

Persian Homograph Disambiguation: Leveraging ParsBERT for Enhanced Sentence Understanding with a Novel Word Disambiguation Dataset

Seyed Moein Ayyoubzadeh

*Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.
E-mail(s): s.m.ayyoubzadeh@aut.ac.ir;

Abstract

Homograph disambiguation, the task of distinguishing words with identical spellings but different meanings, poses a substantial challenge in natural language processing. In this study, we introduce a novel dataset tailored for Persian homograph disambiguation. Our work encompasses a thorough exploration of various embeddings, evaluated through the cosine similarity method and their efficacy in downstream tasks like classification. Our investigation entails training a diverse array of lightweight machine learning and deep learning models for phonograph disambiguation. We scrutinize the models' performance in terms of Accuracy, Recall, and F1 Score, thereby gaining insights into their respective strengths and limitations. The outcomes of our research underscore three key contributions. First, we present a newly curated Persian dataset, providing a solid foundation for future research in homograph disambiguation. Second, our comparative analysis of embeddings highlights their utility in different contexts, enriching the understanding of their capabilities. Third, by training and evaluating a spectrum of models, we extend valuable guidance for practitioners in selecting suitable strategies for homograph disambiguation tasks. In summary, our study unveils a new dataset, scrutinizes embeddings through diverse perspectives, and benchmarks various models for homograph disambiguation. These findings empower researchers and practitioners to navigate the intricate landscape of homograph-related challenges effectively.

Keywords: Persian Homograph Disambiguation, Persian Word Sense Disambiguation, Natural Language Processing

1 Introduction

The fundamental pursuit of enhancing natural language understanding has paved the way for a myriad of challenges in the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP). Among these challenges, the disambiguation of words and the subsequent clarification of sentence meanings have emerged as pivotal tasks to unlock the true potential of language-centric applications. Ambiguities, characterized by words possessing multiple meanings in various contexts, intricately intertwine the texture of language, often leading to difficulties in comprehension and accurate interpretation. Addressing this challenge holds substantial importance across diverse domains such as machine translation, information retrieval, sentiment analysis, and question-answering systems.

The significance of homograph disambiguation in the Persian language is further underscored by the absence of diacritics or vowel markings in their written form. Unlike some languages, where diacritics aid in distinguishing between various meanings of a word, Persian lacks such markers. Consequently, a single word can possess multiple meanings and interpretations, often as many as four distinct forms of pronunciation. For instance, consider the Persian word "کرم" (kerm), which can be pronounced as "کَرم" (kérem), "کِرم" (kém), and "کَرَم" (karam). This inherent complexity in Persian homographs can lead to confusion, especially in the absence of contextual cues. Ensuring accurate disambiguation becomes paramount, as failing to differentiate these forms can compromise comprehension, precise translation, and effective communication, both in text-based systems and in speech-to-text applications. Yarowsky [1997] Consequently, devising robust mechanisms for homograph disambiguation becomes crucial to harness the full potential of the Persian language in various language processing applications.

Despite the strides that have been made in NLP, the task of disambiguating words and enhancing sentence clarity remains intricate due to the nuances inherent in human language usage. To tackle this, recent advancements in pre-trained language models, exemplified by Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT), have redefined the landscape of NLP tasks. BERT's ability to capture contextual semantics and syntactic structures has led to breakthroughs in tasks such as text classification, named entity recognition, and machine translation. In this regard, leveraging BERT's capabilities to tackle word disambiguation and sentence clarity holds the potential to unravel intricate semantic layers, thereby empowering various applications with more nuanced language understanding. Nicolis and Klimkov [2021], Devlin et al. [2018] This paper sets out to delve into the realm of sentence disambiguation and clarity enhancement by harnessing the prowess of BERT, a transformative language model. In particular, we introduce a novel word disambiguation dataset meticulously curated to encompass a wide array of lexical and contextual ambiguities. Through a comprehensive investigation, we aim to demonstrate the efficacy of BERT in deciphering and resolving word ambiguities to foster improved sentence comprehension. The subsequent sections of this

paper are structured as follows: In Section 2, we provide an overview of the landscape of related works and research endeavors that have contributed to the realm of word disambiguation and sentence enhancement. Section 3 delves into the methodology we employed, offering intricate insights into the design and construction of our innovative word disambiguation dataset. The architecture and capabilities of BERT are explored in Section 4, elucidating its aptness for our proposed task. Moving on to Section 5, we meticulously detail our experimental setup, unveil the results, and conduct a comprehensive analysis of the outcomes. Finally, Section 6 brings this discourse to a close by summarizing our contributions, delving into the implications they hold, and suggesting promising pathways for future research endeavors. Through this study, we aim to make a significant stride towards fortifying the bridge between language understanding and ambiguity resolution, thereby contributing to the advancement of NLP applications across diverse domains.

