

Boosting the Performance of Transformer Architectures for Semantic Textual Similarity

Ivan Rep

Department of Electronics, Microelectronics,
Computer and Intelligent Systems
Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing
Zagreb, Croatia
ivan.rep2@fer.hr

Assoc. prof. Vladimir Čeperić

Department of Electronics, Microelectronics,
Computer and Intelligent Systems
Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing
Zagreb, Croatia
vladimir.ceperic@fer.hr

Abstract—Semantic textual similarity is the task of estimating the similarity between the meaning of two texts. In this paper, we fine-tune transformer architectures for semantic textual similarity on the Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark by tuning the model partially and then end-to-end. We experiment with BERT, RoBERTa, and DeBERTaV3 cross-encoders by approaching the problem as a binary classification task or a regression task. We combine the outputs of the transformer models and use hand-made features as inputs for boosting algorithms. Due to worse test set results coupled with improvements on the validation set, we experiment with different dataset splits to further investigate this occurrence. We also provide an error analysis, focused on the edges of the prediction range.

Index Terms—semantic textual similarity, transformers, boosting algorithms, natural language processing

I. INTRODUCTION

In any natural language processing task, it is difficult to encapsulate understanding text into a series of clear steps, which is why many approaches exploit machine learning. One of the tasks in natural language processing is determining the semantic similarity of texts in which the system estimates how similar the texts are by their meaning. A common technique coupled with these tasks is the usage of transformer architectures. These models exploit the attention mechanism by estimating the connection of each word to a different word in the text. Combining these architectures and representing words as embeddings proved to be a powerful tool. These models are usually pretrained on large text corpora using different pretraining techniques.

In this paper we explore fine-tuning transformer architectures on the *Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark* (STS-B) dataset [1] [2]. Our approach consists of employing different architectures and different sizes of these architectures. What we do differently is that we combine these models with gradient boosting algorithms which are state-of-the-art algorithms for learning from tabular data. Besides using outputs of multiple models as inputs for the gradient boosting algorithm, we also use handcrafted features that model structure instead of semantics. Another deviation from the usual approach is that we train the transformers by only fine-tuning the regression head, followed by end-to-end fine-tuning. The rest

of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the related work. In Section 3. we describe our experimental setup. Section 4. presents the results achieved by transformer architectures and boosting algorithms. In Section 5. we discuss and analyse the results and explore different data splits to get more consistent results. Finally, in Section 6. we present our conclusions and suggest future improvements.

II. RELATED WORK

With the advancement of representation learning techniques like BERT [3], a lot of natural language processing has shifted towards deep learning. This approach combines masked language modeling and next-sentence prediction to pretrain a transformer architecture in an unsupervised fashion. The RoBERTa [4] model does a replication study with smaller modifications: removing the next sentence prediction objective and training the model longer, with bigger batches and more data. DistilBERT [5] is a different approach that considers the size of BERT models. It uses smaller models and knowledge distillation to retain most of the performances while being faster. DeBERTa [6] is a technique that uses two novelties: the disentangled attention mechanism, where words are represented using vectors for content encoding and position encoding, and the modified mask decoder to incorporate the absolute positions in the decoding layer used in pretraining. DeBERTaV3 [7], an improvement of the original model, replaces masked language modeling with replaced token detection. The most computationally efficient approach for this task is the SentenceBERT [16] architecture. This model derives sentence embeddings which can be compared using cosine similarity. This method is more efficient because the calculated embeddings are independent of one another before calculating the cosine similarity. Each architecture was also fine-tuned for semantic textual similarity, while some achieved state-of-the-art results. Before these advancements, some of the used methods were feature-based [8]. The features used for these systems usually relied on lexical resources such as WordNet [9] and were heavily dependent on ontologies with semantic features. Most of these methods can be combined with ensembles. Similar approaches have been a research

