

Ramon Ferrer-i-Cancho\* and Marta Arias

# Who is the root in a syntactic dependency structure?

**Abstract:** The syntactic structure of a sentence can be described as a tree that indicates the syntactic relationships between words. In spite of significant progress in unsupervised methods that retrieve the syntactic structure of sentences, guessing the right direction of edges is still a challenge. As in a syntactic dependency structure edges are oriented away from the root, the challenge of guessing the right direction can be reduced to finding an undirected tree and the root. The limited performance of current unsupervised methods demonstrates the lack of a proper understanding of what a root vertex is from first principles. We consider an ensemble of centrality scores, some that only take into account the free tree (non-spatial scores) and others that take into account the position of vertices (spatial scores). We test the hypothesis that the root vertex is an important or central vertex of the syntactic dependency structure. We confirm that hypothesis and find that the best performance in guessing the root is achieved by novel scores that only take into account the position of a vertex and that of its neighbours. We provide theoretical and empirical foundations towards a universal notion of rootness from a network science perspective.

**Keywords:** dependency syntax; root; vertex centrality

## 1 Introduction

The syntactic structure of a sentence can be described as a rooted tree that indicates the syntactic relationships between its words as in Fig. 1 (Mel'čuk, 1988). In these trees, there is a particular vertex, called root, that has no incoming edges. The backbone of the tree is the free tree (Fig. 1 (c)), that is the undirected tree that results from removing link direction from the rooted tree (Fig. 1 (b)).


The question of who is the root of a syntactic dependency structure arises in two contexts. In a theoretical context, when one wishes to understand the foundations of syntactic dependency structures and characterize what a root vertex

---

\*Corresponding author: Ramon Ferrer-i-Cancho, Quantitative, Mathematical and Computational Linguistics Research Group, Department of Computer Science, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, 08034 Barcelona, Catalonia (Spain)

is. In the context of natural language processing, there has been a lot of research on extracting those trees automatically from texts using unsupervised methods (Han, Jiang, Ng, & Tu, 2020; Marecek, 2016). These methods are critical when there is no training dataset because very little is known about that language, e.g., in low resourced languages, languages that deviate from the safe frame of Indo-European languages or that do not have a large number of speakers. A serious limitation of these methods is that they make mistakes concerning the direction of the arcs. Namely, these methods often guess correctly that two words  $u$  and  $v$  are linked but they fail to guess if  $u \rightarrow v$  or  $u \leftarrow v$ . For these reason, the are often evaluated just in terms of whether they have guessed that there is an undirected edge between  $u$  and  $v$  (Marecek, 2016). There are distinct ways the right direction of the arcs can be guessed. One is by identifying the root in the free tree and then assigning arc direction consistently from that root (from the root away to the leaves).<sup>1</sup> That takes us back to the theoretical question of who is the root of a syntactic dependency structure from first principles thinking.

The main objective of the present article is two-fold. First, to achieve a theoretical understanding of what the root of a sentence is. Our focus are generalizations that are valid across languages (rather than what a root is in a specific language). Second, to contribute to the development of unsupervised methods to guess the root node of a free tree when the root of a tree is unknown or



**Fig. 1:** (a) The syntactic dependency structure of a sentence. (b) The corresponding rooted tree. (c) The corresponding free tree.

<sup>1</sup> Notice that, in a rooted tree, no two vertices can point to the same vertex.

unreliable, either as a part of powerful parsing methods or simply methods to assess the reliability of the root obtained by an unsupervised parser.

Here we will present and test unsupervised methods to guess the root vertex in a simplified setting that still sheds light on a language-independent notion of rootness. Given a sentence, the model guesses the root based only on information from that sentence (other sentences are neglected) and the kind of information the model exploits from a syntactic dependency structure is restricted. As for the latter, the syntactic structure of a sentence can be seen as a three-fold entity consisting of

1. A rooted tree.
2. A linear arrangement. Typically a table that indicates the position in the sentence of every vertex of the tree.
3. Additional labels. Labels attached to vertices of the rooted tree indicate the word form of each vertex. Labels attached to edges indicate the syntactic function (e.g., subject or direct object for verb arguments).

The methods introduced in the present article discard the additional labels and focus on exploiting the free tree of the syntactic dependency structure. To illustrate the setting, the model cannot exploit

1. Information about the word that corresponds to the vertex (its string, its part-of-speech,...).
2. The language of the sentence where the vertex appears. This excludes precious information such as the branching direction in the language (Liu, 2010) or the likely placement of the main verb.
3. As the prediction has to be made on the free tree, information on the rooted tree cannot be used. For instance, one cannot use the in-degree of the vertex. That would make the problem trivial because the root vertex is the vertex that has zero in-degree.
4. Information outside the sentence, namely ontologies or word embeddings.

The main goal of this article is to test the hypothesis that the root vertex is an important or central vertex of a syntactic dependency structure across languages. Søgaard proposed that a “dependency structure is, among other things, a partial order on the nodes in terms of centrality or saliency.” (Søgaard, 2012b). In particular, he hypothesized that roots are words of high PageRank (Søgaard, 2012a, 2012b) and presented an unsupervised parsing method that operates in two phases. In the 1st phase, various rules are used to build a directed graph representation of the sentence that is used to compute the PageRank of each word. In the second phase, a parsing algorithm obtains the syntactic dependency structure representation of the sentence by setting the word of highest PageR-

ank as the root. Here we will test a specific version of the hypothesis, namely that the root vertex is an important or central vertex of the free tree or both the free tree and the linear order of a syntactic dependency structure. Our approach differs from Søgaard’s in the sense that he used the importance of words to find a rooted tree when there is still no rooted or free tree available, while we assume that a free tree is already available. In addition, the 1st stage of the algorithm uses additional linguistic information (e.g. the word form, part of speech tags) to build a graph that is used to compute the PageRank of the words in the sentence. We exclude that kind of information from the root finding problem.

In particular, we tackle the problem of guessing the root by means of centrality scores from two perspectives. First, as a binary classification problem where the goal is to predict whether a vertex is a root or not. Second, as a ranking problem, where the goal is to sort vertices by their centrality, ideally ranking the root at the top.

The organization of the remainder of the article is as follows. Section 2 reviews the centrality scores that will be used in this article. Section 2.1 presents the scores that are borrowed from the standard toolbox while Section 2.2 presents new centrality scores that are put forward in this article. Section 3 presents the parallel treebanks and annotation styles used to evaluate the models. Section 4 presents the models that apply the centrality scores in Section 2 to guess the root, the metrics used to evaluate them and further methodological details. Section 5 presents the results of the evaluation of the models and Section 6 discusses the implications for the nature of root vertices.

## 2 Vertex centrality

### 2.1 The standard toolbox

Network science provides a large toolbox of scores of the importance (or centrality) of a vertex in a network such as free tree: degree centrality, PageRank centrality, closeness centrality, betweenness centrality,...(see Newman (2010, Chapter 7) and Barthélemy (2011) for an overview). One of the simplest centrality scores is the degree centrality of a vertex, namely the number of links of the vertex. The degree center is the vertex (or vertices) that maximize the degree. The degree of the vertex “wrote” in Figure 1 (a) is 3. Indeed, “wrote” is the only degree center of that sentence (Table 2). Hereafter we refer to the degree centrality of vertex  $v$  as  $k(v)$ . Various advanced scores take into account the shortest paths between two vertices. Suppose that  $\delta(u, v)$  is the network shortest path

**Tab. 1:** The sizes of the subtrees that are produced when a vertex from Fig. 1 is removed.

Vertex	Subtree sizes
She	5
wrote	1, 2, 2
a	5
book	1, 4
last	5
year	1, 4

Centrality	She	wrote	a	book	last	year
degree	1	3	1	2	1	2
eccentricity	3	2	4	3	4	3
closeness	0.53	0.8	0.48	0.67	0.48	0.67
max subtree size	5	2	5	4	5	4
subtree size 2nd moment	25	3	25	8.5	25	8.5
betweenness	0	8	0	4	0	4
$D$	1	7	1	3	1	5
corrected $D$	0.33	7	0.33	1.5	0.33	4.2
coverage	2	6	2	3	2	5
straightness	1.4	1.8	0.73	1.2	0.93	1.9

**Tab. 2:** The outcome of each centrality score on the vertices of the sentence in Figure 1. Boldface is used to mark the root of the sentence and the optimal vertices for each centrality score.

Spatial	Centrality	Information	Optimum
no	degree	degree	max
no	eccentricity	distance	min
no	closeness	distance	max
no	max subtree size	subtree size	min
no	subtree size 2nd moment	subtree size	min
no	betweenness	subtree size	max
yes	$D$	neighbours	max
yes	corrected $D$	neighbours	max
yes	coverage	neighbours	max
yes	straightness	distance	max

**Tab. 3:** Summary of the features of each centrality score “Information” indicates the information that the scores take as input from the free tree. “Optimum” indicates the kind of optimization of centrality value required to produce a center (“max” for maximization of centrality value and “min” for minimization).

distance in edges between two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in the network. The closeness centrality score of vertex  $v$  can be defined as (Newman, 2010, Chapter 7)

$$closeness(v) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{u \in V \setminus \{v\}} \frac{1}{\delta(u, v)},$$

where  $n$  is the number of vertices of the network. Thus  $1/closeness(v)$  is the harmonic mean of the network distance of  $v$  to all other vertices. The betweenness centrality of a vertex  $v$  can be defined as (Newman, 2010, Chapter 7)

$$betweenness(v) = \sum_{s < t} \frac{\sigma_{st}(v)}{\sigma_{st}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_{st}(v)$  is the number of shortest paths between vertices  $s$  and  $t$  passing through vertex  $v$  and  $\sigma_{st}$  is the number of shortest paths between vertices  $s$  and  $t$ , that is

$$\sigma_{st} = \sum_v \sigma_{st}(v).$$

Network science also offers specific scores for spatial networks, networks where vertices have coordinates in some space (Barthélemy, 2011). A syntactic dependency structure is a spatial network on the 1-dimensional space defined by the linear arrangement of the words of the sentence. Straightness centrality is defined as average of the ratio between the network distance and the physical distance between the vertices (Crucitti, Latora, & Porta, 2006). If  $d(u, v)$  is the Euclidean distance between vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , the straightness centrality of  $v$  can be defined as (Crucitti et al., 2006)

$$straightness(v) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{u \in V \setminus \{v\}} \frac{d(u, v)}{\delta(u, v)}. \quad (2)$$

In a syntactic dependency structure, the physical distance between vertices is often measured as the linear distance between them (in words units) (Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2004; Lin, 1996; Liu, 2008),

$$d(u, v) = |\pi(u) - \pi(v)|,$$

where  $\pi(v)$  is the position of  $v$  in the linear arrangement ( $1 \leq \pi(v) \leq n$ ).

Now we turn our attention to the sizes of the connected components that the removal of  $v$  produces, namely  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k$ , where the size of the tree is

$$n = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k n_i. \quad (3)$$

Each of these components is a subtree of the original tree. It is well-known that the definition of the betweenness centrality simplifies for trees, where  $\sigma_{st} = 1$  and then equation 1 becomes (Britz, 2019; Raghavan Unnithan, Kannan, & Jathavedan, 2014)

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{betweenness}(v) &= \sum_{s < t} \sigma_{st}(v) \\ &= \sum_{i < j} n_i n_j. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In the centrality scores above, the importance of a vertex is positively correlated with the value of the score. Within classic graph theory one finds criteria to locate “central” vertices that are based on the minimization of some vertex parameter and that have been investigated theoretically in the context of trees (Harari, 1969, 35-36)

- The center (also known as Jordan center (Jordan, 1869)), a vertex that minimizes the eccentricity. The eccentricity of vertex  $v$  is

$$e(v) = \max_u \delta(v, u).$$

Then a center is a vertex  $v$  such the greatest distance  $\delta(u, v)$  to other vertices  $u$  is minimal. In a tree, there can be one or two centers. The sentence in Figure 1 (a) has a single center that is “wrote” because that is the vertex that minimizes eccentricity (Table 4 and Table 2).

- The centroid, a vertex that minimizes the maximum size of its subtrees. For a vertex  $v$ , that maximum size is

$$n_{max}(v) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} n_i.$$

Equivalently, a centroid is a vertex such that, when removed, it produces connected components (subtrees) whose number of vertices does not exceed  $n/2$ , where  $n$  is the size of the original tree.<sup>2</sup> In a tree, there can be one or two centroidal vertices. Figure 1 (a) has  $n = 6$  and a single centroid that is “wrote” because that vertex is the only vertex whose removal produces subtrees of size  $\leq n/2 = 3$  (Table 1). The leaves of a tree with  $n > 2$  (the vertices “She”, “a”, “last” in the example) cannot be centroids. When  $n > 2$ , the removal of a leaf produces a subtree of size  $n - 1$  (and  $n - 1 > n/2$  when  $n > 2$ ).

---

**2** Formally,  $v$  is a centroid if  $n_i \leq n/2$  for all  $i$  such that  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

**Tab. 4:** The distance matrix, showing  $\delta(v, u)$  for each pair of vertices  $v$  and  $u$ .

Vertex	She	wrote	a	book	last	year
She	0	1	3	2	3	2
wrote	1	0	2	1	2	1
a	3	2	0	1	4	3
book	2	1	1	0	3	2
last	3	2	4	3	0	1
year	2	1	3	2	1	0

See Steinbach (1995) for a gentle definition of center and centroid and a beautiful gallery of free trees with their Jordan centers and centroids.<sup>3</sup>

The set of possible centrality scores is too wide (Barthélemy, 2011; Newman, 2010; Riveros, Salas, & Skibski, 2023) and thus a research strategy is needed. Furthermore, expanding the set of scores has the increased risk of finding a score that adapts to a group of languages by chance but it is unlikely that it works well on all languages. We are interested in a universal notion of root vertex, not a notion that fits specific languages in a typological sense. Thus, we identify a core of suitable centrality scores from first principles. First, we will justify the centroid and then we will shift to proposals of new centrality scores (Section 2.2).

Centroids are crucial vertices in optimal linear arrangements of trees. An optimal linear arrangement is a total order of the vertices of a free tree that minimizes the sum of distances between linked vertices (Chung, 1984; Shiloach, 1979). In minimum planar linear arrangements, namely minimum linear arrangements such that edges do not cross, the centroid has to be placed in the middle of the linear ordering of the sentence surrounded by subtrees that are sorted by size around the centroid in a specific way (Alemany-Puig, Esteban, & Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2022; Hochberg & Stallmann, 2003; Iordanskii, 1987). In minimum unconstrained linear arrangements, the centroid is also a key vertex for building an optimal linear arrangement (Chung, 1984; Shiloach, 1979). Thus the saliency of the centroid follows from first principles. On the one hand, for its critical role in the theory optimal linear arrangements of trees (Chung, 1984; Hochberg & Stallmann, 2003; Iordanskii, 1987; Shiloach, 1979). On the other hand, for the suitability of that theory for real sentences, where the distance between syntactically related words is smaller than expected by chance (Ferrer-i-Cancho,

---

<sup>3</sup> Freely available from [https://oeis.org/A000055/a000055\\_7.pdf](https://oeis.org/A000055/a000055_7.pdf).

Gómez-Rodríguez, Esteban, & Alemany-Puig, 2022; Futrell, Mahowald, & Gibson, 2015; Liu, 2008) as expected by the principle of syntactic dependency distance minimization (Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2004; Lin, 1996; Rijkhoff, 1986).

## 2.2 New centrality scores

### 2.2.1 Hard versus soft centrality scores

The Jordan centers, that are found by minimizing a hard score, i.e. the maximum distance of a vertex to the remainder of the vertices, has a soft correlate, that are the closeness centers, that are found by maximizing the closeness centrality, that is the inverse of the harmonic mean. Namely, the Jordan center, that is based on maximum distance (eccentricity), a hard score, has a soft correlate that operates on the mean distance of a vertex to the remainder of the vertices. In contrast, let us consider centroids, the vertices that minimize a hard score, i.e the maximum subtree size produced by their removal. At first glance, our centrality score toolbox seems to lack a soft correlate, in the form of a simple aggregation of the values these subtrees sizes. For trees, betweenness centrality is usually defined in terms of a sum of pairwise products of subtree sizes (equation 4) (Britz, 2019; Raghavan Unnithan et al., 2014). However, the following property shows that betweenness reduces to a sum of squared subtree sizes.

#### Property 2.1.

$$betweenness(v) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (n-1)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2 \right]$$

*Proof.* Equation 4 can be expressed equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} betweenness(v) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^k n_j - n_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Then the application of equation 3 produces the desired result. □

Thus, betweenness centrality is indeed a straightforward soft correlate of the maximum subtree size. The following property shows that the mean ( $m$ ) and

the variance ( $V$ ) of the subtree sizes produced by the removal of a vertex  $v$  have simple expressions.

**Property 2.2.**

$$\begin{aligned} m(v) &= \frac{n-1}{k} \\ V(v) &= \frac{1}{k} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2 - \frac{(n-1)^2}{k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First,

$$m(v) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i = \frac{n-1}{k} \quad (5)$$

thanks to equation 3. Then the substitution of  $m(v)$  in the definition

$$V(v) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2 - m(v)^2$$

yields the final expression for  $V(v)$ . □

The following property shows lower and upper bounds for betweenness uncovering a dependency with degree centrality.

**Property 2.3.**

$$\frac{(n-1)^2}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{k} \right) \leq \textit{betweenness}(v) \leq \binom{n-1}{2}$$

*Proof.* First, we will derive lower and upper bounds for  $\sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2$ . On the one hand,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^k n_i = n-1$$

thanks to equation 3. On the other hand,  $V(v) \geq 0$  yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{k} (n-1)^2. \quad (6)$$

Then the lower and upper bounds of betweenness follow after plugging the lower and upper bounds of  $\sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2$  into the simple definition of betweenness in Equation 2.1. □

Given the form of betweenness in Property 2.1, we also consider the 2nd moment of degree as an alternative soft score. The mean of the subtree sizes is the 1st moment about zero of the subtree sizes, i.e.  $m_1(v) = m(v)$  (Equation 5) while their 2nd moment about zero is

$$m_2(v) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i^2. \tag{7}$$

and then the variance of the subtree sizes is

$$Var(v) = m_2(v) - m_1(v)^2.$$

and the betweenness becomes

$$betweenness(v) = \frac{1}{2} [(n-1)^2 - km_2(v)].$$

### 2.2.2 New spatial scores

We use the term spatial score to refer to a centrality score that takes into account both the free tree and the linear arrangement of the vertices. The challenge is to find a criterion that is valid for any language, and thus no parameter tuning (training) is required in the model that uses that score to guess the root or its ranking. Notice that the preferred placement of a the root may depend on the language: certain languages may have a bias for a late placement of root, that is typically the main verb (as in SOV languages), while other languages may have a bias for a placement of the root in the middle (as in SVO languages) and still some languages may have a bias for an early placement of the verb (as in VSO languages). Therefore, we must reflect on what a root vertex is in an axiomatic sense. One could argue that a root is a vertex that unites distinct components of the sentence and thus it will naturally form long distance dependencies. A prototypical example in the main verb, that unites the major kinds of components of a clause: the subject, the object, the complements and the adjuncts <sup>4</sup>. For that definition, degree centrality would not suffice because, in addition, the root has to link components that are far away in the sentence. Accordingly, we put forward the first spatial centrality score: the sum of the edge distances of a vertex. For a vertex  $v$ , it is defined as

$$D(v) = \sum_{u \in \Gamma(v)} d(u, v), \tag{8}$$

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/adjuncts>

where  $\Gamma(v)$  is the set of neighbours of  $v$  and  $d(u, v)$  is the distance between vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in the linear arrangement.  $D = 1 + 2 + 4 = 7$  for the vertex “wrote” in Figure 1 (a). The linear distance center is the vertex (or vertices) that maximize  $D(v)$ . Indeed, “wrote” is the only linear distance center of that sentence (Table 2). A further justification of the vertex that maximizes  $D(v)$  as a likely root from first principles is the structure of optimal projective and planar arrangements. In an optimal projective arrangement, the root has to be surrounded by its optimal projective arrangements following a specific ordering by subtree sizes (Gildea & Temperley, 2007). If the root is a centroid, then the optimal projective arrangement is also a planar projective arrangement (Alemany-Puig et al., 2022; Hochberg & Stallmann, 2003; Iordanskii, 1987) furthermore, the fact that the root is a centroid warrants that the subtree sizes do not exceed  $n/2$ , which may increase the chance that the root maximizes  $D(v)$ .