2 Related Work

The challenge of homograph disambiguation in the context of the Persian language has attracted the attention of numerous researchers, leading to the exploration of diverse approaches and techniques. In this section, we delve into significant contributions that have not only addressed the intricate nature of Persian homographs but have also paved the way for advancing the precision of homograph disambiguation in this linguistic context. [Nicolis and Klimkov \[2021\]](#)

Early work on supervised learning for homograph disambiguation includes [Yarowsky \[1992\]](#), who proposed an unsupervised approach based on identifying and clustering salient collocations to disambiguate senses. [Lee and Ng \[2002\]](#) developed a supervised learning method using contextual features like surrounding words and part-of-speech tags with a naive Bayes classifier. They achieved 92.1% accuracy on a dataset of 121 homographs.

Since then, numerous supervised models using classifiers like SVM and neural networks have been applied for WSD (Word Sense Disambiguation) and homograph disambiguation [[Navigli, 2009](#), [Taghipour and Ng, 2015](#), [Raganato et al., 2017](#)]. These methods rely on labeled training data which can be difficult to obtain for all senses. As a result, knowledge-based and semi-supervised approaches have also been explored.

[Zhong and Ng \[2012\]](#) constructed a graph representation using dictionary definitions and expanded it with WordNet relations. They selected the sense whose definition had the highest relatedness to the context, achieving 65.6% accuracy. [Chaplot and Salakhutdinov \[2018\]](#) also generated a knowledge graph from WordNet but combined it with an RNN model with attention to capturing contextual information.

In recent years, word embeddings have become ubiquitous in NLP. Embeddings can capture semantic information and have been leveraged extensively for WSD and homograph disambiguation. [Iacobacci et al. \[2016\]](#)

computed word embeddings for each sense based on definitions and checked similarity to the context. [Khaoula et al. \[2022\]](#) trained sense-specific embeddings by linking WordNet senses to occurrences in a large corpus.

More advanced contextual embeddings from models like ELMo [[Peters et al., 2018](#)], BERT [[Devlin et al., 2018](#)], and GPT-3 have also been applied. Contextual embeddings can model polysemy and account for surrounding words. [Wiedemann et al. \[2019\]](#) found improvements using BERT embeddings over static Word2Vec embeddings for WSD.

A Semi-Supervised Method for Persian Homograph Disambiguation – In their work, Riahi and Sedghi [Riahi and Sedghi \[2012\]](#) introduce a semi-supervised approach designed specifically for the disambiguation of Persian homographs. Their method introduces a novel strategy by harnessing the synergy between a small tagged corpus and a large untagged corpus. By utilizing both labeled and unlabeled data, their approach seeks to enhance the accuracy of homograph disambiguation. This method navigates the intricate landscape of homograph ambiguity with promising outcomes, providing insights into the effectiveness of leveraging both types of data sources.

Word Sense Disambiguation of Farsi Homographs Using Thesaurus and Corpus – Makki and Homayoonpoor [Makki and Homayoonpoor \[2008\]](#) present an innovative approach to disambiguating Farsi homographs. Their method capitalizes on the rich linguistic resources available, namely thesauri and corpora, to unravel the intricate web of meanings associated with homographs. By extracting insights from these linguistic resources, their method demonstrates a practical and effective means of enhancing homograph disambiguation accuracy. This contribution highlights the value of leveraging existing lexical knowledge and contextual information to disentangle the diverse meanings hidden within homographs.

Word Sense Disambiguation of Persian Homographs – Jani and Pilevar [Jani and Pilevar \[2012\]](#) make a significant contribution by tackling the complex task of disambiguating Persian homographs that share the same written form but possess distinct meanings. Their work delves into the intricacies of the disambiguation process, offering insights into strategies aimed at navigating the complexities inherent in Persian language processing. By addressing the challenges posed by these homographs, this work adds depth to the discourse surrounding Persian language understanding and communication.

These seminal works collectively underscore the multi-faceted nature of Persian homograph disambiguation. Our proposed method builds upon the foundations laid by these studies, incorporating advancements in language processing techniques and leveraging the capabilities of ParsBert to enhance the precision of homograph disambiguation in Persian. By integrating insights from these pioneering works, our research contributes to the ongoing efforts in addressing the challenge of homograph ambiguity in the Persian language.

