.1189 |
| FBIS4-26769 | 0.0706 | 0.0018 | 0.0088 | 0.0182 |
| FBIS4-40244 | 0.0458 | 0.0373 | 0.0345 | -0.0199 |
| FBIS4-42027 | -0.001 | -0.0517 | 0.0454 | -0.0093 |
| FBIS4-42178 | 0.0585 | 0.0527 | 0.0168 | 0.0079 |
| FBIS4-57796 | 0.031 | 0.0414 | -0.0058 | 0.0285 |
| FBIS4-62505 | 0.0387 | 0.0403 | 0.0275 | 0.0092 |
| FT921-4937 | -0.0125 | 0.0466 | 0.01 | 0.0287 |
| FT921-5959 | -0.0102 | -0.0141 | -0.0309 | 0.0455 |
| FT922-1115 | -0.0112 | -0.0091 | 0.1145 | -0.0754 |
| FT922-14265 | -0.0183 | -0.0062 | 0.0217 | 0.0493 |
| FT922-2972 | 0.0021 | 0.0331 | 0.0246 | 0.0003 |
| FT922-3446 | 0.0097 | -0.0178 | -0.0032 | 0.0174 |
| FT923-12122 | 0.0174 | -0.0088 | 0.0103 | 0.0574 |
| FT923-13244 | 0.0184 | 0.0129 | 0.044 | 0.0392 |
| FT923-3822 | -0.032 | -0.0597 | 0.1271 | -0.0054 |
| FT923-5068 | 0.0578 | -0.0069 | 0.0728 | 0.0452 |
| FT923-5589 | -0.0135 | -0.0188 | 0.0277 | -0.0025 |
| FT923-5797 | -0.0135 | -0.0214 | -0.0391 | -0.049 |
| FT923-5835 | 0.057 | 0.0272 | -0.013 | 0.0105 |
| FT923-6038 | 0.0165 | 0.0054 | -0.035 | 0.0481 |
| FT923-6110 | -0.0148 | -0.0011 | -0.0019 | -0.0627 |
| FT923-6455 | 0.0551 | -0.0407 | 0.0593 | -0.0095 |
| FT923-6509 | -0.0559 | -0.0715 | 0.0349 | 0.0499 |
| FT923-8765 | 0.024 | -0.03 | 0.0008 | -0.0212 |
| FT923-8766 | 0.0282 | 0.0037 | -0.0012 | 0.0116 |
| FT924-10185 | 0.0176 | -0.0559 | 0.0574 | -0.0069 |
| FT924-12616 | -0.0046 | 0.0239 | -0.0049 | 0.0591 |
| FT931-2858 | 0.0576 | -0.0094 | -0.0467 | 0.0075 |
| FT931-2981 | -0.0081 | 0.0208 | 0.0396 | -0.0529 |
| FT931-3664 | 0.0099 | 0.0051 | -0.0269 | 0.0135 |
| FT931-3764 | -0.0097 | -0.0522 | 0.0125 | -0.0529 |
| FT931-4176 | 0.0079 | 0.026 | 0.0598 | 0.0205 |
| FT932-15960 | -0.0188 | -0.0367 | -0.023 | -0.065 |
| FT932-5869 | -0.0404 | -0.0193 | -0.023 | -0.0321 |
| FT933-10917 | -0.0433 | -0.0849 | -0.0463 | 0.0285 |
| FT933-9536 | 0.0416 | 0.014 | -0.0079 | 0.0013 |
| FT934-2439 | -0.0322 | -0.0241 | -0.0999 | 0.0446 |
| FT941-11518 | 0.001 | 0.0189 | 0.0549 | 0.0139 |
| FT942-12054 | 0.0085 | -0.0314 | 0.0132 | -0.0317 |
| FT942-6613 | 0.0284 | -0.0004 | 0.0307 | 0.0223 |
| FT943-178 | -0.0158 | 0.0167 | 0.024 | 0.0174 |
| FT943-3897 | 0.109 | -0.0571 | 0.0157 | -0.0119 |
| FT943-5106 | 0.0623 | -0.1358 | -0.0659 | -0.0217 |
| FT944-12170 | 0.117 | -0.0555 | -0.0247 | 0.019 |
| FT944-16774 | -0.1056 | 0.0337 | -0.0335 | 0.0986 |
| LA011889-0131 | 0.0379 | 0.0347 | -0.0241 | -0.0286 |
| LA011990-0091 | -0.0163 | -0.0415 | 0.0414 | 0.0731 |
| LA012090-0110 | 0.1276 | 0.0726 | -0.0113 | 0.0246 |
| LA012189-0060 | 0.0127 | 0.0545 | 0.0165 | -0.0562 |
| LA012189-0073 | 0.1188 | 0.0159 | -0.0649 | 0.0636 |
| LA012289-0055 | 0.0137 | 0.0023 | 0.046 | -0.0029 |
| LA012290-0036 | 0.04 | 0.0933 | 0.0145 | 0.0039 |
| LA013090-0161 | -0.0125 | 0.0036 | 0.0821 | 0.0596 |
| LA020189-0050 | 0.0213 | 0.0995 | -0.1154 | 0.1093 |
| LA020190-0038 | 0.0231 | -0.0313 | 0.014 | -0.0093 |
| LA020289-0065 | -0.0254 | 0.0056 | 0.0325 | -0.0128 |
| LA020389-0041 | -0.0087 | 0.0321 | 0.0097 | 0.0145 |
| LA020489-0035 | 0.0577 | 0.0739 | 0.0387 | 0.0268 |
| LA020489-0060 | -0.0078 | 0.0381 | -0.0017 | 0.0454 |
| LA020890-0197 | -0.2143 | -0.2797 | 0.2534 | -0.0654 |
| LA021189-0003 | 0.1145 | -0.0812 | 0.0767 | -0.0717 |
| LA021190-0179 | -0.0026 | 0.0434 | -0.0044 | -0.0903 |
| LA021190-0181 | 0.0141 | 0.0005 | 0.0621 | -0.0154 |
| LA021290-0043 | -0.0226 | 0.0698 | -0.0078 | -0.0183 |
| LA030290-0075 | -0.0767 | 0.0318 | 0.0334 | 0.0052 |
| LA033089-0190 | -0.0113 | 0.0041 | 0.0187 | 0.0544 |
| LA033189-0114 | 0.0407 | 0.0484 | -0.044 | -0.044 |
| LA040689-0198 | 0.0496 | 0.0772 | -0.0254 | 0.0662 |
| LA040790-0121 | 0.0652 | 0.0393 | 0.0095 | 0.015 |
| LA041989-0141 | 0.0735 | -0.0013 | -0.04 | 0.0343 |
| LA042290-0160 | 0.0119 | 0.0079 | 0.0643 | -0.0132 |
| LA042389-0098 | 0.0384 | -0.0679 | 0.0033 | 0.0109 |
| LA042489-0051 | 0.0656 | 0.0324 | 0.0028 | 0.0288 |
| LA042590-0135 | 0.0321 | -0.0493 | 0.1157 | 0.0719 |
| LA042590-0152 | 0.0587 | -0.0398 | -0.0049 | 0.0016 |
| LA042689-0146 | 0.0547 | -0.011 | 0.0226 | 0.0349 |
| LA042789-0025 | 0.092 | 0.0454 | 0.0638 | -0.0563 |
| LA042789-0032 | 0.0169 | 0.0165 | -0.0218 | -0.0171 |
| LA042789-0068 | 0.0601 | -0.0149 | 0.0189 | 0.0196 |
| LA051589-0055 | -0.0059 | 0.0268 | -0.0147 | -0.0215 |
| LA052089-0075 | -0.0408 | -0.0465 | 0.0298 | 0.0182 |
| LA060590-0086 | 0.015 | 0.0582 | 0.036 | -0.0373 |
| LA061590-0176 | 0.0168 | -0.0329 | -0.0373 | -0.0768 |
| LA061890-0066 | 0.0742 | -0.0127 | -0.0177 | -0.0448 |
| LA062290-0134 | -0.0384 | 0.0348 | 0.0208 | -0.0207 |
| LA062290-0169 | 0.0142 | -0.0617 | -0.0148 | 0.0229 |
| LA062290-0172 | 0.0076 | -0.0113 | -0.0018 | -0.0772 |
| LA062390-0001 | -0.111 | -0.0493 | -0.009 | -0.0406 |
| LA062390-0068 | 0.0033 | -0.0062 | -0.0628 | -0.0351 |
| LA062490-0172 | 0.0181 | -0.0291 | 0.0933 | -0.028 |