Guessing that the root is the vertex (or vertices) that maximize  $D(v)$  is potentially problematic because one wishes to distinguish the main root from other heads, e.g., the main verb of a subordinate clause or the heads of complex noun phrases. Indeed, it has been shown that dependency distances are naturally maximized (against the principle of syntactic dependency distance minimization) in simple noun phrases (Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2024) or in short sequences (Ferrer-i-Cancho & Gómez-Rodríguez, 2021a; Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022). Thus we consider an alternative centrality score, that we call coverage, that is simply the distance between the left-most and the right-most vertex among  $v$  and its neighbours. The coverage of a vertex  $v$  is defined as

$$C(v) = \max_{u \in \Gamma'(v)} \pi(u) - \min_{u \in \Gamma'(v)} \pi(u),$$

where  $\Gamma' = \Gamma \cup \{v\}$ . Notice that  $1 \leq C(v) \leq n - 1$ . Finally, we consider a correction of  $D(v)$  that takes into account the fraction of the whole linear arrangement covered by  $v$  and its neighbours, that is defined as

$$D'(v) = \frac{C(v)}{n - 1} D(v).$$

and then  $\leq D'(v) \leq D(v)$ .

### 2.2.3 The relationship between degree centrality and the new spatial scores

Degree centrality ( $k(v)$ ) serves as a control for linear distance centrality ( $D(v)$ ). The following property shows that relationships between these two notions of centrality

**Property 2.4.** *Suppose a syntactic dependency structure of  $n$  vertices ( $n$  words). In a random linear arrangement (namely a random shuffling of the words of the sentence), the expected value of  $D(v)$  is*

$$\mathbb{E}[D(v)] = k(v) \frac{n+1}{3}. \tag{9}$$

$D(v)$  is bounded below and above by a quadratic function of  $k(v)$ , namely,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{4}(k(v) + 1)^2 \right\rfloor \leq D(v) \leq \frac{1}{2}k(v)(2n - 1 - k(v)).$$

*Proof.* The expected value of  $D(v)$  in a random linear arrangement is

$$\mathbb{E}[D(v)] = \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} \mathbb{E}[d(u,v)]$$

in Equation 8 and the linearity of expectation. Knowing that (Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2004)<sup>5</sup>

$$\mathbb{E}[d(u,v)] = \frac{n+1}{3},$$

we finally obtain Equation 9. As for the range of variation of  $D(v)$ , notice  $v$  and its neighbours in the free tree form a star tree of  $n = k(v) + 1$  vertices. On the one hand,  $D(v)$  is minimized by a minimum linear arrangement of such star tree. Recalling that the minimum sum of edge distances of a tree of  $n$  vertices is (Iordanskii, 1974)

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^2 \right\rfloor$$

it follows that  $D(v)$  is bounded below by

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{4}(k(v) + 1)^2 \right\rfloor.$$


Second,  $D(v)$  is maximized by placing  $v$  at one end of the linear arrangement and its neighbours at the other end, which yields the following upper bound of  $D(v)$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k(v)} (n - i) = \frac{1}{2}k(v)(2n - 1 - k(v)).$$

□

---

<sup>5</sup> See Alemany-Puig and Ferrer-i-Cancho (2022, Section 2.2) for a detailed derivation.



**Fig. 2:** All unlabelled trees between 3 and 6 vertices and their canonical names.

The first relationship (Equation 9) indicates that degree centrality would be equivalent to the linear distance centrality if the order of a sentence was arbitrary. However, it is well-known that dependency distances only achieve lengths that are neither shorter nor longer than expected by chance in short sentences (Ferrer-i-Cancho & Gómez-Rodríguez, 2021a) or exceptionally in languages depending on the annotation style (Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022).<sup>6</sup>

## 2.3 Consistency between centrality scores

Given an unlabelled tree, we say that two or more centrality scores are consistent if they give the same center (or centers). Here we investigate the consistency of the centrality scores on trees of the following kinds (figure 2)

1. Star tree. A tree with a vertex of maximum degree. That vertex is called the hub of the star tree. A star tree of  $n$  vertices has a hub of degree  $n - 1$ .
2. Quasistar tree. A quasistar tree of  $n$  vertices is formed by attaching a vertex to one of the leaves of a star tree of  $n - 1$  vertices.
3. Path tree. A tree where the maximum degree is two. A path tree has two leaves (that have degree 1) and  $n - 2$  internal vertices (that have degree 2). A path tree has one middle vertex (when  $n$  is odd) or two middle vertices (when  $n$  is even).
4. Quasipath tree. A quasipath tree of  $n$  vertices is formed by attaching a vertex to one of the internal vertices of a path tree of  $n - 1$  vertices.
5.  $d$ -quasipath tree. A  $d$ -quasipath tree of  $n$  vertices is a quasipath tree that is formed by (a) taking a path tree of  $n - 1$  vertices (b) selecting an internal vertex of the path tree that is at distance  $d$  of the middle vertex or vertices, where  $0 \leq d \leq \frac{n}{2} - 1$  and (c) attaching a leave to that internal vertex. This definition of quasipath tree requires  $n \geq 4$  because the existence of a path tree with at least one internal vertex requires  $n = 3$ .
6. Balanced bistar tree. A bistar tree is obtained by linking the respective hubs of two star trees. These two hubs are the hubs of the bistar tree. A balanced bistar tree of  $n$  vertices is formed by two stars of size  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1$  and  $\lceil n/2 \rceil - 1$ .

Figure 2 shows all the unlabelled free trees up to 6 vertices and the names that we use to refer to each of them (notice that the same tree may receive different names according to the definitions above; the figure shows the canonical name we use in this article).<sup>7</sup> The free tree in Figure 1 is a 0-quasipath of 6 vertices.

We have verified computationally that all the centrality scores on the free tree that are used in this article satisfy the following consistency properties<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The exceptions were Telugu and Warlpiri when using UD annotation style; no exception when SUD annotation style was used (Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022).

<sup>7</sup> All the possible unlabelled trees up to  $n = 10$  can be seen in Harari's classic graph theory book (Harari, 1969).

<sup>8</sup> Indeed, we have checked that this is true for  $n \leq 10^3$ . A rigorous mathematical proof is a tedious exercise.

1. Star trees. The scores are consistent for star trees, that is, for any star tree, all centrality scores give the same center, that is the hub vertex of the star (the vertex of degree  $n - 1$ ).
2. Quasistar trees with  $n > 4$  (when  $n \leq 4$  the quasistar is also a star). All scores except eccentricity (Jordan center) are consistent on quasistar trees. Eccentricity finds that the centers are the hub and the vertex of degree 2 whereas the remainder of centrality scores agree that the hub (the vertex of degree  $n - 2$ ) is the only center.
3. Path trees. All scores except vertex degree are consistent on linear trees. The degree centrality finds  $\max(n - 2, n)$  centers (all vertices if  $n < 3$  or the  $n - 2$  vertices of degree two if  $n \geq 3$ ) whereas the remainder of the centrality scores find the middle vertices of the path.
4. Balanced bistar trees (with  $n > 3$ ; when  $n \leq 3$  the tree becomes a star tree). All centrality scores are consistent on balanced bistar trees when  $n$  is even; when  $n$  is odd all centrality scores except eccentricity are consistent. When  $n$  is even, all the centrality scores agree that the two hubs of that tree are the center; when  $n$  is odd, all centrality scores agree that the hub with highest degree is the center except eccentricity, that determines that the two hubs are indeed the centers.

The consistency properties have two main corollaries. First, all the non-spatial centrality scores on the free trees used in this article are consistent if  $1 \leq n \leq 4$ , given any tree with if  $1 \leq n \leq 4$  all produce the same centers because within that range of  $n$ , the trees are either star trees or linear trees ( $n = 4$ ) or both ( $n < 4$ ). Given only a free tree with  $1 \leq n \leq 4$ , all centrality scores will agree that the node(s) with highest degree must be the roots. Second, they define classes of equivalence between scores on the free tree given a kind of tree:

- Path tree. There are two classes, one that contains degree alone and another, represented by eccentricity (Jordan center), that covers the remainder of the scores.
- Star tree. There is only one class that is represented by degree centrality.
- Quasistar tree. There are two classes, one that contains eccentricity alone and another, represented by degree centrality, that covers the remainder of the scores.

As for spatial scores, we have verified computationally that the linear sum of dependency distances ( $D(v)$ ) and its correction ( $D'(v)$ ) are consistent with all the scores on the free tree for star trees, namely,  $D(v)$  and  $D'(v)$  find the same center (the hub) as the scores on the free tree independently of the linear order of the words of the sentences. It is easy to see that the other two spatial score fail

to be consistent with the scores on the free tree on star trees. When  $n \geq 3$  and the hub of the star tree is placed at one of the ends of the linear arrangement, the coverage of both the hub and the leaf at the other end coincides, giving two centers instead of one. To see that straightness centrality also fails, consider  $n = 3$  and that the hub is placed at the center. Then all vertices are centers because they all yield the same centrality: the straightness centrality of the hub is (Equation 2)

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{1} \right) = 1$$

while the straightness centrality of the leaves is

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{1} + \frac{2}{2} \right) = 1.$$

## 2.4 Small sequences

We aim to investigate the performance of the centrality scores in small sequences. The reason is four-fold. First, the placement of the head is more predictable in small sequences. In particular, it has been shown that the hub of star trees is more likely to be placed at one of the ends (either first or last) in small sentences (Ferrer-i-Cancho & Gómez-Rodríguez, 2021a; Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022) or in short noun-phrases (Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2024). Second, to control for the kind of tree in a setting where the number of distinct unlabelled trees is small. Third, to take advantage of the classes of equivalence between centrality scores (Section 2.3). Fourth, to set some foundations for research on simple sentences or on languages where subordination is lacking or debated (Pullum, 2024).

For the sake of simplicity, we restrict the analysis of small sequences to sentences with  $3 \leq n \leq 6$  (Figure 2). We need to identify all classes of equivalence for any free tree with  $n$  within that range. When  $n \geq 5$ , all trees are either star, quasistar or path (Figure 2) and then all centrality scores on the free tree fall into one of the classes of equivalence presented in Section 2.3. When  $n = 6$ , we find, in addition, balanced bistar and 0/1-quasipath trees.

- Balanced bistar tree. As  $n$  is even, there is only one class for balanced bistar trees (Section 2.3), that is represented by degree centrality.
- 0-quasipath tree. We already know that there is only one class (Figure 1 (a); Table 2) and then we use degree centrality as representative.
- 1-quasipath tree. The 1-quasipath tree of 6 vertices is the smallest tree with two centroids (Harari, 1969, Figure 4.4, p. 36). Computing the center according to each centrality scores as we did for the 0-quasipath tree of 6 vertices, we find that there are three classes of equivalence: one class the contains

eccentricity (Jordan center) alone, another class that contains maximum subtree size (centroid), and another class that contains the remainder of the scores, that is represented by degree. More precisely, degree centrality finds a single center that is the hub (the vertex of degree three); eccentricity finds a single center, that is the internal vertex that is the closest to the hub; finally, the maximum subtree size finds the union of the centers found by degree and eccentricity, namely the hub and the Jordan center (Figure 2).

For any tree of a given size  $n$ , we combine the representatives of each class, which yields:


- $n = 3$  (the tree is both a star tree and a linear tree). Just degree centrality.
- $n = 4$  (the trees are path or star trees). Degree and eccentricity.
- $n = 5$  (the trees are path, quasistar or star trees). Degree and eccentricity.
- $n = 6$  (the trees are path, 0-quasipath, 1-quasipath, balanced bistar, quasistar or star trees). Degree, eccentricity and maximum subtree size.

The centers that are retrieved by each class are summarized in Fig. 3. Accordingly, we will only show one representative of the corresponding class when reporting on the performance of each score in small sequences (Tables 6 and 7).

## 2.5 Summary of scores

The spatial scores in our study comprise straightness centrality and all the linear distance centrality scores. Non-spatial scores are scores that only take into account the structure of the free tree that in our study are the center and the centroid as well as degree, closeness and betweenness centrality. Table 3 summarizes the main features of the centrality scores used in this study and Table 2 shows their value for each vertex in the example sentence (Figure 1). Straightness centrality is the only score that fails to identify the root, although the root has the second largest centrality value.

The rationale behind the set of centrality scores used in this article is as follows. Concerning old scores, it covers the typical scores considered in the literature (Barthélemy, 2011; Crucitti et al., 2006). The non-spatial scores give a reference point to spatial scores. We wish to know how much powerful a non-spatial centrality score can be. Some centrality scores are justified or designed by first principles (centroid and the new spatial scores) while others are just included for being representative of the network science or graph theory toolbox (the remainder). Given their simplicity, some scores serve as reference for others. In particular, degree centrality serves as a control for the new spatial scores,



**Fig. 3:** All unlabelled trees between 3 and 6 vertices, their canonical names and the centers retrieved by the centrality scores on the free tree. Centers are colored according to the representative of the class that retrieves them: degree centrality (red), eccentricity (green and yellow; green when eccentricity is the only member of the class) and maximum subtree size (orange). The centers of each class are plotted on the same tree if they do not overlap.

**Tab. 5:** The 21 languages in the PUD collection grouped by linguistic family. For each language, we also indicate the dominant order of subject (S), verb (V) and direct object (O) according to WALS (Dryer & Haspelmath, 2013).

Family	Languages	Dominant order
Afro-Asiatic	Arabic	VSO
Austronesian	Indonesian	SVO
Koreanic	Korean	SOV
Indo-European	Czech, English, French, Galician, German, Hindi, Icelandic, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Swedish	SVO for all languages except German (SOV or SVO) and Hindi (SOV).
Japonic	Japanese	SOV
Sino-Tibetan	Chinese	SVO
Tai-Kadai	Thai	SVO
Turkic	Turkish	SOV
Uralic	Finnish	SVO

which in turn yield a simple reference for non-spatial scores and also provide a baseline to complex spatial scores such as straightness centrality.

### 3 Material

The source data is the Parallel Universal Dependencies (PUD) collection (Zeman et al., 2017). PUD consists of a series of sentences and their syntactic dependency annotation from 21 languages belonging to 9 linguistic families (Table 5). That collection is chosen to control for the content or the source text of the treebanks. In particular, we borrow PUD from the 2.14 release of the Universal Dependencies treebank collection.<sup>9</sup>

By default, the PUD treebank collection follows the UD annotation style (Zeman et al., 2020). To control for annotation style, we also use the SUD annotation style (Gerdes, Guillaume, Kahane, & Perrier, 2018). SUD stands for Surface-Syntactic Universal Dependencies. The preprocessing method is borrowed from a recent study (Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022) and involves the removal of punctuation marks and reparallelization to warrant there is no loss of parallelism after punctuation mark removal and setting the minimum sentence length to  $n = 3$ . As a result the reparallelization process, all languages end up

<sup>9</sup> In previous quantitative dependency syntax research, the 2.6 release of PUD was used (Ferrer-i-Cancho & Gómez-Rodríguez, 2021b; Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022).

having  $N_S = 995$  sentences. The preprocessed treebanks in head vector format are available from <https://cqlab.upc.edu/lal/universal-dependencies/>

## 4 Methods

### 4.1 Evaluation

#### 4.1.1 Ranking

We evaluate the centrality scores by their capacity to rank the root vertex near the top. Depending on the score, the centrality score will be minimized or maximized (Table 3). Suppose a centrality score that is to be maximized to find the root. Then we sort all vertices decreasingly by centrality. An ideal score would leave the root vertex in the first position of the ranking. In practice, that may not happen and the centrality score may produce the same value for distinct vertices. For this reason our first evaluation metric is the rank as defined in non-parametric statistics, that is, if there is a maximal sequence of tied vertices starting in position  $i$  and ending in position  $j$  of the order, all these vertices get a rank that is the average position of the vertices (Conover, 1999), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
 r = r(i, j) &= \frac{1}{j - i + 1} \sum_{k=i}^j k \\
 &= \frac{1}{j - i + 1} (i + j)(j - i + 1)/2 \\
 &= \frac{i + j}{2}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

If the centrality score is such that it has to be minimized to find the root (e.g., eccentricity, maximum subtree size) the procedure is the same but vertices are sorted increasingly by centrality.

As ranks from sentences of different length are not comparable, we transform all ranks into numbers between 0 and 1 knowing that  $1 \leq r \leq n$ . The normalized rank is

$$\bar{r} = \frac{r - 1}{n - 1}.$$

The performance of a score on a language is the mean  $\bar{r}$ , namely the average value of  $\bar{r}$  over all the sentences of that language. It is easy to see that the expected average normalized rank of the random baseline, that consists of selecting a random vertex as root, is  $1/2$ , as the following property states.

**Property 4.1.** *The expectation of  $r$  and  $\bar{r}$  according to a random baseline that picks a random vertex as root of a tree of size  $n$  are*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[r] &= \frac{n+1}{2} \\ \mathbb{E}[\bar{r}] &= \frac{1}{2}\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Simply (recall Equation 10),

$$\mathbb{E}[r] = r(1, n) = (n+1)/2.$$

By the linearity of expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{r}] = \frac{1}{n-1}(\mathbb{E}[r] - 1) = 1/2.$$

□

### 4.1.2 Classification

We also evaluate the centrality scores by their capacity to classify a vertex as root. Each score is used to build a binary classification model. Suppose a centrality score that is to be maximized to find the root. The model classifies the vertex or vertices that maximize the score as root and the other as non root. The random baseline model selects a vertex uniformly at random, that is classified as root, while the remainder of vertices are classified as non root.

All the classification models are evaluated by means of traditional scores from the field of supervised machine learning: precision, recall and the  $F$ -measure, that is the harmonic mean of precision and recall, i.e.

$$F\text{-measure} = \frac{2}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}}.$$

We define  $N_M$  as the number of pairs produced by the model and  $N_S$  as the number of actual pairs. Notice that  $N_S$  is also the number of sentences of the treebank, as every sentence has a single root. We define  $h$  as the number of hits (true positives), namely the number of pairs produced by the model that are also found among the actual pairs. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{precision} &= \frac{h}{N_M} \\ \text{recall} &= \frac{h}{N_S}.\end{aligned}$$

For the random baseline model, the following property indicates that the expected value of each of the evaluation metrics is just the inverse of the harmonic mean of sentence length.

