A Novel Document Generation Process for Topic Detection based on Hierarchical Latent Tree Models

Peixian Chen, Zhourong Chen, Nevin L. Zhang *
The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology {pchenac,zchenbb,lzhang@cse.ust.hk}

arXiv:1712.04116v3 [cs.CL] 28 Jun 2019

Abstract

We propose a novel document generation process based on hierarchical latent tree models (HLTMs) learned from data. An HLTM has a layer of observed word variables at the bottom and multiple layers of latent variables on top. For each document, we first sample values for the latent variables layer by layer via logic sampling, then draw relative frequencies for the words conditioned on the values of the latent variables, and finally generate words for the document using the relative word frequencies. The motivation for the work is to take word counts into consideration with HLTMs. In comparison with LDA-based hierarchical document generation processes, the new process achieves drastically better model fit with much fewer parameters. It also yields more meaningful topics and topic hierarchies. It is the new state-of-the-art for the hierarchical topic detection.

Introduction

The objective of *hierarchical topic detection* is, given a corpus of documents, to obtain a tree of topics with more general topics at high levels of the tree and more specific topics at low levels of the tree. Several hierarchical topic detection methods have been proposed based on latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) (Blei, Ng, and Jordan 2003), including the hierarchical latent Dirichlet allocation (hLDA) model (Blei, Griffiths, and Jordan 2010), the hierarchical Pachinko allocation model (hPAM) (Li and McCallum 2006; Mimno, Li, and McCallum 2007), and the nested hierarchical Dirichlet process (nHDP) (Paisley et al. 2015) .

A very different method named hierarchical latent tree analysis (HLTA) is recently proposed by (Liu, Zhang, and Chen 2014; Chen et al. 2016; 2017a). HLTA learns models such as the one shown in Figure 1, where there is a layer of observed variables at the bottom, and one or more layers of latent variables on top. The variables are connected up to form a tree. The model is hence called a *hierarchical latent tree model (HLTM)*. The observed variables are binary and represent the absence or presence of words in documents. The latent variables are also binary variables. They are introduced during data analysis to explain co-occurrence patterns. For example, $z14$ explains the probabilistic co-occurrences of the words `card`, `video` and `driver`; $z16$ explains the co-occurrences of `display`, `graphics` and `image`; and $z22$ explains the probabilistic co-occurrence of the patterns represented by $z14$, $z15$, $z16$ and $z17$.

HLTMs is a generalization of latent class models (LCMs)(Bartholomew and Knott 1999), which is a type of finite mixture models for discrete data. In a finite mixture model, there is one latent variable and it is used to partition objects into soft clusters. Similarly, in an HLTM, each latent variable partitions all the documents into two clusters. One of the clusters consists of the documents that contain, in a probabilistic sense, the words in subtree rooted at the latent variable. It is interpreted as a topic. The other cluster is viewed as the background. In this manner each latent variable gives one topic.

Topics given by some of the latent variables in Figure 1 are listed below. For example, $z14$ gives a topic that consists of 12% of the documents, and the words `card`, `video` and `driver` occur with relatively high probabilities inside the topic and relatively low probabilities outside. Note that, for $z22$, only a subset of words in its subtree are used when characterizing the topic. The reader is referred to (Chen et al. 2017a) for how the words for characterizing a topic are picked and ordered.

$z22$ [0.24] `windows card graphics video dos`
$z14$ [0.12] `card video driver`
$z15$ [0.15] `windows dos`
$z16$ [0.10] `graphics display image`
$Z17$ [0.09] `computer science`

In general, latent variables at high levels of an HLTM capture "long-range" word co-occurrence patterns and hence give thematically more general topics, while those at low levels capture "short-range" word co-occurrence patterns and give thematically more specific topics. For example, the topic given by $z22$ concerns several aspects of computers, while its subtopics are each concerned with only one aspect of computers. In this sense, HLTA is a tool for hierarchical topic detection.

As will be discussed in the next section, HLTA differs fundamentally from the LDA-based methods. However, comparisons between them are still possible. The reason is that they both define distributions over documents and characterize topics using lists of words. Empirical results reported by (Chen et al. 2016; 2017a) show that HLTA significantly outperforms the LDA-based methods in terms of model quality




Figure 1: An example hierarchical latent tree model from (Chen et al. 2016), learned by HLTA on a toy text dataset.

as measured by held-out likelihood, and it finds more meaningful topics and topic hierarchies.

It should be noted, however, that the aforementioned comparisons were conducted only on binary data. The reason is that HLTA is unable to take word counts into consideration. In the experiments, documents were represented as binary vectors over the vocabulary for HLTA. For the LDA-based methods, they were represented as bags of words, where duplicates removed such that no word appears more than once. The two representations are equivalent.