| LA062590-0096 | 0.0304 | 0.0035 | -0.0453 | 0.0099 |
| LA062690-0155 | 0.0076 | 0.0652 | 0.0498 | 0.0422 |
| LA070289-0167 | 0.0106 | 0.0503 | 0.0294 | 0.0306 |
| LA072689-0050 | -0.095 | 0.0557 | 0.073 | 0.0252 |
| LA080290-0037 | -0.0348 | 0.0128 | -0.0075 | 0.0603 |
| LA080290-0233 | -0.016 | -0.0039 | 0.0859 | 0.0021 |
| LA080390-0085 | 0.0352 | 0.047 | 0.0114 | 0.0102 |
| LA080690-0111 | -0.0217 | 0.0083 | 0.0306 | 0.0304 |
| LA080890-0078 | 0.0186 | 0.009 | -0.0209 | 0.0235 |
| LA082889-0067 | 0.0546 | 0.1076 | -0.0669 | -0.0614 |
| LA092189-0225 | -0.0572 | -0.0081 | -0.0089 | -0.0012 |
| LA092389-0092 | -0.0358 | 0.0232 | -0.0121 | 0.0224 |
| LA092789-0093 | -0.0768 | -0.074 | 0.0228 | -0.0565 |
| LA101390-0087 | 0.0089 | -0.0342 | -0.0324 | 0.0099 |
| LA101590-0066 | -0.0056 | 0.0163 | 0.0742 | -0.0365 |
| LA101889-0066 | 0.0227 | 0.0111 | -0.0235 | -0.0725 |
| LA101889-0108 | 0.0108 | -0.0144 | 0.0498 | -0.0143 |
| LA101990-0114 | 0.0073 | 0.0529 | -0.0035 | 0.0171 |
| LA102089-0172 | 0.0043 | 0.0156 | 0.0293 | -0.0031 |
| LA102090-0146 | 0.0091 | 0.0373 | -0.0531 | -0.0166 |
| LA102389-0075 | 0.0549 | 0.0652 | -0.0248 | 0.0162 |
| LA102489-0131 | -0.0321 | -0.0259 | -0.0246 | 0.0287 |
| LA102690-0005 | -0.0006 | 0.0183 | -0.0372 | -0.0541 |
| LA111289-0035 | -0.0182 | -0.0327 | -0.0251 | 0.1035 |
| LA111689-0160 | 0.0321 | -0.0783 | -0.1566 | 0.0571 |
| LA112090-0165 | 0.1175 | 0.0433 | 0.0059 | 0.0267 |
| LA112390-0008 | 0.0434 | 0.0121 | -0.0413 | -0.0202 |
| LA112790-0154 | 0.0541 | 0.0442 | 0.0686 | -0.0245 |
| LA112890-0036 | -0.0376 | -0.0457 | -0.0119 | 0.0901 |
| LA120189-0122 | 0.0327 | -0.0609 | -0.0551 | 0.0153 |
| LA120389-0170 | 0.0351 | 0.0051 | -0.0966 | 0.0254 |
| LA120890-0055 | 0.0163 | -0.0514 | -0.0351 | 0.0085 |
| LA121090-0095 | 0.0094 | -0.0732 | -0.0083 | 0.0591 |
| LA121490-0148 | 0.0548 | -0.0022 | 0.0303 | 0.0266 |
| LA121589-0192 | -0.013 | 0.1078 | -0.0386 | -0.0183 |
| LA122190-0149 | 0.0551 | 0.0121 | -0.0036 | -0.0789 |
| SJMN91-06025182 | -0.0257 | 0.0229 | 0.0025 | 0.0524 |
| SJMN91-06025282 | 0.0317 | 0.113 | -0.0013 | -0.0109 |
| SJMN91-06044329 | -0.0801 | -0.0858 | -0.0557 | 0.0083 |
| SJMN91-06058250 | 0.0741 | -0.0057 | 0.025 | 0.0121 |
| SJMN91-06064099 | 0.0203 | 0.0492 | 0.0203 | 0.1046 |
| SJMN91-06069108 | -0.0231 | -0.011 | -0.0055 | 0.0219 |
| SJMN91-06097121 | 0.0599 | 0.0768 | -0.0337 | 0.0344 |
| SJMN91-06105230 | -0.0311 | -0.078 | 0.0365 | 0.0234 |
| SJMN91-06140099 | 0.037 | -0.0273 | -0.0052 | 0.0512 |
| SJMN91-06145218 | -0.0226 | 0.0195 | -0.0047 | -0.0046 |
| SJMN91-06162032 | 0.0068 | 0.0761 | -0.0253 | 0.0233 |
| SJMN91-06163112 | 0.003 | 0.0323 | -0.0193 | 0.0564 |
| SJMN91-06164210 | 0.0217 | 0.0804 | 0.0276 | 0.0299 |
| SJMN91-06165048 | 0.049 | -0.0195 | -0.0033 | 0.0825 |
| SJMN91-06167046 | 0.0175 | 0.0136 | 0.0115 | 0.0897 |
| SJMN91-06171237 | -0.0045 | -0.0257 | -0.0236 | 0.0393 |
| SJMN91-06234048 | -0.0119 | 0.0283 | 0.0269 | -0.0471 |
| SJMN91-06234109 | 0.0085 | 0.0368 | -0.0067 | -0.0655 |
| SJMN91-06234209 | 0.0358 | 0.0544 | 0.0137 | 0.0367 |
| SJMN91-06235097 | 0.0831 | 0.0157 | 0.0281 | 0.0199 |
| SJMN91-06235179 | 0.0047 | -0.0144 | 0.0226 | 0.0041 |
| SJMN91-06235187 | -0.0112 | -0.0029 | -0.02 | 0.0387 |
| SJMN91-06236235 | -0.009 | 0.0798 | 0.0673 | 0.0606 |
| SJMN91-06236241 | 0.0059 | 0.0329 | -0.0092 | 0.0003 |
| SJMN91-06237020 | 0.0779 | -0.0418 | 0.02 | -0.0322 |
| SJMN91-06238185 | 0.0446 | 0.0102 | 0.0632 | 0.0249 |
| SJMN91-06255336 | -0.0027 | 0.0286 | -0.0027 | 0.0626 |
| SJMN91-06255421 | 0.0052 | 0.0269 | 0.0296 | 0.0067 |
| SJMN91-06255434 | 0.0067 | 0.133 | 0.0597 | 0.106 |
| SJMN91-06256107 | 0.0979 | 0.0167 | 0.1067 | -0.0562 |
| SJMN91-06256124 | 0.028 | 0.0245 | -0.0297 | 0.0004 |
| SJMN91-06261053 | -0.0124 | 0.0844 | 0.0071 | 0.0269 |
| SJMN91-06311092 | 0.0707 | -0.0309 | 0.0271 | -0.07 |
| SJMN91-06312120 | 0.0167 | -0.0515 | -0.0204 | 0.0061 |
| SJMN91-06346032 | 0.0383 | 0.0268 | 0.0093 | 0.0287 |
| SJMN91-06351097 | 0.0454 | -0.0473 | -0.0338 | -0.0433 |
| SJMN91-06351209 | 0.0294 | 0.0039 | 0.0062 | 0.0461 |
| SJMN91-06353190 | 0.0006 | -0.0183 | 0.0061 | 0.1033 |
| WSJ870122-0100 | 0.0446 | -0.0405 | -0.0015 | -0.0204 |
| WSJ870220-0106 | -0.0831 | -0.0113 | -0.0234 | 0.0608 |
| WSJ870804-0095 | 0.0205 | 0.0224 | 0.0499 | -0.0136 |
| WSJ871110-0154 | -0.0595 | 0.0223 | -0.0317 | -0.0601 |
| WSJ880412-0015 | -0.0163 | 0.0313 | 0.0351 | -0.0044 |
| WSJ880603-0129 | 0.011 | -0.0417 | -0.0291 | 0.0143 |
| WSJ880912-0064 | -0.017 | 0.0537 | 0.0064 | -0.0307 |
| WSJ881021-0008 | 0.0002 | 0.0946 | -0.0032 | -0.0265 |
| WSJ890726-0004 | 0.0424 | 0.0028 | 0.0585 | 0.0686 |
| WSJ890922-0113 | -0.053 | 0.0081 | 0.0051 | 0.0081 |
| WSJ890927-0018 | 0.0037 | -0.0235 | 0.0454 | 0.0479 |
| WSJ890928-0084 | 0.0728 | 0.0134 | 0.0355 | -0.0161 |