**Property 4.2.**

$$\mathbb{E}[\textit{precision}] = \mathbb{E}[\textit{recall}] = \mathbb{E}[\textit{F-measure}] = \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \frac{1}{\nu_i},$$

where  $\nu_i$  is the sentence length (in words) of the  $i$ -th sentence and  $N_S$  is the total number of sentences.

*Proof.* For the baseline model,  $N_M = N_S$  because the model only one makes one random guess per sentence and then

$$\textit{precision} = \textit{recall} = \textit{F-measure} = \frac{h}{N_S}.$$

Since  $N_S$  is constant, the expected value of precision and recall can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}[\textit{precision}] = \mathbb{E}[\textit{recall}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{h}{N_S}\right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[h]}{N_S}.$$

$h$  can be decomposed as

$$h = \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} h_i,$$

where  $h_i$  is a Bernoulli variable that indicates if the baseline model has guessed the correct root vertex for the  $i$ -th sentence ( $h_i = 1$  if the guess is right;  $h_i = 0$  otherwise). The probability that the baseline model guesses the right root for the  $i$ -th sentence is  $1/\nu_i$ , where  $\nu_i$  is the number of words of the  $i$ -th sentence. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[h] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_S} h_i\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \mathbb{E}[h_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \frac{1}{\nu_i}.$$

Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}[\textit{precision}] = \mathbb{E}[\textit{recall}] = \mathbb{E}[\textit{F-measure}] = \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \frac{1}{\nu_i}.$$

□

Let us consider  $g$ , the number of guesses that a model produces for a given sentence. For a model based on the center or the centroid,  $1 \leq g \leq 2$ , because each tree has one or two center and one or two centroids. For the degree centrality

model,  $1 \leq g \leq n-l$  where  $l$  is the number of leaves of the free tree.  $g$  is minimum for a star tree, where  $l = n - 1$  and  $g = 1$ , and maximum for a path (or linear tree), where  $l = n - 2$  and  $g = n - 2$ . Since every sentence has one root, the number of false positives that a model produces for a sentence, is at least  $g - 1$ .

The false discovery rate is

$$FDR = \frac{fp}{tp + fp},$$

where  $tp$  is the number of true positives and  $fp$  is the number of false positives. Then precision can also be defined equivalently as

$$precision = 1 - FDR$$

Since  $N_M = tp + fp$  and  $fp \geq N_M - N_S$ , it turns out that

$$precision \leq \frac{N_S}{N_M}$$

$$FDR \geq 1 - \frac{N_S}{N_M}.$$


Thus, precision is limited in models that produce more than one guess per sentence (Figure 3).

## 4.2 Small sequences

When investigating the performance of the centrality scores on short sentences for a given  $n$ , we mix the sentences of distinct languages because of the scarcity of short sentences and our focus on a language-independent notion of rootness. As for the former reason, Fig. 4 shows the distribution of sentence lengths when mixing languages, that is identical for each annotation style. The fact that there are 21 languages but only 36 sentences when  $n = 3$  and 112 sentences when  $n = 4$  motivates the mixing.

## 4.3 Visualization

In boxplots, the thick line indicates the median. The lower and upper hinges correspond to the first and third quartiles (the 25th and 75th percentiles). The upper whisker extends from the hinge to the largest value no further than  $1.5 \cdot IQR$  from the hinge (where IQR is the inter-quartile range, or distance between the first and third quartiles). The lower whisker extends from the hinge to the



**Fig. 4:** The distribution of sentence length ( $n$ ) given an annotation style over all languages. The frequency of lengths up to  $n = 6$  is shown on top of each bar. Notice that the  $y$ -axis is in logarithmic scale. Only 3.3% of sentences are of length 6 or smaller.

smallest value at most  $1.5 \cdot IQR$  of the hinge. Data beyond the end of the whiskers are called “outlying” points and are plotted individually. Individual points correspond to languages.

## 4.4 Implementation

A word of caution is required for the implementation of centrality scores that do not produce an integer number: closeness and straightness centralities, that involve sums of rational numbers. If the sums of rational numbers are implemented as sums of real numbers it is possible that two vertices that indeed have the same centrality get distinct centrality values because of numerical precision errors. This can be addressed in three ways. First, neglecting the problem, assuming that the problem will have a low frequency among the vertices of maximum centrality. If the problem is not addressed, a likely consequence is to finding just one of the vertices of maximum centrality and then introducing a bias towards higher precision or lower precision. Another problem is also possible: that two vertices end up having the same centrality because of numerical precision problems while they do not have actually the same centrality. The second solution consists of introducing a tolerance error in the comparison of centrality values, which raises the question of the appropriate value of that threshold and introduces an additional parameter into the analyses. The third solution, the one we have adopted, is computing these sums as sums of rational numbers with an exact method.<sup>10</sup>

## 5 Results

We analyze the performance of the scores from two perspectives: ranking, i.e. by their ability to rank the root at the top (Section 5.1) or as binary classification problem, i.e. by their ability to identify the root vertex in general (Section 5.2) or in short sentences (Section 5.3). We consider a series of evaluation metrics, i.e. mean normalized rank (mean  $\bar{r}$ ) for ranking, as well as precision, recall and F-measure for binary classification. Then, every score is evaluated with respect

---

**10** The method consist of keeping the numerator and the denominator of a rational numbers as smalls as possible by means of the *gcd* (the greatest common divisor); when summing to rational numbers, the magnitude of the denominator is reduced by using *lcm* (the least common multiplier), of the denominators of the summands.

to these metrics on each language. On top of that, we determine the best and the worst score according to a certain evaluation metric by considering both the mean and the median of the score across languages so as to get more robust conclusions. For instance, we say that a certain centrality score is the best in terms of precision if its mean and median are smaller than that of any of the other centrality scores. We extend the criterion to groups of centrality scores. For instance, we say that a set of centrality score contains the best scores in terms of precision if their means and medians over languages are smaller than that of any of the other centrality scores.

## 5.1 Ranking

Figure 5 summarizes the performance of the centrality scores according their ability to rank the root vertex. A perfect centrality score would assign rank 1 (i.e.  $\bar{r} = 0$ ), to the root vertex. Independently of the annotation style, we find that

1. All centrality scores tend to put the root near top positions (near rank 1). The mean  $\bar{r}$  over all sentences of a language is far from the  $1/2$  predicted by the random baseline (Property 4.1) except for Japanese when using SUD annotation style, where the average rank is  $\approx 0.4$ .
2. The best scores are the new spatial scores in UD and all the spatial scores in SUD, that manage to get closer to top positions.
3. Among the non-spatial scores, degree centrality and eccentricity (Jordan center) are clearly the worst scores for UD whereas eccentricity is the worst for SUD.
4. The performance of the scores is generally higher with UD annotation style (for instance, languages with a normalized average rank above 0.2 are exceptional in UD but they abound in SUD). In addition, SUD shows marked outliers (Japanese and Hindi).

Appendix A shows further details on the distribution of the performance of each centrality score across languages according to rank-based evaluation metrics for each annotation style. It also considers a state-of-the-art ranking score from the field of information retrieval, i.e. discounted cumulative gain (DCG) (Croft, Metzler, & Strohman, 2010). DCG was originally designed for evaluating systems that can retrieve a large number of documents and then introduces a logarithmic correction on ranks that is not powerful enough for the problem of retrieving the root vertex because most sentence lengths vary within the same order of

magnitude (Figure 4). Then it is not surprising that the qualitative results above are almost the same when rank is replaced by DCG (Appendix A).

## 5.2 Classification

Figures 6 and 7 summarize the performance of the classification models according to standard evaluation metrics. The main results are


- Baseline. The baseline model is always the worst model by far independently of the evaluation metric and the annotation style.
- Precision. Both in UD and SUD, the new corrected  $D$  is the centrality score with highest precision. The three scores with highest precision are the new spatial scores.
- Recall. Both in UD and SUD, coverage is the centrality score with highest recall. In UD, the new spatial scores and eccentricity are the best scores. In SUD, the three best scores are the new spatial scores.
- F-measure. Both in UD and SUD, the three scores with highest F-measure are the three new spatial scores. There is no clear single best when just focusing on UD or SUD.

See Appendix B for further details about the performance of the classification models.


## 5.3 Small sentences

We highlight some results about the performance of the scores on small sentences with  $3 \leq n \leq 6$  (Tables 6 and 7). To ease summarization, we focus on the F-measure. For specific unlabelled trees with a given  $n$  we find:


- Star trees ( $n \geq 3$ ). The best scores are  $k$  and  $D$ , that are tied. Their accuracy (F-measure) starts at 0.83 for UD and 0.78 for SUD ( $n = 3$ ) and continues increasing as  $n$  increases (their precision and recall are identical). Taking into account space (linear order) does not help.
- Path trees ( $n \geq 3$ ). We find an opposite effect with respect to star trees, i.e. the accuracy of the centrality scores tends to reduce as  $n$  increases both in UD and SUD. In UD, the best score is always a linear dependency distance score (a spatial score excluding straightness centrality) while in SUD the best score is either a linear dependency score or the degree centrality class.
- Quasistar trees ( $n \geq 5$ ). The two best scores are a linear dependency score (other than straightness) in terms of F-measure (0.7 in UD and 0.73 in SUD



**Fig. 5:** The distribution of the mean  $\bar{r}$ , the mean normalized rank, by means of a combined boxplot and violin plot across languages for each centrality score when using UD (top) and SUD (bottom) annotation style. The mean normalized rank of a score is computed for each language by averaging the normalized rank for that score over all sentences. For each centrality score, black thick lines indicate medians while blue diamonds indicate means. The red dashed line indicates the expected normalized rank according to the random baseline (Property 4.1).



**Fig. 6:** The distribution of the performance of each classification model across languages when using UD annotation style. Performance is evaluated using the following metrics: precision (top), recall (middle), and  $F$ -measure (bottom). For each centrality score, black thick lines indicate medians while blue diamonds indicate means.



**Fig. 7:** The distribution of the performance of each classification model across languages when using SUD annotation style depending on the evaluation metric. The format is the same as in Figure 6.

when  $n = 5$ ; 0.78 in UD and 0.75-0.78 in SUD when  $n = 6$ ); the difference with respect to the degree centrality class is small. When  $n = 6$ , the degree centrality class also gives best performance (0.78) in UD while in SUD it gives the second best performance (0.75).

- Quasipath trees and balanced trees with  $n = 6$ . The spatial scores (except straightness centrality) give the best performance in terms of F-measure.

When all trees of same  $n$  are mixed, the two best scores tend to be the new spatial scores.

**Tab. 6:** The performance of the centrality scores on small trees mixing languages in PUD and using UD annotation style. Kind of tree indicates the size of the tree, followed optionally by the kind of tree (b-bistar stands for balanced bistar). Centrality indicates the representative of the class of equivalence.  $N_S$  is the number of sentences,  $N_M$  is the number of guesses of the classification model,  $h$  is the number of hits of the model (the intersection between the guesses produced by the model and the actual roots of each sentence). The evaluation metrics are precision, recall and  $F$ -measure. “baseline” indicates the expected precision, recall and  $F$ -measure of the baseline model (Property 4.2).

tree kind	centrality	$N_S$	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
3	$k$	36	36	30	0.333	0.833	0.833	0.833
3	$D$	36	36	30	0.333	0.833	0.833	0.833
3	coverage	36	63	34	0.333	0.54	0.944	0.687
3	straightness	36	54	32	0.333	0.593	0.889	0.711
4	$k$	112	182	105	0.25	0.577	0.938	0.714
4	eccentricity	112	182	105	0.25	0.577	0.938	0.714
4	$D$	112	167	105	0.25	0.629	0.938	0.753
4	coverage	112	167	96	0.25	0.575	0.857	0.688
4	$D'$	112	134	94	0.25	0.701	0.839	0.764
4	straightness	112	184	85	0.25	0.462	0.759	0.574
4 path	$k$	70	140	68	0.25	0.486	0.971	0.648
4 path	eccentricity	70	140	68	0.25	0.486	0.971	0.648
4 path	$D$	70	125	68	0.25	0.544	0.971	0.697
4 path	coverage	70	107	57	0.25	0.533	0.814	0.644
4 path	$D'$	70	92	57	0.25	0.62	0.814	0.704
4 path	straightness	70	118	48	0.25	0.407	0.686	0.511
4 star	$k$	42	42	37	0.25	0.881	0.881	0.881
4 star	$D$	42	42	37	0.25	0.881	0.881	0.881
4 star	coverage	42	60	39	0.25	0.65	0.929	0.765
4 star	straightness	42	66	37	0.25	0.561	0.881	0.685
5	$k$	191	277	151	0.2	0.545	0.791	0.645

tree kind	centrality	$N_S$	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
5	eccentricity	191	306	158	0.2	0.516	0.827	0.636
5	$D$	191	224	144	0.2	0.643	0.754	0.694
5	coverage	191	265	158	0.2	0.596	0.827	0.693
5	$D'$	191	204	141	0.2	0.691	0.738	0.714
5	straightness	191	219	92	0.2	0.42	0.482	0.449
5 path	$k$	43	129	43	0.2	0.333	1	0.5
5 path	eccentricity	43	43	20	0.2	0.465	0.465	0.465
5 path	$D$	43	76	33	0.2	0.434	0.767	0.555
5 path	coverage	43	63	30	0.2	0.476	0.698	0.566
5 path	$D'$	43	56	30	0.2	0.536	0.698	0.606
5 path	straightness	43	67	21	0.2	0.313	0.488	0.382
5 quasistar	$k$	115	115	77	0.2	0.67	0.67	0.67
5 quasistar	eccentricity	115	230	107	0.2	0.465	0.93	0.62
5 quasistar	$D$	115	115	80	0.2	0.696	0.696	0.696
5 quasistar	coverage	115	156	96	0.2	0.615	0.835	0.708
5 quasistar	$D'$	115	115	80	0.2	0.696	0.696	0.696
5 quasistar	straightness	115	115	40	0.2	0.348	0.348	0.348
5 star	$k$	33	33	31	0.2	0.939	0.939	0.939
5 star	$D$	33	33	31	0.2	0.939	0.939	0.939
5 star	coverage	33	46	32	0.2	0.696	0.97	0.81
5 star	straightness	33	37	31	0.2	0.838	0.939	0.886
6	$k$	347	488	246	0.167	0.504	0.709	0.589
6	eccentricity	347	520	241	0.167	0.463	0.695	0.556
6	$n_{max}$	347	508	263	0.167	0.518	0.758	0.615
6	$D$	347	402	234	0.167	0.582	0.674	0.625
6	coverage	347	461	258	0.167	0.56	0.744	0.639
6	$D'$	347	360	237	0.167	0.658	0.683	0.67
6	straightness	347	367	129	0.167	0.351	0.372	0.361
6 path	$k$	27	108	27	0.167	0.25	1	0.4
6 path	eccentricity	27	54	15	0.167	0.278	0.556	0.37
6 path	$D$	27	52	20	0.167	0.385	0.741	0.506
6 path	coverage	27	37	18	0.167	0.486	0.667	0.562
6 path	$D'$	27	34	17	0.167	0.5	0.63	0.557
6 path	straightness	27	38	10	0.167	0.263	0.37	0.308
6 0-quasipath	$k$	81	81	46	0.167	0.568	0.568	0.568
6 0-quasipath	$D$	81	81	46	0.167	0.568	0.568	0.568
6 0-quasipath	coverage	81	100	47	0.167	0.47	0.58	0.519
6 0-quasipath	$D'$	81	81	46	0.167	0.568	0.568	0.568

tree kind	centrality	$N_S$	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
6 0-quasipath	straightness	81	81	22	0.167	0.272	0.272	0.272
6 1-quasipath	$k$	74	74	33	0.167	0.446	0.446	0.446
6 1-quasipath	eccentricity	74	74	29	0.167	0.392	0.392	0.392
6 1-quasipath	$n_{max}$	74	148	62	0.167	0.419	0.838	0.559
6 1-quasipath	$D$	74	78	39	0.167	0.5	0.527	0.513
6 1-quasipath	coverage	74	112	60	0.167	0.536	0.811	0.645
6 1-quasipath	$D'$	74	75	44	0.167	0.587	0.595	0.591
6 1-quasipath	straightness	74	74	21	0.167	0.284	0.284	0.284
6 b-bistar	$k$	60	120	54	0.167	0.45	0.9	0.6
6 b-bistar	$D$	60	86	43	0.167	0.5	0.717	0.589
6 b-bistar	coverage	60	74	44	0.167	0.595	0.733	0.657
6 b-bistar	$D'$	60	65	44	0.167	0.677	0.733	0.704
6 b-bistar	straightness	60	65	26	0.167	0.4	0.433	0.416
6 quasistar	$k$	86	86	67	0.167	0.779	0.779	0.779
6 quasistar	eccentricity	86	172	78	0.167	0.453	0.907	0.605
6 quasistar	$D$	86	86	67	0.167	0.779	0.779	0.779
6 quasistar	coverage	86	111	70	0.167	0.631	0.814	0.711
6 quasistar	$D'$	86	86	67	0.167	0.779	0.779	0.779
6 quasistar	straightness	86	86	31	0.167	0.36	0.36	0.36
6 star	$k$	19	19	19	0.167	1	1	1
6 star	$D$	19	19	19	0.167	1	1	1
6 star	coverage	19	27	19	0.167	0.704	1	0.826
6 star	straightness	19	23	19	0.167	0.826	1	0.905

**Tab. 7:** The performance of the centrality score on small trees mixing languages in PUD and using SUD annotation style. The format is the same as in Table 6.