To amend the serious drawback, this paper extends HLTA so as to take word counts into consideration. Specifically, we propose a document generation model based on the model structure learned by HLTA from binary data, design a parameter learning algorithm for the new model, and give an importance sampling method for model evaluation. The new method is named HLTA-c, where the letter "c" stands for count data. We present empirical results to show that, on count data, HLTA-c also significantly outperforms LDA-based methods in terms of both model quality and meaningfulness of topics and topic hierarchies.

Related work

Detecting topics and topic hierarchies from large archives of documents has been one of the most active research areas in last decade. The most commonly used method is latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) (Blei, Ng, and Jordan 2003). LDA has been extended in various ways for additional modeling capabilities. Topic correlations are considered in (Lafferty and Blei 2006; Li and McCallum 2006); topic evolution is modeled in (Blei and Lafferty 2006; Wang and McCallum 2006; Ahmed and Xing 2008); topic hierarchies are built in (Li and McCallum 2006; Blei et al. 2004; Mimno, Li, and McCallum 2007); side information is exploited in (Andrzejewski, Zhu, and Craven 2009; Jagarlamudi, Daumé III, and Udupa 2012); and so on.

A fundamental difference between HLTA/HLTA-c and the LDA-based methods for hierarchical topic detection is that observed variables in HLTA/HLTA-c correspond to words in the vocabulary, while those in the LDA-based methods correspond to tokens in the documents. The use of word variables allows the detection and representation of patterns of word co-occurrences qualitatively using model structures as illustrated in Figure 1. When token variables are used, on the other hand, we cannot have a graphical structure among words because they are values of the nodes (tokens) rather than nodes themselves. It is clear from Figure 1 that modeling structures among words is conducive to the discovery of meaningful topics and topic hierarchies.

Another important difference is in the definition and characterization of topics. Topics in the LDA-based methods are probabilistic distributions over a vocabulary. When presented to users, a topic is characterized using a few words with the highest probabilities. In contrast, topics in HLTA/HLTA-c are clusters of documents. For presentation to users, a topic is characterized using the words that not only occur with high probabilities in the topic but also occur with low probabilities outside the topic.

A third difference lies in the relationship between topics and documents. In the LDA-based methods, a document is a mixture of topics, and the probabilities of the topics within a document sum to 1. Because of this, the LDA models are sometimes called *mixed-membership models*. In HLTA/HLTA-c, a topic is a soft cluster of documents, and a document might belong to multiple topics with probability 1. In this sense, HLTMs can be said to be *multi-membership models*.

HLTA and HLTA-c produce hierarchies with word variables at the bottom and multiple levels of latent variables on top. It is related to hierarchical variable clustering. However, there are fundamental differences. One difference is that HLTA and HLTA-c define a distribution over documents while variable clustering does not.


HLTA and HLTA-c partition document collections in multiple ways. There is a vast literature on document clustering. In particular, co-clustering (Dhillon 2001) can identify document clusters where each cluster is associated with a potentially different set of words. However, document clustering and topic detection are generally considered two different fields with little overlap. This paper bridges the two fields by developing a full-fledged hierarchical topic detection method that partitions documents in multiple ways.

Document Generation Process

Our HLTM-c model for document generation is illustrated in Figure 2 (b). It is based on an HLTM M_b learned from binary data.

We regard M_b as model that generates binary vectors over words as follows: First, pick values for the latent variables using logic sampling (Pearl 1988). Specifically, sample a value for the root z_{21} from its marginal distribution $P(z_{21})$ [1] and sample values for other latent variables z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{13}

[1] When there are multiple latent variables at the top level, arbitrarily pick one of them as the root.



(a) M_b (b) M_c (c) M_a

Figure 2: The model M_b is learned by HLTA from binary data. Each v_i is binary variable and corresponds to the i-th word in the vocabulary. Its distribution given its parent is a Bernoulli distribution. The model M_c is for modeling count data and defines a document generation process. Each unnormalized relative frequency variable x_i takes its value from the interval $[0, 1]$ and its distribution given its parent is a truncated Normal distribution. The relative frequency variables y_i are obtained by normalizing the x_i's. They form a multinomial distribution from which words of a document are drawn. The model M_a is a auxiliary model used in parameter estimation and model evaluation. It is the same as the top part of M_c, except that the variables r_i are observed and are not restricted to the interval $[0, 1]$. It shares the same parameters as M_c.

from their conditional distributions given their respective parents. For example, the value for z_{11} is sampled from the distribution $P(z_{11}|z_{21})$. Then, sample a binary value for each of the word variables $v_1, \ldots, v_7$ from the its conditional distribution given its parent. For example, the value for v_1 is sampled from the distribution $P(v_1|z_{11})$. Note that all distributions mentioned here are Bernoulli distributions.

