

# Sentence Embeddings by Ensemble Distillation

Fredrik Carlsson

RISE

Sweden

fredrik.carlsson@ri.se

Magnus Sahlgren

RISE

Sweden

magnus.sahlgren@ri.se

## Abstract

This paper contributes a new State Of The Art (SOTA) for Semantic Textual Similarity (STS). We compare and combine a number of recently proposed sentence embedding methods for STS, and propose a novel and simple ensemble knowledge distillation scheme that improves on previous approaches. Our experiments demonstrate that a model trained to learn the average embedding space from multiple ensemble students outperforms all the other individual models with high robustness. Utilizing our distillation method in combination with previous methods, we significantly improve on the SOTA unsupervised STS, and by proper hyperparameter tuning of previous methods we improve the supervised SOTA scores.

## 1 A Note on Terminology

Common practice in work on STS is to use the term “unsupervised” to refer to not explicitly utilizing labeled STS data. Approaches using other sorts of labeled data, such as the NLI data for S-BERT, is therefore described as unsupervised in this context. This is somewhat confusing, and not in line with our interpretation of the term unsupervised. Hence, throughout this paper we will use the term “zero-shot” when referring to algorithms that do not explicitly use labeled STS data, reserving the term “unsupervised” for methods which are *completely* unsupervised/self-supervised throughout their training process. We hope proceeding work will follow this convention in order to align the terminology with other fields of Machine Learning and NLP.

## 2 Introduction

Creating semantically coherent sentence representations is an important and long standing goal in NLP. The use of such sentence representations

is ubiquitous, and include tasks such as sentiment analysis (Yu and Jiang, 2016), question answering (Yadav et al., 2019), machine translation (Wang et al., 2017), and natural language inference (Talman et al., 2019). The quality of sentence representations is measured either by their performance in downstream tasks, or by their correspondence to human semantic similarity judgments (Conneau and Kiela, 2018a). This latter task is referred to as Semantic Textual Similarity (STS), and has become the standard way to benchmark the quality of sentence representations.

This paper investigates the combination of recent SOTA methods for unsupervised and zero-shot STS. In addition to this, we introduce a simple, but novel, method for knowledge distillation when the aim is to learn sentence embeddings. Our method relies on the realisation that averaging the actual embeddings of multiple teacher models makes for good student regression targets. We evaluate our method on STS and find our method to be robust and work well with already established methods.

Additionally, we observe that previous supervised embedding methods are hampered by poor hyperparameter tuning. By performing a simple grid-search over the possible relative regression targets proposed by Carlsson et al. (2021), certain models see a significant performance increase. This results in a new SOTA for supervised STS.

Our top performing models are available at: <https://github.com/FreddeFrallan/Contrastive-Tension>

## 3 Related Work

### 3.1 Sentence Embeddings

Work on sentence embeddings can be divided into three different categories. The arguably simplest approach (except, of course, bag-of-words) is to rely on composition of

pre-trained word embeddings (Le and Mikolov, 2014; Wieting et al., 2016; Arora et al., 2017; Wieting and Kiela, 2019). Another approach is to rely on some form of supervision, which often uses an initial supervised proxy task before potentially training directly for STS. Examples of such supervised approaches include InferSent by Conneau et al. (2017) which learns sentence embeddings via a siamese BiLSTM trained on NLI data. Cer et al. (2018) propose the Universal Sentence Encoder (USE), which is a Transformer encoder trained with both unlabeled data and labeled NLI data. Finally, S-BERT by Reimers and Gurevych (2019) adopts the training objective of InferSent but instead applies it to pre-trained BERT models (Devlin et al., 2019).

A third category of sentence embedding methods is self-supervised methods that require no labeled data. Examples of such methods include Skip-Thoughts of Kiros et al. (2015), which trains an encoder-decoder to reconstruct surrounding sentences given an encoded passage. Logeswaran and Lee (2018) propose Quick-Thoughts, which instead formulates the training objective as a sentence context classification task. Li et al. (2020) propose to use Normalizing Flows to transform a pre-trained model’s embedding space into a Gaussian Distribution. Finally, Carlsson et al. (2021) introduce Contrastive Tension, which tunes two independent models to yield similar embeddings for identical sentences, and dissimilar embeddings for non-identical sentences.