3 Methodology

In this section, we delve into the comprehensive methodology adopted in our research, with a primary focus on introducing the meticulously curated dataset created specifically to address the challenge of homograph disambiguation in the Persian language. We provide a detailed exposition of the fundamental attributes and salient features intrinsic to the dataset, playing a pivotal role in both the training and evaluation of models dedicated to homograph disambiguation.

3.1 Persian Homograph Disambiguation Dataset

The cornerstone of our research efforts is the meticulously crafted dataset tailored to the task of homograph disambiguation. The dataset encompasses an assortment of sentences meticulously selected to contain a diverse range of homograph instances. Each sentence within the dataset has been carefully annotated to facilitate an in-depth exploration of the intricacies associated with the disambiguation of homographs. This dataset is poised to serve as an invaluable resource for advancing the comprehension and refinement of efficient disambiguation models.

3.2 Dataset Features

Our curated dataset boasts a spectrum of features that significantly enhance its utility in both the development and evaluation phases of homograph disambiguation models. A few of the salient features include:

- **Homograph:** Denotes the specific homograph under consideration, present within each sentence.
- **Phoneme:** Represents the phonetic rendition of the homograph within the sentence.
- **Sentence:** Contains the textual content of the sentence housing the target homograph.

To gain a comprehensive insight into the structural attributes of the dataset and unveil intricate patterns in sentence lengths, we embarked on a meticulous analysis empowered by visual aids. The ensuing graphical representation provides a succinct synopsis of our observations and discoveries. The visualization vividly captures the distribution of sentence lengths within the dataset, thereby revealing the spectrum of sentence structures and their frequencies.

The graph generated for this purpose presents an illustrative portrayal of the distribution of sentence lengths. On the x-axis, the length of sentences is quantified in terms of word count, while the y-axis represents the frequency of sentences belonging to each length category. The histogram is elegantly adorned with a serene blue shade, encapsulating the essence of the sentence length distribution across the dataset. Our intention in presenting this visual depiction is to offer an immediate and intuitive grasp of the range of sentence lengths encountered in the dataset. This, in turn, contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the intricate linguistic composition of the dataset.

The incorporation of such visual elucidations augments the clarity of the dataset’s inherent traits and acts as an illuminating tool to underscore the foundational components that underscore our subsequent methodologies and strategies in the domain of Persian homograph disambiguation.




Fig. 1: Distribution of Sentence Lengths

In our pursuit of unraveling the intricate dynamics of the dataset, we embarked on an examination of the distribution of homograph positions within sentences. This exploration aimed to elucidate the occurrences and placements of homographs across the textual corpus. To this end, we employed a systematic analysis, complemented by a visual representation that offers insights into the nuances of homograph positioning.

Figure 1 illustrates the distribution of homograph positions within sentences. The x-axis signifies the position of the homograph within the tokenized sentence, while the y-axis denotes the frequency of homograph occurrences at each position. The histogram, adorned with a captivating green hue, encapsulates the essence of the distribution pattern. By presenting this visual depiction, we endeavor to provide an immediate and intuitive grasp of the prevalence and distribution of homographs within the dataset’s sentences, further enriching our understanding of linguistic intricacies.

Figure 2 shed light on the spatial distribution of homographs, revealing patterns and trends that can significantly inform our subsequent methodologies and strategies for Persian homograph disambiguation.

An intrinsic facet of our investigation revolves around the analysis of homograph distributions based on the number of unique phonemes they encompass. This exploration seeks to unearth the intricacies of phonemic diversity among homographs and their corresponding prevalence. Employing systematic analysis complemented by visual aids, we embark on a journey to unravel patterns and insights underlying this phenomenon.




Fig. 2: Distribution of Homograph Positions

The ensuing bar plot, a vivid manifestation of our endeavor, effectively delineates the distribution of homographs according to their unique phoneme counts. On the x-axis, we denote the number of unique phoneme counts, while the y-axis signifies the count of homographs exhibiting each specific number of unique phonemes. This visualization serves as a tangible representation of the phonemic variety within homographs, shedding light on patterns that contribute to the nuanced landscape of our dataset.

As Figure 3 illustrates, there are 71 homographs with two unique phonemes, 10 homographs with three unique phonemes, and a singular homograph with four unique phonemes. These figures provide a clear overview of the distribution of phonemic diversity among homographs. The insights gleaned from this graphical representation enhance our understanding of the intricate phonemic structures within homographs, enabling us to make informed decisions and develop robust strategies for Persian homograph disambiguation.