In the HLTM-c model M_c, we generate values for the latent variables in the same way as in M_b. However, we do not sample binary values for word variables. Instead, we draw a real value x_i for each word v_i. The value x_i is restricted to lie in the interval $[0, 1]$ and it is meant to be, approximately, the relative frequency of the word in a document. Let z be the parent of x_i. We draw x_i from a truncated normal distribution

$$P(x_i|z) = \mathcal{TN}(\mu_{iz}, \sigma^2_{iz}, 0, 1)$$

with mean μ_{iz} and standard deviation σ_{iz}. Note that, for a fixed x_i, the notation μ_{iz} refers to two numerical values, one for $z = 0$ and another for $z = 1$. The same can be said for σ_{iz}.

Different x_i's are drawn independently and hence there is no guarantee that they sum to 1. We normalize them to get a multinomial distribution $(y_1, \ldots, y_7)$. Finally, we draw words W for a document from this multinomial distribution.

In general, suppose there is a collection D of documents and there are V words in the vocabulary. Assume an HLTM M_b with binary word variables has been learned from the binary version of the data using the HLTA algorithm described in (Chen et al. 2017a). To take word counts into consideration, we turn M_b into a document generation model M_c by replacing the binary word variables v_i with real-valued variables x_i, and we assume a document of length N is generated using M_c as follows:

1. Draw values of the binary latent variables via logic sampling.
2. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, V\}$, draw x_i from the conditional distribution $p(x_i|pa(x_i))$, a truncated normal distribution, of x_i given its parent $pa(x_i)$.
3. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, V\}$, set $y_i = x_i / \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$.
4. For each $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, draw the n-th word of the document from $Multi(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$.

In the generation process, Step 2 generates the *unnormalized relative frequencies (URF)* $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_V)$, while Step 3 obtains the (normalized) *relative frequencies* $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$. The first three steps define a distribution over all possible the relative frequency vectors, i.e., over the probability simplex $S = \{(y_1, \ldots, y_n)|y_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i = 1\}$. We denote the distribution as $p(\mathbf{y}|M_c, \theta)$. The parameter vector θ includes the parameters for the distributions of all binary latent variables, and the means and standard deviations for the truncated normal distributions for the URF variables.

Let N_i be the number of times the i-th word from the vocabulary occurs in a document d. The count vector $\mathbf{c} = (N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_V)$ can be used as a representation of d. The sum of those counts is the document length, i.e., $N = \sum_{i=1}^{V} N_i$. The conditional probability of d given the relative frequencies $\mathbf{y}$ is:

$$P(d|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{N!}{N_1! \ldots N_V!} \prod_{i=1}^{V} y_i^{N_i}. \quad (1)$$

The entire generation process defines a distribution over documents. The probability of a document d is:

$$P(d|M_c, \theta_c) = \int_{\mathbf{y}} P(d|\mathbf{y}) p(\mathbf{y}|M_c, \theta) d\mathbf{y}. \quad (2)$$

The document generation process given here is very different in flavor from the generation processes one typically sees in the LDA literature. Nonetheless, it is a well-defined generation process. It defines a distribution over count-vector representations of documents. An LDA-based model, on the other hand, defines a distribution over bag-of-words representations of documents. Because the count-vector representation is equivalent to the bag-of-words representation, HLTM-c and the LDA-based methods define distributions

over the same collection of objects and hence can be compared with each other.

Parameter Estimation

We now consider how to estimate the parameters θ of the mode M_c. The log likelihood function of θ given a collection of documents D is:

$$\log P(D|M_c, \theta) = \sum_{d \in D} \log P(d|M_c, \theta). \quad (3)$$

The objective of parameter estimation is to find the value of θ that maximizes the likelihood function. This task is difficult because of the the use of truncated normal distributions and the normalization step in the document generation process.

We propose an approximate method based on two ideas. First, notice that the model parameters θ influence the relative frequencies $\mathbf{y}$ and the word counts $\mathbf{c}$ indirectly through the URF variables $\mathbf{x}$. Given $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are independent of θ. Our first idea is to obtain a point estimate of $\mathbf{x}$ from $\mathbf{c}$ and regard $\mathbf{x}$ as observed variables afterwards.