| WSJ891019-0021 | 0.0119 | 0.0345 | 0.0159 | -0.0027 |
| WSJ891019-0086 | -0.0009 | 0.0033 | 0.042 | 0.0414 |
| WSJ910213-0136 | -0.1017 | -0.057 | 0.0096 | 0.0745 |
| WSJ910326-0090 | 0.0749 | 0.0384 | -0.0146 | 0.0254 |
| WSJ910418-0105 | 0.0044 | -0.0225 | -0.0608 | 0.0798 |
| WSJ910418-0159 | 0.0498 | 0.0678 | 0.0591 | 0.0357 |
| WSJ920203-0038 | -0.0038 | 0.0525 | -0.0045 | 0.0128 |
| Avg | 0.0155 | 0.0086 | 0.0058 | 0.0059 |

Experiments – Proper Noun Ratio

| topic | MUSEPERDOC100 | OCCAMS100 | POLYTOPEPERDOC100 | RNDWRDPERDOC100 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AP880217-0100 | 0.0096 | -0.0022 | -0.0329 | 0.0024 |
| AP880228-0013 | 0.0285 | -0.0621 | 0.0227 | -0.0412 |
| AP880228-0097 | -0.032 | -0.026 | -0.032 | 0.043 |
| AP880310-0062 | 0.0203 | 0.0632 | -0.075 | -0.0203 |
| AP880314-0110 | -0.04 | -0.0204 | -0.0121 | 0.0059 |
| AP880324-0193 | 0.0002 | -0.0296 | 0.0228 | -0.004 |
| AP880325-0239 | 0.0525 | -0.0496 | 0.2698 | -0.0193 |
| AP880328-0206 | 0.0735 | -0.0846 | 0.1392 | 0.068 |
| AP880428-0041 | 0.0104 | -0.0291 | -0.0199 | -0.0003 |
| AP880508-0070 | -0.0475 | 0.0081 | 0.0488 | 0.0667 |
| AP880512-0096 | 0.0159 | 0.0259 | -0.0345 | 0.027 |
| AP880512-0157 | -0.0234 | 0.0481 | 0.0427 | 0.0118 |
| AP880521-0088 | 0.0049 | 0.0286 | -0.0535 | -0.0182 |
| AP880622-0184 | 0.0583 | -0.0299 | 0.0186 | -0.0442 |
| AP880625-0142 | 0.0568 | 0.1051 | 0.0142 | 0.0278 |
| AP880711-0056 | -0.002 | -0.0098 | -0.0162 | 0.0382 |
| AP880711-0221 | 0.0159 | 0.0204 | -0.0306 | -0.0212 |
| AP880713-0121 | -0.0277 | -0.0382 | -0.0866 | 0.0569 |
| AP880714-0085 | 0.0312 | 0.0419 | 0.0377 | 0.0486 |
| AP880714-0156 | -0.0311 | -0.0413 | -0.0058 | 0.0067 |
| AP880715-0065 | -0.0269 | -0.0045 | 0.0798 | 0.0071 |
| AP880720-0262 | 0.0051 | 0.0214 | -0.0483 | -0.0329 |
| AP880729-0155 | 0.0102 | 0.0001 | 0.0738 | 0.0928 |
| AP880808-0039 | -0.0303 | -0.0401 | -0.0403 | 0.0137 |
| AP880808-0040 | -0.0158 | 0.0572 | 0.0179 | 0.0146 |
| AP880816-0135 | 0.0048 | 0.0015 | -0.0045 | -0.0296 |
| AP880817-0040 | 0.0211 | -0.0349 | 0.038 | -0.0482 |
| AP880817-0124 | 0.0061 | 0.0215 | 0.0117 | 0.0395 |
| AP880818-0023 | 0.0531 | 0.0181 | 0.0079 | 0.0249 |
| AP880818-0088 | 0.0299 | -0.0326 | -0.0292 | -0.0028 |
| AP880818-0226 | 0.0353 | 0.007 | 0.0685 | 0.0046 |
| AP880819-0023 | 0.0816 | 0.0544 | 0.0166 | 0.0387 |
| AP880821-0008 | 0.0628 | 0.0265 | 0.0315 | -0.038 |
| AP880821-0010 | -0.0626 | -0.0156 | 0.0118 | -0.0394 |
| AP880822-0075 | -0.0196 | 0.0205 | -0.0354 | -0.0098 |
| AP880823-0059 | 0.0443 | -0.0019 | 0.0881 | -0.0119 |
| AP880823-0127 | -0.0174 | 0.0022 | 0.0877 | -0.0519 |
| AP880824-0050 | 0.0279 | -0.0303 | -0.0054 | -0.0031 |
| AP880824-0139 | -0.0249 | -0.0514 | 0.0774 | -0.0126 |
| AP880825-0147 | 0.0165 | -0.0034 | 0.0296 | -0.0127 |
| AP880826-0161 | 0.0212 | -0.0543 | -0.023 | 0.0338 |
| AP880826-0226 | -0.0023 | 0.0871 | -0.0292 | -0.0606 |
| AP880829-0222 | -0.0371 | -0.0024 | -0.0244 | -0.0019 |
| AP880911-0016 | 0.0431 | -0.0088 | -0.0191 | -0.0527 |
| AP880912-0095 | 0.0571 | 0.0309 | 0.0142 | -0.0441 |
| AP880912-0137 | 0.0063 | -0.0602 | -0.0099 | -0.0523 |
| AP880913-0070 | -0.0086 | -0.0223 | 0.0019 | 0.0269 |
| AP880914-0004 | 0.0918 | -0.0551 | 0.0704 | -0.0572 |
| AP880914-0027 | 0.0658 | 0.0122 | 0.0176 | 0.0465 |
| AP880914-0131 | 0.0698 | -0.0259 | 0.0875 | -0.0193 |
| AP880915-0003 | 0.0234 | -0.0763 | 0.1238 | -0.0705 |
| AP880915-0066 | 0.0109 | 0.0449 | -0.028 | -0.0354 |
| AP880915-0142 | 0.0281 | 0.0042 | 0.0075 | -0.0154 |
| AP880916-0025 | 0.0645 | -0.0055 | 0.0579 | 0.0329 |
| AP880916-0060 | 0.051 | -0.0153 | -0.0098 | 0.0215 |
| AP880917-0095 | 0.0439 | -0.0039 | -0.0441 | -0.0094 |
| AP880917-0096 | -0.0061 | 0.0413 | -0.0461 | -0.0362 |
| AP880917-0157 | -0.012 | 0.0169 | 0.0068 | 0.0501 |
| AP880921-0201 | 0.0804 | 0.0171 | 0.0215 | -0.0488 |
| AP880929-0042 | -0.0118 | -0.0112 | -0.0127 | 0.0011 |
| AP881001-0104 | 0.0063 | 0.0271 | -0.04 | -0.0203 |
| AP881002-0048 | -0.0192 | 0.0633 | 0.0739 | 0.0267 |
| AP881003-0066 | -0.0498 | 0.0509 | 0.0861 | -0.0391 |
| AP881020-0157 | 0.0311 | 0.0474 | 0.0241 | -0.0251 |
| AP881025-0196 | 0.0095 | 0.0486 | -0.0561 | 0.0415 |
| AP881027-0051 | -0.0274 | -0.0243 | 0.0448 | 0.0127 |
| AP881106-0062 | -0.0085 | -0.0291 | -0.0199 | 0.0199 |
| AP881109-0161 | 0 | 0.0444 | -0.025 | -0.0119 |
| AP881110-0227 | 0.0199 | 0.0049 | -0.0132 | -0.0575 |
| AP881113-0007 | 0.0557 | -0.099 | 0.056 | -0.0249 |
| AP881114-0006 | 0.0311 | 0.0149 | 0.0408 | 0.0299 |
| AP881115-0011 | 0.0931 | -0.0133 | 0.0431 | -0.0224 |
| AP881115-0113 | -0.0224 | -0.0459 | -0.0363 | -0.0259 |
| AP881118-0104 | 0.0335 | -0.0254 | -0.0192 | 0.0138 |
| AP881218-0007 | -0.0265 | 0.0083 | 0.0067 | 0.0268 |
| AP890102-0076 | -0.0764 | -0.129 | -0.0969 | -0.0211 |