This paper investigates in particular the combinations of the supervised Natural Language Inference (NLI) task of Reimers and Gurevych (2019), the unsupervised Gaussian Flow Normalization (Flow) of Li et al. (2020), and the Self-Supervised Contrastive Tension (CT) algorithm of Carlsson et al. (2021).

### 3.2 Knowledge Distillation

Knowledge distillation is a method where instead of training a model directly towards a specific task, it is trained towards the information of either a strong teacher model, or an ensemble of teacher models (Hinton et al., 2015). Barkan et al. (2019) use this technique to learn an embedding space by training it to contain the same pairwise relationships between sentences as that of a fine-tuned Transformer model fine-tuned on sentence-

pair tasks. Reimers and Gurevych (2020) distill cross-lingual sentence embeddings using parallel corpora, by directly approximating the embedding space of an English S-BERT fine-tuned on labeled STS data.

Our distillation scheme is mostly similar to that of Reimers and Gurevych (2020), in the sense that we directly train a model’s embedding space to approximate an already existing space. However, we distill from an ensemble of models within the same language, by averaging the ensemble model’s embedding space.

## 4 Sentence Ensemble Distillation

Our Sentence Ensemble Distillation (SED) objective aims to train a new model, which we refer to as “the distillation learner”, by distilling the information from multiple already existing sentence embedding models. This is realised by training the distillation learner to minimize the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between its embeddings and the average sentence embedding from that of the ensemble models. Our SED objective only updates the weights of the distillation learner.

Formally, we describe our SED objective in the following terms. Using a set of  $N$  sentence embedding models  $E = \{M_0, M_1, M_2, \dots, M_N\}$ , where  $M_i(S)$  produces a vector with  $D$  dimensions, given sentence  $S$ . The mean ensemble embedding  $S_E$  is calculated as:

$$S_E = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N M_i(S). \quad (1)$$

The per-example loss for distillation learner  $f$  is then calculated as:

$$J(S) = \text{MSE}(S_E, f(S)) \quad (2)$$

where  $f(S)$  also produces a vector with  $D$  dimensions.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Setup

Both distillation learners and ensemble models are pre-trained Transformers and always share the same architecture. For brevity, we limit this to BERT-Large, with the exception of the Supervised STS tasks where we also include RoBERTa-Large (Liu et al., 2020). Additional results for BERT-Distill and BERT-Base are available in Appendix-A.1. During SED we generate sentence embeddings from both the ensemble and the distillation

Table 1: Pearson and Spearman correlation (x100) for Unsupervised algorithms on various zero-shot semantic textual similarity tasks. \* indicates reported results that are taken directly from their original paper.

	STS12	STS13	STS14	STS15	STS16	Avg.
Avg GloVe *	52.30 / 53.30	50.50 / 50.70	55.20 / 55.60	56.70 / 59.20	54.90 / 57.70	53.92 / 55.3
Skip-Thoughts *	41.00 / -	29.80 / -	40.00 / -	46.00 / -	52.00 / -	41.76 / -
BERT-L	42.59 / 49.01	47.35 / 50.88	49.31 / 49.69	55.56 / 56.79	60.43 / 61.41	51.05 / 53.56
BERT-L-Flow	58.94 / 60.35	65.34 / 65.96	64.67 / 62.09	71.19 / 71.88	72.27 / 71.88	66.48 / 66.43
BERT-L-Flow *	- / 65.20	- / 73.39	- / 69.42	- / 74.92	- / 77.63	- / 72.11
BERT-L-CT	69.63 / 69.50	75.79 / 75.97	77.15 / 74.22	78.28 / 78.83	77.70 / 78.92	75.71 / 75.49
<i>Our Contributions</i>						
BERT-L-CT-Flow	69.78 / 69.51	77.32 / 77.49	77.71 / 74.53	80.32 / 80.73	79.46 / 79.56	76.92 / 76.36
BERT-L-CT-SED	69.74 / <b>69.87</b>	78.12 / 77.84	78.71 / <b>75.87</b>	79.43 / 80.48	78.76 / <b>80.74</b>	76.95 / 76.96
BERT-L-CT-SED-Flow	<b>70.15</b> / 69.76	<b>78.75</b> / <b>78.91</b>	<b>78.73</b> / 75.53	<b>81.15</b> / <b>81.39</b>	<b>79.96</b> / 80.14	<b>77.75</b> / <b>77.15</b>

learner by mean pooling the final layer. When evaluating the distillation learner, we mean pool over the two final layers (See Appendix-A.3 for a layer-pooling study).