It is well known that, given the word counts $\mathbf{c}$, the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) of $\mathbf{y}$ is $y_i = N_i/N$ for all i, i.e., the empirical relative word frequencies. Ignoring the normalization step, we also use the empirical relative word frequencies as a point estimation for URF variables $\mathbf{x}$, i.e., we assume $\mathbf{x} = (N_1/N, \ldots, N_V/N)$.

The second idea is to relax the restriction that x_i must be from the interval $[0, 1]$, and to assume that x_i is sampled from a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{iz}, \sigma_{iz}^2)$ instead of a truncated normal distribution $\mathcal{TN}(\mu_{iz}, \sigma_{iz}^2, 0, 1)$.

Those two considerations turn the problem of estimating θ in M_c with data represented as count vectors into the problem of estimating θ in a related model, denoted as M_a, with data represented as vectors of relative frequencies. As shown in Figure 2(c), the auxiliary model M_a is the same as the top part of M_c, except that the URF variables x_i's are replaced with real-value variables r_i's. The conditional distribution of each r_i given its parent z is a normal distribution, i.e.,

$$p(r_i|z) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_{iz}, \sigma_{iz}^2).$$

Use d_f to denote the vector of relative word frequencies in a document d, i.e., $d_f = (N_1/N, \ldots, N_V/N)$. Moreover, use D_f to denote the entire data set when represented as vectors of relative frequencies. In the auxiliary model M_a, the log likelihood of θ given D_f is

$$\log P(D_f|M_a, \theta) = \sum_{d_f \in D_f} \log P(d_f|M_a, \theta). \quad (4)$$

Maximizing this likelihood function is relatively easy because M_a is a tree model. It can be done using the EM algorithm.

We do not have any error bounds relating the target likelihood function $\log P(D|M_c, \theta)$ and the approximate likelihood function $\log P(D_f|M_a, \theta)$. However, there are strong reasons to believe that maximizing (4) would result in high quality parameter estimation for the generative model M_c due to the way the approximation is derived. Empirical results to be presented later show that the method does produce good enough parameter estimations for M_c to achieve substantially higher held-out likelihood than the LDA-based methods.

Although M_a is a tree model, EM can still be very time consuming when the sample size is large. In this case, we use stepwise EM (Sato and Ishii 2000; Cappé and Moulines 2009), which is the result of applying the idea of stochastic gradient descent to EM. It scales up much better than EM.

Model Evaluation

After obtaining an estimation θ^* of the parameters in the document generation model M_c, we need to evaluate it by calculating its log likelihood on a test set D_t:

$$\log P(D_t|M_g, \theta^*)) = \sum_{d \in D_t} \log P(d|M_c, \theta^*).$$

To calculate the probability $\log P(d|M_c, \theta^*)$ of a test document d, we need to approximately compute the integration in (2). Since the distribution of $P(\mathbf{y}|M_c, \theta^*)$ is defined through a generation process, it is straightforward to obtain samples of $\mathbf{y}$ by running the process multiple times. Suppose K samples $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}^{(K)}$ of $\mathbf{y}$ are obtained. We can estimate $P(d|M_c, \theta^*)$ as follows:

$$P(d|M_c, \theta^*) \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} P(d|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}). \quad (5)$$

Unfortunately, there is a well-known problem with this naive method (Wallach et al. 2009). When the document d is long, the integrand $p(d|\mathbf{y})$ as a function of $\mathbf{y}$ is highly peaked around the MLE of $\mathbf{y}$ and is very small elsewhere in the probability simplex. Because the document d is not taken into consideration when drawing samples of $\mathbf{y}$, it is unlikely for the samples to hit the high value area. This can easily lead to underestimation and high variance. Unless K is extremely large, there could be large differences in the estimates one obtains at different runs.

A standard way to solve this problem is to use *importance sampling* (Owen 2013), and to utilize a proposal distribution that is related to d and has its density concentrated in the region where the integrand function $P(d|\mathbf{y})$ is not close to zero. We derive such a distribution using the auxiliary model M_a.

Let $\mathbf{z}$ be the set of all latent variables in the auxiliary model M_a on the level right above the r_i's. For each latent variable z in $\mathbf{z}$, it is easy to compute the posterior distribution $p(z|d_f, M_a, \theta^*)$ of z given a document d (represented as a vector of relative word frequencies d_f) because M_a is a tree model. In fact, it can be done in linear time using message propagation. We define

$$q(\mathbf{z}|d) = \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} p(z|d_f, M_a, \theta^*). \quad (6)$$

Note that $\mathbf{z}$ (defined in M_a) is the same as the set of all latent variables in the generative model M_c on the level right

Table 1: Per-document held-out log likelihood scores. The sign "-" indicates non-termination after 96 hours.