Fig. 3: Distribution of Homographs by Unique Phoneme Counts




Fig. 4: Distribution of Homograph Lengths

Directing our attention to homograph lengths, we also investigate the distribution of character counts exhibited by the homographs present within our dataset. This exploration aims to reveal insights into the prevalence of different homograph lengths and provide an overview of their distribution. Figure 4 showcases the distribution of homographs based on their lengths. The x-axis indicates the number of characters in each homograph, while the y-axis signifies the frequency of homographs within each length category. This visual representation offers a clear and concise depiction of the distribution patterns of homograph lengths. By assimilating this visual representation, we gain an understanding of the diverse range of homograph lengths present in our dataset. This knowledge serves as a foundational element for designing effective methodologies and approaches in the realm of Persian homograph disambiguation.

We also provide table 1 demonstrates the diversity in phonetic representations of homographs in our dataset. Each homograph can be associated with multiple phonemes, capturing different pronunciations and contextual nuances. The "Number of Sentences" column reflects the frequency of each phoneme's occurrence in the dataset. This analysis sheds light on the complexity of the relationship between orthography and pronunciation, highlighting the need for robust language understanding models to handle such linguistic intricacies. The table is organized in a way that facilitates comparisons among homographs, allowing us to observe the variations in phonetic representations across different contexts. These findings emphasize the importance of accurate phoneme-level analysis, especially in natural language processing tasks that involve speech recognition, text-to-speech synthesis, and other phonetically sensitive applications.

Homograph	Phonemes	Number of Sentences
اعمال	\emAl, amAl	201, 200
برنده	barande, borande	192, 193
تن	tan, ton	193, 202

Homograph	Phonemes	Number of Sentences
جرم	jarm, jorm	191, 199
خلق	xalq, xolq	203, 199
خير	xayyer, xeyr	198, 192
دين	deyn , din	199, 187
رب	rab, rob	200, 204
سبک	sabk, sabok	195, 188
سر	sar, ser, sor	198, 196, 186
سمت	samt, semat	203, 201
نشش	SeS, SoS	200, 194
سک	Sak, Sok	195, 183
شده	Sekve, Sokuh	192, 194
فوت	fot, fut	193, 196
مرد	mard, mord	198, 200
مقدم	maqdam, moqaddam	160, 202
نشستن	našostan, nešastan	197, 198
کرد	kard, kord	204, 178
گزید	gazid, gozid	200, 189
اشراف	\aSrAf, \eSrAf	40, 45
تنگ	tang, tong	40, 43
خودرو	xodro, xodru	42, 40
درک	darak, dark	38, 43
دز	dez, doz	44, 38
رحم	rahem, rahm	40, 41
سم	sam, som	41, 39
طبق	tabaq, tebq	43, 38
عرق	\araq, \erq	42, 43
غنا	qanA, qenA	34, 40
قسم	qasam, qesm	41, 40
قطر	qatar, qotr	41, 40
مبلغ	mablaq, moballeq	41, 38
مسلم	mosallam, moslem	40, 40
میل	meyl, mil	36, 38
نقل	naql , noql	40, 42
هزار	hazAr, hezAr	39, 37
پیچ	peyk, pik	43, 41
کابل	kAbl, kAbol	42, 41
کشت	keSti, koSti	42, 34
حسن	hasan, hosn	267, 391
ده	dah, deh	404, 399
سحر	sahar, sehr	349, 400
شدر	Sekar, Sokr	403, 387
عمر	\omar, \omr	309, 394

Homograph	Phonemes	Number of Sentences
نفس	nafas, nafs	404, 387
پر	par, por	397, 388
پست	past, post	397, 398
کشت	kesht, koSt	391, 392
گل	gel, gol	382, 399
بر	bar, ber, bor	100, 104, 94
تُرک	tarak, tark, tork	95, 99, 100
تو	to, tu	105, 66
جست	jast, jost	95, 92
جنگ	jang, jong	104, 105
خفت	kheft, xeffat, xoft	101, 100, 98
خم	xam, xom	101, 97
در	dar, dorr	100, 238
رفت	raft, roft	96, 101
سرور	sarvar, server, sorur	98, 97, 99
سیر	seyr, sir, siyar	98, 100, 94
صرف	sarf, serf	104, 100
قوت	qovvat, qut	101, 101
محرم	mahram, moharram, mohrem	100, 104, 101
مَل	malak, malek, melk, molk	97, 90, 102, 99
مهر	mahr, mehr, mohr	102, 96, 98
کش	kas, kes, koS	102, 96, 100
ک	key, ki	93, 100
گرده	garde, gerde, gorde	104, 103, 100
اشدال	\aSkAl, \eSkAl	20, 20
بعدی	"badi", "bodi"	20, 19
رم	ram, rom	20, 23
رویه	raviyye, ruye	21, 21
سند	senni, sonni	20, 20
عمان	ammAn, ommAn	20, 20
معین	"moayyan", "moin"	16, 20
مفصل	mafsal, mofassal	22, 21
نیل	neyl, nil	19, 21
پرت	part, pert	20, 20
کنده	kande, konde	22, 25
گردان	gardAn, gordAn	21, 20
گَل	geli, goli	20, 21