TABLE I: Hyperparameters chosen for the final models using mean squared error

Model	Partial fine-tuning			End-to-end fine-tuning		
	Batch size	Learning rate	Weight decay	Batch size	Learning rate	Weight decay
BERT base cased	32	5e-4	1e-4	32	5e-5	1e-4
BERT large cased	8	5e-4	1e-2	16	1e-5	1e-3
RoBERTa base	32	5e-4	1e-4	32	5e-5	1e-4
RoBERTa large	32	5e-4	1e-4	32	5e-5	1e-4
DistilBERT base cased	32	5e-4	1e-4	32	5e-5	1e-4
DistilRoBERTa base	32	5e-4	1e-4	32	5e-5	1e-4
DeBERTaV3 small	32	5e-4	1e-4	8	5e-5	1e-2
DeBERTaV3 base	32	5e-4	1e-4	8	5e-5	1e-3
DeBERTaV3 large	8	5e-4	1e-2	8	1e-5	1e-4

TABLE II: Hyperparameters chosen for the final models using cross-entropy error

Model	Partial fine-tuning			End-to-end fine-tuning		
	Batch size	Learning rate	Weight decay	Batch size	Learning rate	Weight decay
BERT base cased	8	5e-4	1e-2	8	5e-5	1e-2
BERT large cased	32	5e-4	1e-2	8	1e-5	1e-4
RoBERTa base	32	5e-4	1e-4	8	5e-5	1e-2
RoBERTa large	32	5e-4	1e-4	8	1e-5	1e-2
DistilBERT base cased	8	5e-4	1e-2	8	5e-5	1e-2
DistilRoBERTa base	32	5e-4	1e-4	8	5e-5	1e-2
DeBERTaV3 small	32	5e-4	1e-4	28	5e-5	1e-4
DeBERTaV3 base	32	5e-4	1e-4	32	5e-5	1e-4
DeBERTaV3 large	32	5e-4	1e-4	8	1e-5	1e-3

topic in different areas of deep learning [10].

On the other hand, boosting algorithms are an older approach to learning from tabular data that has recently seen a rise in popularity due to the development of new algorithms. The AdaBoost approach [11] combines weak learners where subsequent weak learners are tweaked to mitigate the error of previous classifiers and offers resistance to overfitting. One of the more recent approaches is XGBoost [12], which uses sparsity awareness and weighted quantile sketch for approximate tree learning. Finally, LightGBM [13] offers a different approach to boosting algorithms by incorporating two novel techniques: gradient-based one-side sampling (GOSS) and exclusive feature bundling (EFB). GOSS uses the exclusion of data with small gradients, while EFB bundles together mutually exclusive features to select a smaller number of features.

TABLE III: Dataset breakdown according to the original datasets and years

Genre	File	Years	Train	Dev	Test
news	MSRpar	2012	1000	250	250
news	headlines	2013-16	1999	250	250
news	deft-news	2014	300	0	0
captions	MSRvid	2012	1000	250	250
captions	images	2014-15	1000	250	250
captions	track5.en-en	2017	0	125	125
forum	deft-forum	2014	450	0	0
forum	answers-forums	2015	0	375	0
forum	answer-answer	2016	0	0	254

III. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

A. Dataset and Metrics

As previously mentioned, the dataset used for all the experiments is the *Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark* dataset. This dataset is a collection of English datasets used for semantic textual similarity tasks in SemEval between 2012 and 2017. The texts are from various sources like image captions, news headlines, and user forums. The dataset contains 5749 examples in the train split, 1500 in the dev split, and 1379 in the test splits, summing up to 8628 sentence pairs. Since this task is a regression task, the given labels are in the $[0, 5]$ range. A more detailed examination of the dataset is shown in table III. An interesting observation is that some datasets only appear in some dataset splits.

The metrics used for this task are Pearson’s correlation coefficient (denoted by 1), which measures the linear correlation between the variables, and Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient (denoted by 2), which represents the Pearson’s correlation coefficient applied to ranks of observations.

$$r_p = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}) \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})} \quad (1)$$

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6}{n(n^2 - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^2 \quad (2)$$

In equation (1), x_i and y_i represent observation i , \bar{x} and \bar{y} represent the means of corresponding variables., while in equation (2), n represents the number of observations and d_i represents the rank difference of observations x_i and y_i .