The fine-tuning objectives and their combinations are applied to each ensemble model sequentially, where the model name describes the order. However, the Flow normalization is only applied to the final distillation learner, and not to the ensemble models. For example, BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow is a Flow normalized BERT-Large model trained with SED from an ensemble of BERT-Large models, which each have been first fine-tuned towards the siamese NLI task and then tuned with CT.

All SED experiments use the same set of hyperparameters, with the same set of  $100k$  randomly sampled sentences from the English Wikipedia and always using an ensemble of 10 models. The distillation is performed with the Adam optimizer using a batch size of 32, a final learning rate of  $2e^{-5}$  and a linear warm-up schedule for 10% of the training data. The hyperparameters for the separate fine-tuning tasks of NLI, CT and Flow are taken from their respective publications, and are listed in Appendix-B for completeness.

## 5.2 Unsupervised STS

Table 1 shows results for the various unsupervised methods and their combinations when evaluated on the zero-shot English STS tasks of Agirre et al. (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016). As the SED itself requires no labeled data, the distillation learner is deemed unsupervised if its ensemble is trained without labeled data. Hence, we utilize both Flow and CT for these ensemble models, but not the siamese NLI objective.

We observe that the combination of previously

proposed methods lead to improved performance, and that adding the SED method further increases the performance. We set a new SOTA for unsupervised STS with an average score of 77.75 (Pearson) and 77.15 (Spearman). We also note a sometimes significant discrepancy between previously reported results and results replicated in our experiments.

## 5.3 Zero-Shot STS

Table 2 shows results for the various methods which require labeled data when evaluated on the English zero-shot STS tasks. We observe a similar tendency as in section-5.2, combining previous approaches leads to improved performance. However, the addition of SED does not contribute as much for the zero-shot methods. Again, we note discrepancies between previously reported results and our own.

## 5.4 Distillation Stability

In order to investigate the stability of the SED method, we train 10 distillation learners for each ensemble and compare their final performance on the zero-shot STS tasks. Table 3 reports the max, mean and standard deviation for the average Spearman score on the zero-shot STS task, for each model in the different ensembles, and for their respective 10 distillation learners. Finally, we report the results attained when utilizing the full ensemble for prediction.

The average case of the SED models all outperform the best performing model of their respective ensemble. The standard deviation between the performance of different runs of SED is significantly smaller than that of the models within the ensembles.

Table 2: Pearson and Spearman correlation (x100) for algorithms relying on labeled NLI data on various zero-shot semantic textual similarity tasks. \* indicates reported results that are taken directly from their original paper.

	STS12	STS13	STS14	STS15	STS16	Avg.
Infer-Sent *	59.30 / 60.30	58.80 / 58.70	69.60 / 66.70	71.30 / 72.20	71.50 / 72.60	66.10 / 66.10
BERT-L-NLI	67.74 / 67.48	70.93 / 72.61	75.3 / 75.26	78.15 / 79.18	72.98 / 76.09	73.02 / 74.12
BERT-L-NLI-CT	72.7 / 71.07	78.01 / 78.17	80.42 / 78.23	81.4 / 82.34	78.29 / 80.01	78.16 / 77.96
BERT-L-NLI-Flow	71.0 / 69.73	75.53 / 75.59	79.29 / 77.11	81.8 / 81.8	78.53 / 78.79	77.23 / 76.6
BERT-L-NLI-Flow *	- / 70.19	- / <b>80.27</b>	- / <b>78.85</b>	- / 82.97	- / <b>80.57</b>	- / <b>78.57</b>
<i>Our Contributions</i>						
BERT-L-NLI-CT-Flow	<b>72.76</b> / 70.89	76.75 / 76.82	<b>80.55</b> / 77.85	<b>82.9</b> / <b>83.12</b>	<b>79.98</b> / 80.18	78.59 / 77.77
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED	71.87 / 70.94	<b>78.91</b> / 78.81	79.98 / 78.09	81.35 / 82.77	76.42 / 78.94	77.71 / 77.91
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	72.56 / <b>71.55</b>	78.70 / 79.29	80.88 / 78.06	82.71 / 82.98	79.27 / 79.72	<b>78.82</b> / 78.32