tree kind	centrality	$N_S$	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
3	$k$	36	36	28	0.333	0.778	0.778	0.778
3	$D$	36	36	28	0.333	0.778	0.778	0.778
3	coverage	36	62	34	0.333	0.548	0.944	0.694
3	straightness	36	56	30	0.333	0.536	0.833	0.652
4	$k$	112	189	101	0.25	0.534	0.902	0.671
4	eccentricity	112	189	101	0.25	0.534	0.902	0.671
4	$D$	112	172	101	0.25	0.587	0.902	0.711
4	coverage	112	173	95	0.25	0.549	0.848	0.667
4	$D'$	112	151	95	0.25	0.629	0.848	0.722

tree kind	centrality	$N_S$	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
4	straightness	112	247	94	0.25	0.381	0.839	0.524
4 path	$k$	77	154	71	0.25	0.461	0.922	0.615
4 path	eccentricity	77	154	71	0.25	0.461	0.922	0.615
4 path	$D$	77	137	71	0.25	0.518	0.922	0.664
4 path	coverage	77	133	65	0.25	0.489	0.844	0.619
4 path	$D'$	77	116	65	0.25	0.56	0.844	0.674
4 path	straightness	77	182	62	0.25	0.341	0.805	0.479
4 star	$k$	35	35	30	0.25	0.857	0.857	0.857
4 star	$D$	35	35	30	0.25	0.857	0.857	0.857
4 star	coverage	35	40	30	0.25	0.75	0.857	0.8
4 star	straightness	35	65	32	0.25	0.492	0.914	0.64
5	$k$	191	353	160	0.2	0.453	0.838	0.588
5	eccentricity	191	281	124	0.2	0.441	0.649	0.525
5	$D$	191	277	144	0.2	0.52	0.754	0.615
5	coverage	191	279	138	0.2	0.495	0.723	0.587
5	$D'$	191	231	133	0.2	0.576	0.696	0.63
5	straightness	191	280	99	0.2	0.354	0.518	0.42
5 path	$k$	81	243	77	0.2	0.317	0.951	0.475
5 path	eccentricity	81	81	24	0.2	0.296	0.296	0.296
5 path	$D$	81	167	59	0.2	0.353	0.728	0.476
5 path	coverage	81	129	48	0.2	0.372	0.593	0.457
5 path	$D'$	81	121	48	0.2	0.397	0.593	0.475
5 path	straightness	81	166	43	0.2	0.259	0.531	0.348
5 quasistar	$k$	90	90	64	0.2	0.711	0.711	0.711
5 quasistar	eccentricity	90	180	81	0.2	0.45	0.9	0.6
5 quasistar	$D$	90	90	66	0.2	0.733	0.733	0.733
5 quasistar	coverage	90	129	71	0.2	0.55	0.789	0.648
5 quasistar	$D'$	90	90	66	0.2	0.733	0.733	0.733
5 quasistar	straightness	90	90	37	0.2	0.411	0.411	0.411
5 star	$k$	20	20	19	0.2	0.95	0.95	0.95
5 star	$D$	20	20	19	0.2	0.95	0.95	0.95
5 star	coverage	20	21	19	0.2	0.905	0.95	0.927
5 star	straightness	20	24	19	0.2	0.792	0.95	0.864
6	$k$	347	638	243	0.167	0.381	0.7	0.493
6	eccentricity	347	504	168	0.167	0.333	0.484	0.395
6	$n_{max}$	347	553	219	0.167	0.396	0.631	0.487
6	$D$	347	510	218	0.167	0.427	0.628	0.509
6	coverage	347	535	216	0.167	0.404	0.622	0.49

tree kind	centrality	$N_S$	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
6	$D'$	347	433	197	0.167	0.455	0.568	0.505
6	straightness	347	484	141	0.167	0.291	0.406	0.339
6 path	$k$	89	356	83	0.167	0.233	0.933	0.373
6 path	eccentricity	89	178	43	0.167	0.242	0.483	0.322
6 path	$D$	89	226	54	0.167	0.239	0.607	0.343
6 path	coverage	89	175	42	0.167	0.24	0.472	0.318
6 path	$D'$	89	172	41	0.167	0.238	0.461	0.314
6 path	straightness	89	218	44	0.167	0.202	0.494	0.287
6 0-quasipath	$k$	92	92	45	0.167	0.489	0.489	0.489
6 0-quasipath	$D$	92	92	48	0.167	0.522	0.522	0.522
6 0-quasipath	coverage	92	134	56	0.167	0.418	0.609	0.496
6 0-quasipath	$D'$	92	92	48	0.167	0.522	0.522	0.522
6 0-quasipath	straightness	92	92	32	0.167	0.348	0.348	0.348
6 1-quasipath	$k$	93	93	55	0.167	0.591	0.591	0.591
6 1-quasipath	eccentricity	93	93	16	0.167	0.172	0.172	0.172
6 1-quasipath	$n_{max}$	93	186	71	0.167	0.382	0.763	0.509
6 1-quasipath	$D$	93	109	60	0.167	0.55	0.645	0.594
6 1-quasipath	coverage	93	133	62	0.167	0.466	0.667	0.549
6 1-quasipath	$D'$	93	93	53	0.167	0.57	0.57	0.57
6 1-quasipath	straightness	93	93	31	0.167	0.333	0.333	0.333
6 b-bistar	$k$	24	48	22	0.167	0.458	0.917	0.611
6 b-bistar	$D$	24	34	18	0.167	0.529	0.75	0.621
6 b-bistar	coverage	24	29	16	0.167	0.552	0.667	0.604
6 b-bistar	$D'$	24	27	16	0.167	0.593	0.667	0.627
6 b-bistar	straightness	24	27	13	0.167	0.481	0.542	0.51
6 quasistar	$k$	44	44	33	0.167	0.75	0.75	0.75
6 quasistar	eccentricity	44	88	37	0.167	0.42	0.841	0.561
6 quasistar	$D$	44	44	33	0.167	0.75	0.75	0.75
6 quasistar	coverage	44	59	35	0.167	0.593	0.795	0.68
6 quasistar	$D'$	44	44	34	0.167	0.773	0.773	0.773
6 quasistar	straightness	44	44	16	0.167	0.364	0.364	0.364
6 star	$k$	5	5	5	0.167	1	1	1
6 star	$D$	5	5	5	0.167	1	1	1
6 star	coverage	5	5	5	0.167	1	1	1
6 star	straightness	5	10	5	0.167	0.5	1	0.667

## 6 Discussion

Here we have investigated the general problem of finding the root of a free tree (Riveros et al., 2023) in the context of syntactic dependency structures. We have validated the hypothesis that the root of a syntactic dependency structure is a word of high centrality in the free tree or both the free tree and the linear arrangement: all centrality scores tend to put the root vertex in top positions (figure 5).

### 6.1 The baselines

It may not be surprising that all the centrality scores perform better than the random baselines. For that reason, we presented degree centrality as a stronger baseline in Section 2. The new spatial scores never perform worse than degree centrality in spite of their close theoretical relationship with vertex degree (Section 2.2.3). When considering the ability of a centrality score to put the root in top positions, we find that eccentricity (Jordan center) tends to perform worse than degree centrality (figure 5). When considering the classification models, degree centrality never performs better than the new spatial scores but performs better in the following conditions: recall of closeness,  $m_2(v)$  and betweenness in UD; precision of eccentricity in SUD, recall of all other non-spatial scores in SUD and F-measure of eccentricity (Jordan center) in SUD. Thus, our findings on recall in SUD indicate that all the complexity of the non-spatial scores is totally useless in that setting.

### 6.2 The best scores

*A priori*, spatial scores are expected to be better than non-spatial scores because they exploit more information (both the free tree structure and vertex positions). By the same token, scores that exploit global information about the free tree (e.g., the shortest path distances in the tree) should perform better than scores that exploit only local information (e.g., the neighbours of a vertex).

Unsurprisingly, the new spatial centrality scores ( $D$ ,  $D'$  and coverage) have the highest ability to place the root vertex in top positions. Surprisingly, straightness centrality, a spatial score that exploits global information of the free tree, has a lower performance even with respect to non-spatial scores especially in UD (Figures 5, 6 and 7). It is interesting that the new spatial scores beat the non-spatial scores just by exploiting local information.

It could be argued that the average performance of the best classification model in sentences of any length is poor (about 42–47%)<sup>11</sup> with respect to state-of-the-art unsupervised dependency parsing (Han et al., 2020) or the recently introduced deep supervised parsing methods (Kulmizev, de Lhoneux, Gontrum, Fano, & Nivre, 2019). The latter are able to guess the correct arc and the corresponding label with an accuracy of 85% or more.<sup>12</sup> Notice however, that our models are parameter-less and that they are not taking into account any information about the words attached to the free tree vertices, e.g., the word form or its part-of-speech (Han et al., 2020),<sup>13</sup> neither any information outside the sentence such as word ontologies or word embeddings, as it is customary in traditional supervised and unsupervised parsing methods (Han et al., 2020; Jurafsky & Martin, 2024).

### 6.3 Why do the new spatial scores work?

We introduced the corrected  $D$  ( $D'$ ) hoping that it would perform better than  $D$ . There is a slight tendency of  $D'$  to perform better than  $D$  (figure 5), that becomes evident when looking at the performance of the classification models (Figures 6 and 7). Then our fear that simply  $D$  could retrieve heads due to anti dependency distance minimization in short spans (Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2024; Ferrer-i-Cancho & Gómez-Rodríguez, 2021a; Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2022) was totally justified and demonstrates the power of word order theory. Our findings suggest that roots are words that form long dependencies, not because dependency distance minimization is surpassed by other word order principles but rather because they connect distant elements in the sentence. Furthermore, these scores may be able to break ties between centers with respect to non-spatial scores (Figure 3) by combining information on the free tree with positional information.

---

**11**  $D'$  reaches an average F-measure over languages of 0.417 in UD and 0.468 in SUD; Tables 12 and .

**12** Here we refer to labelled attachment score, that is just percentage of correct arcs, relative to the gold standard, but ignoring arc labels.

**13** Recall that (Søgaard, 2012a, 2012b) also exploited that information.

## 6.4 Soft versus hard

We introduced the  $m_2(v)$  hoping that it would be a soft centrality score that would perform better than  $n_{max}(v)$  (centroid). The fact is that  $m_2(v)$  is worse than  $n_{max}(v)$  in UD and slightly better in SUD, both in terms of normalized rank (figure 5). Regarding the classification models,  $m_2(v)$  performs worse than  $n_{max}(v)$  (in terms of precision, recall and F-measure) in UD whereas performance depends on the evaluation metric in SUD (Figures 6 and 7). Thus,  $m_2(v)$  does not show a clear general improvement with respect to its hard version. The fact that betweenness, which shares ingredients with  $m_2(v)$  (Section 2.1), yields always better classification models (figures 6 and 7), suggests that  $m_2(v)$  does not make any addition to the literature on standard centrality scores. Instead, betweenness centrality seems to yield the soft version of  $n_{max}(v)$  that we were looking for.

## 6.5 Who is the root?

The question of who is the root of a syntactic dependency structure can be answered in two ways by means of the classification models (Figures 6 and 7). From a precision perspective, the vertex or vertices that maximize  $D'$  are likely to be the roots. From a recall perspective, the root is likely to be a vertex that maximizes coverage. These findings suggest that long distance dependencies can fool the classification models based on  $D$  or  $D'$  and that  $D'$  does not clear all confusion caused by long distance dependencies. Interestingly, the performance of the new centrality scores is  $\approx 60\%$  or greater in certain languages that appear as “outlying” points in Figures 6 and 7 (for precise values, check Tables 14 and 15). These languages, tend to be Korean and Turkish and Japanese in UD and Korean and Turkish in SUD, which are among the SOV languages in our sample (Table 5). We believe that their tendency to put the main verb by the end of the sentence increases the chance that the main verb has longer syntactic dependencies and then the chance of confusing it with other heads reduces.

We have also seen that the performance of the scores is higher with UD than with SUD annotation style (Figures 5, 6 and 7), suggesting that UD is a better format for the discovery or validation of roots.

If we restrict the answer to the question above to non-spatial scores, the vertex or vertices that maximize the betweenness centrality (or the centroids in case of UD; or the vertices that maximize closeness in SUD) are likely to be the roots (precision). In contrast, the root is likely to be a Jordan center (eccentricity) in UD and simply a hub (the vertex of maximum degree) in SUD

(recall). For UD annotation style, the best non-spatial model according to the F-measure is the centroid (figure 6). It is surprising that the centroid, is able to predict the root of a syntactic dependency structure with an accuracy of  $\approx 40\%$  (for UD) just knowing the undirected links and ignoring any other information (the word labels, their part of speech, their position in the sentence,...). These findings demonstrate the power of the theory of optimal linear arrangements, namely, arrangements that minimize the sum of syntactic dependency distances (Alemany-Puig et al., 2022; Hochberg & Stallmann, 2003; Iordanskii, 1987; Shiloach, 1979). Our findings suggest that among the distinct kinds of information that the centrality scores exploit (Table 3), subtree sizes are the most valuable non-spatial information to find the root of a syntactic dependency tree (precision). This is consistent with the importance of subtree sizes in the theory of optimal linear arrangements, whereby subtrees must be laid out around the centroid in a specific way (Chung, 1984; Hochberg & Stallmann, 2003; Iordanskii, 1987; Shiloach, 1979).

We have seen that the performance of the centrality scores improves in short sentences (Tables 6 and 7). In this context, we have found that the root is easier to predict in star-like structures and more difficult to predict in path-like structures. In decreasing order of star-likeness and decreasing prediction performance we find stars, quasistars and balanced bistars. Interestingly, linear order is practically irrelevant for a successful guess of the root in sufficiently long sentences with a star tree structure. In star trees, the hub is very likely to be the root, no matter where the hub is placed.

## 7 Future work

Here we have investigated the problem of finding the root of a vertex with the simplifying assumption that a model can only consider a single notion of centrality. Future research should consider models that combine distinct notions of centrality. We have seen that the ratio  $N_S/N_M$  (Tables 12 and 13) yields an upper bound to precision and a low value of this ratio is an indication of a high proportion of false positives (Section 4.1). A low value of the ratio  $N_S/N_M$  is low in the worst classification models in terms of precision, i.e. the degree centrality model and the eccentricity model independently of the annotation style, and is due to an excess of guesses per sentence. The problem of reducing the number of guesses of a model should be the subject of future research. Such a reduction can be achieved by combining distinct centrality criteria to reduce the number of tied vertices. We have paved the way for unsupervised machine

learning methods that find the root vertex given the free tree structure and the positions of vertices.

**Acknowledgment:** This article is dedicated to the memory of Á. Cancho-Victorio (1934-2023) for his inspiring discussions on first principles. We thank L. Alemany-Puig for producing and making available the PUD/PSUD dataset in head vector format for the UD 2.14 release. This research is supported by a recognition 2021SGR-Cat (01266 LQMC) from AGAUR (Generalitat de Catalunya) and the grant AGRUPS-2024 from Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya.

## References

- Alemany-Puig, L., Esteban, J. L., & Ferrer-i-Cancho, R. (2022). Minimum projective linearizations of trees in linear time. *Information Processing Letters*, 174, 106204. doi: 10.1016/j.ipl.2021.106204
- Alemany-Puig, L., & Ferrer-i-Cancho, R. (2022). Linear-time calculation of the expected sum of edge lengths in random projective linearizations of trees. *Journal of Computational Linguistics*, 48(3), 491–516. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03277> doi: 10.1162/coli\_a\_00442
- Barthélemy, M. (2011). Spatial networks. *Physics Reports*, 499(1), 1 - 101. doi: 10.1016/j.physrep.2010.11.002
- Britz, T. (2019). On the betweenness centrality of trees, forests and cycles. *Sustainable Forestry*, 2(2). doi: 10.24294/sf.v1i2.968
- Chung, F. R. K. (1984). On optimal linear arrangements of trees. *Comp. & Maths. with Appls.*, 10(1), 43-60.
- Conover, W. J. (1999). *Practical nonparametric statistics*. New York: Wiley. (3rd edition)
- Croft, B., Metzler, D., & Strohman, T. (2010). *Search engines: Information retrieval in practice*. Addison Wesley.
- Crucitti, P., Latora, V., & Porta, S. (2006). Centrality in networks of urban streets. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 16(1), 015113. doi: 10.1063/1.2150162
- Dryer, M. S., & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.). (2013). *WALS Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from <http://wals.info/>
- Ferrer-i-Cancho, R. (2004). Euclidean distance between syntactically linked words. *Physical Review E*, 70, 056135. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.70.056135
- Ferrer-i-Cancho, R. (2024). The optimal placement of the head in the noun phrase. The case of demonstrative, numeral, adjective and noun. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, in press. doi: 10.1080/09296174.2024.2400847
- Ferrer-i-Cancho, R., & Gómez-Rodríguez, C. (2021a). Anti dependency distance minimization in short sequences. A graph theoretic approach. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 28(1), 50 – 76. doi: 10.1080/09296174.2019.1645547
- Ferrer-i-Cancho, R., & Gómez-Rodríguez, C. (2021b). Dependency distance minimization predicts compression. In *Proceedings of the second workshop on quantitative syntax (quasy, syn-*

*taxfest 2021*) (p. 45-57). Sofia, Bulgaria: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2021.quasy-1.4/>

Ferrer-i-Cancho, R., Gómez-Rodríguez, C., Esteban, J. L., & Alemany-Puig, L. (2022). Optimality of syntactic dependency distances. *Physical Review E*, *105*(1), 014308. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.105.014308

Futrell, R., Mahowald, K., & Gibson, E. (2015). Large-scale evidence of dependency length minimization in 37 languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *112*(33), 10336-10341. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1502134112>

Gerdes, K., Guillaume, B., Kahane, S., & Perrier, G. (2018, November). SUD or surface-syntactic universal dependencies: An annotation scheme near-isomorphic to UD. In *Proceedings of the second workshop on universal dependencies (UDW 2018)* (pp. 66–74). Brussels, Belgium: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W18-6008> doi: 10.18653/v1/W18-6008

Gildea, D., & Temperley, D. (2007, June). Optimizing grammars for minimum dependency length. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual meeting of the association of computational linguistics* (pp. 184–191). Prague, Czech Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P07-1024>

Han, W., Jiang, Y., Ng, H. T., & Tu, K. (2020, December). A survey of unsupervised dependency parsing. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on computational linguistics* (pp. 2522–2533). Barcelona, Spain (Online): International Committee on Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2020.coling-main.227> doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.227

Harari, F. (1969). *Graph theory*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hochberg, R. A., & Stallmann, M. F. (2003). Optimal one-page tree embeddings in linear time. *Information Processing Letters*, *87*, 59-66.

lordanskii, M. A. (1974). Minimal numberings of the vertices of trees. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, *218*(2), 272-275.

lordanskii, M. A. (1987). Minimal numberings of the vertices of trees — Approximate approach. In L. Budach, R. G. Bukharajev, & O. B. Lupanov (Eds.), *Fundamentals of computation theory* (p. 214-217). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Jordan, C. (1869). Sur les assemblages de lignes. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, *70*(2), 185-190.

Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2024). *Speech and language processing* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from <https://web.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/slp3/>

Kulmizev, A., de Lhoneux, M., Gontrum, J., Fano, E., & Nivre, J. (2019, November). Deep contextualized word embeddings in transition-based and graph-based dependency parsing - a tale of two parsers revisited. In K. Inui, J. Jiang, V. Ng, & X. Wan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (emnlp-ijcnlp)* (pp. 2755–2768). Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1277

Lin, D. (1996). On the structural complexity of natural language sentences. In *COLING 1996 volume 2: The 16th international conference on computational linguistics*. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/C96-2123>

Liu, H. (2008). Dependency distance as a metric of language comprehension difficulty. *Journal of Cognitive Science*, *9*, 159-191. doi: 10.17791/jcs.2008.9.2.159

Liu, H. (2010). Dependency direction as a means of word-order typology: a method based on dependency treebanks. *Lingua*, *120*(6), 1567-1578.

Marecek, D. (2016). Twelve years of unsupervised dependency parsing. In B. Brejová (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 16th ITAT conference information technologies - applications and theory, tatranské matliare, slovakia, september 15-19, 2016* (Vol. 1649, pp. 56–62). CEUR-WS.org. Retrieved from <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1649/56.pdf>

Mel'čuk, I. (1988). *Dependency syntax: theory and practice*. Albany: State of New York University Press.

Newman, M. E. J. (2010). *Networks. an introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pullum, G. K. (2024). Daniel Everett on Pirahã syntax. In E. Gibson & M. Poliak (Eds.), *From fieldwork to linguistic theory: A tribute to Dan Everett*. Language Science Press. doi: 10.5281/ZENODO.12665907

Raghavan Unnithan, S. K., Kannan, B., & Jathavedan, M. (2014). Betweenness centrality in some classes of graphs. *International Journal of Combinatorics*, 2014(1), 241723. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/241723>

Rijkhoff, J. (1986). Word order universals revisited: The principle of head proximity. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 1, 95–125. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/bjl.1.05rij> doi: 10.1075/bjl.1.05rij

Riveros, C., Salas, J., & Skibski, O. (2023). How Do Centrality Measures Choose the Root of Trees? In F. Geerts & B. Vandevoort (Eds.), *26th international conference on database theory (icdt 2023)* (Vol. 255, pp. 12:1–12:17). Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.ICDT.2023.12

Shiloach, Y. (1979). A minimum linear arrangement algorithm for undirected trees. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 8(1), 15-32.