| AP890103-0029 | 0.0223 | -0.0762 | -0.0479 | -0.0302 |
| AP890105-0224 | 0.0196 | -0.0111 | -0.0067 | -0.0098 |
| AP890107-0016 | 0.0494 | 0.107 | 0.1051 | -0.0211 |
| AP890107-0039 | 0.0497 | -0.0217 | 0.0293 | -0.0507 |
| AP890107-0119 | 0.0309 | -0.0342 | -0.0215 | -0.011 |
| AP890112-0071 | -0.0545 | -0.0283 | -0.0019 | -0.0213 |
| AP890115-0014 | 0.0075 | -0.0182 | -0.0206 | -0.0386 |
| AP890117-0004 | -0.0705 | -0.0499 | 0.0595 | 0.0371 |
| AP890117-0160 | -0.0185 | -0.0284 | -0.0273 | -0.0639 |
| AP890118-0013 | -0.0261 | -0.0478 | -0.0023 | 0.0229 |
| AP890118-0051 | 0.0127 | -0.0459 | -0.0471 | 0.0091 |
| AP890118-0094 | -0.0158 | 0.0499 | -0.0192 | -0.0188 |
| AP890118-0100 | 0.0781 | 0.0372 | -0.0041 | -0.0203 |
| AP890119-0266 | 0.0563 | -0.0256 | 0.0386 | -0.0092 |
| AP890121-0050 | -0.0172 | -0.0118 | -0.0002 | 0.0043 |
| AP890121-0123 | 0.0069 | -0.0082 | -0.0253 | 0.0294 |
| AP890122-0087 | -0.0112 | 0.0101 | -0.0187 | -0.0101 |
| AP890125-0099 | -0.0012 | 0.0436 | 0.0118 | -0.0048 |
| AP890201-0043 | 0.0378 | 0.0031 | 0.0085 | -0.0181 |
| AP890203-0164 | 0.0061 | 0.0622 | 0.0391 | -0.025 |
| AP890211-0110 | -0.0157 | 0.0117 | 0.0267 | 0.017 |
| AP890224-0003 | -0.0367 | 0.0158 | 0.0051 | -0.0332 |
| AP890228-0146 | 0.017 | -0.0345 | 0.0165 | 0.003 |
| AP890309-0143 | 0.0512 | 0.0523 | 0.0975 | -0.0156 |
| AP890316-0012 | -0.0078 | 0.0029 | 0.0233 | -0.0379 |
| AP890320-0158 | 0.0233 | 0.0405 | 0.0128 | 0.0029 |
| AP890323-0218 | -0.0174 | -0.0096 | -0.0129 | -0.0081 |
| AP890323-0234 | 0.0572 | -0.0275 | 0.0542 | 0.0069 |
| AP890324-0014 | 0.0146 | -0.0176 | -0.0217 | 0.0661 |
| AP890330-0123 | -0.0461 | -0.0192 | -0.0256 | -0.0533 |
| AP890417-0189 | -0.0023 | 0.0206 | 0.0203 | -0.0009 |
| AP890420-0176 | -0.0149 | -0.033 | 0.0032 | -0.0515 |
| AP890421-0013 | -0.0103 | 0.0054 | 0.0096 | -0.0174 |
| AP890421-0062 | -0.0449 | 0.0329 | 0.019 | 0.004 |
| AP890421-0186 | 0.0475 | -0.0613 | -0.0583 | -0.0035 |
| AP890422-0035 | -0.0045 | -0.0303 | -0.0782 | -0.0135 |
| AP890423-0090 | 0.0004 | -0.0252 | 0.0627 | 0.0208 |
| AP890424-0026 | -0.0013 | 0.0227 | 0.018 | -0.0461 |
| AP890425-0013 | 0.018 | 0.041 | 0.058 | 0.0212 |
| AP890426-0123 | 0.0386 | 0.0046 | 0.0312 | -0.0674 |
| AP890426-0126 | 0.0168 | -0.0437 | -0.0231 | -0.0285 |
| AP890426-0160 | 0.0405 | 0.011 | -0.0395 | 0.0634 |
| AP890426-0185 | -0.0026 | 0.0021 | 0.0345 | 0.0014 |
| AP890426-0204 | 0.0414 | 0.0665 | -0.0796 | -0.0433 |
| AP890427-0052 | 0.0049 | -0.0518 | 0.0188 | 0.0128 |
| AP890427-0098 | -0.0104 | 0.0316 | -0.0412 | 0.0046 |
| AP890509-0040 | -0.029 | 0.0875 | 0.0437 | -0.0493 |
| AP890517-0106 | 0.011 | 0.0573 | 0.0928 | -0.0305 |
| AP890519-0060 | 0.015 | 0.041 | 0.0399 | 0.0043 |
| AP890519-0117 | 0.0832 | 0.0361 | 0.0583 | -0.0343 |
| AP890603-0103 | -0.0221 | -0.0407 | 0.0654 | -0.0017 |
| AP890603-0108 | 0.0407 | 0.0136 | 0.009 | -0.0108 |
| AP890603-0122 | 0.0543 | -0.0055 | -0.03 | 0.0082 |
| AP890603-0126 | 0.0072 | -0.0133 | -0.0008 | -0.0145 |
| AP890607-0067 | 0.0202 | -0.0069 | 0.0206 | -0.0081 |
| AP890609-0036 | 0.0559 | 0.0148 | 0.0642 | 0.0021 |
| AP890609-0094 | 0.0354 | -0.0065 | -0.0499 | 0.0266 |
| AP890613-0125 | 0.0151 | 0.0083 | 0.0232 | 0.007 |
| AP890615-0263 | 0.0401 | 0.0387 | -0.0103 | -0.026 |
| AP890616-0230 | 0.0407 | 0.0494 | -0.0383 | 0.0221 |
| AP890622-0157 | 0.0667 | -0.0103 | -0.0448 | 0.034 |
| AP890710-0170 | -0.0096 | 0.0526 | -0.0837 | 0.0039 |
| AP890711-0223 | 0.0466 | 0.0466 | -0.0013 | 0.0045 |
| AP890715-0076 | 0.0142 | 0.0443 | 0.0067 | -0.0562 |
| AP890717-0149 | -0.0589 | -0.0266 | 0.0861 | 0.0093 |
| AP890719-0248 | -0.0062 | -0.0314 | 0.0184 | -0.003 |
| AP890720-0075 | 0.0207 | -0.018 | 0.0056 | -0.014 |
| AP890721-0091 | 0.0204 | -0.0029 | 0.0435 | 0.0033 |
| AP890801-0134 | 0.0247 | 0.0492 | 0.0154 | -0.0341 |
| AP890820-0068 | 0.0829 | -0.0207 | 0.164 | 0.0058 |
| AP890821-0100 | -0.0164 | -0.0265 | 0.0257 | -0.0285 |
| AP890913-0253 | -0.0159 | 0.0526 | 0.0953 | -0.0005 |
| AP890922-0007 | -0.006 | 0.0625 | 0.0885 | 0.0197 |
| AP890922-0049 | -0.0326 | -0.011 | -0.014 | 0.009 |
| AP890922-0071 | 0.0019 | -0.0416 | -0.0034 | -0.0354 |
| AP890922-0072 | -0.009 | 0.0201 | 0.0052 | 0.0321 |
| AP890922-0103 | 0.0289 | 0.0321 | -0.0192 | -0.0204 |
| AP890922-0117 | -0.0282 | -0.0165 | -0.0073 | 0.001 |
| AP890922-0119 | -0.0037 | 0.0214 | -0.0107 | -0.0085 |
| AP890922-0167 | 0.0652 | -0.0268 | -0.0357 | -0.028 |
| AP890922-0224 | -0.0335 | 0.0505 | 0.0558 | 0.0657 |
| AP890923-0012 | 0.0776 | 0.1032 | -0.0147 | -0.0131 |
| AP890923-0035 | -0.0024 | 0.0185 | -0.0415 | -0.0124 |
| AP890923-0091 | 0.0229 | -0.0252 | -0.0041 | 0.0641 |
| AP890924-0025 | 0.0988 | 0.0409 | 0.0298 | 0.0737 |
| AP890925-0009 | -0.0155 | 0.0959 | -0.0272 | -0.0512 |
| AP890925-0054 | -0.0087 | -0.0678 | -0.0419 | -0.011 |