TABLE IV: Transformer results using using mean squared error

Model	Partial fine-tuning			End-to-end fine-tuning		
	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Train set	Dev set	Test set
BERT base cased	0.793/0.749	0.814/0.809	0.735/0.697	0.995/0.995	0.899/0.896	0.865/0.856
BERT large cased	0.790/0.754	0.824/0.823	0.731/0.694	0.993/0.992	0.908/0.904	0.869/0.857
RoBERTa base	0.631/0.629	0.585/0.591	0.569/0.578	0.989/0.988	0.913/0.911	0.895/0.890
RoBERTa large	0.512/0.506	0.492/0.486	0.493/0.502	0.994/0.994	0.921/0.920	0.904/0.899
DistilBERT base cased	0.639/0.604	0.604/0.605	0.579/0.555	0.994/0.993	0.863/0.861	0.814/0.800
DistilRoBERTa base	0.576/0.581	0.485/0.477	0.510/0.516	0.988/0.986	0.887/0.885	0.858/0.849
DeBERTaV3 small	0.782/0.764	0.761/0.763	0.758/0.758	0.991/0.990	0.906/0.904	0.892/0.888
DeBERTaV3 base	0.838/0.832	0.809/0.823	0.824/0.831	0.996/0.996	0.917/0.915	0.907/0.904
DeBERTaV3 large	0.828/0.822	0.807/0.816	0.820/0.825	0.991/0.990	0.927/0.926	0.922/0.921

TABLE V: Transformer results using using cross-entropy error

Model	Partial fine-tuning			End-to-end fine-tuning		
	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Train set	Dev set	Test set
BERT base cased	0.779/0.723	0.813/0.802	0.726/0.686	0.997/0.996	0.899/0.896	0.861/0.849
BERT large cased	0.791/0.751	0.822/0.821	0.736/0.699	0.978/0.976	0.909/0.906	0.875/0.865
RoBERTa base	0.621/0.612	0.575/0.577	0.567/0.572	0.992/0.991	0.908/0.906	0.886/0.881
RoBERTa large	0.513/0.520	0.484/0.478	0.494/0.513	0.989/0.988	0.924/0.923	0.913/0.909
DistilBERT base cased	0.656/0.614	0.609/0.614	0.589/0.561	0.991/0.990	0.860/0.856	0.814/0.801
DistilRoBERTa base	0.590/0.586	0.488/0.475	0.515/0.510	0.990/0.989	0.890/0.888	0.859/0.850
DeBERTaV3 small	0.793/0.767	0.769/0.767	0.770/0.762	0.990/0.988	0.907/0.904	0.893/0.890
DeBERTaV3 base	0.843/0.830	0.813/0.819	0.828/0.827	0.988/0.987	0.919/0.917	0.912/0.911
DeBERTaV3 large	0.835/0.821	0.814/0.817	0.826/0.824	0.986/0.984	0.927/0.926	0.919/0.919

B. Model Fine-Tuning

The fine-tuning approach we took is fine-tuning with the frozen base model followed by end-to-end fine-tuning. The regression head weights are randomly initialized, so the idea was to make the model more used to the data it is going to be fine-tuned on. This procedure is followed by end-to-end fine-tuning that tunes all the parameters of the transformer architecture.

The hyperparameter optimization for fine-tuning with the frozen base model was done using exclusively Population-based training [14], while end-to-end fine-tuning was done using a combination of Population-based training and hand tuning. The Population-based training method was preferred, but due to hardware constraints, the RoBERTa large, BERT large cased, DeBERTaV3 base, and DeBERTaV3 large were tuned by hand. Final selected hyperparameters can be seen in tables I and II.

Two approaches were explored:

- Framing the problem as a regression problem by using mean squared error
- Framing the problem as a binary classification problem by using a cross-entropy error

The second approach also required scaling the labels to range [0, 1].