Søgaard, A. (2012a, June). Two baselines for unsupervised dependency parsing. In T. Cohn, P. Blunsom, & J. Graca (Eds.), *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT workshop on the induction of linguistic structure* (pp. 81–83). Montréal, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/W12-1910>

Søgaard, A. (2012b). Unsupervised dependency parsing without training. *Natural Language Engineering*, 18(2), 187–203. doi: 10.1017/S1351324912000022

Steinbach, P. (1995). Field guide to simple graphs. In (2nd ed., Vol. 3, chap. Chapter 2: Centers and Centroids). Albuquerque, NM: Design Lab, Albuquerque Technical-Vocational.

Zeman, D., Nivre, J., Abrams, M., Ackermann, E., Aepli, N., Agič, Ž., ... others (2020). *Universal dependencies 2.6*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-3226> (LINDAT/CLARIAH-CZ digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics (ÚFAL), Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University)

Zeman, D., Popel, M., Straka, M., Hajič, J., Nivre, J., Ginter, F., ... others (2017, August). CoNLL 2017 shared task: Multilingual parsing from raw text to universal dependencies. In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 shared task: Multilingual parsing from raw text to universal dependencies* (pp. 1–19). Vancouver, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/K17-3001> doi: 10.18653/v1/K17-3001

## Appendix

### A Ranking

#### A.1 Discounted cumulative gain

We also consider another ranking approach that we borrow from the field of information retrieval: discounted cumulative gain (DCG) (Croft et al., 2010). The DCG of a list of  $n$  documents retrieved is defined as (Croft et al., 2010)

$$DCG = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\rho_i}{\log_2(i+1)},$$

where  $i$  is the position of the document in the list and  $\rho_i$  is the relevance of the  $i$ -th document selected. In our application, the documents correspond to the vertices of the tree, there is only one possible relevant vertex that is the root (a tree has only one root) and so the DCG becomes

$$DCG = \frac{1}{\log_2(i+1)},$$

where now  $i$  is simply the average rank of the root in the sorting (Equation 10). If there are not tied values among vertices, then  $i$  is simply the position of the root in the sorting. DCG aims to give more importance to finding the root in top positions with respect to the plain definition of rank above.

As DCGs from sentences of different length are not comparable, we transform them into numbers between 0 and 1 knowing that  $1/\log_2(n+1) \leq DCG \leq 1$ . Then the performance of a score on a language is the average value of the normalized DCGs. The following property indicates that the average normalized DCG of the random baseline will never exceed 0.131.

**Property A.1.** *Let  $\overline{DCG}$  be the normalized DCG, namely*

$$\overline{DCG} = \frac{DCG - DCG_{min}}{1 - DCG_{min}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} DCG &= 1/\log_2(r+1) \\ DCG_{min} &= 1/\log_2(n+1). \end{aligned}$$

Then the expectations according to a random baseline that picks a random vertex as root of a tree of size  $n$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[DCG] &\leq \frac{1}{\log_2 \frac{n+3}{2}} \\ \mathbb{E}[\overline{DCG}] &\leq \frac{1}{1 - DCG_{min}} \left( \frac{1}{\log_2 \frac{n+3}{2}} - DCG_{min} \right) \\ &\leq 0.131. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* As the function  $1/\log_2(x + 1)$  is convex for  $x > 1$  (Figure 8), Jensen's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E}[DCG] \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[r + 1]}.$$

Knowing that (recall Equation 10) (recall Equation 10)

$$\mathbb{E}[r + 1] = r(2, n + 1) = \frac{n + 3}{2},$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[DCG] \leq \frac{1}{\log_2 \frac{n+3}{2}}.$$

By the linearity of expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}[\overline{DCG}] \leq f(n) = \frac{1}{1 - DCG_{min}} \left( \frac{1}{\log_2 \frac{n+3}{2}} - \frac{1}{\log_2(n + 1)} \right).$$

When  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f(n)$  reaches a maximum at  $n = 3$  (Figure 8). Hence


$$\mathbb{E}[\overline{DCG}] \leq f(3) < 0.131.$$

□

## A.2 Detailed results

Figure 9 shows the performance of the scores based on DCG for UD and SUD. Recall that higher DCG means higher ability to place the root in top positions (the opposite of plain ranks). The mean normalized DCG is far from the upper bound predicted for the random baseline, that is 0.131 (Property A.1).

DCG supports the overall conclusion that all centrality scores tend to put the root vertex close to top positions and also that the new spatial centrality scores ( $D$ ,  $D'$  and coverage) are better suited (figure 9). With respect to the summary of results in Section 5, the only differences are (Figure 9)



**Fig. 8:** Left. The function  $1/\log_2(x + 1)$  for  $x \geq 1$ . Right. The function  $f(n)$  (Equation A.1) for  $n \geq 1$

2. The best scores are the new spatial scores both in UD and SUD.
3. Among the non-spatial scores, degree centrality and eccentricity are the worst scores, both in UD and SUD.

In addition, the distribution over languages is narrower (the violin plots for DCG in Figure 9 are wider than those for normalized rank) probably due to the smoothing effect of the logarithmic correction of ranks performed by DCG. Besides, DCG confirms that eccentricity (Jordan center) tends to perform worse than degree centrality (figure 9). DCG also confirms the slight tendency of  $D'$  to perform better than  $D$  (Figure 9). It also confirms that  $m_2(v)$  is worse than  $n_{max}(v)$  in UD and slightly better in SUD (figure 9).

Tables 8 and 9 summarize the distributions shown in Figures 5 and 9, respectively. For the sake of completeness, Tables 10 and 11 detail the performance of the centrality score on each language.

**Tab. 10:** The performance of each centrality score for each language in the PUD treebank using UD annotation style. For the rank and the DCG of the root, we show the mean and the median over all sentences of the language. Rank is the normalized rank.

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Arabic	$k$	0.19	0.156	0.395	0.297
Arabic	eccentricity	0.198	0.132	0.443	0.308
Arabic	closeness	0.15	0.091	0.502	0.427
Arabic	$n_{max}$	0.141	0.079	0.525	0.488

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		rank	median	mean	median
Arabic	$m_2$	0.156	0.1	0.497	0.382
Arabic	betweenness	0.143	0.083	0.53	0.488
Arabic	$D$	0.109	0.059	0.592	0.52
Arabic	coverage	0.117	0.062	0.546	0.515
Arabic	$D'$	0.11	0.059	0.587	0.517
Arabic	straightness	0.081	0.026	0.676	0.635
Chinese	$k$	0.109	0.062	0.574	0.515
Chinese	eccentricity	0.127	0.05	0.547	0.662
Chinese	closeness	0.085	0.042	0.656	0.538
Chinese	$n_{max}$	0.083	0.038	0.656	0.644
Chinese	$m_2$	0.089	0.042	0.65	0.534
Chinese	betweenness	0.083	0.04	0.657	0.535
Chinese	$D$	0.071	0.033	0.684	0.657
Chinese	coverage	0.064	0.031	0.697	0.673
Chinese	$D'$	0.063	0	0.72	1
Chinese	straightness	0.094	0.071	0.588	0.499
Czech	$k$	0.168	0.136	0.446	0.361
Czech	eccentricity	0.196	0.125	0.461	0.338
Czech	closeness	0.146	0.1	0.528	0.461
Czech	$n_{max}$	0.136	0.083	0.537	0.472
Czech	$m_2$	0.144	0.1	0.527	0.472
Czech	betweenness	0.136	0.091	0.545	0.481
Czech	$D$	0.115	0.067	0.584	0.511
Czech	coverage	0.1	0.045	0.64	0.622
Czech	$D'$	0.105	0.059	0.624	0.517
Czech	straightness	0.146	0.125	0.469	0.363
English	$k$	0.123	0.1	0.484	0.4
English	eccentricity	0.157	0.1	0.487	0.367
English	closeness	0.099	0.071	0.569	0.508
English	$n_{max}$	0.091	0.06	0.587	0.515
English	$m_2$	0.099	0.071	0.568	0.504
English	betweenness	0.092	0.059	0.592	0.52
English	$D$	0.089	0.053	0.602	0.522
English	coverage	0.071	0.04	0.657	0.622
English	$D'$	0.075	0.045	0.651	0.53
English	straightness	0.125	0.111	0.478	0.355
Finnish	$k$	0.122	0.091	0.552	0.488

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		rank	median	mean	median
Finnish	eccentricity	0.176	0.115	0.494	0.404
Finnish	closeness	0.11	0.077	0.607	0.508
Finnish	$n_{max}$	0.111	0.071	0.602	0.511
Finnish	$m_2$	0.11	0.083	0.602	0.504
Finnish	betweenness	0.108	0.071	0.616	0.511
Finnish	$D$	0.103	0.062	0.627	0.517
Finnish	coverage	0.097	0.056	0.647	0.622
Finnish	$D'$	0.096	0.053	0.659	0.524
Finnish	straightness	0.145	0.125	0.502	0.446
French	$k$	0.115	0.087	0.48	0.4
French	eccentricity	0.147	0.086	0.484	0.365
French	closeness	0.09	0.056	0.581	0.517
French	$n_{max}$	0.083	0.054	0.59	0.52
French	$m_2$	0.092	0.059	0.573	0.515
French	betweenness	0.083	0.051	0.594	0.522
French	$D$	0.069	0.04	0.639	0.534
French	coverage	0.056	0.025	0.69	0.686
French	$D'$	0.062	0.032	0.671	0.54
French	straightness	0.111	0.094	0.48	0.363
Galician	$k$	0.173	0.167	0.381	0.275
Galician	eccentricity	0.163	0.091	0.476	0.353
Galician	closeness	0.126	0.083	0.505	0.38
Galician	$n_{max}$	0.111	0.065	0.551	0.508
Galician	$m_2$	0.135	0.097	0.492	0.37
Galician	betweenness	0.116	0.069	0.543	0.494
Galician	$D$	0.1	0.053	0.577	0.522
Galician	coverage	0.081	0.038	0.628	0.54
Galician	$D'$	0.088	0.042	0.622	0.531
Galician	straightness	0.12	0.091	0.497	0.374
German	$k$	0.116	0.089	0.498	0.412
German	eccentricity	0.145	0.083	0.505	0.603
German	closeness	0.092	0.059	0.586	0.517
German	$n_{max}$	0.083	0.056	0.602	0.52
German	$m_2$	0.094	0.062	0.584	0.515
German	betweenness	0.084	0.059	0.606	0.517
German	$D$	0.08	0.047	0.634	0.528
German	coverage	0.075	0.042	0.65	0.603

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		rank	median	mean	median
German	$D'$	0.072	0.04	0.668	0.533
German	straightness	0.101	0.08	0.536	0.494
Hindi	$k$	0.092	0.053	0.57	0.515
Hindi	eccentricity	0.16	0.094	0.475	0.349
Hindi	closeness	0.087	0.04	0.627	0.534
Hindi	$n_{max}$	0.08	0.043	0.616	0.533
Hindi	$m_2$	0.078	0.043	0.63	0.531
Hindi	betweenness	0.078	0.04	0.635	0.534
Hindi	$D$	0.065	0.029	0.684	0.548
Hindi	coverage	0.079	0.038	0.632	0.652
Hindi	$D'$	0.065	0	0.704	1
Hindi	straightness	0.109	0.062	0.583	0.508
Icelandic	$k$	0.113	0.083	0.525	0.461
Icelandic	eccentricity	0.176	0.121	0.472	0.347
Icelandic	closeness	0.102	0.067	0.59	0.515
Icelandic	$n_{max}$	0.1	0.071	0.585	0.515
Icelandic	$m_2$	0.098	0.071	0.587	0.511
Icelandic	betweenness	0.099	0.067	0.591	0.515
Icelandic	$D$	0.084	0.05	0.637	0.53
Icelandic	coverage	0.076	0.043	0.648	0.603
Icelandic	$D'$	0.078	0.043	0.656	0.53
Icelandic	straightness	0.121	0.095	0.539	0.472
Indonesian	$k$	0.153	0.133	0.454	0.361
Indonesian	eccentricity	0.165	0.1	0.484	0.378
Indonesian	closeness	0.124	0.083	0.542	0.494
Indonesian	$n_{max}$	0.109	0.069	0.577	0.515
Indonesian	$m_2$	0.124	0.083	0.539	0.494
Indonesian	betweenness	0.111	0.071	0.576	0.508
Indonesian	$D$	0.098	0.059	0.61	0.522
Indonesian	coverage	0.081	0.031	0.674	0.678
Indonesian	$D'$	0.088	0.045	0.652	0.528
Indonesian	straightness	0.135	0.111	0.487	0.361
Italian	$k$	0.146	0.115	0.416	0.322
Italian	eccentricity	0.159	0.1	0.467	0.328
Italian	closeness	0.113	0.077	0.527	0.481
Italian	$n_{max}$	0.101	0.062	0.554	0.508
Italian	$m_2$	0.116	0.077	0.523	0.481

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		rank	median	mean	median
Italian	betweenness	0.102	0.067	0.558	0.504
Italian	$D$	0.091	0.05	0.595	0.526
Italian	coverage	0.075	0.038	0.643	0.546
Italian	$D'$	0.081	0.043	0.63	0.531
Italian	straightness	0.117	0.1	0.487	0.361
Japanese	$k$	0.092	0.053	0.545	0.462
Japanese	eccentricity	0.138	0.095	0.464	0.329
Japanese	closeness	0.07	0.037	0.618	0.535
Japanese	$n_{max}$	0.072	0.038	0.611	0.535
Japanese	$m_2$	0.074	0.038	0.614	0.535
Japanese	betweenness	0.07	0.036	0.627	0.536
Japanese	$D$	0.039	0	0.771	1
Japanese	coverage	0.048	0.029	0.666	0.547
Japanese	$D'$	0.04	0	0.761	1
Japanese	straightness	0.029	0	0.807	1
Korean	$k$	0.163	0.094	0.515	0.433
Korean	eccentricity	0.209	0.133	0.448	0.347
Korean	closeness	0.15	0.071	0.573	0.508
Korean	$n_{max}$	0.152	0.077	0.558	0.508
Korean	$m_2$	0.147	0.071	0.575	0.511
Korean	betweenness	0.147	0.071	0.579	0.511
Korean	$D$	0.076	0	0.772	1
Korean	coverage	0.117	0.062	0.531	0.52
Korean	$D'$	0.081	0	0.751	1
Korean	straightness	0.044	0	0.86	1
Polish	$k$	0.165	0.125	0.472	0.394
Polish	eccentricity	0.192	0.125	0.464	0.342
Polish	closeness	0.139	0.083	0.557	0.499
Polish	$n_{max}$	0.136	0.077	0.558	0.499
Polish	$m_2$	0.142	0.083	0.552	0.499
Polish	betweenness	0.135	0.077	0.572	0.504
Polish	$D$	0.109	0.062	0.616	0.52
Polish	coverage	0.101	0.05	0.63	0.572
Polish	$D'$	0.103	0.056	0.636	0.522
Polish	straightness	0.137	0.107	0.507	0.398
Portuguese	$k$	0.147	0.121	0.428	0.322
Portuguese	eccentricity	0.148	0.086	0.491	0.4

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		rank	median	mean	median
Portuguese	closeness	0.109	0.071	0.544	0.504
Portuguese	$n_{max}$	0.097	0.059	0.574	0.52
Portuguese	$m_2$	0.116	0.077	0.535	0.494
Portuguese	betweenness	0.1	0.062	0.572	0.515
Portuguese	$D$	0.091	0.048	0.603	0.526
Portuguese	coverage	0.075	0.034	0.654	0.635
Portuguese	$D'$	0.08	0.04	0.646	0.534
Portuguese	straightness	0.118	0.097	0.477	0.363
Russian	$k$	0.152	0.125	0.458	0.388
Russian	eccentricity	0.178	0.125	0.474	0.361
Russian	closeness	0.126	0.083	0.548	0.494
Russian	$n_{max}$	0.117	0.071	0.568	0.508
Russian	$m_2$	0.125	0.083	0.547	0.494
Russian	betweenness	0.117	0.075	0.571	0.504
Russian	$D$	0.107	0.06	0.6	0.517
Russian	coverage	0.092	0.043	0.646	0.657
Russian	$D'$	0.097	0.053	0.639	0.524
Russian	straightness	0.151	0.125	0.471	0.355
Spanish	$k$	0.16	0.138	0.404	0.307
Spanish	eccentricity	0.159	0.095	0.474	0.349
Spanish	closeness	0.119	0.083	0.519	0.422
Spanish	$n_{max}$	0.106	0.062	0.558	0.508
Spanish	$m_2$	0.127	0.091	0.51	0.388
Spanish	betweenness	0.11	0.067	0.553	0.508
Spanish	$D$	0.094	0.05	0.598	0.524
Spanish	coverage	0.077	0.038	0.638	0.548
Spanish	$D'$	0.084	0.043	0.631	0.531
Spanish	straightness	0.119	0.091	0.487	0.365
Swedish	$k$	0.122	0.096	0.502	0.416
Swedish	eccentricity	0.163	0.1	0.486	0.363
Swedish	closeness	0.101	0.071	0.571	0.504
Swedish	$n_{max}$	0.094	0.071	0.589	0.508
Swedish	$m_2$	0.103	0.077	0.57	0.499
Swedish	betweenness	0.094	0.067	0.594	0.511
Swedish	$D$	0.088	0.056	0.621	0.522
Swedish	coverage	0.077	0.048	0.636	0.534
Swedish	$D'$	0.079	0.045	0.652	0.528

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		rank	median	mean	median
Swedish	straightness	0.115	0.091	0.541	0.481
Thai	$k$	0.128	0.083	0.489	0.412
Thai	eccentricity	0.17	0.114	0.446	0.321
Thai	closeness	0.107	0.059	0.558	0.515
Thai	$n_{max}$	0.104	0.057	0.557	0.515
Thai	$m_2$	0.108	0.062	0.552	0.511
Thai	betweenness	0.103	0.059	0.567	0.515
Thai	$D$	0.078	0.042	0.623	0.533
Thai	coverage	0.066	0.026	0.683	0.683
Thai	$D'$	0.071	0.034	0.66	0.539
Thai	straightness	0.103	0.074	0.521	0.461
Turkish	$k$	0.155	0.111	0.498	0.404
Turkish	eccentricity	0.176	0.115	0.487	0.394
Turkish	closeness	0.129	0.077	0.575	0.508
Turkish	$n_{max}$	0.129	0.071	0.579	0.511
Turkish	$m_2$	0.131	0.077	0.578	0.508
Turkish	betweenness	0.127	0.071	0.592	0.511
Turkish	$D$	0.066	0	0.76	1
Turkish	coverage	0.087	0.05	0.648	0.657
Turkish	$D'$	0.063	0	0.788	1
Turkish	straightness	0.055	0	0.778	1

**Tab. 11:** The performance of each centrality score for each language in the PUD treebank using SUD annotation style. The format is the same as in Table 10.