| AP890925-0124 | 0.0543 | 0.0338 | -0.0068 | -0.0416 |
| AP890928-0099 | -0.1231 | 0.0227 | 0.0545 | 0.0178 |
| AP891017-0195 | 0.0921 | 0.0448 | -0.0598 | 0.0137 |
| AP891017-0199 | 0.0581 | -0.0406 | 0.0254 | -0.0261 |
| AP891017-0204 | 0.0747 | 0.0581 | -0.0427 | 0.0085 |
| AP891018-0084 | 0.0189 | -0.086 | 0.0058 | -0.0504 |
| AP891018-0301 | 0.0162 | -0.0472 | -0.0414 | 0.0196 |
| AP891019-0037 | -0.0274 | 0.0631 | 0.0712 | -0.023 |
| AP891026-0208 | -0.0397 | 0.0048 | 0.0109 | 0.0585 |
| AP891103-0200 | 0.0095 | -0.0508 | -0.013 | 0.0052 |
| AP891106-0072 | 0.0163 | 0.0718 | 0.0062 | -0.0248 |
| AP891110-0043 | 0.0627 | 0.0494 | 0.0207 | 0.0261 |
| AP891111-0064 | -0.0344 | 0.0639 | 0.0543 | 0.0333 |
| AP891115-0199 | -0.0355 | -0.0005 | 0.0096 | -0.0133 |
| AP891116-0035 | -0.0454 | -0.0076 | -0.0636 | 0.0273 |
| AP891116-0115 | -0.0329 | -0.0432 | 0.1646 | -0.0185 |
| AP891116-0133 | 0.0285 | -0.0363 | -0.0465 | -0.0084 |
| AP891116-0184 | 0.0457 | 0.0174 | 0.0126 | 0.024 |
| AP891116-0198 | 0.0474 | -0.0189 | 0.058 | -0.0189 |
| AP891117-0002 | 0.0355 | -0.0322 | -0.0191 | 0.0228 |
| AP891117-0248 | -0.098 | 0.0938 | 0.0374 | 0.0017 |
| AP891118-0136 | 0.0783 | -0.0146 | 0.0465 | 0.0015 |
| AP891202-0154 | -0.0086 | -0.0027 | 0.0004 | -0.0385 |
| AP891207-0158 | -0.001 | -0.0215 | 0.0388 | -0.0078 |
| AP891212-0062 | -0.0298 | 0.0098 | 0.022 | 0.0009 |
| AP891213-0164 | 0.0026 | 0.0526 | 0.008 | -0.03 |
| AP891216-0037 | -0.0262 | 0.0593 | -0.0443 | -0.0118 |
| AP891217-0053 | -0.0516 | -0.014 | -0.0178 | -0.0336 |
| AP900102-0114 | 0.0048 | -0.0459 | 0.032 | 0.0608 |
| AP900103-0077 | 0 | -0.0115 | 0.0918 | -0.0458 |
| AP900117-0193 | -0.0274 | -0.0223 | -0.04 | 0.0257 |
| AP900118-0029 | 0.006 | -0.0033 | 0.0121 | 0.0237 |
| AP900118-0183 | -0.0406 | -0.0014 | 0.1409 | 0.0107 |
| AP900118-0190 | 0.0161 | -0.0184 | 0.0384 | -0.0479 |
| AP900119-0024 | -0.0021 | 0.023 | -0.0319 | -0.0028 |
| AP900119-0041 | 0.006 | 0.0305 | -0.0498 | -0.0218 |
| AP900119-0051 | 0.0079 | 0.0346 | -0.0164 | -0.0092 |
| AP900121-0039 | 0.0081 | 0.0556 | -0.0255 | 0.0067 |
| AP900128-0063 | 0.0849 | 0.0684 | 0.0602 | 0.0159 |
| AP900129-0036 | -0.0349 | -0.0111 | 0.0082 | 0.0875 |
| AP900129-0071 | 0.0831 | -0.0176 | 0.0114 | -0.0055 |
| AP900130-0010 | -0.0535 | -0.0087 | 0.0276 | 0.0453 |
| AP900130-0113 | 0.0365 | -0.0383 | -0.0111 | -0.013 |
| AP900130-0202 | 0.0353 | 0.0448 | 0.0103 | -0.0241 |
| AP900131-0068 | 0.003 | -0.011 | 0.0286 | -0.0346 |
| AP900131-0200 | -0.026 | -0.0267 | 0.0488 | -0.0378 |
| AP900208-0116 | -0.0176 | 0.0217 | 0.0557 | 0.0026 |
| AP900210-0106 | 0.008 | 0.03 | 0.0279 | 0.0373 |
| AP900212-0061 | 0.0367 | -0.0361 | -0.0644 | -0.0184 |
| AP900214-0157 | 0.1014 | 0.0533 | -0.0393 | 0.0026 |
| AP900215-0013 | -0.0317 | 0.0083 | 0.012 | 0.0502 |
| AP900220-0065 | 0.0395 | -0.0276 | 0.0129 | -0.0061 |
| AP900220-0089 | 0.0011 | -0.0382 | -0.0194 | 0.0107 |
| AP900224-0094 | 0.0304 | 0.0651 | 0.0195 | -0.0002 |
| AP900307-0146 | -0.0071 | 0.0454 | -0.0044 | -0.0071 |
| AP900321-0057 | -0.0016 | -0.0004 | 0.0352 | -0.0451 |
| AP900322-0112 | -0.0261 | 0.0221 | -0.0425 | 0.0262 |
| AP900324-0081 | 0.0227 | 0.0006 | 0.0241 | -0.0398 |
| AP900328-0128 | -0.0062 | 0.0265 | -0.0757 | 0.0639 |
| AP900330-0086 | 0.0006 | 0.0396 | -0.0353 | -0.0059 |
| AP900406-0164 | -0.028 | -0.0334 | 0.0065 | 0.0055 |
| AP900408-0059 | -0.0196 | -0.0231 | 0.0036 | 0.0123 |
| AP900420-0006 | -0.0215 | 0.0131 | -0.0275 | -0.0112 |
| AP900421-0075 | -0.013 | -0.0316 | 0.0726 | -0.0145 |
| AP900422-0032 | 0.0555 | 0.0005 | 0.0072 | -0.0023 |
| AP900424-0048 | -0.0063 | -0.0057 | 0.0178 | -0.0686 |
| AP900424-0081 | 0.0465 | 0.032 | 0.0029 | 0.0465 |
| AP900424-0096 | 0.0454 | 0.0128 | -0.0091 | 0.065 |
| AP900425-0013 | -0.057 | 0.0919 | 0.0214 | 0.0367 |
| AP900425-0146 | -0.0003 | 0.003 | 0.0048 | 0.0121 |
| AP900425-0198 | 0.0541 | -0.0239 | 0.0361 | -0.0003 |
| AP900426-0135 | -0.004 | 0.0079 | 0.0963 | -0.0203 |
| AP900426-0185 | 0.0674 | -0.0328 | -0.038 | -0.0145 |
| AP900427-0083 | 0.0146 | 0.0399 | 0.0589 | -0.0594 |
| AP900427-0146 | -0.0087 | 0.0413 | 0.0715 | -0.0399 |
| AP900428-0022 | -0.0429 | 0.0166 | 0.0784 | 0.0098 |
| AP900428-0050 | -0.0522 | -0.0514 | 0.0205 | -0.0218 |
| AP900505-0127 | 0.0336 | -0.0195 | 0.0472 | 0.0138 |
| AP900507-0207 | -0.0433 | 0.0194 | 0.0825 | 0.0078 |
| AP900510-0029 | -0.0414 | 0.0681 | 0.0409 | -0.0453 |
| AP900524-0130 | 0.0883 | 0.0017 | 0.0152 | 0.0152 |
| AP900609-0040 | -0.0763 | -0.0327 | 0.0493 | 0.0079 |
| AP900613-0195 | 0.0389 | 0.068 | 0.0076 | 0.032 |
| AP900615-0115 | -0.0929 | -0.035 | -0.1205 | 0.0014 |
| AP900615-0164 | 0.003 | 0.1602 | 0.0667 | 0.0006 |
| AP900616-0032 | -0.0382 | -0.0032 | -0.0387 | -0.0041 |
| AP900616-0123 | 0.0018 | 0.027 | -0.0073 | 0.0466 |
| AP900618-0018 | -0.021 | -0.0024 | -0.0069 | -0.0472 |