	NIPS-1k	NIPS-5k	NIPS-10k	News-1k	News-5k	NYT	AI
HLTA-c	**-1,182**±2	**-2,658**±1	**-3,249**±2	**-183**±1	**-383**±2	**-1,255**±3	**-3,216**±3
hLDA	-2,951±35	-5,626±117	—	—	—	—	—
nHDP	-3,273±6	-7,169±11	-8,318±18	-262±1	-565±3	-2,070±6	-7,606± 12
hPAM	-3,196±3	-6,759±15	-7,922 ± 12	-255±2	-556±4	—	—

above the x_i's. We rewrite (2) as follows for the test document d:

$$P(d|M_c,\theta^*) = \int \sum_{\mathbf{z}} P(d|\mathbf{y})p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z}|M_c,\theta^*)d\mathbf{y}$$

Note that $p(\mathbf{z}|M_c,\theta^*) = p(\mathbf{z}|M_a,\theta^*)$. Inserting $\frac{q(\mathbf{z}|d)}{q(\mathbf{z}|d)}$ into the right hand side and rearranging terms, we get

$$P(d|M_c,\theta^*) = \int \sum_{\mathbf{z}} P(d|\mathbf{y})\frac{p(\mathbf{z}|M_a,\theta^*)}{q(\mathbf{z}|d)}p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z})q(\mathbf{z}|d)d\mathbf{y}.$$

This expression implies that we can sample a sequence of pairs $(\mathbf{y}^{(1)},\mathbf{z}^{(1)}),\ldots,(\mathbf{y}^{(K)},\mathbf{z}^{(K)})$ from $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z})q(\mathbf{z}|d)$ [2], and estimate $P(d|M_c,\theta^*)$ as follows:

$$P(d|M,\theta^*) \approx \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} P(d|\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\frac{p(\mathbf{z}^{(k)}|M_a,\theta^*)}{q(\mathbf{z}^{(k)})}. \quad (7)$$

Note that $P(d|\mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ can be calculated using (1) and the term $p(\mathbf{z}^{(k)}|M_a,\theta^*)$ is obtained using message propagation in M_a. As mentioned earlier, the term $q(\mathbf{z}^{(k)})$ can also be easily computed in M_a.

In comparison with (5), the use of (7) improves estimation accuracy and reduces the variance because the sample points $(\mathbf{y}^{(k)},\mathbf{z}^{(k)})$ are generated by taking the test document d into consideration. Hence, the samples are more likely to hit the area where the integrand function $P(d|\mathbf{y})$ has high values. In the experiments, we set $K = 300$.

Empirical Results

We have now finished describing the HLTA-c algorithm. Starting with a collection of documents, it first learns a model by running HLTA on the binary version of the data. Then it turns the model into a document generation model and estimates the parameters from the count version of the data. The final model defines a probability distributions over count-vector representations of documents and gives a hierarchy of topics.

In this section, we present empirical results to compare HLTA-c with common LDA-based methods for hierarchical topic detection, including hPAM (Mimno, Li, and McCallum 2007), hLDA (Blei, Griffiths, and Jordan 2010) and nHDP (Paisley et al. 2015). The comparisons are in terms of both model quality and the quality of topics and topic hierarchies. Model quality is measured using held-out likelihood on test data. The quality of topics is assessed using topic coherence (Mimno et al. 2011) and topic compactness (Chen et al. 2017b). Example branches of the topic hierarchies obtained by nHDP and HLTA-c are also included for qualitative comparisons.

Datasets and Settings

We used four datasets in our experiments. The first one is the NIPS dataset, which consists of 1,955 articles published at the NIPS conference between 1988 and 1999[3]. The second one is the 20 Newsgroup dataset[4], which consists of 19,940 newsgroup posts. The third one is the New York Times (NYT) dataset[5], which consists of 300,000 articles published on New York Times between 1987 and 2007. The last one is a dataset that includes all 24,307 papers published at seven AI conferences and three AI journals between 2000 to 2017. We refer to it as the AI dataset.

To have some variabilities on the vocabulary size, we created different versions of the NIPS and the Newgroup datasets by choosing vocabularies with different sizes using average TF-IDF. The NIPS dataset has three versions with vocabulary sizes of 1,000, 5,000 and 10,000 respectively, and the Newsgroup dataset has two versions with vocabulary sizes of 5,000 and 10,000. The NYT and AI datasets each have only one version with vocabulary size 10,000.

Implementations of HLTA and the LDA baselines were obtained from their authors [6]. HLTA-c was implemented on top of HLTA. The implementation will be released along with the publication of this paper.