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Arabic	$k$	0.196	0.111	0.441	0.355
Arabic	eccentricity	0.267	0.2	0.348	0.244
Arabic	closeness	0.189	0.1	0.497	0.38
Arabic	$n_{max}$	0.198	0.125	0.46	0.338
Arabic	$m_2$	0.179	0.091	0.507	0.431
Arabic	betweenness	0.189	0.1	0.502	0.374
Arabic	$D$	0.123	0.047	0.617	0.536
Arabic	coverage	0.15	0.071	0.535	0.511
Arabic	$D'$	0.131	0.053	0.603	0.524
Arabic	straightness	0.089	0.038	0.66	0.535

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Chinese	$k$	0.232	0.136	0.42	0.302
Chinese	eccentricity	0.25	0.196	0.339	0.235
Chinese	closeness	0.189	0.125	0.475	0.346
Chinese	$n_{max}$	0.235	0.147	0.427	0.315
Chinese	$m_2$	0.222	0.129	0.46	0.342
Chinese	betweenness	0.229	0.132	0.444	0.338
Chinese	$D$	0.191	0.091	0.507	0.461
Chinese	coverage	0.192	0.071	0.514	0.508
Chinese	$D'$	0.189	0.077	0.525	0.494
Chinese	straightness	0.197	0.143	0.412	0.315
Czech	$k$	0.205	0.132	0.423	0.333
Czech	eccentricity	0.268	0.208	0.371	0.255
Czech	closeness	0.202	0.118	0.478	0.358
Czech	$n_{max}$	0.201	0.147	0.456	0.33
Czech	$m_2$	0.188	0.118	0.487	0.361
Czech	betweenness	0.195	0.133	0.483	0.349
Czech	$D$	0.153	0.071	0.559	0.511
Czech	coverage	0.143	0.053	0.604	0.622
Czech	$D'$	0.145	0.059	0.599	0.517
Czech	straightness	0.176	0.125	0.442	0.349
English	$k$	0.174	0.132	0.402	0.322
English	eccentricity	0.261	0.2	0.344	0.234
English	closeness	0.168	0.095	0.481	0.374
English	$n_{max}$	0.174	0.125	0.46	0.328
English	$m_2$	0.159	0.1	0.483	0.369
English	betweenness	0.167	0.109	0.483	0.361
English	$D$	0.142	0.062	0.559	0.517
English	coverage	0.131	0.045	0.593	0.538
English	$D'$	0.136	0.053	0.59	0.524
English	straightness	0.157	0.111	0.464	0.365
Finnish	$k$	0.175	0.125	0.48	0.398
Finnish	eccentricity	0.241	0.182	0.415	0.306
Finnish	closeness	0.171	0.1	0.529	0.481
Finnish	$n_{max}$	0.172	0.115	0.513	0.4
Finnish	$m_2$	0.163	0.1	0.535	0.481
Finnish	betweenness	0.168	0.105	0.531	0.472
Finnish	$D$	0.162	0.083	0.551	0.499


language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Finnish	coverage	0.152	0.077	0.562	0.515
Finnish	$D'$	0.154	0.077	0.578	0.508
Finnish	straightness	0.19	0.15	0.466	0.358
French	$k$	0.182	0.14	0.382	0.274
French	eccentricity	0.246	0.184	0.348	0.229
French	closeness	0.161	0.091	0.471	0.363
French	$n_{max}$	0.162	0.111	0.452	0.338
French	$m_2$	0.158	0.103	0.461	0.353
French	betweenness	0.157	0.1	0.475	0.355
French	$D$	0.121	0.05	0.565	0.524
French	coverage	0.105	0.031	0.622	0.675
French	$D'$	0.113	0.043	0.594	0.531
French	straightness	0.142	0.091	0.455	0.365
Galician	$k$	0.204	0.143	0.372	0.272
Galician	eccentricity	0.256	0.184	0.351	0.232
Galician	closeness	0.177	0.097	0.477	0.367
Galician	$n_{max}$	0.18	0.107	0.459	0.346
Galician	$m_2$	0.176	0.1	0.463	0.361
Galician	betweenness	0.174	0.1	0.485	0.369
Galician	$D$	0.131	0.048	0.576	0.53
Galician	coverage	0.123	0.037	0.609	0.622
Galician	$D'$	0.126	0.042	0.605	0.533
Galician	straightness	0.138	0.088	0.482	0.369
German	$k$	0.162	0.125	0.443	0.338
German	eccentricity	0.229	0.175	0.382	0.259
German	closeness	0.146	0.091	0.503	0.39
German	$n_{max}$	0.151	0.114	0.482	0.361
German	$m_2$	0.142	0.091	0.506	0.394
German	betweenness	0.146	0.1	0.503	0.372
German	$D$	0.127	0.077	0.543	0.494
German	coverage	0.113	0.05	0.595	0.53
German	$D'$	0.119	0.062	0.575	0.515
German	straightness	0.134	0.107	0.465	0.365
Hindi	$k$	0.308	0.357	0.323	0.16
Hindi	eccentricity	0.32	0.265	0.28	0.18
Hindi	closeness	0.279	0.2	0.368	0.219
Hindi	$n_{max}$	0.285	0.2	0.359	0.219

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Hindi	$m_2$	0.289	0.217	0.368	0.202
Hindi	betweenness	0.283	0.2	0.377	0.224
Hindi	$D$	0.201	0.091	0.483	0.367
Hindi	coverage	0.227	0.111	0.39	0.313
Hindi	$D'$	0.205	0.097	0.487	0.367
Hindi	straightness	0.194	0.12	0.461	0.328
Icelandic	$k$	0.162	0.107	0.473	0.4
Icelandic	eccentricity	0.278	0.225	0.344	0.228
Icelandic	closeness	0.178	0.087	0.518	0.494
Icelandic	$n_{max}$	0.191	0.132	0.462	0.342
Icelandic	$m_2$	0.16	0.091	0.526	0.488
Icelandic	betweenness	0.179	0.1	0.503	0.404
Icelandic	$D$	0.122	0.05	0.605	0.53
Icelandic	coverage	0.124	0.056	0.59	0.53
Icelandic	$D'$	0.119	0.048	0.624	0.53
Icelandic	straightness	0.14	0.077	0.563	0.504
Indonesian	$k$	0.177	0.119	0.442	0.349
Indonesian	eccentricity	0.242	0.179	0.383	0.272
Indonesian	closeness	0.161	0.091	0.514	0.488
Indonesian	$n_{max}$	0.166	0.105	0.499	0.388
Indonesian	$m_2$	0.157	0.091	0.515	0.472
Indonesian	betweenness	0.159	0.091	0.52	0.481
Indonesian	$D$	0.12	0.056	0.602	0.526
Indonesian	coverage	0.103	0.026	0.67	0.683
Indonesian	$D'$	0.111	0.045	0.641	0.531
Indonesian	straightness	0.155	0.111	0.448	0.367
Italian	$k$	0.216	0.158	0.337	0.244
Italian	eccentricity	0.264	0.198	0.327	0.228
Italian	closeness	0.192	0.111	0.449	0.355
Italian	$n_{max}$	0.185	0.125	0.439	0.307
Italian	$m_2$	0.187	0.115	0.438	0.349
Italian	betweenness	0.18	0.105	0.463	0.358
Italian	$D$	0.15	0.056	0.551	0.522
Italian	coverage	0.138	0.042	0.584	0.536
Italian	$D'$	0.144	0.05	0.573	0.524
Italian	straightness	0.153	0.1	0.443	0.355
Japanese	$k$	0.419	0.423	0.161	0.084

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Japanese	eccentricity	0.395	0.382	0.179	0.101
Japanese	closeness	0.407	0.385	0.176	0.096
Japanese	$n_{max}$	0.42	0.397	0.178	0.093
Japanese	$m_2$	0.416	0.389	0.178	0.099
Japanese	betweenness	0.419	0.397	0.179	0.094
Japanese	$D$	0.257	0.103	0.424	0.321
Japanese	coverage	0.283	0.13	0.319	0.274
Japanese	$D'$	0.268	0.12	0.389	0.283
Japanese	straightness	0.1	0.048	0.555	0.524
Korean	$k$	0.238	0.136	0.435	0.338
Korean	eccentricity	0.26	0.188	0.384	0.272
Korean	closeness	0.218	0.125	0.493	0.361
Korean	$n_{max}$	0.22	0.133	0.471	0.358
Korean	$m_2$	0.218	0.136	0.489	0.361
Korean	betweenness	0.216	0.125	0.489	0.372
Korean	$D$	0.116	0	0.708	1
Korean	coverage	0.163	0.077	0.466	0.511
Korean	$D'$	0.126	0	0.675	1
Korean	straightness	0.055	0	0.826	1
Polish	$k$	0.209	0.125	0.443	0.353
Polish	eccentricity	0.258	0.19	0.376	0.259
Polish	closeness	0.196	0.105	0.5	0.376
Polish	$n_{max}$	0.2	0.125	0.475	0.37
Polish	$m_2$	0.191	0.1	0.502	0.446
Polish	betweenness	0.193	0.111	0.504	0.412
Polish	$D$	0.148	0.062	0.578	0.517
Polish	coverage	0.138	0.05	0.615	0.635
Polish	$D'$	0.141	0.059	0.605	0.52
Polish	straightness	0.167	0.118	0.458	0.363
Portuguese	$k$	0.191	0.139	0.385	0.291
Portuguese	eccentricity	0.246	0.175	0.358	0.242
Portuguese	closeness	0.167	0.095	0.481	0.369
Portuguese	$n_{max}$	0.172	0.111	0.464	0.349
Portuguese	$m_2$	0.166	0.103	0.474	0.358
Portuguese	betweenness	0.167	0.1	0.487	0.365
Portuguese	$D$	0.128	0.056	0.574	0.524
Portuguese	coverage	0.119	0.042	0.602	0.572

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Portuguese	$D'$	0.123	0.048	0.597	0.528
Portuguese	straightness	0.139	0.094	0.466	0.369
Russian	$k$	0.159	0.1	0.484	0.412
Russian	eccentricity	0.231	0.167	0.409	0.286
Russian	closeness	0.153	0.077	0.541	0.499
Russian	$n_{max}$	0.161	0.1	0.515	0.404
Russian	$m_2$	0.144	0.079	0.545	0.494
Russian	betweenness	0.153	0.083	0.539	0.488
Russian	$D$	0.123	0.05	0.615	0.526
Russian	coverage	0.109	0.029	0.665	0.681
Russian	$D'$	0.115	0.036	0.655	0.644
Russian	straightness	0.166	0.118	0.452	0.361
Spanish	$k$	0.191	0.133	0.392	0.299
Spanish	eccentricity	0.249	0.167	0.352	0.246
Spanish	closeness	0.17	0.091	0.489	0.372
Spanish	$n_{max}$	0.171	0.107	0.471	0.361
Spanish	$m_2$	0.165	0.1	0.485	0.37
Spanish	betweenness	0.166	0.1	0.497	0.375
Spanish	$D$	0.129	0.045	0.582	0.533
Spanish	coverage	0.117	0.034	0.614	0.662
Spanish	$D'$	0.123	0.04	0.611	0.534
Spanish	straightness	0.144	0.094	0.469	0.365
Swedish	$k$	0.153	0.111	0.47	0.38
Swedish	eccentricity	0.264	0.2	0.355	0.241
Swedish	closeness	0.157	0.091	0.524	0.488
Swedish	$n_{max}$	0.174	0.13	0.475	0.342
Swedish	$m_2$	0.146	0.091	0.528	0.472
Swedish	betweenness	0.161	0.091	0.514	0.461
Swedish	$D$	0.125	0.056	0.604	0.526
Swedish	coverage	0.126	0.056	0.58	0.528
Swedish	$D'$	0.122	0.048	0.624	0.526
Swedish	straightness	0.133	0.083	0.556	0.494
Thai	$k$	0.205	0.129	0.382	0.291
Thai	eccentricity	0.276	0.207	0.323	0.207
Thai	closeness	0.202	0.111	0.442	0.342
Thai	$n_{max}$	0.202	0.135	0.409	0.286
Thai	$m_2$	0.187	0.107	0.446	0.349

language	centrality	rank		DCG	
		mean	median	mean	median
Thai	betweenness	0.195	0.125	0.439	0.315
Thai	$D$	0.138	0.058	0.549	0.517
Thai	coverage	0.126	0.033	0.613	0.635
Thai	$D'$	0.131	0.045	0.585	0.528
Thai	straightness	0.156	0.1	0.434	0.358
Turkish	$k$	0.194	0.125	0.448	0.372
Turkish	eccentricity	0.218	0.167	0.423	0.305
Turkish	closeness	0.16	0.1	0.524	0.488
Turkish	$n_{max}$	0.165	0.1	0.515	0.424
Turkish	$m_2$	0.166	0.1	0.521	0.481
Turkish	betweenness	0.162	0.1	0.527	0.481
Turkish	$D$	0.084	0	0.719	1
Turkish	coverage	0.113	0.062	0.587	0.53
Turkish	$D'$	0.085	0	0.738	1
Turkish	straightness	0.058	0	0.77	1



**Fig. 9:** The distribution of the DCG (combined boxplot and violin plot) across languages for each centrality score when using UD (top) and SUD (bottom) annotation style. For each centrality score, black thick lines indicate medians while blue diamonds indicate means. The red dashed line indicates the upper bound of the expected value of DCG for the random baseline (Property A.1).

**Tab. 8:** The distribution of the performance of each centrality score across languages depending on the evaluation metrics (normalized rank or DCG) when UD annotation style is used. “Agregation” indicates how, for each language, normalized rank or DCG are aggregated: by applying the mean or the median over all sentences. The distribution is described by the minimum value (min), the mean, the median, the maximum value (max) and the standard deviation (sd).

evaluation	aggregation	centrality	min	mean	median	max	sd
rank	mean	$k$	0.092	0.138	0.146	0.19	0.028
rank	mean	eccentricity	0.127	0.167	0.163	0.209	0.021
rank	mean	closeness	0.07	0.113	0.11	0.15	0.022
rank	mean	$n_{max}$	0.072	0.106	0.104	0.152	0.022
rank	mean	$m_2$	0.074	0.115	0.116	0.156	0.023
rank	mean	betweenness	0.07	0.107	0.103	0.147	0.022
rank	mean	$D$	0.039	0.087	0.089	0.115	0.018
rank	mean	coverage	0.048	0.082	0.077	0.117	0.018
rank	mean	$D'$	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.017
rank	mean	straightness	0.029	0.108	0.117	0.151	0.033
rank	median	$k$	0.053	0.106	0.1	0.167	0.031
rank	median	eccentricity	0.05	0.104	0.1	0.133	0.02
rank	median	closeness	0.037	0.071	0.071	0.1	0.017
rank	median	$n_{max}$	0.038	0.064	0.065	0.083	0.013
rank	median	$m_2$	0.038	0.074	0.077	0.1	0.018
rank	median	betweenness	0.036	0.064	0.067	0.091	0.014
rank	median	$D$	0	0.044	0.05	0.067	0.021
rank	median	coverage	0.025	0.042	0.04	0.062	0.011
rank	median	$D'$	0	0.035	0.043	0.059	0.021
rank	median	straightness	0	0.08	0.091	0.125	0.04
DCG	mean	$k$	0.381	0.48	0.484	0.574	0.056
DCG	mean	eccentricity	0.443	0.477	0.475	0.547	0.023
DCG	mean	closeness	0.502	0.566	0.569	0.656	0.04
DCG	mean	$n_{max}$	0.525	0.578	0.577	0.656	0.03
DCG	mean	$m_2$	0.492	0.562	0.568	0.65	0.042
DCG	mean	betweenness	0.53	0.584	0.579	0.657	0.032
DCG	mean	$D$	0.577	0.639	0.621	0.772	0.06
DCG	mean	coverage	0.531	0.642	0.647	0.697	0.039
DCG	mean	$D'$	0.587	0.667	0.652	0.788	0.05
DCG	mean	straightness	0.469	0.561	0.507	0.86	0.118
DCG	median	$k$	0.275	0.397	0.4	0.515	0.068
DCG	median	eccentricity	0.308	0.381	0.353	0.662	0.088
DCG	median	closeness	0.38	0.494	0.508	0.538	0.04
DCG	median	$n_{max}$	0.472	0.517	0.511	0.644	0.032
DCG	median	$m_2$	0.37	0.488	0.504	0.535	0.048
DCG	median	betweenness	0.481	0.512	0.511	0.536	0.014
DCG	median	$D$	0.511	0.599	0.526	1	0.17
DCG	median	coverage	0.515	0.605	0.622	0.686	0.058
DCG	median	$D'$	0.517	0.641	0.531	1	0.206
DCG	median	straightness	0.355	0.507	0.446	1	0.218

Tab. 9: The distribution of the performance of each centrality score across languages when SUD annotation style is used. The format is the same as in Table 8.

evaluation	aggregation	centrality	min	mean	median	max	sd
rank	mean	$k$	0.153	0.207	0.194	0.419	0.059
rank	mean	eccentricity	0.218	0.263	0.258	0.395	0.037
rank	mean	closeness	0.146	0.193	0.177	0.407	0.057
rank	mean	$n_{max}$	0.151	0.199	0.18	0.42	0.059
rank	mean	$m_2$	0.142	0.189	0.166	0.416	0.062
rank	mean	betweenness	0.146	0.193	0.174	0.419	0.06
rank	mean	$D$	0.084	0.143	0.129	0.257	0.037
rank	mean	coverage	0.103	0.143	0.126	0.283	0.044
rank	mean	$D'$	0.085	0.139	0.126	0.268	0.039
rank	mean	straightness	0.055	0.142	0.144	0.197	0.039
rank	median	$k$	0.1	0.153	0.132	0.423	0.081
rank	median	eccentricity	0.167	0.202	0.19	0.382	0.047
rank	median	closeness	0.077	0.118	0.1	0.385	0.066
rank	median	$n_{max}$	0.1	0.138	0.125	0.397	0.063
rank	median	$m_2$	0.079	0.121	0.1	0.389	0.068
rank	median	betweenness	0.083	0.124	0.1	0.397	0.067
rank	median	$D$	0	0.058	0.056	0.103	0.025
rank	median	coverage	0.026	0.056	0.05	0.13	0.027
rank	median	$D'$	0	0.052	0.048	0.12	0.027
rank	median	straightness	0	0.091	0.1	0.15	0.04
DCG	mean	$k$	0.161	0.406	0.423	0.484	0.072
DCG	mean	eccentricity	0.179	0.352	0.352	0.423	0.052
DCG	mean	closeness	0.176	0.473	0.489	0.541	0.078
DCG	mean	$n_{max}$	0.178	0.45	0.462	0.515	0.072
DCG	mean	$m_2$	0.178	0.472	0.487	0.545	0.078
DCG	mean	betweenness	0.179	0.474	0.489	0.539	0.077
DCG	mean	$D$	0.424	0.575	0.574	0.719	0.065
DCG	mean	coverage	0.319	0.568	0.593	0.67	0.085
DCG	mean	$D'$	0.389	0.594	0.599	0.738	0.069
DCG	mean	straightness	0.412	0.512	0.465	0.826	0.111
DCG	median	$k$	0.084	0.313	0.333	0.412	0.079
DCG	median	eccentricity	0.101	0.241	0.242	0.306	0.044
DCG	median	closeness	0.096	0.381	0.372	0.499	0.096
DCG	median	$n_{max}$	0.093	0.333	0.342	0.424	0.07
DCG	median	$m_2$	0.099	0.383	0.369	0.494	0.096
DCG	median	betweenness	0.094	0.372	0.372	0.488	0.09
DCG	median	$D$	0.321	0.547	0.524	1	0.16
DCG	median	coverage	0.274	0.553	0.536	0.683	0.107
DCG	median	$D'$	0.283	0.555	0.526	1	0.163
DCG	median	straightness	0.315	0.448	0.365	1	0.194

## B Evaluation

Tables 12 and 13 summarize the distributions shown in Figures 6 and 7, respectively.