Each model was fine-tuned for ten epochs with the addition of early stopping if no improvement occurs in the last three epochs. The scheduler used was the cosine annealing scheduler with a 10% warmup ratio. FP16 training was used to reduce

computation time and help with the hardware constraints for all the models. Also, every model was optimized using Adam with weight decay regularization [15].

C. Boosting

After training the transformer models, their outputs were used as features combined with handcrafted features. The handcrafted features chosen were focused on the structure of sentences because transformers encode semantics very well. The chosen features were counts of:

- characters
- stopwords
- tokens
- verbs
- adjectives
- overlapping tokens
- overlapping lemmas

The first two features were chosen due to their simplicity and to provide some basic information about the length and composition of the sentences. The reason for counts of tokens is that transformer architectures are only aware of the number of subwords due to the subword tokenization algorithm, and the token count provides a way to capture some information about the original words in the sentence. The motivation for

TABLE VI: Results using the baselines

Model	Train set	Dev set	Test set
Cosine similarity	0.459/0.462	0.478/0.540	0.367/0.388
Linear regression	0.440/0.425	0.119/0.118	0.194/0.193
Support vector machine	0.585/0.576	0.258/0.240	0.330/0.301

TABLE VII: Boosting results using using mean squared error transformers

Model	Using 2 transformers				Using 3 transformers			
	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Transformers used	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Transformers used
AdaBoost	0.993/0.995	0.927/0.926	0.911/0.908	DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa	0.994/0.996	0.927/0.925	0.904/0.899	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa
XGBoost	0.996/0.996	0.929/0.927	0.912/0.909	DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa	0.997/0.997	0.929/0.927	0.910/0.906	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa
LightGBM	0.996/0.996	0.929/0.927	0.915/0.913	DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa	0.997/0.997	0.930/0.928	0.910/0.906	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa

TABLE VIII: Boosting results using using cross-entropy error transformers

Model	Using 2 transformers				Using 3 transformers			
	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Transformers used	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Transformers used
AdaBoost	0.988/0.989	0.929/0.929	0.915/0.913	BERT, DeBERTaV3	0.992/0.993	0.930/0.930	0.919/0.917	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa
XGBoost	0.991/0.990	0.931/0.929	0.914/0.910	BERT, DeBERTaV3	0.994/0.993	0.932/0.931	0.919/0.915	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa
LightGBM	0.990/0.989	0.933/0.931	0.918/0.916	BERT, DeBERTaV3	0.994/0.993	0.933/0.931	0.921/0.918	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa

TABLE IX: Results using cross-entropy error transformers with a stratified cross-validation split

Model	Partial fine-tuning			End-to-end fine-tuning		
	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Train set	Dev set	Test set
BERT large cased	0.798/0.768	0.793/0.761	0.794/0.760	0.994/0.994	0.908/0.898	0.904/0.890
RoBERTa large	0.550/0.563	0.526/0.541	0.534/0.534	0.984/0.984	0.932/0.927	0.926/0.919
DeBERTaV3 large	0.829/0.821	0.834/0.831	0.833/0.824	0.994/0.993	0.937/0.933	0.936/0.928

TABLE X: Boosting results using using cross-entropy error transformers with a stratified cross-validation split

Model	Using 2 transformers				Using 3 transformers			
	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Transformers used	Train set	Dev set	Test set	Transformers used
AdaBoost	0.995/0.996	0.922/0.917	0.918/0.909	BERT, DeBERTaV3	0.995/0.996	0.925/0.920	0.921/0.912	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa
XGBoost	0.997/0.996	0.931/0.926	0.926/0.917	BERT, DeBERTaV3	0.997/0.997	0.931/0.927	0.926/0.917	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa
LightGBM	0.997/0.996	0.933/0.927	0.930/0.920	BERT, DeBERTaV3	0.997/0.996	0.934/0.928	0.930/0.921	BERT, DeBERTaV3, RoBERTa

counts of verbs is similar to the previous reason, but also because the models do not have explicit knowledge of POS tags, and therefore counting verbs can provide more detail about the syntax of a sentence. Finally, overlapping tokens and lemmas were included to capture some of the semantic and syntactic information in the text, especially when similar sentences use different words with similar meanings. This information might help the boosting algorithm to understand the sentences better and make more accurate predictions.