HLTA-c determined the height of topic hierarchy and the number of nodes at each level by running the HLTA at its default parameter settings on the binary version of a dataset. We tuned the parameters of the LDA-based baselines in such a way that they would yield roughly the same total number of topics as HLTA-c. For example, HLTA produced 1133 topics on the AI dataset. To ensure that nHDP would produce a similar number of topics, we used 20 nodes for the top level, 20×6 nodes for the the second level, and $20\times6\times8$ for the third level, leading to a total number of 1100 topics. The other parameters of the baselines that do not affect the number of topics were left at their default values.

HLTA-c needs to call stepwise EM in the parameter estimation step. Stepwise EM has a parameter called stepwise η_t, which we set as $\eta_t = (t+2)^{-0.75}$ as is usually done in the literature. All experiments were conducted on the same desktop computer.

[2] For each pair, first sample $\mathbf{z}$ from $q(\mathbf{z}|d)$, and then sample $\mathbf{y}$ from $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z})$

[3] http://www.cs.nyu.edu/∼roweis/data.html

[4] http://qwone.com/∼jason/20Newsgroups/

[5] http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Bag+of+Words

[6] github.com/kmpoon/hlta; github.com/blei-lab/hlda; www.columbia.edu/∼jwp2128/code/nHDP.zip; www.arbylon.net/projects/knowceans-lda-cgen/Hpam2pGibbsSampler.java.

Table 2: Average coherence scores.

	NIPS-1k	NIPS-5k	NIPS-10k	News-1k	News-5k	NYT	AI
HLTA-c	**-6.46±0.01**	**-8.20±0.02**	**-8.93±0.04**	-12.50±0.08	**-13.43±0.15**	**-12.70 ± 0.18**	**-16.18 ± 0.15**
hLDA	-7.46±0.31	-9.03±0.16	—	—	—	—	—
nHDP	-7.66±0.23	-9.70±0.19	-10.89±0.38	-13.51±0.08	-13.93±0.21	-12.90±0.16	-18.66±0.21
hPAM	-6.86±0.08	-8.89±0.04	-9.74±0.04	**-11.74±0.14**	-14.06 ±0.09	—	—

Table 3: Average compactness scores.

	NIPS-1k	NIPS-5k	NIPS-10k	News-1k	News-5k	NYT	AI
HLTA-c	**0.228±0.001**	**0.255±0.001**	**0.243±0.001**	**0.219±0.001**	**0.226±0.001**	**0.288±0.009**	**0.229±0.001**
hLDA	0.163±0.003	0.153±0.001	—	—	—	—	—
nHDP	0.164±0.005	0.147±0.006	0.138±0.002	0.150±0.003	0.148±0.004	0.250±0.003	0.144±0.001
hPAM	0.211±0.003	0.167±0.001	0.141±0.002	0.210±0.006	0.178±0.002	—	—

Model Quality

We randomly divided each dataset into a training set with 80% of the data, and a test set with 20% of the data. The algorithms were run on the training set, and the resulting models were evaluated on the test set. The per-document log likelihood scores are reported in Table 1.

We see that the held-out likelihood scores for HLTA-c are drastically higher than those for all the baseline methods. On the NYT and AI datasets, for instance, the models produced by HLTA-c have scores of -1,255 and -3,216 respectively, while the models by nHDP have scores of -2,070 and -7,606. The results imply that the models obtained by HLTA-c can predict unseen data much better than those by the other methods.

HLTA-c not only achieved much higher held-out likelihood scores than the baselines, but also did so with much fewer parameters. In an HLTM-c, each URF variable x_i has 4 parameters. Suppose there are V words in the vocabulary. The total number of parameters associated with those variables is $4V$. The number of latent variables is upper bounded by V and each of them has no more than 2 parameters. So, the total number of parameters is upper bounded by $6V$. In an LDA-based model with β topics, on the other hand, one needs $\beta(V-1)$ parameters just to describe the topics. In practice, β is much larger than 6. In addition, one also needs to describe the topic proportions for each document. The number of parameters needed here increases linearly with the number of documents, which can be very large.

Topic Extraction from HLTM-c

Suppose an HLTM-c has been learned from a collection of documents. Each latent variable z in the model partitions the collection into two soft clusters. To interpret the clusters, we consider all the URF variables in the subtree rooted at z and examine their distributions in the two clusters. Let x_i be such a variable, and let μ_i and ν_i be the means of x_i in the two clusters. We sort the variables in descending order of the difference $|\mu_i - \nu_i|$, and pick a number of top variables to characterize the differences between the two clusters.