Table 3: Max, mean and the standard deviation of the Spearman correlation (x100) for the average zero-shot STS tasks.

	Max	Mean	STD
<b>Ensemble Models</b>			
BERT-L-CT	75.22	74.07	0.80
BERT-L-CT-Flow	75.30	74.41	0.48
BERT-L-NLI-CT	77.35	76.91	0.32
BERT-L-NLI-CT-Flow	77.87	77.50	0.25
<b>Full Ensemble</b>			
BERT-L-CT	77.40	-	-
BERT-L-CT-Flow	77.62	-	-
BERT-L-NLI-CT	78.06	-	-
BERT-L-NLI-CT-Flow	77.91	-	-
<b>Distillation Learners</b>			
BERT-L-CT-SED	77.04	76.76	0.20
BERT-L-CT-SED-Flow	77.15	76.73	0.26
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED	78.08	77.93	0.09
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	<b>78.32</b>	<b>78.19</b>	0.10

## 5.5 Supervised STS

Building upon the supervised STS regression task proposed by Reimers and Gurevych (2019), we propose to set the target upper bound to 1 and find the lower bound for each model by training 10 models for all 20 lower bounds in  $\{0, 0.05, 0.1, \dots, 0.95\}$ , comparing the performance on the STS-b development set. Using the top performing lower bound, we create an ensemble of 10 supervised STS models. For each ensemble we then use SED with early stopping in regards to the STS-b development set.

Similar to the findings of Carlsson et al. (2021), who found no improvements to the supervised task with either NLI or CT, we see no improvements in Table 4 of either SED or Flow. However, the grid hyperparameter search over the regression lower bounds results in significant improvements for RoBERTa-large, while having no noticeable effect on BERT-Large. The improvements seen with

RoBERTa-Large result in a new supervised STS SOTA, of 87.56 (Pearson) and 88.50 (Spearman).

Table 4: Pearson and Spearman correlation (x100) for Supervised STS on the STS-b test set. (1) indicates the pooling is done from the final layer. \* indicates results taken directly from their original paper.

	STS-b Test
BERT-L (1)	85.90 / 86.35
RoBERTa-L (1) *	- / 86.39
<b>Our Contributions - No STS Data</b>	
BERT-L-CT-SED-Flow	80.98 - 79.55
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	83.14 / 82.05
<b>Our Contributions - With STS Data</b>	
BERT-L	85.40 / 86.35
RoBERTa-L	<b>87.56</b> / <b>88.50</b>
BERT-L-Flow	83.85 / 83.32
RoBERTa-L-Flow	86.85 / 86.52
BERT-L-SED	85.11 / 85.80
BERT-L-SED-Flow	83.15 / 82.30
RoBERTa-L-SED	87.15 / 88.29
RoBERTa-L-SED-Flow	86.29 / 85.92

## 6 Conclusion

There have been several recent suggestions on how to improve the unsupervised ability of Transformer language models to quantify semantic textual similarity. This paper analyzed the possibility to combine several of these proposed methods, and introduced a Sentence Ensemble Distillation (SED) method that trains a distillation learner to approximate the average embedding space of multiple existing embedding models. Combining previously proposed methods and our distillation objective, we set a new SOTA for unsupervised STS with an average of circa 2 Spearman points. We also contribute a new Supervised SOTA (with an improvement of circa 2 Spearman points) by proper hyperparameter tuning.

Interestingly, we see no improvement for su-

pervised STS when incorporating either previous methods or the SED objective. However, we note that the difference between the top unsupervised and the top supervised methods is only 6.45 (Spearman), and that the difference between our best fully unsupervised method and our best method using NLI data is only 1.17 (Spearman) on the zero-shot task.