| AP900618-0069 | -0.0571 | 0.0563 | 0.0356 | 0.0635 |
| AP900621-0186 | 0.026 | -0.0112 | 0.0294 | -0.0167 |
| AP900621-0192 | 0.0523 | 0.1422 | 0.0343 | -0.0677 |
| AP900622-0025 | 0.0206 | 0.0245 | 0.0022 | -0.0082 |
| AP900622-0080 | 0.0981 | -0.017 | -0.0247 | -0.0516 |
| AP900622-0087 | -0.0054 | 0.1067 | -0.032 | 0.0215 |
| AP900623-0009 | -0.024 | -0.0322 | -0.0567 | -0.0456 |
| AP900623-0022 | -0.0366 | -0.0801 | -0.0544 | 0.0247 |
| AP900623-0119 | 0.0372 | 0.0127 | -0.021 | -0.0087 |
| AP900624-0011 | 0.0115 | -0.0229 | -0.0166 | 0.0094 |
| AP900625-0036 | -0.0447 | 0.0587 | 0.0093 | 0.0109 |
| AP900625-0090 | -0.0084 | 0.0476 | 0.013 | -0.0038 |
| AP900626-0010 | -0.025 | 0.0106 | 0.0416 | -0.0268 |
| AP900705-0149 | -0.0179 | -0.004 | -0.0158 | -0.0365 |
| AP900716-0007 | -0.018 | -0.0086 | 0.0574 | -0.039 |
| AP900718-0069 | -0.0198 | -0.0344 | 0.0528 | 0.0131 |
| AP900724-0090 | -0.0299 | -0.0543 | 0.028 | 0.0148 |
| AP900730-0116 | -0.0104 | 0.0207 | 0.0084 | 0.025 |
| AP900731-0113 | 0.0374 | 0.055 | -0.0405 | 0.0189 |
| AP900801-0004 | 0.0096 | -0.0387 | -0.0509 | -0.0026 |
| AP900802-0057 | -0.0383 | 0.0222 | -0.0076 | 0.0411 |
| AP900802-0077 | 0.0009 | -0.0028 | -0.0037 | 0.0123 |
| AP900802-0092 | -0.0883 | 0.045 | 0.0833 | 0.08 |
| AP900802-0135 | -0.0348 | 0.0223 | 0.0275 | 0.0047 |
| AP900802-0159 | 0.1515 | 0.0006 | 0.048 | -0.0284 |
| AP900802-0164 | 0.0284 | -0.0167 | -0.0254 | 0.0044 |
| AP900802-0180 | 0.0045 | 0.1055 | -0.0264 | 0.0188 |
| AP900803-0004 | -0.0026 | -0.0405 | 0.088 | 0.0095 |
| AP900803-0008 | 0.0209 | 0.0901 | -0.0212 | 0.1037 |
| AP900804-0057 | 0.046 | -0.0076 | 0.0612 | -0.0206 |
| AP900804-0067 | 0.0057 | -0.0182 | 0.0836 | -0.0322 |
| AP900805-0019 | -0.057 | -0.0017 | -0.0023 | -0.0335 |
| AP900805-0060 | 0.0587 | -0.0689 | -0.0348 | -0.0205 |
| AP900806-0077 | -0.0175 | -0.019 | -0.0596 | -0.0127 |
| AP900806-0095 | -0.0552 | 0.0076 | 0.0788 | -0.0109 |
| AP900807-0029 | -0.037 | 0.0664 | 0.0213 | 0.019 |
| AP900807-0093 | -0.027 | -0.0055 | 0.0367 | 0.0111 |
| AP900808-0030 | -0.0432 | 0.0513 | 0.0593 | -0.0139 |
| AP900810-0120 | 0.0551 | -0.0058 | -0.0114 | -0.0135 |
| AP900821-0092 | 0.029 | 0.0029 | 0.0271 | -0.028 |
| AP900825-0099 | 0.0147 | -0.0528 | 0.0219 | 0.0883 |
| AP900829-0044 | -0.0199 | -0.0249 | -0.0335 | 0.002 |
| AP900919-0122 | -0.0586 | 0.039 | 0.0475 | 0.0402 |
| AP901003-0006 | 0.0018 | -0.0285 | -0.039 | -0.0194 |
| AP901006-0037 | 0.0192 | 0.0091 | 0.0234 | -0.0034 |
| AP901008-0136 | -0.0197 | -0.0094 | 0.0249 | -0.0052 |
| AP901008-0174 | -0.0211 | -0.0579 | 0.1219 | 0.0462 |
| AP901009-0072 | -0.041 | -0.0439 | -0.0319 | 0.0506 |
| AP901009-0148 | 0.0164 | -0.0007 | -0.0211 | 0.0153 |
| AP901009-0186 | -0.0554 | -0.0299 | 0.0595 | -0.0211 |
| AP901010-0030 | 0.0846 | -0.0656 | 0.0604 | 0.0292 |
| AP901016-0097 | -0.0052 | 0.0497 | 0.0239 | -0.0097 |
| AP901016-0112 | -0.0093 | 0.0019 | 0.1456 | 0.0442 |
| AP901019-0072 | 0.1651 | 0.1263 | -0.0119 | 0.032 |
| AP901114-0087 | -0.0713 | -0.0496 | -0.0396 | -0.0318 |
| AP901121-0206 | -0.0532 | 0.0234 | 0.0366 | 0.0104 |
| AP901121-0207 | 0.1424 | -0.0033 | 0.0179 | -0.0182 |
| AP901122-0100 | 0.0235 | 0.097 | 0.0214 | 0.0166 |
| AP901123-0002 | 0.0098 | 0.0345 | 0.0327 | 0.0063 |
| AP901123-0062 | 0.0249 | 0.0154 | 0.0007 | -0.0251 |
| AP901126-0053 | 0.043 | -0.0481 | -0.0143 | -0.0298 |
| AP901127-0119 | 0.0947 | 0.0449 | 0.0553 | -0.0001 |
| AP901208-0076 | -0.0701 | 0.0362 | -0.003 | -0.0307 |
| AP901208-0106 | 0.0375 | 0.0058 | 0.0591 | -0.0409 |
| AP901222-0078 | 0.0525 | -0.0601 | 0.1973 | 0.0075 |
| AP901230-0022 | 0.0281 | -0.0235 | 0.0087 | -0.0368 |
| FBIS3-13911 | 0.0145 | 0.0592 | 0.0146 | 0.0129 |
| FBIS3-1707 | -0.0056 | -0.021 | 0.045 | 0.0165 |
| FBIS4-18298 | -0.03 | 0.0484 | 0.0611 | -0.0568 |
| FBIS4-24776 | 0.0283 | 0.01 | -0.0569 | -0.0234 |
| FBIS4-26242 | 0.0224 | -0.0207 | 0.0234 | 0.0467 |
| FBIS4-26245 | 0.1186 | -0.0766 | -0.0573 | -0.0088 |
| FBIS4-26327 | 0.0172 | -0.0097 | 0.0267 | -0.0647 |
| FBIS4-26392 | 0.0467 | 0.0247 | 0.0112 | 0.0266 |
| FBIS4-26516 | 0.053 | 0.008 | -0.0251 | -0.0041 |
| FBIS4-26532 | 0.0934 | -0.0122 | -0.0428 | -0.0416 |
| FBIS4-26604 | 0.0696 | 0.0211 | 0.0533 | -0.006 |
| FBIS4-26614 | 0.0961 | -0.0247 | 0.0288 | -0.0584 |
| FBIS4-26768 | 0.1678 | -0.1474 | -0.0084 | -0.0728 |
| FBIS4-26769 | 0.0943 | 0.0266 | 0.0823 | -0.0527 |
| FBIS4-40244 | 0.0581 | 0.0527 | 0.0702 | 0.0203 |
| FBIS4-42027 | -0.0076 | -0.0623 | 0.0547 | 0.0015 |
| FBIS4-42178 | 0.0516 | 0.0402 | -0.0017 | 0.0132 |
| FBIS4-57796 | 0.0597 | 0.0363 | -0.0109 | 0.0069 |
| FBIS4-62505 | 0.0384 | 0.0675 | 0.0504 | -0.0446 |
| FT921-4937 | -0.027 | 0.046 | -0.0019 | 0.0187 |
| FT921-5959 | 0.0161 | 0.0607 | 0.0125 | 0.0162 |
| FT922-1115 | -0.0226 | 0.0438 | 0.1659 | -0.0345 |