The boosting algorithms chosen for the task were AdaBoost, XGBoost, and LightGBM. Hyperparameter optimization was carried out, although using grid search. Only combinations of two and three transformers were considered.

IV. RESULTS

The baselines chosen are simple machine learning algorithms combined with averaged *word2vec* token representation. The results are in table VI. All the baselines perform poorly, indicating that non-contextual token representations and inductive biases of these algorithms aren't powerful enough to determine sentence similarity. The best baseline approach is the unsupervised approach where the cosine similarity between two averaged *word2vec* token representations is calculated.

The tables IV and V illustrate the performance of transformer architectures on the STSB dataset. We can see that the transformer models outperform the baselines.

Another important observation is that partial fine-tuning achieves decent results in most cases. The worst-performing models are the RoBERTa, distilBERT, and distilRoBERTa. We speculate this subpar performance is due to the representations not being good enough. RoBERTa does not use next sentence prediction, and distilled models have fewer parameters, so they do not understand language as BERT does. Interestingly, using either loss function approach to partial fine-tuning, DeBERTaV3 base achieves the best results even though it has only 42% of the parameters of DeBERTaV3 large.

As expected, the results for end-to-end tuning are better than partial fine-tuning. Here, DeBERTaV3 large achieves the best results using either loss function. Also, we can observe that RoBERTa, distilBERT, and distilRoBERTa achieved comparable results, despite performing much worse when partially fine-tuning.

Finally, we apply the boosting algorithms whose performance can be seen in tables VII and VIII. LightGBM and XGBoost give slightly better results in contrast to the AdaBoost algorithm, while LightGBM outperforms XGBoost in most cases by a small margin. An important observation regarding the choice of transformers is that the hyperparameter optimization procedure always selected a combination of different transformer architectures instead of combining smaller and larger models of the same architecture. We speculate this is due to different architectures excelling on different examples

Fig. 1: The approximated densities for the Jaccard index of lemmas, the Jaccard index of lemmas without stopwords, percentage of meaningful lemmas in the first sentence, percentage of meaningful lemmas in the second sentence. The blue curve represents the correct predictions, while the orange curve represents the incorrect predictions. The plots in the first row use the best model trained with mean squared error, while the plots in the second row use the best one with cross-entropy error.





Fig. 2: Scatter plot of predictions and labels. The left plot represents the mean squared error model, while the right plot represents the cross-entropy error model.



in the dataset.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Examining the dataset splits

After training the ensembles we noticed that we achieved better development set results but worse test set results. For comparison, the best-performing ensemble model achieves worse results than the best single transformer model. To examine this better, we compared the label distributions in different splits using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Table XI shows the achieved results. At a significance level of 0.01, we reject the null hypothesis that the samples are drawn from the same distributions in the train and development set. The same is true for those drawn from the development and test set. At a significance level of 0.01, we cannot reject the null hypothesis regarding the samples from train and test sets. This result

TABLE XI: Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The double asterisk (**) denotes significance at a level of 0.01, and a single asterisk (*) significance at a level of 0.05

	Train and dev	Dev and test	Train and test
Statistic value	0.10512	0.08657	0.04509
p-value	6.680e-12**	3.854e-5**	2.095e-2*

indicates that the problem might lie in the label distributions, which differ across the given splits. To confirm, we retrain the best ensemble model and the corresponding transformers architectures using a stratified cross-validation split achieved by binning. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves only to re-training BERT large, DeBERTaV3 large, and RoBERTa large. The results in tables IX and X confirm our suspicions. We can see that the differences between the development and test correlation coefficients of the best-performing model decrease from 0.012/0.013 to 0.004/0.007.