## References

- Eneko Agirre, Carmen Banea, Claire Cardie, Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Weiwei Guo, Iñigo Lopez-Gazpio, Montse Maritxalar, Rada Mihalcea, German Rigau, Larraitz Uribe, and Janyce Wiebe. 2015. [SemEval-2015 task 2: Semantic textual similarity, English, Spanish and pilot on interpretability](#). In *Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2015)*, pages 252–263, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eneko Agirre, Carmen Banea, Claire Cardie, Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Weiwei Guo, Rada Mihalcea, German Rigau, and Janyce Wiebe. 2014. [SemEval-2014 task 10: Multilingual semantic textual similarity](#). In *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2014)*, pages 81–91, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eneko Agirre, Carmen Banea, Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Rada Mihalcea, German Rigau, and Janyce Wiebe. 2016. [SemEval-2016 task 1: Semantic textual similarity, monolingual and cross-lingual evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2016)*, pages 497–511, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eneko Agirre, Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, and Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre. 2012. [SemEval-2012 task 6: A pilot on semantic textual similarity](#). In *\*SEM 2012: The First Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics – Volume 1: Proceedings of the main conference and the shared task, and Volume 2: Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2012)*, pages 385–393, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eneko Agirre, Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, and Weiwei Guo. 2013. [\\*SEM 2013 shared task: Semantic textual similarity](#). In *Second Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (\*SEM), Volume 1: Proceedings of the Main Conference and the Shared Task: Semantic Textual Similarity*, pages 32–43, Atlanta, Georgia, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sanjeev Arora, Yingyu Liang, and Tengyu Ma. 2017. A simple but tough-to-beat baseline for sentence embeddings. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Oren Barkan, Noam Razin, Itzik Malkiel, Ori Katz, Avi Caciularu, and Noam Koenigstein. 2019. [Scalable attentive sentence-pair modeling via distilled sentence embeddings](#).
- Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fredrik Carlsson, Magnus Sahlgren, Evangelia Gogoulou, Amaru Cuba Gyllenstein, and Erik Ylipää Hellqvist. 2021. [Semantic re-tuning with contrastive tension](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Daniel Cer, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St. John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Cespedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. 2018. [Universal sentence encoder for English](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 169–174, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexis Conneau and Douwe Kiela. 2018a. [Senteval: An evaluation toolkit for universal sentence representations](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05449*.
- Alexis Conneau and Douwe Kiela. 2018b. [Senteval: An evaluation toolkit for universal sentence representations](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Alexis Conneau, Douwe Kiela, Holger Schwenk, Loïc Barrault, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. [Supervised learning of universal sentence representations from natural language](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 670–680, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. 2015. [Distilling the knowledge in a neural network](#).

- In *NIPS Deep Learning and Representation Learning Workshop*.
- Tieleman Hinton. 2012. Lecture 6.5 - rmsprop, course: Neural networks for machine learning.
- Ryan Kiros, Yukun Zhu, Russ R Salakhutdinov, Richard Zemel, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. [Skip-thought vectors](#). In C. Cortes, N. D. Lawrence, D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, pages 3294–3302. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Quoc Le and Tomas Mikolov. 2014. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1188–1196.
- Bohan Li, Hao Zhou, Junxian He, Mingxuan Wang, Yiming Yang, and Lei Li. 2020. [On the sentence embeddings from pre-trained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9119–9130, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Ro{bert}a: A robustly optimized {bert} pretraining approach](#).
- Lajanugen Logeswaran and Honglak Lee. 2018. [An efficient framework for learning sentence representations](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4512–4525, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aarne Talman, Anssi Yli-Jyrä, and Jörg Tiedemann. 2019. [Sentence embeddings in nli with iterative refinement encoders](#). *Natural Language Engineering*, 25:467–482.
- Rui Wang, Andrew Finch, Masao Utiyama, and Eiichiro Sumita. 2017. [Sentence embedding for neural machine translation domain adaptation](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 560–566, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Wieting, Mohit Bansal, Kevin Gimpel, and Karen Livescu. 2016. Towards universal paraphrastic sentence embeddings.
- John Wieting and Douwe Kiela. 2019. [No training required: Exploring random encoders for sentence classification](#). In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nan-gia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. [A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through annotated paraphrases](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vikas Yadav, Steven Bethard, Mihai Surdeanu. 2019. [Alignment over heterogeneous embeddings for question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2681–2691, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jianfei Yu and Jing Jiang. 2016. [Learning sentence embeddings with auxiliary tasks for cross-domain classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 236–246, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Additional Experiments