Table 1: Phoneme and Sentence Information

3.3 Dataset Preparation

We begin by preparing our dataset, which consists of a collection of homographs along with their corresponding sentences and phonetic transcriptions. Each homograph is associated with multiple pronunciations and meanings, contributing to the linguistic complexity of our dataset. We tokenize the sentences and obtain their phonetic transcriptions, forming the basis for further analysis.

3.4 Embedding Approach

In this section, we outline the methodology employed to generate embeddings for the homographs using the ParsBERT language model. We explore two different approaches for obtaining embeddings: utilizing the last hidden layer and calculating the average of the last four hidden layers. Our objective is to investigate the effectiveness of these methods in capturing semantic nuances and differentiating between various pronunciations of homographs. [Farahani et al. \[2021\]](#)

3.4.1 ParsBERT Language Model

ParsBERT, a variant of the BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) model, is a powerful language model pre-trained on large Persian text corpora. It serves as the foundation for our embedding generation process. We employ the pre-trained ParsBERT model to convert our input text into contextualized word embeddings, capturing intricate relationships between words in sentences. To generate embeddings for the homographs, we leverage the ParsBERT model. Specifically, we focus on two distinct methods for obtaining embeddings:

3.4.1.1 Last Hidden Layer

In this approach, we extract the embeddings from the last hidden layer of the ParsBERT model. This layer encapsulates the contextual information of each token in the sentence. We use these embeddings to represent the homographs, preserving the influence of surrounding words on their meanings.

3.4.1.2 Average of Last Four Hidden Layers

An alternative approach involves calculating the average of embeddings from the last four hidden layers of ParsBERT. These layers capture different levels of abstraction, ranging from syntactic to semantic information. By averaging embeddings across these layers, we aim to incorporate a broader spectrum of linguistic features.

3.5 Embedding Analysis

Once we generate embeddings using the two methods, we proceed with an in-depth analysis of their effectiveness. We evaluate the embeddings based on their ability to distinguish between different phonetic variations of homographs and capture their diverse meanings. To achieve this, we employed a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) classifier for each homograph in our dataset. We trained and tested these classifiers to assess their performance in disambiguating homographs. Our approach involved the use of two distinct embedding methods: embeddings from the last hidden layer of ParsBert, and the average of the last four hidden layers. The methodology for assessing embeddings can be summarized as follows:

1. **Classifier Training and Data Splitting:** We divided the dataset into training and testing sets, using a standard test size of 0.3. Each homograph was associated with its corresponding MLP classifier.
2. **Embedding Extraction:** We extracted embeddings from the ParsBert model to capture the semantic information of the homographs and their contexts. Both the embeddings from the last hidden layer and the average of the last four hidden layers were utilized.
3. **Categorization of Homographs:** Homographs were categorized based on the count of their associated phonemes. This categorization allowed us to evaluate the impact of embedding methods on different levels of disambiguation complexity.
4. **Evaluation and Result Comparison:** After training the MLP classifiers, we evaluated their performance on the testing set for each category of homographs. Accuracy scores were calculated for different phoneme categories and embedding methods.

3.6 Evaluation Metrics

To quantify the performance of our embedding methods, we utilize several evaluation metrics. We measure the cosine similarity between embeddings corresponding to different pronunciations of the same homograph, as well as embeddings associated with distinct homographs. Additionally, we perform downstream tasks such as classification to assess the utility of the embeddings in capturing semantic information.

3.6.1 Interpretation

Comparing the two methods allows us to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the embeddings generated by each method:

- **Accuracy of Trained MLP:** Higher accuracy indicates that the embeddings effectively capture semantic relationships and features that contribute to accurate predictions. However, this method might not provide insights into the nature of semantic relationships and might not be able to differentiate subtle differences.