For the sake of completeness, Tables 14 and 15 detail the performance of the model on each language.

**Tab. 12:** The distribution of the performance of each model across languages depending on the evaluation metrics (the ratio  $N_S/N_M$ , precision, recall and  $F$ -measure) when UD annotation style is used. The distribution is described by the minimum value (min), the mean, the median, the maximum value (max) and the standard deviation (sd).

evaluation	centrality	min	mean	median	max	sd
ratio	$k$	0.613	0.656	0.643	0.733	0.033
ratio	eccentricity	0.655	0.67	0.67	0.681	0.007
ratio	closeness	0.95	0.969	0.968	0.988	0.009
ratio	$n_{max}$	0.853	0.888	0.89	0.915	0.018
ratio	$m_2$	0.948	0.973	0.975	0.989	0.01
ratio	betweenness	0.924	0.96	0.961	0.98	0.015
ratio	$D$	0.879	0.916	0.912	0.975	0.024
ratio	coverage	0.728	0.826	0.833	0.889	0.037
ratio	$D'$	0.951	0.977	0.978	0.993	0.011
ratio	straightness	0.973	0.989	0.991	0.997	0.007
precision	$k$	0.174	0.263	0.267	0.362	0.051
precision	eccentricity	0.273	0.309	0.308	0.372	0.022
precision	closeness	0.275	0.347	0.34	0.466	0.048
precision	$n_{max}$	0.312	0.362	0.364	0.458	0.033
precision	$m_2$	0.27	0.347	0.345	0.468	0.048
precision	betweenness	0.32	0.371	0.371	0.462	0.037
precision	$D$	0.337	0.424	0.39	0.629	0.085
precision	coverage	0.274	0.424	0.431	0.486	0.054
precision	$D'$	0.352	0.462	0.44	0.642	0.073
precision	straightness	0.21	0.335	0.259	0.776	0.166
recall	$k$	0.269	0.4	0.402	0.509	0.066
recall	eccentricity	0.409	0.461	0.458	0.552	0.033
recall	closeness	0.285	0.358	0.353	0.477	0.049
recall	$n_{max}$	0.361	0.408	0.408	0.509	0.036
recall	$m_2$	0.276	0.356	0.354	0.478	0.049
recall	betweenness	0.33	0.387	0.385	0.477	0.038
recall	$D$	0.373	0.462	0.432	0.699	0.088
recall	coverage	0.341	0.513	0.522	0.602	0.062
recall	$D'$	0.364	0.473	0.453	0.656	0.072
recall	straightness	0.211	0.339	0.263	0.786	0.168
$F$ -measure	$k$	0.212	0.318	0.316	0.423	0.057
$F$ -measure	eccentricity	0.329	0.37	0.368	0.444	0.026
$F$ -measure	closeness	0.28	0.352	0.345	0.471	0.049
$F$ -measure	$n_{max}$	0.334	0.384	0.384	0.482	0.034
$F$ -measure	$m_2$	0.273	0.351	0.349	0.473	0.048
$F$ -measure	betweenness	0.325	0.379	0.378	0.47	0.037
$F$ -measure	$D$	0.354	0.442	0.408	0.663	0.087
$F$ -measure	coverage	0.312	0.464	0.47	0.537	0.057
$F$ -measure	$D'$	0.358	0.468	0.446	0.649	0.072
$F$ -measure	straightness	0.21	0.337	0.261	0.781	0.167

**Tab. 13:** The distribution of the performance of each model across languages when SUD annotation style is used. The format is the same as in Table 12.

evaluation	centrality	min	mean	median	max	sd
ratio	$k$	0.508	0.569	0.569	0.623	0.026
ratio	eccentricity	0.655	0.668	0.669	0.692	0.009
ratio	closeness	0.953	0.971	0.968	0.99	0.011
ratio	$n_{max}$	0.828	0.846	0.848	0.87	0.011
ratio	$m_2$	0.948	0.965	0.962	0.981	0.011
ratio	betweenness	0.919	0.944	0.941	0.968	0.016
ratio	$D$	0.787	0.866	0.867	0.921	0.034
ratio	coverage	0.644	0.766	0.769	0.873	0.043
ratio	$D'$	0.889	0.954	0.956	0.988	0.023
ratio	straightness	0.924	0.976	0.981	0.998	0.019
precision	$k$	0.062	0.213	0.231	0.269	0.05
precision	eccentricity	0.058	0.19	0.19	0.252	0.043
precision	closeness	0.058	0.283	0.293	0.344	0.061
precision	$n_{max}$	0.063	0.26	0.269	0.319	0.056
precision	$m_2$	0.054	0.28	0.291	0.338	0.063
precision	betweenness	0.059	0.291	0.303	0.349	0.062
precision	$D$	0.297	0.382	0.367	0.567	0.066
precision	coverage	0.085	0.36	0.394	0.48	0.097
precision	$D'$	0.186	0.407	0.406	0.572	0.075
precision	straightness	0.172	0.286	0.218	0.727	0.151
recall	$k$	0.122	0.373	0.392	0.477	0.083
recall	eccentricity	0.086	0.285	0.288	0.381	0.064
recall	closeness	0.058	0.292	0.304	0.356	0.065
recall	$n_{max}$	0.075	0.308	0.315	0.382	0.067
recall	$m_2$	0.055	0.291	0.302	0.355	0.067
recall	betweenness	0.061	0.309	0.323	0.374	0.068
recall	$D$	0.346	0.442	0.426	0.651	0.078
recall	coverage	0.132	0.468	0.514	0.625	0.123
recall	$D'$	0.201	0.427	0.428	0.59	0.078
recall	straightness	0.178	0.293	0.222	0.734	0.154
$F$ -measure	$k$	0.082	0.271	0.295	0.341	0.062
$F$ -measure	eccentricity	0.069	0.228	0.23	0.302	0.051
$F$ -measure	closeness	0.058	0.287	0.298	0.35	0.063
$F$ -measure	$n_{max}$	0.069	0.282	0.29	0.348	0.061
$F$ -measure	$m_2$	0.055	0.285	0.295	0.345	0.065
$F$ -measure	betweenness	0.06	0.3	0.313	0.361	0.065
$F$ -measure	$D$	0.331	0.41	0.395	0.606	0.071
$F$ -measure	coverage	0.103	0.407	0.437	0.541	0.108
$F$ -measure	$D'$	0.193	0.417	0.416	0.581	0.076
$F$ -measure	straightness	0.175	0.289	0.22	0.73	0.152

**Tab. 14:** The performance of each centrality score for each language in the PUD treebank using UD annotation style.  $N_M$  is the number of guesses of the model,  $h$  is the number of hits of the model (the intersection between the guesses produced by the model and the actual roots of each sentence). The evaluation metrics are precision, recall and  $F$ -measure. “baseline” indicates the expected precision, recall and  $F$ -measure of the baseline model (Property 4.2).

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Arabic	$k$	1584	313	0.066	0.198	0.315	0.243
Arabic	eccentricity	1461	407	0.066	0.279	0.409	0.331
Arabic	closeness	1024	287	0.066	0.28	0.288	0.284
Arabic	$n_{max}$	1152	359	0.066	0.312	0.361	0.334
Arabic	$m_2$	1026	293	0.066	0.286	0.294	0.29
Arabic	betweenness	1055	340	0.066	0.322	0.342	0.332
Arabic	$D$	1100	405	0.066	0.368	0.407	0.387
Arabic	coverage	1175	339	0.066	0.289	0.341	0.312
Arabic	$D'$	1028	362	0.066	0.352	0.364	0.358
Arabic	straightness	1011	503	0.066	0.498	0.506	0.501
Chinese	$k$	1398	506	0.065	0.362	0.509	0.423
Chinese	eccentricity	1476	549	0.065	0.372	0.552	0.444
Chinese	closeness	1020	475	0.065	0.466	0.477	0.471
Chinese	$n_{max}$	1104	506	0.065	0.458	0.509	0.482
Chinese	$m_2$	1017	476	0.065	0.468	0.478	0.473
Chinese	betweenness	1028	475	0.065	0.462	0.477	0.47
Chinese	$D$	1063	513	0.065	0.483	0.516	0.499
Chinese	coverage	1119	544	0.065	0.486	0.547	0.515
Chinese	$D'$	1002	530	0.065	0.529	0.533	0.531
Chinese	straightness	1004	370	0.065	0.369	0.372	0.37
Czech	$k$	1548	374	0.076	0.242	0.376	0.294
Czech	eccentricity	1477	435	0.076	0.295	0.437	0.352
Czech	closeness	1025	327	0.076	0.319	0.329	0.324
Czech	$n_{max}$	1142	369	0.076	0.323	0.371	0.345
Czech	$m_2$	1027	330	0.076	0.321	0.332	0.326
Czech	betweenness	1035	352	0.076	0.34	0.354	0.347
Czech	$D$	1109	399	0.076	0.36	0.401	0.379
Czech	coverage	1206	527	0.076	0.437	0.53	0.479
Czech	$D'$	1023	422	0.076	0.413	0.424	0.418
Czech	straightness	1001	210	0.076	0.21	0.211	0.21
English	$k$	1481	381	0.063	0.257	0.383	0.308
English	eccentricity	1492	471	0.063	0.316	0.473	0.379

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
English	closeness	1027	349	0.063	0.34	0.351	0.345
English	$n_{max}$	1103	401	0.063	0.364	0.403	0.382
English	$m_2$	1014	350	0.063	0.345	0.352	0.348
English	betweenness	1033	383	0.063	0.371	0.385	0.378
English	$D$	1092	396	0.063	0.363	0.398	0.379
English	coverage	1168	508	0.063	0.435	0.511	0.47
English	$D'$	1020	437	0.063	0.428	0.439	0.434
English	straightness	998	221	0.063	0.221	0.222	0.222
Finnish	$k$	1432	478	0.089	0.334	0.48	0.394
Finnish	eccentricity	1472	488	0.089	0.332	0.49	0.396
Finnish	closeness	1037	406	0.089	0.392	0.408	0.4
Finnish	$n_{max}$	1143	445	0.089	0.389	0.447	0.416
Finnish	$m_2$	1034	398	0.089	0.385	0.4	0.392
Finnish	betweenness	1049	433	0.089	0.413	0.435	0.424
Finnish	$D$	1108	460	0.089	0.415	0.462	0.437
Finnish	coverage	1214	539	0.089	0.444	0.542	0.488
Finnish	$D'$	1022	467	0.089	0.457	0.469	0.463
Finnish	straightness	1023	255	0.089	0.249	0.256	0.253
French	$k$	1574	390	0.054	0.248	0.392	0.304
French	eccentricity	1492	474	0.054	0.318	0.476	0.381
French	closeness	1017	361	0.054	0.355	0.363	0.359
French	$n_{max}$	1105	403	0.054	0.365	0.405	0.384
French	$m_2$	1009	353	0.054	0.35	0.355	0.352
French	betweenness	1017	376	0.054	0.37	0.378	0.374
French	$D$	1074	432	0.054	0.402	0.434	0.418
French	coverage	1180	571	0.054	0.484	0.574	0.525
French	$D'$	1013	456	0.054	0.45	0.458	0.454
French	straightness	1001	219	0.054	0.219	0.22	0.219
Galician	$k$	1539	268	0.058	0.174	0.269	0.212
Galician	eccentricity	1478	459	0.058	0.311	0.461	0.371
Galician	closeness	1031	284	0.058	0.275	0.285	0.28
Galician	$n_{max}$	1124	366	0.058	0.326	0.368	0.345
Galician	$m_2$	1017	275	0.058	0.27	0.276	0.273
Galician	betweenness	1025	328	0.058	0.32	0.33	0.325
Galician	$D$	1101	371	0.058	0.337	0.373	0.354
Galician	coverage	1189	480	0.058	0.404	0.482	0.44
Galician	$D'$	1016	407	0.058	0.401	0.409	0.405
Galician	straightness	999	252	0.058	0.252	0.253	0.253

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
German	$k$	1507	402	0.065	0.267	0.404	0.321
German	eccentricity	1481	501	0.065	0.338	0.504	0.405
German	closeness	1031	369	0.065	0.358	0.371	0.364
German	$n_{max}$	1100	410	0.065	0.373	0.412	0.391
German	$m_2$	1020	369	0.065	0.362	0.371	0.366
German	betweenness	1037	392	0.065	0.378	0.394	0.386
German	$D$	1052	430	0.065	0.409	0.432	0.42
German	coverage	1167	507	0.065	0.434	0.51	0.469
German	$D'$	1002	458	0.065	0.457	0.46	0.459
German	straightness	999	267	0.065	0.267	0.268	0.268
Hindi	$k$	1358	464	0.056	0.342	0.466	0.394
Hindi	eccentricity	1480	452	0.056	0.305	0.454	0.365
Hindi	closeness	1011	433	0.056	0.428	0.435	0.432
Hindi	$n_{max}$	1090	436	0.056	0.4	0.438	0.418
Hindi	$m_2$	1006	422	0.056	0.419	0.424	0.422
Hindi	betweenness	1015	444	0.056	0.437	0.446	0.442
Hindi	$D$	1021	493	0.056	0.483	0.495	0.489
Hindi	coverage	1242	524	0.056	0.422	0.527	0.468
Hindi	$D'$	1007	534	0.056	0.53	0.537	0.533
Hindi	straightness	1003	420	0.056	0.419	0.422	0.42
Icelandic	$k$	1515	448	0.072	0.296	0.45	0.357
Icelandic	eccentricity	1462	450	0.072	0.308	0.452	0.366
Icelandic	closeness	1033	386	0.072	0.374	0.388	0.381
Icelandic	$n_{max}$	1118	413	0.072	0.369	0.415	0.391
Icelandic	$m_2$	1026	381	0.072	0.371	0.383	0.377
Icelandic	betweenness	1040	390	0.072	0.375	0.392	0.383
Icelandic	$D$	1100	459	0.072	0.417	0.461	0.438
Icelandic	coverage	1200	517	0.072	0.431	0.52	0.471
Icelandic	$D'$	1026	451	0.072	0.44	0.453	0.446
Icelandic	straightness	1010	307	0.072	0.304	0.309	0.306
Indonesian	$k$	1584	376	0.07	0.237	0.378	0.292
Indonesian	eccentricity	1495	475	0.07	0.318	0.477	0.382
Indonesian	closeness	1028	322	0.07	0.313	0.324	0.318
Indonesian	$n_{max}$	1128	411	0.07	0.364	0.413	0.387
Indonesian	$m_2$	1029	322	0.07	0.313	0.324	0.318
Indonesian	betweenness	1043	377	0.07	0.361	0.379	0.37
Indonesian	$D$	1116	431	0.07	0.386	0.433	0.408
Indonesian	coverage	1237	599	0.07	0.484	0.602	0.537

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Indonesian	$D'$	1038	467	0.07	0.45	0.469	0.459
Indonesian	straightness	1012	237	0.07	0.234	0.238	0.236
Italian	$k$	1577	316	0.058	0.2	0.318	0.246
Italian	eccentricity	1470	439	0.058	0.299	0.441	0.356
Italian	closeness	1032	301	0.058	0.292	0.303	0.297
Italian	$n_{max}$	1100	359	0.058	0.326	0.361	0.343
Italian	$m_2$	1026	301	0.058	0.293	0.303	0.298
Italian	betweenness	1035	343	0.058	0.331	0.345	0.338
Italian	$D$	1087	393	0.058	0.362	0.395	0.378
Italian	coverage	1186	498	0.058	0.42	0.501	0.457
Italian	$D'$	1018	413	0.058	0.406	0.415	0.41
Italian	straightness	1001	238	0.058	0.238	0.239	0.238
Japanese	$k$	1457	459	0.046	0.315	0.461	0.374
Japanese	eccentricity	1498	434	0.046	0.29	0.436	0.348
Japanese	closeness	1007	392	0.046	0.389	0.394	0.392
Japanese	$n_{max}$	1088	423	0.046	0.389	0.425	0.406
Japanese	$m_2$	1006	393	0.046	0.391	0.395	0.393
Japanese	betweenness	1016	413	0.046	0.406	0.415	0.411
Japanese	$D$	1037	629	0.046	0.607	0.632	0.619
Japanese	coverage	1144	471	0.046	0.412	0.473	0.44
Japanese	$D'$	1005	591	0.046	0.588	0.594	0.591
Japanese	straightness	998	643	0.046	0.644	0.646	0.645
Korean	$k$	1597	495	0.08	0.31	0.497	0.382
Korean	eccentricity	1500	410	0.08	0.273	0.412	0.329
Korean	closeness	1034	396	0.08	0.383	0.398	0.39
Korean	$n_{max}$	1166	436	0.08	0.374	0.438	0.404
Korean	$m_2$	1034	395	0.08	0.382	0.397	0.389
Korean	betweenness	1058	417	0.08	0.394	0.419	0.406
Korean	$D$	1106	696	0.08	0.629	0.699	0.663
Korean	coverage	1367	374	0.08	0.274	0.376	0.317
Korean	$D'$	1015	603	0.08	0.594	0.606	0.6
Korean	straightness	1008	782	0.08	0.776	0.786	0.781
Polish	$k$	1554	420	0.076	0.27	0.422	0.33
Polish	eccentricity	1505	446	0.076	0.296	0.448	0.357
Polish	closeness	1035	366	0.076	0.354	0.368	0.361
Polish	$n_{max}$	1127	396	0.076	0.351	0.398	0.373
Polish	$m_2$	1038	359	0.076	0.346	0.361	0.353
Polish	betweenness	1055	394	0.076	0.373	0.396	0.384