### A.1 Results with BERT-Distill & BERT-Base

We perform identical experiments to the unsupervised STS in section-5.2 and the zero-shot STS experiments of section-5.3, but also including BERT-Distill and BERT-Base. Table-5 shows the results for the methods which don't require any labeled data, and Table-6 shows the results for methods relying on labeled NLI data.

In the unsupervised STS tasks we see that BERT-Base performs the worse out of the three models, with BERT-Large performing 2.54 Spearman points better than BERT-Distill. The difference between the three models are smaller when using NLI data, where BERT-Large is the best, followed by BERT-Base and finally BERT-Distill. The difference between the best BERT-Large model and the BERT-Distill model is less than 2 Spearman points. Interestingly, both BERT-Base and BERT-Distill react negatively to being Flow Normalized after SED, and their best combinations seems to be NLI-CT-SED.

### A.2 SentEval

Although the SentEval test bed of [Conneau and Kiela \(2018b\)](#), has fallen a bit out of fashion as recent publications have been more focused towards STS, Table-7 includes results for all its downstream tasks which are not the zero-shot STS tasks. The combination of NLI-CT-SED performs the best in most tasks and also in the average score. However, this improvement is quite marginal for most tasks. We find the Flow normalization to hamper performance on all tasks, sometimes significantly.

### A.3 Layer Pooling Ablation

The results in Table-8 shows an layer-pooling ablation study for mean zero-shot STS Spearman correlation. Pooling from the two final layers is almost always preferable to only using a single layer. This goes for both fine-tuning objectives using NLI data and the combinations of self-supervised objectives. However, the differences between two and three layers are more sporadic. The best self-supervised method is found using two layers, and the best NLI score is found pooling from three layers.

## B Hyperparameters

### B.1 Siamese Natural Language Inference (NLI)

All NLI models are trained according to the parameters and settings given in the original paper of [Reimers and Gurevych \(2019\)](#). Additionally, the code used for all NLI models is from the official S-BERT Github<sup>1</sup>. The labeled data used is the combined datasets of SNLI ([Bowman et al., 2015](#)) and MultiNLI ([Williams et al., 2018](#)), which results in 1 million labeled training examples. We perform one epoch over the data using the Adam Optimizer, a learning rate of  $2e^{-5}$  and a linear warm-up schedule over 10% of the data.

### B.2 Contrastive Tension (CT)

All CT models are trained according to the parameters given in the original paper of [Carlsson et al. \(2021\)](#). Additionally, the code used for all CT models is from the official CT Github: [github.com/FreddeFrallan/Contrastive-Tension](https://github.com/FreddeFrallan/Contrastive-Tension). Using the RMSProp optimizer ([Hinton, 2012](#)) with a fixed learning rate schedule that decreases from  $1e^{-5}$  to  $2e^{-6}$ , we perform 50,000 update steps. Sentences randomly sampled from the English Wikipedia<sup>2</sup>, where we have 7 nonidentical sentence pairs for each positive sentence pair and a batch of 16. Hence, every batch consists of 2 positive sentence pairs and 14 negative sentence pairs.

### B.3 Normalizing Flows (Flow)

All Flow normalization are trained according to the parameters given in the original paper of [Li et al. \(2020\)](#). Additionally, the code used for all Flow models is from the official BERT-Flow Github<sup>3</sup>. The Flow normalization is always done in regards to the combined data from all zero-shot STS tasks, with a learning rate of  $1e^{-3}$  and 1 epoch. The coupling architecture used is described in Table-7 of the original paper of ([Li et al., 2020](#)).