The following table shows the information about a latent variable in the HLTM-c learned from the AI dataset: [7]

	cluster 1 (0.93)	cluster 2 (0.07)
`neural-network`	$0.00029 \pm 1.5E-3$	$0.00455 \pm 6.9E-3$
`layer`	$0.00069 \pm 3.5E-3$	$0.00471 \pm 9.5E-3$
`deep`	$0.00012 \pm 9.7E-4$	$0.00301 \pm 5.4E-3$
`architecture`	$0.00053 \pm 2.1E-3$	$0.00324 \pm 5.5E-3$
`hinton`	$0.00011 \pm 6.3E-4$	$0.00187 \pm 2.4E-3$
`deep-learning`	$0.00004 \pm 5.5E-4$	$0.00168 \pm 3.3E-3$
...	...	...

It partitions the documents into two clusters that consist of 93% an 7% of the documents respectively. In the second cluster, the URF variables have relatively high means, and hence the cluster is interpreted as a topic. The topic is labeled with the top words, i.e., "`neural-network layer deep architecture hinton deep-learning`". Clearly, the topic is about `neural network` and `deep learning`. In the first cluster, the URF variables have relatively low means, and hence the cluster is interpret as background, consisting of documents not in the topic just mentioned.

Topic Quality

Both HLTA-c and the LDA-based methods characterize topics using lists of words when presenting them to users. Direct comparisons are therefore possible. We measure the quality of a topic using two metrics. The first one is the *topic coherence score* (Mimno et al. 2011). The intuition behind this metric is that words in a good topic should tend to co-occur in the documents. Suppose a topic t is characterized by a list $\{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_M\}$ of M words. The coherence score of t is given by:

$$\texttt{coherence}(t) = \sum_{i=2}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \log \frac{D(w_i, w_j) + 1}{D(w_j)},$$

where $D(w_i)$ is the number of documents containing the word w_i, and $D(w_i, w_j)$ is the number of documents containing both w_i and w_j. Higher coherence score means better topic quality.

The second metric is the *topic compactness score* (Chen et al. 2017b). It is calculated on the basis of the word2vec model that was trained on a part of the Google News dataset[8]

[7] At the preprocessing stage, frequent n-grams in the AI dataset were combined into tokens.

[8] `https://code.google.com/archive/p/word2vec/`




Figure 3: Selected branches of the topic trees produced by HLTA-c (left) and nHDP (right) on the AI dataset.

(Mikolov et al. 2013a; 2013b). The word2vec model maps each word into a vector that captures the semantic meaning of the word. The intuition behind the compactness score is that words in a good topic should be closely related semantically. The compactness score of a topic t is given by:

$$\texttt{compactness}(t) = \frac{2}{M(M-1)} \sum_{i=2}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} S(w_i, w_j),$$

where $S(w_i, w_j)$ is the cosine similarity between the vector representations of the words w_i and w_j. Words that do not occur in the *word2vec* model were simply skipped. Higher compactness score means better topic quality.

Both of the scores decrease with the length M of the word list. Some of the topics produced by HLTA-c consist of only 4 words. Hence, we set $M = 4$. Using a higher value for M would put the LDA-based methods at a disadvantage.

The average coherence and compactness scores are shown in Tables 2 and 3. We see that HLTA-c achieved the highest compactness score in all cases. It also achieved the highest coherence score in all cases except for News-1k. The differences between the scores for HLTA-c and those for the LDA-based methods are often large. On the AI dataset, for instance, HLTA-c achieved a coherence score of -16.18 and a compactness score of 0.299. The corresponding scores for nHDP are -18.66 and 0.144 respectively.

Selected Branches of Topic Hierarchies

Figure 3 shows branches of the topic trees produced by HLTA-c and nHDP on the AI dataset that are related to neural networks and deep learning. In the HLTA-c topic tree, there is a topic on `neural network` and `deep learning`, which has a subtopic on `neural network` and another subtopic on `deep learning`. The topic `neural network` in turn has subtopics on network `architecture` and training algorithms (`contrastive divergence` and `stochastic gradient descent`). The topic on `deep learning` has subtopics on `convolutional neural network`, `restricted Boltzmann machine`, `deep neural network`, and `autoencoder`. The names of several prominent deep learning authors appear in the topic descriptions. The topics `recurrent neural network` and `lstm` are placed in the first group instead of the second, which indicates that they co-occur more often with the `neural network` topics than the `deep learning` topics. In fact, in RNN papers, one comes across phrases such as `neural network`, `layer` and `hidden layer` more often than phrases such as `deep`, `pool` and `convolution`. A similar statement can be made about `word embedding`.

The topics obtained by nHDP are also meaningful. However, the relationships among them are not as meaningful as those among the HLTA-c topics. In particular, the last three topics clearly do not fit well with the other topics in the group.