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Polish	$D$	1126	449	0.076	0.399	0.451	0.423
Polish	coverage	1234	519	0.076	0.421	0.522	0.466
Polish	$D'$	1046	447	0.076	0.427	0.449	0.438
Polish	straightness	1013	262	0.076	0.259	0.263	0.261
Portuguese	$k$	1576	330	0.058	0.209	0.332	0.257
Portuguese	eccentricity	1486	478	0.058	0.322	0.48	0.385
Portuguese	closeness	1028	330	0.058	0.321	0.332	0.326
Portuguese	$n_{max}$	1120	399	0.058	0.356	0.401	0.377
Portuguese	$m_2$	1020	324	0.058	0.318	0.326	0.322
Portuguese	betweenness	1021	363	0.058	0.356	0.365	0.36
Portuguese	$D$	1089	408	0.058	0.375	0.41	0.392
Portuguese	coverage	1185	520	0.058	0.439	0.523	0.477
Portuguese	$D'$	1012	440	0.058	0.435	0.442	0.438
Portuguese	straightness	1005	219	0.058	0.218	0.22	0.219
Russian	$k$	1623	410	0.074	0.253	0.412	0.313
Russian	eccentricity	1474	454	0.074	0.308	0.456	0.368
Russian	closeness	1035	339	0.074	0.328	0.341	0.334
Russian	$n_{max}$	1146	409	0.074	0.357	0.411	0.382
Russian	$m_2$	1021	333	0.074	0.326	0.335	0.33
Russian	betweenness	1047	373	0.074	0.356	0.375	0.365
Russian	$D$	1132	425	0.074	0.375	0.427	0.4
Russian	coverage	1233	552	0.074	0.448	0.555	0.496
Russian	$D'$	1031	441	0.074	0.428	0.443	0.435
Russian	straightness	1019	223	0.074	0.219	0.224	0.221
Spanish	$k$	1556	308	0.058	0.198	0.31	0.241
Spanish	eccentricity	1498	456	0.058	0.304	0.458	0.366
Spanish	closeness	1023	292	0.058	0.285	0.293	0.289
Spanish	$n_{max}$	1109	373	0.058	0.336	0.375	0.355
Spanish	$m_2$	1019	292	0.058	0.287	0.293	0.29
Spanish	betweenness	1026	340	0.058	0.331	0.342	0.336
Spanish	$D$	1069	394	0.058	0.369	0.396	0.382
Spanish	coverage	1196	503	0.058	0.421	0.506	0.459
Spanish	$D'$	1013	417	0.058	0.412	0.419	0.415
Spanish	straightness	999	238	0.058	0.238	0.239	0.239
Swedish	$k$	1494	400	0.07	0.268	0.402	0.321
Swedish	eccentricity	1489	472	0.07	0.317	0.474	0.38
Swedish	closeness	1038	351	0.07	0.338	0.353	0.345
Swedish	$n_{max}$	1116	406	0.07	0.364	0.408	0.385

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Swedish	$m_2$	1024	352	0.07	0.344	0.354	0.349
Swedish	betweenness	1036	384	0.07	0.371	0.386	0.378
Swedish	$D$	1091	425	0.07	0.39	0.427	0.407
Swedish	coverage	1194	477	0.07	0.399	0.479	0.436
Swedish	$D'$	1016	437	0.07	0.43	0.439	0.435
Swedish	straightness	1005	301	0.07	0.3	0.303	0.301
Thai	$k$	1418	381	0.054	0.269	0.383	0.316
Thai	eccentricity	1494	414	0.054	0.277	0.416	0.333
Thai	closeness	1011	333	0.054	0.329	0.335	0.332
Thai	$n_{max}$	1109	364	0.054	0.328	0.366	0.346
Thai	$m_2$	1010	332	0.054	0.329	0.334	0.331
Thai	betweenness	1022	350	0.054	0.342	0.352	0.347
Thai	$D$	1073	415	0.054	0.387	0.417	0.401
Thai	coverage	1180	574	0.054	0.486	0.577	0.528
Thai	$D'$	1020	452	0.054	0.443	0.454	0.449
Thai	straightness	1003	263	0.054	0.262	0.264	0.263
Turkish	$k$	1567	446	0.082	0.285	0.448	0.348
Turkish	eccentricity	1518	473	0.082	0.312	0.475	0.376
Turkish	closeness	1047	380	0.082	0.363	0.382	0.372
Turkish	$n_{max}$	1160	440	0.082	0.379	0.442	0.408
Turkish	$m_2$	1050	395	0.082	0.376	0.397	0.386
Turkish	betweenness	1077	420	0.082	0.39	0.422	0.405
Turkish	$D$	1069	630	0.082	0.589	0.633	0.61
Turkish	coverage	1336	576	0.082	0.431	0.579	0.494
Turkish	$D'$	1017	653	0.082	0.642	0.656	0.649
Turkish	straightness	1012	652	0.082	0.644	0.655	0.65

Tab. 15: The performance of each centrality score for each language in the PUD treebank using SUD annotation style. The format is the same as in Table 14.

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Arabic	$k$	1726	411	0.066	0.238	0.413	0.302
Arabic	eccentricity	1478	274	0.066	0.185	0.275	0.222
Arabic	closeness	1028	321	0.066	0.312	0.323	0.317
Arabic	$n_{max}$	1202	328	0.066	0.273	0.33	0.299
Arabic	$m_2$	1034	331	0.066	0.32	0.333	0.326
Arabic	betweenness	1067	354	0.066	0.332	0.356	0.343
Arabic	$D$	1168	504	0.066	0.432	0.507	0.466

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Arabic	coverage	1245	362	0.066	0.291	0.364	0.323
Arabic	$D'$	1051	426	0.066	0.405	0.428	0.416
Arabic	straightness	1024	479	0.066	0.468	0.481	0.474
Chinese	$k$	1597	390	0.065	0.244	0.392	0.301
Chinese	eccentricity	1510	256	0.065	0.17	0.257	0.204
Chinese	closeness	1031	305	0.065	0.296	0.307	0.301
Chinese	$n_{max}$	1161	295	0.065	0.254	0.296	0.274
Chinese	$m_2$	1038	300	0.065	0.289	0.302	0.295
Chinese	betweenness	1046	280	0.065	0.268	0.281	0.274
Chinese	$D$	1080	344	0.065	0.319	0.346	0.332
Chinese	coverage	1198	399	0.065	0.333	0.401	0.364
Chinese	$D'$	1018	351	0.065	0.345	0.353	0.349
Chinese	straightness	1004	200	0.065	0.199	0.201	0.2
Czech	$k$	1756	406	0.076	0.231	0.408	0.295
Czech	eccentricity	1488	325	0.076	0.218	0.327	0.262
Czech	closeness	1029	302	0.076	0.293	0.304	0.298
Czech	$n_{max}$	1189	313	0.076	0.263	0.315	0.287
Czech	$m_2$	1034	308	0.076	0.298	0.31	0.304
Czech	betweenness	1058	321	0.076	0.303	0.323	0.313
Czech	$D$	1168	413	0.076	0.354	0.415	0.382
Czech	coverage	1294	530	0.076	0.41	0.533	0.463
Czech	$D'$	1046	437	0.076	0.418	0.439	0.428
Czech	straightness	1027	198	0.076	0.193	0.199	0.196
English	$k$	1787	359	0.063	0.201	0.361	0.258
English	eccentricity	1470	263	0.063	0.179	0.264	0.213
English	closeness	1027	273	0.063	0.266	0.274	0.27
English	$n_{max}$	1171	306	0.063	0.261	0.308	0.283
English	$m_2$	1033	278	0.063	0.269	0.279	0.274
English	betweenness	1057	304	0.063	0.288	0.306	0.296
English	$D$	1164	405	0.063	0.348	0.407	0.375
English	coverage	1301	512	0.063	0.394	0.515	0.446
English	$D'$	1041	416	0.063	0.4	0.418	0.409
English	straightness	1013	221	0.063	0.218	0.222	0.22
Finnish	$k$	1721	458	0.089	0.266	0.46	0.337
Finnish	eccentricity	1485	374	0.089	0.252	0.376	0.302
Finnish	closeness	1044	351	0.089	0.336	0.353	0.344
Finnish	$n_{max}$	1190	380	0.089	0.319	0.382	0.348
Finnish	$m_2$	1050	353	0.089	0.336	0.355	0.345

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Finnish	betweenness	1083	372	0.089	0.343	0.374	0.358
Finnish	$D$	1185	422	0.089	0.356	0.424	0.387
Finnish	coverage	1291	469	0.089	0.363	0.471	0.41
Finnish	$D'$	1057	413	0.089	0.391	0.415	0.403
Finnish	straightness	1052	252	0.089	0.24	0.253	0.246
French	$k$	1767	325	0.054	0.184	0.327	0.235
French	eccentricity	1459	265	0.054	0.182	0.266	0.216
French	closeness	1005	260	0.054	0.259	0.261	0.26
French	$n_{max}$	1154	280	0.054	0.243	0.281	0.261
French	$m_2$	1016	258	0.054	0.254	0.259	0.257
French	betweenness	1029	285	0.054	0.277	0.286	0.282
French	$D$	1116	391	0.054	0.35	0.393	0.37
French	coverage	1271	551	0.054	0.434	0.554	0.486
French	$D'$	1032	404	0.054	0.391	0.406	0.399
French	straightness	1002	203	0.054	0.203	0.204	0.203
Galician	$k$	1761	313	0.058	0.178	0.315	0.227
Galician	eccentricity	1519	289	0.058	0.19	0.29	0.23
Galician	closeness	1016	279	0.058	0.275	0.28	0.277
Galician	$n_{max}$	1174	303	0.058	0.258	0.305	0.279
Galician	$m_2$	1020	264	0.058	0.259	0.265	0.262
Galician	betweenness	1049	311	0.058	0.296	0.313	0.304
Galician	$D$	1148	424	0.058	0.369	0.426	0.396
Galician	coverage	1278	519	0.058	0.406	0.522	0.457
Galician	$D'$	1036	433	0.058	0.418	0.435	0.426
Galician	straightness	1009	241	0.058	0.239	0.242	0.241
German	$k$	1732	387	0.065	0.223	0.389	0.284
German	eccentricity	1496	324	0.065	0.217	0.326	0.26
German	closeness	1020	294	0.065	0.288	0.295	0.292
German	$n_{max}$	1158	313	0.065	0.27	0.315	0.291
German	$m_2$	1023	298	0.065	0.291	0.299	0.295
German	betweenness	1036	312	0.065	0.301	0.314	0.307
German	$D$	1080	350	0.065	0.324	0.352	0.337
German	coverage	1140	458	0.065	0.402	0.46	0.429
German	$D'$	1008	364	0.065	0.361	0.366	0.363
German	straightness	1000	191	0.065	0.191	0.192	0.191
Hindi	$k$	1596	260	0.056	0.163	0.261	0.201
Hindi	eccentricity	1470	191	0.056	0.13	0.192	0.155
Hindi	closeness	1011	222	0.056	0.22	0.223	0.221

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Hindi	$n_{max}$	1144	221	0.056	0.193	0.222	0.207
Hindi	$m_2$	1018	222	0.056	0.218	0.223	0.221
Hindi	betweenness	1043	234	0.056	0.224	0.235	0.23
Hindi	$D$	1082	344	0.056	0.318	0.346	0.331
Hindi	coverage	1318	235	0.056	0.178	0.236	0.203
Hindi	$D'$	1018	326	0.056	0.32	0.328	0.324
Hindi	straightness	997	297	0.056	0.298	0.298	0.298
Icelandic	$k$	1844	475	0.072	0.258	0.477	0.335
Icelandic	eccentricity	1519	287	0.072	0.189	0.288	0.228
Icelandic	closeness	1034	346	0.072	0.335	0.348	0.341
Icelandic	$n_{max}$	1197	323	0.072	0.27	0.325	0.295
Icelandic	$m_2$	1049	348	0.072	0.332	0.35	0.341
Icelandic	betweenness	1083	348	0.072	0.321	0.35	0.335
Icelandic	$D$	1234	494	0.072	0.4	0.496	0.443
Icelandic	coverage	1394	511	0.072	0.367	0.514	0.428
Icelandic	$D'$	1119	478	0.072	0.427	0.48	0.452
Icelandic	straightness	1077	369	0.072	0.343	0.371	0.356
Indonesian	$k$	1770	415	0.07	0.234	0.417	0.3
Indonesian	eccentricity	1480	319	0.07	0.216	0.321	0.258
Indonesian	closeness	1031	319	0.07	0.309	0.321	0.315
Indonesian	$n_{max}$	1174	361	0.07	0.307	0.363	0.333
Indonesian	$m_2$	1036	320	0.07	0.309	0.322	0.315
Indonesian	betweenness	1059	348	0.07	0.329	0.35	0.339
Indonesian	$D$	1154	461	0.07	0.399	0.463	0.429
Indonesian	coverage	1328	622	0.07	0.468	0.625	0.536
Indonesian	$D'$	1062	485	0.07	0.457	0.487	0.472
Indonesian	straightness	1028	177	0.07	0.172	0.178	0.175
Italian	$k$	1849	281	0.058	0.152	0.282	0.198
Italian	eccentricity	1485	237	0.058	0.16	0.238	0.191
Italian	closeness	1023	252	0.058	0.246	0.253	0.25
Italian	$n_{max}$	1172	284	0.058	0.242	0.285	0.262
Italian	$m_2$	1032	236	0.058	0.229	0.237	0.233
Italian	betweenness	1050	278	0.058	0.265	0.279	0.272
Italian	$D$	1135	396	0.058	0.349	0.398	0.372
Italian	coverage	1286	498	0.058	0.387	0.501	0.437
Italian	$D'$	1043	400	0.058	0.384	0.402	0.393
Italian	straightness	1014	198	0.058	0.195	0.199	0.197
Japanese	$k$	1959	121	0.046	0.062	0.122	0.082

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Japanese	eccentricity	1489	86	0.046	0.058	0.086	0.069
Japanese	closeness	1008	58	0.046	0.058	0.058	0.058
Japanese	$n_{max}$	1189	75	0.046	0.063	0.075	0.069
Japanese	$m_2$	1014	55	0.046	0.054	0.055	0.055
Japanese	betweenness	1037	61	0.046	0.059	0.061	0.06
Japanese	$D$	1264	375	0.046	0.297	0.377	0.332
Japanese	coverage	1545	131	0.046	0.085	0.132	0.103
Japanese	$D'$	1077	200	0.046	0.186	0.201	0.193
Japanese	straightness	1017	337	0.046	0.331	0.339	0.335
Korean	$k$	1741	433	0.08	0.249	0.435	0.317
Korean	eccentricity	1506	322	0.08	0.214	0.324	0.257
Korean	closeness	1033	340	0.08	0.329	0.342	0.335
Korean	$n_{max}$	1192	363	0.08	0.305	0.365	0.332
Korean	$m_2$	1039	338	0.08	0.325	0.34	0.332
Korean	betweenness	1069	348	0.08	0.326	0.35	0.337
Korean	$D$	1142	648	0.08	0.567	0.651	0.606
Korean	coverage	1345	278	0.08	0.207	0.279	0.238
Korean	$D'$	1007	507	0.08	0.503	0.51	0.506
Korean	straightness	1004	730	0.08	0.727	0.734	0.73
Polish	$k$	1692	421	0.076	0.249	0.423	0.313
Polish	eccentricity	1479	312	0.076	0.211	0.314	0.252
Polish	closeness	1037	328	0.076	0.316	0.33	0.323
Polish	$n_{max}$	1167	332	0.076	0.284	0.334	0.307
Polish	$m_2$	1041	324	0.076	0.311	0.326	0.318
Polish	betweenness	1080	347	0.076	0.321	0.349	0.334
Polish	$D$	1189	451	0.076	0.379	0.453	0.413
Polish	coverage	1293	540	0.076	0.418	0.543	0.472
Polish	$D'$	1078	444	0.076	0.412	0.446	0.428
Polish	straightness	1053	209	0.076	0.198	0.21	0.204
Portuguese	$k$	1748	329	0.058	0.188	0.331	0.24
Portuguese	eccentricity	1517	295	0.058	0.194	0.296	0.235
Portuguese	closeness	1013	286	0.058	0.282	0.287	0.285
Portuguese	$n_{max}$	1177	315	0.058	0.268	0.317	0.29
Portuguese	$m_2$	1021	280	0.058	0.274	0.281	0.278
Portuguese	betweenness	1033	311	0.058	0.301	0.313	0.307
Portuguese	$D$	1161	426	0.058	0.367	0.428	0.395
Portuguese	coverage	1302	518	0.058	0.398	0.521	0.451
Portuguese	$D'$	1037	421	0.058	0.406	0.423	0.414

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Portuguese	straightness	1012	217	0.058	0.214	0.218	0.216
Russian	$k$	1730	465	0.074	0.269	0.467	0.341
Russian	eccentricity	1438	345	0.074	0.24	0.347	0.284
Russian	closeness	1029	354	0.074	0.344	0.356	0.35
Russian	$n_{max}$	1180	376	0.074	0.319	0.378	0.346
Russian	$m_2$	1035	350	0.074	0.338	0.352	0.345
Russian	betweenness	1063	371	0.074	0.349	0.373	0.361
Russian	$D$	1154	480	0.074	0.416	0.482	0.447
Russian	coverage	1283	616	0.074	0.48	0.619	0.541
Russian	$D'$	1044	507	0.074	0.486	0.51	0.497
Russian	straightness	1031	198	0.074	0.192	0.199	0.195
Spanish	$k$	1806	351	0.058	0.194	0.353	0.251
Spanish	eccentricity	1492	287	0.058	0.192	0.288	0.231
Spanish	closeness	1012	293	0.058	0.29	0.294	0.292
Spanish	$n_{max}$	1164	313	0.058	0.269	0.315	0.29
Spanish	$m_2$	1018	288	0.058	0.283	0.289	0.286
Spanish	betweenness	1039	322	0.058	0.31	0.324	0.317
Spanish	$D$	1141	441	0.058	0.387	0.443	0.413
Spanish	coverage	1309	539	0.058	0.412	0.542	0.468
Spanish	$D'$	1054	448	0.058	0.425	0.45	0.437
Spanish	straightness	1009	227	0.058	0.225	0.228	0.227
Swedish	$k$	1702	443	0.07	0.26	0.445	0.329
Swedish	eccentricity	1504	286	0.07	0.19	0.287	0.229
Swedish	closeness	1032	333	0.07	0.323	0.335	0.329
Swedish	$n_{max}$	1184	324	0.07	0.274	0.326	0.297
Swedish	$m_2$	1037	336	0.07	0.324	0.338	0.331
Swedish	betweenness	1057	343	0.07	0.325	0.345	0.334
Swedish	$D$	1146	463	0.07	0.404	0.465	0.433
Swedish	coverage	1321	486	0.07	0.368	0.488	0.42
Swedish	$D'$	1036	458	0.07	0.442	0.46	0.451
Swedish	straightness	1017	350	0.07	0.344	0.352	0.348
Thai	$k$	1811	344	0.054	0.19	0.346	0.245
Thai	eccentricity	1477	236	0.054	0.16	0.237	0.191
Thai	closeness	1008	254	0.054	0.252	0.255	0.254
Thai	$n_{max}$	1173	252	0.054	0.215	0.253	0.232
Thai	$m_2$	1020	250	0.054	0.245	0.251	0.248
Thai	betweenness	1028	257	0.054	0.25	0.258	0.254
Thai	$D$	1123	393	0.054	0.35	0.395	0.371

language	centrality	$N_M$	$h$	baseline	precision	recall	$F$ -measure
Thai	coverage	1276	521	0.054	0.408	0.524	0.459
Thai	$D'$	1032	412	0.054	0.399	0.414	0.407
Thai	straightness	1002	181	0.054	0.181	0.182	0.181
Turkish	$k$	1686	417	0.082	0.247	0.419	0.311
Turkish	eccentricity	1511	379	0.082	0.251	0.381	0.302
Turkish	closeness	1043	328	0.082	0.314	0.33	0.322
Turkish	$n_{max}$	1185	378	0.082	0.319	0.38	0.347
Turkish	$m_2$	1049	334	0.082	0.318	0.336	0.327
Turkish	betweenness	1076	345	0.082	0.321	0.347	0.333
Turkish	$D$	1127	606	0.082	0.538	0.609	0.571
Turkish	coverage	1346	475	0.082	0.353	0.477	0.406
Turkish	$D'$	1026	587	0.082	0.572	0.59	0.581
Turkish	straightness	1015	645	0.082	0.635	0.648	0.642