<sup>1</sup>[github.com/UKPLab/sentence-transformers](https://github.com/UKPLab/sentence-transformers)

<sup>2</sup>We use the 20200820 Wikipedia-dump.

<sup>3</sup>[github.com/bohanli/BERT-flow](https://github.com/bohanli/BERT-flow)

Table 5: Pearson and Spearman correlation (x100) for Unsupervised algorithms on various zero-Shot semantic textual similarity tasks.

	STS12	STS13	STS14	STS15	STS16	Avg.
BERT-D-CT	67.27 / 66.92	71.31 / 72.41	75.68 / 72.72	77.73 / 78.26	77.17 / 78.60	73.83 / 73.78
BERT-B-CT	67.19 / 66.86	70.77 / 70.91	75.64 / 72.37	77.86 / 78.55	76.65 / 77.78	73.62 / 73.29
BERT-L-CT	69.63 / 69.50	75.79 / 75.97	77.15 / 74.22	78.28 / 78.83	77.70 / 78.92	75.71 / 75.49
<b>Our Contributions</b>						
BERT Distill (xxx parameters)						
BERT-D-CT-Flow	67.61 / 66.69	72.62 / 73.07	76.22 / 72.97	78.71 / 79.09	78.36 / 78.73	74.7 / 74.11
BERT-D-CT-SED	69.05 / 68.17	73.84 / 74.81	76.74 / 74.21	77.71 / 78.61	76.92 / 78.77	74.85 / 74.91
BERT-D-CT-SED-Flow	68.36 / 67.29	74.18 / 74.84	76.13 / 73.0	78.61 / 78.92	78.67 / 79.02	75.19 / 74.61
BERT Base (xxx parameters)						
BERT-B-CT-Flow	66.63 / 66.13	70.99 / 71.28	74.86 / 72.26	77.92 / 78.59	77.85 / 77.95	73.65 / 73.24
BERT-B-CT-SED	65.18 / 65.45	70.72 / 71.15	73.27 / 70.54	77.35 / 77.9	76.34 / 77.23	72.57 / 72.45
BERT-B-CT-SED-Flow	66.54 / 65.92	72.36 / 72.15	73.69 / 70.96	77.78 / 78.22	77.8 / 78.09	73.63 / 73.07
BERT Large (xxx parameters)						
BERT-L-CT-Flow	69.78 / 69.51	77.32 / 77.49	77.71 / 74.53	80.32 / 80.73	79.46 / 79.56	76.92 / 76.36
BERT-L-CT-SED	69.74 / <b>69.87</b>	78.12 / 77.84	78.71 / <b>75.87</b>	79.43 / 80.48	78.76 / <b>80.74</b>	76.95 / 76.96
BERT-L-CT-SED-Flow	<b>70.15</b> / 69.76	<b>78.75 / 78.91</b>	<b>78.73</b> / 75.53	<b>81.15 / 81.39</b>	<b>79.96</b> / 80.14	<b>77.75 / 77.15</b>

Table 6: Pearson and Spearman correlation (x100) for Unsupervised algorithms on various zero-Shot semantic textual similarity tasks.