Concluding Remarks

HLTA is a recently proposed method for hierarchical topic detection. It can only deal with binary data. In this paper we extend HLTA so as to take word counts into consideration. It is achieved by proposing a document generation process based on the model structure learned by HLTA. The extended method is called HLTA-c. In comparison with LDA-based methods, HLTA-c achieves far better held-out likelihood with much fewer parameters. It also produces significantly better topics and topic hierarchies. It is the new state-of-the-art for hierarchical topic detection.

In recent years, machine learning research mostly focuses on parameter learning. Relative little attention is placed on model structure learning. The work on HLTA and this paper serve to illustrate a strategy where one uses a simpler form of data for model structure learning and the full data for parameter learning. Such a strategy can lead to superior performances when compared with the practice where ones relies on manually constructed model structures.

References

Ahmed, A., and Xing, E. 2008. Dynamic non-parametric mixture models and the recurrent Chinese restaurant process: with applications to evolutionary clustering. In *ICDM*.

Andrzejewski, D.; Zhu, X.; and Craven, M. 2009. Incorporating domain knowledge into topic modeling via Dirichlet forest priors. In *ICML*.

Bartholomew, D. J., and Knott, M. 1999. *Latent Variable Models and Factor Analysis*. Arnold, 2nd edition.

Blei, D. M., and Lafferty, J. D. 2006. Dynamic topic models. In *ICML*.

Blei, D. M.; Griffiths, T.; Jordan, M.; and Tenenbaum, J. 2004. Hierarchical topic models and the nested Chinese restaurant process. In *NIPS*.

Blei, D. M.; Griffiths, T.; and Jordan, M. 2010. The nested Chinese restaurant process and Bayesian nonparametric inference of topic hierarchies. *Journal of the ACM* 57(2):7:1–7:30.

Blei, D. M.; Ng, A. Y.; and Jordan, M. I. 2003. Latent Dirichlet allocation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3:993–1022.

Cappé, O., and Moulines, E. 2009. On-line expectation–maximization algorithm for latent data models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 71(3):593–613.

Chen, P.; Zhang, N. L.; Poon, L. K.; and Chen, Z. 2016. Progressive EM for latent tree models and hierarchical topic detection. In *AAAI*.

Chen, P.; Zhang, N. L.; Liu, T.; Poon, L. K.; Chen, Z.; and Khawar, F. 2017a. Latent tree models for hierarchical topic detection. *Artificial Intelligence* 250:105–124.

Chen, Z.; Zhang, N. L.; Yeung, D.; and Chen, P. 2017b. Sparse boltzmann machines with structure learning as applied to text analysis. In *AAAI*.

Dhillon, I. S. 2001. Co-clustering documents and words using bipartite spectral graph partitioning. In *Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 269–274. ACM.

Jagarlamudi, J.; Daumé III, H.; and Udupa, R. 2012. Incorporating lexical priors into topic models. In *EACL*.

Lafferty, J., and Blei, D. M. 2006. Correlated topic models. In *NIPS*.

Li, W., and McCallum, A. 2006. Pachinko allocation: Dag-structured mixture models of topic correlations. In *ICML*.

Liu, T.; Zhang, N. L.; and Chen, P. 2014. Hierarchical latent tree analysis for topic detection. In *ECML/PKDD*.

Mikolov, T.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G.; and Dean, J. 2013a. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. In *International Conference on Learning Representations Workshops*.

Mikolov, T.; Sutskever, I.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G. S.; and Dean, J. 2013b. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *NIPS*.

Mimno, D.; Wallach, H. M.; Talley, E.; Leenders, M.; and McCallum, A. 2011. Optimizing semantic coherence in topic models. In *EMNLP*.

Mimno, D.; Li, W.; and McCallum, A. 2007. Mixtures of hierarchical topics with pachinko allocation. In *ICML*.

Owen, A. B. 2013. Monte carlo theory, methods and examples. *Monte Carlo Theory, Methods and Examples. Art Owen*.

Paisley, J.; Wang, C.; Blei, D. M.; Jordan, M.; et al. 2015. Nested hierarchical Dirichlet processes. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on* 37(2):256–270.

Pearl, J. 1988. *Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems: Networks of plausible inference*. Morgan Kaufmann.

Sato, M.-A., and Ishii, S. 2000. On-line EM algorithm for the normalized gaussian network. *Neural computation* 12(2):407–432.

Wallach, H. M.; Murray, I.; Salakhutdinov, R.; and Mimno, D. 2009. Evaluation methods for topic models. In *ICML*.

Wang, X., and McCallum, A. 2006. Topics over time: a non-Markov continuous-time model of topical trends. In *KDD*.