- **Cosine Similarity:** The cosine similarity method focuses on directly comparing the embeddings of pairs of words using the cosine similarity metric. Cosine similarity measures the angle between two vectors and provides a value between -1 and 1 , where higher values indicate greater similarity. By comparing the cosine similarity values between pairs of words, we can gain insights into how well the embeddings differentiate between words. High cosine similarity values imply that embeddings are close in the vector space, suggesting similar semantic meanings. Conversely, low cosine similarity values suggest distinct semantic meanings. This method helps us understand how well embeddings distinguish between different semantic concepts. High cosine similarity values might indicate that embeddings are capturing some shared context, while low values might signify effective differentiation.

3.6.2 Implications

The analysis of different embeddings using these two methods helps us make informed decisions about which embeddings are more suitable for specific tasks. If the goal is to achieve high accuracy in downstream tasks, embeddings with better performance in the MLP-based evaluation might be preferred. On the other hand, if understanding the semantic relationships between words is crucial, examining cosine similarity patterns could be more insightful.

Ultimately, the choice of method depends on the specific goals of the analysis and the tasks the embeddings will be used for. A combination of both methods can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the embeddings.

3.7 Homograph Disambiguation Methodology

In this section, we outline our proposed methodology for homograph disambiguation, which involves training different classifiers for each homograph. Our approach aims to leverage contextual embeddings to effectively distinguish between different meanings of homographs.

3.7.1 Classifier Training

To disambiguate the meanings of homographs, we adopt a personalized classifier approach. Specifically, we train a separate classifier for each distinct homograph present in the dataset. This allows us to capture the unique semantic nuances associated with each homograph. For each homograph, we partition the data into training and testing sets using an 80/20 split. We opted to employ a variety of lightweight machine learning and deep learning models as our base classifiers, taking advantage of their ability to efficiently learn intricate patterns from embeddings. In the training phase, the embeddings are employed as input features, while the corresponding sense labels serve as target outputs.

3.7.2 Data Preprocessing

We start by preprocessing the dataset, which consists of a collection of sentences containing homographs. For each homograph, we gather the associated sentences and their corresponding embeddings. These embeddings are obtained from the ParsBERT model, utilizing both the embeddings of the last hidden layer and the average of the last four hidden layers.

3.7.3 Evaluation and Comparison

After training, we evaluate the performance of our classifiers using the testing data. We compute various evaluation metrics, such as accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score, to assess the effectiveness of our approach.

3.8 Experimental Setup

Our experiments were conducted using a powerful computing system consisting of an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8750H CPU operating at 2.20GHz and an NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1050Ti GPU. This provided the necessary computational resources for our machine-learning tasks.

We utilized Python and key libraries including HuggingFace Transformers and Scikit-learn to extract embeddings and evaluate our models. The main machine learning models and their key parameters are summarized below:

- K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN): K=7 neighbors
- Multilayer Perceptron (MLP): 2 hidden layers with 100 neurons
- Random Forest: 100 estimators, Gini criterion for the quality of splits

The experiments follow a methodology to ensure unbiased analysis. The system hardware combined with Python libraries and optimized model parameters provides an ideal experimental platform to thoroughly evaluate and compare text embeddings.

4 Results

4.1 Analysis of Different Embeddings

In this analysis, we explore the effectiveness of two different methods for generating word embeddings by considering their impact on two evaluation metrics: the accuracy of a trained MLP (Multi-Layer Perceptron) and the cosine similarity between embeddings. The goal is to understand how these two methods perform in capturing semantic relationships between words.

4.1.1 Comparison Based on the Accuracy of Trained MLP

The results of our homograph disambiguation approach are presented in Figure 5. We evaluated the performance of two different types of embeddings: embeddings from the last hidden layer (Last Layer Embeddings) and the average of the last four hidden layers (Avg Last Four Layers Embeddings). The accuracies of the classifiers

trained using these embeddings for homograph disambiguation are compared based on the number of phonemes present in each homograph.




Fig. 5: Classifier Accuracies for Different Embeddings

As depicted in the figure, the accuracies vary across different homographs and phoneme counts. It is evident that for homographs with a phoneme count of 2, Last Layer Embeddings outperform Avg Last Four Layers Embeddings. For homographs with a phoneme count of 3, we observe they performed almost equally, with Avg Last Four Layers Embeddings maintaining a higher accuracy. However, as the phoneme count increases to 4, the accuracy of classifiers trained with Avg Last Four Layers Embeddings surpasses that of classifiers trained with Last Layer Embeddings.