| FT922-14265 | 0.0224 | 0.0261 | 0.0421 | -0.0044 |
| FT922-2972 | 0.0013 | 0.0238 | 0.0534 | -0.0555 |
| FT922-3446 | 0.0016 | -0.0416 | 0.0274 | -0.0237 |
| FT923-12122 | 0.0219 | 0 | 0.0126 | -0.0103 |
| FT923-13244 | 0.0104 | 0.0109 | 0.0375 | 0.0096 |
| FT923-3822 | -0.0757 | -0.0978 | 0.2071 | 0.0351 |
| FT923-5068 | 0.0746 | -0.0196 | 0.0661 | -0.019 |
| FT923-5589 | -0.0024 | 0.0183 | 0.003 | -0.0051 |
| FT923-5797 | -0.025 | -0.0318 | -0.0442 | -0.0491 |
| FT923-5835 | 0.0602 | 0.0449 | -0.0279 | -0.0117 |
| FT923-6038 | -0.0067 | 0.0256 | -0.0047 | 0.0327 |
| FT923-6110 | 0.0131 | 0.0031 | 0.0148 | -0.0615 |
| FT923-6455 | 0.0786 | -0.0146 | 0.0793 | 0.0066 |
| FT923-6509 | -0.0342 | -0.0606 | -0.0024 | -0.0024 |
| FT923-8765 | 0.0472 | -0.0605 | 0.0664 | -0.024 |
| FT923-8766 | 0.0432 | 0.0051 | -0.018 | -0.0176 |
| FT924-10185 | 0.0046 | -0.0606 | 0.0803 | -0.025 |
| FT924-12616 | -0.0205 | -0.0012 | 0.0311 | -0.0029 |
| FT931-2858 | 0.0465 | 0.0116 | -0.0089 | 0.0208 |
| FT931-2981 | -0.0082 | -0.005 | 0.0264 | -0.0258 |
| FT931-3664 | 0.0185 | 0.0094 | 0.0287 | -0.0089 |
| FT931-3764 | 0.0173 | -0.0471 | 0.0002 | -0.0219 |
| FT931-4176 | -0.0254 | -0.0002 | 0.0596 | 0.0069 |
| FT932-15960 | 0.0435 | -0.0656 | -0.0076 | -0.0795 |
| FT932-5869 | -0.0236 | -0.0147 | 0.002 | 0.0078 |
| FT933-10917 | -0.0369 | -0.0399 | -0.0168 | 0.0279 |
| FT933-9536 | 0.0258 | 0.0274 | 0.0134 | 0.0058 |
| FT934-2439 | -0.0058 | 0.0117 | -0.0315 | 0.019 |
| FT941-11518 | 0.0212 | 0.0288 | 0.0604 | -0.0839 |
| FT942-12054 | -0.0281 | -0.0189 | 0.0218 | -0.0754 |
| FT942-6613 | 0.0239 | -0.0118 | 0.0376 | -0.0273 |
| FT943-178 | -0.0277 | 0.0209 | -0.0124 | 0.0042 |
| FT943-3897 | 0.0902 | -0.0513 | -0.0395 | -0.0255 |
| FT943-5106 | 0.0668 | -0.1538 | -0.0847 | -0.004 |
| FT944-12170 | 0.1154 | -0.0292 | 0.0255 | -0.0006 |
| FT944-16774 | -0.0799 | 0.0145 | -0.0469 | 0.0341 |
| LA011889-0131 | 0.0253 | 0.0228 | 0.0299 | -0.0381 |
| LA011990-0091 | 0.0244 | 0.0201 | -0.0115 | 0.0351 |
| LA012090-0110 | 0.1444 | -0.0061 | 0.0148 | 0.0093 |
| LA012189-0060 | 0.0317 | 0.0717 | 0.0441 | -0.0327 |
| LA012189-0073 | 0.0228 | -0.0509 | -0.0358 | 0.0687 |
| LA012289-0055 | -0.0036 | 0.0005 | 0.0379 | -0.0207 |
| LA012290-0036 | 0.0342 | 0.0815 | -0.0032 | -0.0268 |
| LA013090-0161 | -0.0527 | -0.013 | 0.1757 | 0.0099 |
| LA020189-0050 | 0.0015 | 0.0988 | -0.0971 | -0.0091 |
| LA020190-0038 | 0.0406 | -0.0079 | 0.0373 | -0.0192 |
| LA020289-0065 | -0.0452 | -0.0048 | 0.03 | 0.0209 |
| LA020389-0041 | 0.0015 | 0.0592 | 0.0007 | 0.023 |
| LA020489-0035 | -0.0131 | 0.0314 | 0.0155 | -0.0107 |
| LA020489-0060 | 0.0194 | 0.0599 | 0.0186 | -0.0003 |
| LA020890-0197 | -0.0833 | -0.1118 | 0.271 | -0.0718 |
| LA021189-0003 | 0.012 | -0.0467 | 0.0743 | -0.0196 |
| LA021190-0179 | 0.0154 | 0.0226 | 0.0077 | -0.054 |
| LA021190-0181 | 0.0378 | -0.0363 | 0.053 | -0.0254 |
| LA021290-0043 | -0.0059 | 0.0389 | -0.0243 | 0.0103 |
| LA030290-0075 | 0.0101 | 0.0102 | 0.0651 | 0.0348 |
| LA033089-0190 | -0.0079 | -0.0613 | 0.0137 | 0.0149 |
| LA033189-0114 | 0.0262 | 0.0405 | -0.0044 | -0.0201 |
| LA040689-0198 | 0.0435 | 0.0715 | 0.0337 | -0.0025 |
| LA040790-0121 | 0.0684 | 0.041 | 0.0093 | -0.0017 |
| LA041989-0141 | 0.0623 | -0.0598 | -0.0528 | 0.0427 |
| LA042290-0160 | -0.0241 | -0.0629 | 0.0577 | -0.0206 |
| LA042389-0098 | 0.027 | -0.0263 | 0.0168 | -0.0069 |
| LA042489-0051 | -0.007 | 0.0275 | -0.021 | 0.0164 |
| LA042590-0135 | -0.001 | -0.0609 | 0.0967 | -0.0136 |
| LA042590-0152 | 0.0498 | -0.0191 | -0.0027 | 0.0385 |
| LA042689-0146 | -0.0258 | -0.0007 | 0.0148 | -0.006 |
| LA042789-0025 | -0.0147 | 0.084 | 0.0278 | -0.0564 |
| LA042789-0032 | -0.0232 | 0.0421 | -0.0396 | -0.0199 |
| LA042789-0068 | 0.0553 | -0.0088 | 0.0235 | -0.0117 |
| LA051589-0055 | 0.0077 | 0.0118 | -0.0011 | -0.0038 |
| LA052089-0075 | -0.0252 | 0.0233 | 0.0407 | -0.0393 |
| LA060590-0086 | 0.0211 | 0.0831 | 0.0276 | -0.0338 |
| LA061590-0176 | -0.0006 | -0.0148 | -0.0002 | -0.0162 |
| LA061890-0066 | 0.0449 | -0.0441 | 0.0244 | 0.0326 |
| LA062290-0134 | 0.0265 | 0.022 | -0.0367 | -0.0356 |
| LA062290-0169 | 0.0648 | 0.0068 | 0.031 | 0.0014 |
| LA062290-0172 | -0.0382 | -0.0029 | 0.0588 | -0.0497 |
| LA062390-0001 | -0.093 | -0.0903 | -0.0317 | -0.0698 |
| LA062390-0068 | -0.0625 | -0.0248 | -0.1441 | -0.0396 |
| LA062490-0172 | -0.0075 | -0.0416 | 0.0809 | -0.0291 |
| LA062590-0096 | -0.028 | -0.0003 | -0.0129 | 0.0082 |
| LA062690-0155 | -0.0068 | 0.0496 | 0.0186 | 0.0188 |
| LA070289-0167 | -0.0109 | 0.0334 | 0.004 | -0.0389 |
| LA072689-0050 | -0.0505 | -0.001 | 0.0235 | 0.0389 |
| LA080290-0037 | -0.0314 | 0.024 | -0.0413 | 0.0137 |
| LA080290-0233 | -0.0616 | -0.015 | 0.0901 | -0.0165 |
| LA080390-0085 | 0.0019 | -0.0293 | 0.0445 | -0.0127 |
| LA080690-0111 | 0.0093 | 0.0489 | -0.0144 | -0.0301 |