B. The edge of prediction range

When visualizing the data we noticed that our ensemble models have issues with prediction close to the edge of the prediction range. This problem can be seen in the scatterplots in figure 2. To tackle this problem, we will only observe examples labeled with 0 or 5. We noticed several sentences with high errors have more filler words than others, which inspired us to calculate the Jaccard index of lemmas for paired sentences and to repeat the same calculation without stopwords and for each of the sentences in a pair. Figure 1 shows the densities of examples with an absolute error smaller than 1 (declared correct) and examples with an absolute error

All of the code is available here: <https://github.com/ir2718/semantic-similarity-scoring>

TABLE XII: Mean of absolute error between predictions and labels in the given label span

Label span	(0, 0.5]	(0.5, 1.5]	(1.5, 2.5]	(2.5, 3.5]	(3.5, 4.5]	(4.5, 5]
LGBM with MSE	0.547	0.532	0.465	0.388	0.472	0.602
LGBM with CE	0.465	0.505	0.474	0.409	0.413	0.462

greater or equal to 1 (declared incorrect) approximated from these features. We can clearly see that some of these features can discriminate very well, i.e., the first column suggests that the density of the correctly classified examples has two modes that are very close to each other, while the density of the incorrectly classified examples has lower values in this area. The differences are even more prominent in the last two columns where the density of the correctly classified examples has a higher mean compared to the density of the incorrect ones. This insight suggests examples with a higher error on the edge of the prediction range have fewer meaningful lemmas.

Table XII illustrates our models have issues with the edge of the prediction range. This occurrence is more noticeable in means of absolute error for the mean squared error ensemble, although still existent for the model that uses cross-entropy error.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we explore combining modern transformer architectures such as BERT with traditional ensembling algorithms. Besides using outputs from 2 and 3 transformer architectures, we combine this information with handcrafted features. Our experiments suggest that this combination of algorithms achieves higher metric values on the development set while being detrimental to performance on the test set. We show that this might be due to the predefined dataset splits by repeating the experiments for our best-performing models using a stratified cross-validation version of the dataset. The results indicate that the models trained this way are more accurate on the development set and have better generalization properties on the test set. Finally, we provide an analysis of our best-performing ensemble models that suggests the number of meaningful lemmas is a good indicator of whether an example is difficult, and that these models are less accurate on the edges of the prediction range. Our work is a good starting point for other ideas regarding combining ensembling algorithms with transformers, such as investigating the effect of ensembling when using only small transformer models, extending this idea to sentence-embedding models such as SentenceBERT, as well as employing ensembling to specific textual domains.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Wang, A. Singh, J. Michael, F. Hill, O. Levy, and S. R. Bowman, "Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.07461>

[2] D. Cer, M. Diab, E. Agirre, I. Lopez-Gazpio, and L. Specia, "SemEval-2017 task 1: Semantic textual similarity multilingual and crosslingual focused evaluation," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*. Vancouver, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2017, pp. 1–14. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/S17-2001>

[3] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>

[4] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov, "Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>

[5] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, and T. Wolf, "Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01108>

[6] P. He, X. Liu, J. Gao, and W. Chen, "Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03654>

[7] P. He, J. Gao, and W. Chen, "Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09543>

[8] D. Chandrasekaran and V. Mago, "Evolution of semantic similarity - A survey," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2004.13820, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.13820>

[9] C. Fellbaum, Ed., *WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database*, ser. Language, Speech, and Communication. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.

[10] M. A. Ganaie, M. Hu, M. Tanveer, and P. N. Suganthan, "Ensemble deep learning: A review," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2104.02395, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.02395>

[11] Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire, "A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 119–139, 1997. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S00220009791504X>

[12] T. Chen and C. Guestrin, "Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1603.02754, 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02754>

[13] G. Ke, Q. Meng, T. Finley, T. Wang, W. Chen, W. Ma, Q. Ye, and T.-Y. Liu, "Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/6449f44a102fde848669bd9eb6b76fa-Paper.pdf>

[14] M. Jaderberg, V. Dalibard, S. Osindero, W. M. Czarnecki, J. Donahue, A. Razavi, O. Vinyals, T. Green, I. Dunning, K. Simonyan, C. Fernando, and K. Kavukcuoglu, "Population based training of neural networks," 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.09846>

[15] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, "Decoupled weight decay regularization," 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05101>

[16] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks," 2019.