This suggests that the choice of embeddings has an impact on the performance of homograph disambiguation, and it is influenced by the complexity of the homograph’s phonemic structure. The phenomenon can be attributed to the different levels of linguistic information captured by the two types of embeddings. Last Layer Embeddings may excel in capturing fine-grained phonetic nuances, while Avg Last Four Layers Embeddings might capture broader contextual information relevant to disambiguation.

In conclusion, our results highlight the importance of selecting appropriate embeddings for homograph disambiguation, considering both the linguistic characteristics of the homographs and the structure of the neural network.

4.1.2 Comparison Based on Cosine Similarity

We computed the cosine similarity between pairs of embeddings for each homograph and calculated the mean cosine similarity for each embedding. Then we examined the distribution of cosine similarity values between pairs of embeddings for each homograph. Figure 6 shows a histogram of the mean cosine similarity values across homographs using the average of the last four hidden layers. Figure 7 presents a histogram of the mean cosine similarity values using

only the last hidden layer. Comparing these distributions provides insight into the similarity of embeddings generated by these two methods. The embeddings derived from just the last layer exhibit a distribution shifted slightly towards higher mean cosine similarity values compared to the embeddings derived from the average of the last four layers. The histogram visualization allows us to see the overall distribution and spread of the similarity values, rather than just summary statistics.




Fig. 6: Classifier Accuracies for Different Embeddings




Fig. 7: Classifier Accuracies for Different Embeddings

4.2 Compare Different Classifiers

In this section, we present the results of our model comparison based on different evaluation metrics, including Mean Accuracy, Mean Recall, and Mean F1 Score

for homograph disambiguation.

We evaluated several common machine learning classifiers on our dataset, tuning key parameters for optimal performance. The K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) algorithm classifies samples based on a majority vote of the K closest training examples. [Taud and Mas \[2018\]](#) For KNN, we set $K = 7$ neighbors. The Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) is a feedforward artificial neural network model that uses backpropagation for training. [Taud and Mas \[2018\]](#) The MLP was configured with a 100-unit hidden layer, 2 hidden layers total, and sigmoid activation functions. Compared to Logistic Regression, a linear classification model, the MLP can model non-linear relationships in the data by introducing a hidden layer. Random Forest is an ensemble

method that constructs multiple decision trees and aggregates their predictions. [Biau and Scornet \[2016\]](#) Ridge regression is a regularized linear model that handles collinearity between variables. [Xingyu et al. \[2022\]](#) Table 2 provides a detailed overview of the performance of these models on our dataset. Each row corresponds to a specific model’s performance across the different metrics considered. The tuned models allow us to effectively evaluate the tradeoffs between accuracy, recall, and F1 score on this task.

Table 2: Comparison of Model Performance using Different Metrics

Model	Accuracy (Percent)	Recall (Percent)	F1 Score (Percent)
KNN (K = 7)	98.94	98.83	98.82
Logistic Regression	99.70	99.66	99.68
MLP (layers size = 100, layers = 2)	99.70	99.66	99.68
Random Forest (# of estimators = 100)	99.08	99.02	99.03
Ridge Classifier (alpha=1.0)	99.61	99.59	99.59

5 Conclusion & Future Work

In this study, We propose the creation of a dedicated Persian homograph disambiguation dataset to enrich the resources available in this domain. Such a dataset would empower researchers and practitioners to undertake more comprehensive investigations and contribute to the evolution of homograph disambiguation methodologies.

we conducted an analysis of homograph disambiguation using various machine-learning techniques. Our primary objective was to assess the efficacy of different models in accurately classifying homographs based on their associated phonemes. To this end, we leveraged embeddings obtained from distinct layers of a pre-trained neural network, employing them as input features for our models.

Through rigorous experimentation and meticulous evaluation, we unveiled variations in the performance exhibited by the range of models. Our findings underscored the significance of selecting an appropriate model in alignment with specific objectives, as certain models showcased excellence in particular

metrics. Our comparative analysis, encompassing Accuracy, Recall, and F1 Score, provided a comprehensive overview of each model's strengths.

Both the Logistic Regression and Ridge Classifier consistently delivered commendable accuracy and F1 scores, rendering them as compelling choices for precise homograph disambiguation. Concurrently, the K-Nearest Neighbors model demonstrated competitive recall values, highlighting its proficiency in detecting instances of significance.

Moreover, the Multilayer Perceptron and Random Forest models exhibited well-balanced performances across diverse metrics, underscoring their versatility in handling homograph disambiguation tasks. Our evaluation not only unveiled the pivotal influence of model selection on performance but also underscored the necessity of comprehending inherent model capabilities and limitations.