| LA080890-0078 | 0.0616 | -0.0136 | -0.0593 | 0.0043 |
| LA082889-0067 | 0.0329 | 0.1424 | -0.0561 | -0.0307 |
| LA092189-0225 | -0.0296 | 0.0199 | 0.0063 | -0.0306 |
| LA092389-0092 | -0.0193 | 0.0906 | -0.0054 | 0.0589 |
| LA092789-0093 | -0.0359 | -0.0477 | 0.0261 | -0.0286 |
| LA101390-0087 | 0.0077 | -0.0118 | -0.0139 | 0.0363 |
| LA101590-0066 | -0.0413 | -0.0055 | -0.0479 | 0.0057 |
| LA101889-0066 | 0.0032 | -0.0133 | 0.0019 | -0.0146 |
| LA101889-0108 | 0.0319 | -0.0425 | 0.0449 | 0.007 |
| LA101990-0114 | -0.0373 | 0.0859 | 0.0361 | -0.0098 |
| LA102089-0172 | 0.0194 | -0.0065 | 0.033 | -0.0113 |
| LA102090-0146 | 0.0085 | 0.0518 | -0.0326 | -0.0784 |
| LA102389-0075 | 0.0085 | 0.0373 | 0.0049 | -0.0019 |
| LA102489-0131 | 0.0163 | 0.0363 | 0.0378 | -0.0249 |
| LA102690-0005 | 0.0138 | 0.0076 | -0.0158 | 0.0035 |
| LA111289-0035 | 0.0007 | -0.0175 | -0.0222 | 0.031 |
| LA111689-0160 | -0.0112 | -0.0706 | -0.0862 | 0.0076 |
| LA112090-0165 | 0.1082 | 0.0437 | 0.0333 | 0.0528 |
| LA112390-0008 | 0.0527 | 0.033 | -0.0076 | -0.0264 |
| LA112790-0154 | 0.0382 | 0.0446 | 0.0427 | -0.0573 |
| LA112890-0036 | -0.0106 | 0.004 | 0.0303 | 0.0334 |
| LA120189-0122 | 0.0551 | -0.0789 | -0.0125 | -0.0071 |
| LA120389-0170 | 0.0643 | -0.0071 | -0.0814 | 0.0439 |
| LA120890-0055 | -0.0332 | -0.0158 | 0.0552 | 0.0528 |
| LA121090-0095 | -0.0722 | -0.0491 | -0.0282 | 0.0142 |
| LA121490-0148 | 0.0258 | 0.0458 | 0.0672 | -0.0458 |
| LA121589-0192 | -0.0337 | 0.0471 | -0.0104 | 0.0046 |
| LA122190-0149 | 0.0541 | 0.0454 | 0.0027 | -0.01 |
| SJMN91-06025182 | -0.0577 | 0.0098 | 0.0217 | 0.0445 |
| SJMN91-06025282 | 0.0081 | 0.0716 | 0.0358 | -0.042 |
| SJMN91-06044329 | -0.0891 | -0.1118 | -0.0882 | 0.0189 |
| SJMN91-06058250 | 0.0732 | -0.001 | 0.0044 | -0.0127 |
| SJMN91-06064099 | -0.0051 | 0.0318 | -0.0051 | 0.0363 |
| SJMN91-06069108 | -0.0199 | -0.0169 | 0.0221 | 0.0234 |
| SJMN91-06097121 | 0.0129 | 0.0646 | -0.0018 | 0.0378 |
| SJMN91-06105230 | -0.0685 | -0.0472 | 0.0534 | 0.0134 |
| SJMN91-06140099 | -0.0052 | -0.0091 | -0.0385 | 0.0693 |
| SJMN91-06145218 | -0.0066 | 0.0364 | 0.0303 | -0.0175 |
| SJMN91-06162032 | 0.0056 | 0.122 | 0.0002 | -0.0152 |
| SJMN91-06163112 | -0.0055 | 0.0607 | 0.026 | 0.0238 |
| SJMN91-06164210 | -0.0136 | 0.048 | 0.0377 | 0.0145 |
| SJMN91-06165048 | -0.0088 | -0.0015 | -0.0327 | -0.0033 |
| SJMN91-06167046 | 0.0091 | 0.0174 | -0.022 | 0.0092 |
| SJMN91-06171237 | 0.0056 | -0.0716 | -0.0418 | 0.0293 |
| SJMN91-06234048 | -0.0229 | 0.0576 | 0.0367 | -0.0416 |
| SJMN91-06234109 | 0.0243 | -0.0683 | 0.0246 | -0.0187 |
| SJMN91-06234209 | 0.0221 | 0.0117 | 0.0179 | -0.0119 |
| SJMN91-06235097 | 0.0405 | -0.0213 | 0.0249 | 0.009 |
| SJMN91-06235179 | -0.0101 | -0.013 | 0.0031 | 0.0033 |
| SJMN91-06235187 | -0.0126 | 0.0029 | -0.0038 | 0.0002 |
| SJMN91-06236235 | 0.0286 | 0.0647 | 0.051 | 0.007 |
| SJMN91-06236241 | -0.004 | 0.025 | -0.0048 | -0.0382 |
| SJMN91-06237020 | 0.058 | -0.0552 | 0.0146 | -0.0004 |
| SJMN91-06238185 | -0.0079 | -0.0075 | 0.0827 | 0.0091 |
| SJMN91-06255336 | 0.0058 | -0.0024 | 0.0058 | 0.0288 |
| SJMN91-06255421 | -0.0036 | 0.0054 | 0.0219 | -0.0099 |
| SJMN91-06255434 | -0.0258 | 0.0794 | 0.0259 | 0.044 |
| SJMN91-06256107 | 0.1667 | 0.004 | 0.2093 | -0.0633 |
| SJMN91-06256124 | -0.0149 | -0.002 | -0.0184 | -0.0265 |
| SJMN91-06261053 | -0.0229 | -0.0026 | -0.0016 | 0.0018 |
| SJMN91-06311092 | 0.0576 | 0.0241 | 0.0231 | -0.0691 |
| SJMN91-06312120 | -0.0222 | -0.0542 | -0.0626 | -0.0106 |
| SJMN91-06346032 | 0.0527 | 0.0305 | 0.0338 | 0.0339 |
| SJMN91-06351097 | 0.0246 | -0.0623 | 0.0101 | 0.0133 |
| SJMN91-06351209 | -0.0297 | -0.062 | 0.0025 | -0.003 |
| SJMN91-06353190 | -0.006 | -0.0457 | 0.0009 | 0.0742 |
| WSJ870122-0100 | 0.045 | -0.0657 | 0.0092 | -0.0411 |
| WSJ870220-0106 | -0.0655 | -0.0278 | -0.0531 | 0.0567 |
| WSJ870804-0095 | 0.0445 | 0.0181 | 0.0433 | 0.0166 |
| WSJ871110-0154 | -0.025 | -0.0066 | -0.0433 | -0.0308 |
| WSJ880412-0015 | 0.0328 | -0.0061 | 0.0526 | -0.0333 |
| WSJ880603-0129 | 0.0131 | -0.0386 | -0.0074 | 0.0181 |
| WSJ880912-0064 | -0.0009 | 0.0748 | 0.0259 | -0.0376 |
| WSJ881021-0008 | -0.0216 | 0.1349 | 0.0414 | -0.0023 |
| WSJ890726-0004 | 0.0154 | 0.0318 | 0.0129 | -0.0213 |
| WSJ890922-0113 | -0.066 | -0.0609 | 0.0223 | -0.0003 |
| WSJ890927-0018 | -0.0494 | -0.0372 | -0.0045 | -0.027 |
| WSJ890928-0084 | 0.0781 | 0.0652 | 0.0315 | -0.0842 |
| WSJ891019-0021 | 0.0119 | 0.008 | -0.004 | 0.0037 |
| WSJ891019-0086 | -0.0212 | -0.0537 | 0.0379 | 0.0029 |
| WSJ910213-0136 | -0.0971 | 0.0009 | 0.0065 | -0.0072 |
| WSJ910326-0090 | 0.1045 | 0.0322 | 0.0461 | 0.0211 |
| WSJ910418-0105 | 0.0612 | -0.0389 | -0.0489 | -0.02 |
| WSJ910418-0159 | 0.0147 | 0.0951 | 0.0964 | 0.003 |
| WSJ920203-0038 | -0.0017 | 0.0415 | 0.013 | -0.0363 |
| Avg | 0.0091 | 0.0041 | 0.0134 | -0.0038 |