	STS12	STS13	STS14	STS15	STS16	Avg.
BERT-D-NLI-CT	69.39 / 68.38	74.83 / 75.15	78.04 / 75.94	78.98 / 80.06	74.91 / 77.57	75.23 / 75.42
BERT-B-NLI-CT	68.58 / 68.80	73.61 / 74.58	78.15 / 76.62	78.60 / 79.72	75.01 / 77.14	74.79 / 75.37
BERT-L-NLI-CT	72.7 / 71.07	78.01 / 78.17	80.42 / 78.23	81.4 / 82.34	78.29 / 80.01	78.16 / 77.96
<b>Our Contributions</b>						
BERT Distill (xxx parameters)						
BERT-D-NLI-CT-Flow	69.81 / 68.34	75.58 / 75.6	79.55 / 76.91	81.96 / 82.33	78.99 / 79.24	77.18 / 76.48
BERT-D-NLI-CT-SED	72.02 / 70.12	76.91 / 77.68	79.98 / <b>78.41</b>	79.68 / 81.11	76.74 / 79.52	77.07 / 77.37
BERT-D-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	70.53 / 68.61	74.86 / 75.48	79.98 / 77.43	81.95 / 82.27	79.24 / 79.46	77.31 / 76.65
BERT Base (xxx parameters)						
BERT-B-NLI-CT-Flow	70.48 / 69.16	75.32 / 75.83	79.96 / 77.37	82.05 / 82.07	79.0 / 79.16	77.36 / 76.72
BERT-B-NLI-CT-SED	71.58 / 70.48	77.1 / 77.49	79.8 / 78.04	80.74 / 81.79	76.09 / 78.36	77.06 / 77.23
BERT-B-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	69.69 / 68.84	75.77 / 76.25	79.75 / 77.19	82.6 / 82.58	78.89 / 79.16	77.34 / 76.8
BERT Large (xxx parameters)						
BERT-L-NLI-CT-Flow	<b>72.76</b> / 70.89	76.75 / 76.82	<b>80.55</b> / 77.85	<b>82.9 / 83.12</b>	<b>79.98 / 80.18</b>	78.59 / 77.77
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED	71.87 / 70.94	<b>78.91</b> / 78.81	79.98 / 78.09	81.35 / 82.77	76.42 / 78.94	77.71 / 77.91
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	72.56 / <b>71.55</b>	78.70 / <b>79.29</b>	80.88 / 78.06	82.71 / 82.98	79.27 / 79.72	<b>78.82 / 78.32</b>

Table 7: Results on the downstream tasks supplied with the SentEval package. For the semantic related tasks SICK-R and STS-b, the Pearson correlation (x100) is reported.

	CR	MR	MPQA	SUBJ	SST2	SST5	TREC	MRPC	SICK-E	SICK-R	STS-b	AVG
BERT-Large	88.74	84.33	86.64	<b>95.27</b>	79.29	50.32	<b>91.40</b>	71.65	75.28	77.09	66.22	78.75
BERT-Large-NLI	<b>90.52</b>	84.36	90.30	94.32	90.72	50.05	86.80	<b>76.52</b>	83.05	84.94	75.02	82.42
BERT-Large-CT	86.81	82.38	88.31	94.34	87.75	46.56	88.00	73.10	81.49	84.93	76.50	80.92
BERT-Large-NLI-CT	89.56	82.56	90.20	83.08	88.85	48.60	87.20	74.43	82.77	84.88	77.49	80.87
<b>Our Contributions</b>												
BERT-L-CT-SED	88.82	83.62	89.04	95.23	89.18	49.77	91.00	74.32	82.52	85.82	77.38	82.43
BERT-L-CT-SED-Flow	88.79	83.17	88.79	95.04	88.54	46.56	91.00	63.30	77.43	79.80	66.13	78.96
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED	90.01	<b>84.46</b>	<b>90.61</b>	95.02	<b>90.77</b>	<b>51.09</b>	90.20	74.38	<b>83.34</b>	<b>86.60</b>	<b>79.43</b>	<b>83.28</b>
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	89.93	83.70	90.40	94.86	90.17	49.77	89.80	71.13	79.72	81.68	72.83	81.64



Table 8: The average Spearman correlation (x100) for the zero-shot STS tasks, comparing three different pooling schemes.

Number of Pooling Layers	1	2	3
<b>Unsupervised</b>			
BERT-L	53.56	54.76	55.52
BERT-L-Flow	66.11	66.56	66.86
BERT-L-CT	74.76	75.22	75.26
BERT-L-CT-Flow	75.99	76.36	75.98
BERT-L-CT-SED	76.92	76.96	76.77
BERT-L-CT-SED-Flow	77.26	77.15	76.48
<b>Using NLI data</b>			
BERT-L-NLI	73.32	74.12	73.5
BERT-L-NLI-Flow	76.42	76.6	76.32
BERT-L-NLI-CT	77.57	77.96	77.95
BERT-L-NLI-CT-Flow	77.54	77.75	77.69
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED	77.42	77.91	<b>78.42</b>
BERT-L-NLI-CT-SED-Flow	<b>77.94</b>	<b>78.05</b>	78.27