In conclusion, our study contributes substantively to the homograph disambiguation field by furnishing invaluable insights into the performance intricacies of distinct machine learning models. These insights can serve as a compass for practitioners when navigating the landscape of model selection for analogous undertakings. As a future avenue of exploration, researchers could delve into more advanced embedding techniques and precision-refinement strategies to further elevate model efficacy.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our heartfelt appreciation to the contributors behind the remarkable tools and libraries that greatly facilitated our research journey. Specifically, we are indebted to the creators and maintainers of NumPy, Jupyter, and scikit-learn for their exceptional software offerings, which played a pivotal role in enabling efficient data manipulation, interactive exploration, and robust machine learning experimentation. Their contributions have undeniably accelerated our research progress and enriched our analytical capabilities.

References

1. Gérard Biau and Erwan Scornet. A random forest guided tour. *Test*, 25:197–227, 2016.
2. Devendra Singh Chaplot and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Knowledge-based word sense disambiguation using topic models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
3. Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
4. Mehrdad Farahani, Mohammad Gharachorloo, Marzieh Farahani, and Mohammad Manthouri. Parsbert: Transformer-based model for persian language understanding. *Neural Processing Letters*, 53:3831–3847, 2021.
5. IGNACIO JAVIER Iacobacci, MOHAMMED TAHER Pilehvar, Roberto Navigli, et al. Embeddings for word sense disambiguation: An evaluation study. In *54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational*

6. Linguistics, ACL 2016–Long Papers, volume 2, pages 897–907. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), 2016.
7. Farid Jani and Abdul Hakim Pilevar. Word sense disambiguation of persian homographs. In ICISOFT, pages 328–331, 2012.
8. Belila Khaoula, Okba Kazar, and Mohammed Charaf Eddine Meftah. Automated word sense disambiguation using wordnet ontology. *International Journal of Organizational and Collective Intelligence*, 12:18, 01 2022. doi: 10.4018/IJOCL.313604.
9. Yoong Keok Lee and Hwee Tou Ng. An empirical evaluation of knowledge sources and learning algorithms for word sense disambiguation. In Proceedings of the ACL–02 conference on Empirical methods in natural language processing–EMNLP ’02, 2002.
10. Raheleh Makki and Mahdi Homayoonpoor. Word sense disambiguation of farsi homographs using thesaurus and corpus. volume 5221, pages 315–323, 08 2008. ISBN 978–3–540–85286–5. doi: 10.1007/978–3–540–85287–2_30.
11. Roberto Navigli. Word sense disambiguation: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 41(2):1–69, 2009.
12. Marco Nicolis and Viacheslav Klimkov. Homograph disambiguation with contextual word embeddings for tts systems. 2021.
13. Matthew E Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Deep contextualized word representations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05365, 2018.
14. Alessandro Raganato, José Camacho–Collados, and Roberto Navigli. Word sense disambiguation: A unified evaluation framework and empirical comparison. 04 2017. doi: 10.18653/v1/E17–1010.
15. Noushin Riahi and Fatemeh Sedghi. A semi–supervised method for persian homograph disambiguation. In 20th Iranian Conference on Electrical Engineering (ICEE2012), pages 748–751, 2012. doi: 10.1109/IranianCEE.2012.6292453.
16. Kaveh Taghipour and Hwee Tou Ng. Semi–supervised word sense disambiguation using word embeddings in general and specific domains. In Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 314–323, Denver, Colorado, May–June 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/N15–1035. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N15–1035>.
17. Hind Taud and JF Mas. Multilayer perceptron (mlp). Geomatic approaches for modeling land change scenarios, pages 451–455, 2018.
18. Gregor Wiedemann, Steffen Remus, Avi Chawla, and Chris Biemann. Does bert make any sense? interpretable word sense disambiguation with contextualized embeddings. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10430, 2019.
19. MA Xingyu, MA Bolei, and FENG Qi. Logistic regression and ridge classifier. 2022.
20. David Yarowsky. Word sense disambiguation using statistical models of roget’s categories trained on large corpora. COLING 1992 Volume 2: The 15th

21. International Conference on Computational Linguistics, 1992.
22. David Yarowsky. Homograph disambiguation in text-to-speech synthesis. In *Progress in speech synthesis*, pages 157–172, New York, NY, 1997. Springer New York.
23. Zhi Zhong and Hwee Tou Ng. Word sense disambiguation improves information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 273–282, 2012.