Multilingual and cross-lingual document classification: A meta-learning approach

Niels van der Heijden[♣] **Helen Yannakoudakis**[♠] **Pushkar Mishra**[♢] **Ekaterina Shutova**[♣]
[♣]ILLC, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands
[♠]Dept. of Informatics, King's College London, United Kingdom
[♢]Facebook AI, London, United Kingdom
niels.vanderheijden@student.uva.nl, helen.yannakoudakis@kcl.ac.uk,
pushkarmishra@fb.com, e.shutova@uva.nl

arXiv:2101.11302v2 [cs.CL] 24 Apr 2021

Abstract

The great majority of languages in the world are considered under-resourced for the successful application of deep learning methods. In this work, we propose a meta-learning approach to document classification in a limited-resource setting and demonstrate its effectiveness in two different settings: few-shot, cross-lingual adaptation to previously unseen languages; and multilingual joint training when limited target-language data is available during training. We conduct a systematic comparison of several meta-learning methods, investigate multiple settings in terms of data availability and show that meta-learning thrives in settings with a heterogeneous task distribution. We propose a simple, yet effective adjustment to existing meta-learning methods which allows for better and more stable learning, and set a new state of the art on several languages while performing on-par on others, using only a small amount of labeled data.

1 Introduction

There are more than 7000 languages around the world and, of them, around 6% account for 94% of the population.[1] Even for the 6% most spoken languages, very few of them possess adequate resources for natural language research and, when they do, resources in different domains are highly imbalanced. Additionally, human language is dynamic in nature: new words and domains emerge continuously and hence no model learned in a particular time will remain valid forever.

With the aim of extending the global reach of Natural Language Processing (NLP) technology, much recent research has focused on the development of multilingual models and methods to efficiently transfer knowledge across languages. Among these advances are multilingual word vectors which aim to give word-translation pairs a similar encoding in some embedding space (Mikolov et al., 2013a; Lample et al., 2017). There has also been a lot of work on multilingual sentence and word encoders that either explicitly utilizes corpora of bi-texts (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019; Lample and Conneau, 2019) or jointly trains language models for many languages in one encoder (Devlin et al., 2018; Conneau et al., 2019). Although great progress has been made in cross-lingual transfer learning, these methods either do not close the gap with performance in a single high-resource language (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019; Conneau et al., 2019; van der Heijden et al., 2019), e.g., because of cultural differences in languages which are not accounted for, or are impractically expensive (Lai et al., 2019).

Meta-learning, or *learning to learn* (Schmidhuber, 1987; Bengio et al., 1990; Thrun and Pratt, 1998), is a learning paradigm which focuses on the quick adaption of a learner to new tasks. The idea is that by training a learner to adapt quickly and from a few examples on a diverse set of training tasks, the learner can also generalize to unseen tasks at test time. Meta-learning has recently emerged as a promising technique for few-shot learning for a wide array of tasks (Finn et al., 2017; Koch et al., 2015; Ravi and Larochelle, 2017) including NLP (Dou et al., 2019; Gu et al., 2018). To our best knowledge, no previous work has been done in investigating meta-learning as a framework for multilingual and cross-lingual few-shot learning. We propose such a framework and demonstrate its effectiveness in document classification tasks. The only current study on meta-learning for cross-lingual few-shot learning is the one by (Nooralahzadeh et al., 2020), focusing on natural language inference and multilingual question answering. In their work, the authors focus on applying meta-learning

[1] https://www.ethnologue.com/statistics

Algorithm 1 Meta-training procedure.

Require: $p(\mathcal{D})$: distribution over tasks.
Require: α, β: step size hyper-parameters
  Initialize θ
  while not done **do**
    Sample batch of tasks $\{D^l\} = \{(S^l, Q^l)\} \sim p(\mathcal{D})$
    for all (S^l, Q^l) **do**
      Initialize $\theta_l^{(0)} = \theta$
      for all steps k **do**
        Compute: $\theta_l^{(k+1)} = \theta_l^{(k)} - \alpha(\nabla_{\theta_l^{(k)}} \mathcal{L}_{S_l}(f_{\theta_l^{(k)}}))$
      end for
    end for
    Update $\theta = \theta - \beta(\text{MetaUpdate}(f_{\theta_l^{(K)}}, Q^l))$
  end while

to learn to adapt a monolingually trained classifier to new languages. In contrast to this work, we instead show that, in many cases, it is more favourable to not initialize the meta-learning process from a monolingually trained classifier, but rather reserve its respective training data for meta-learning instead.

Our contributions are as follows: 1) We propose a meta-learning approach to few-shot cross-lingual and multilingual adaptation and demonstrate its effectiveness on document classification tasks over traditional supervised learning; 2) We provide an extensive comparison of meta-learning methods on multilingual and cross-lingual few-shot learning and release our code to facilitate further research in the field;[2] 3) We analyse the effectiveness of meta-learning under a number of different parameter initializations and multiple settings in terms of data availability, and show that meta-learning can effectively learn from few examples and diverse data distributions; 4) We introduce a simple yet effective modification to existing methods and empirically show that it stabilizes training and converges faster to better local optima; 5) We set a new state of the art on several languages and achieve on-par results on others using only a small amount of data.

2 Meta-learning methods

Meta-learning, or *learning to learn*, aims to create models that can learn new skills or adapt to new tasks rapidly from few training examples. Unlike traditional machine learning, datasets for either training or testing, which are referred to as *meta-train* and *meta-test* datasets, comprise of many tasks sampled from a distribution of tasks $p(\mathcal{D})$ rather than individual data points. Each task is associated with a dataset $\mathcal{D}$ which contains both feature vectors and ground truth labels and is split into a *support set* and a *query set*, $\mathcal{D} = \{S, Q\}$. The support set is used for fast adaptation and the query set is used to evaluate performance and compute a loss with respect to model parameter initialization. Generally, some model f_θ parameterized by θ, often referred to as the *base-learner*, is considered. A cycle of fast-adaptation on a support-set followed by updating the parameter initialization of the base-learner based on the loss on the query-set is called an *episode*. In the case of classification, the optimal parameters maximize the probability of the true labels across multiple batches $Q \subset \mathcal{D}$

$$\theta^* := \underset{\theta}{argmax} \mathbb{E}_{Q \subset \mathcal{D}}[\sum_{(x,y) \in Q} P_\theta(y|x)] \quad (1)$$

In few-shot classification/fast learning, the goal is to minimize the prediction error on data samples with unknown labels given a small support set for learning. *Meta-training* (Algorithm 1) consists of updating the parameters of the base-learner by performing many of the formerly described *episodes*, until some stop criterion is reached.

Following this procedure, the extended definition of optimal parameters is given in Eq. 2 to include fast adaptation based on the support set. The underlined parts mark the difference between traditional supervised-learning and meta-learning. The optimal parameters θ^* are obtained by solving

$$\underset{\theta}{argmax} \underline{\mathbb{E}_{l \subset L}}[\underline{\mathbb{E}_{S^l \subset \mathcal{D}}}, Q^l \subset \mathcal{D}[\sum_{(x,y) \in Q^l} P_\theta(y|x, \underline{S^l})]] \quad (2)$$

In this work, we focus on metric- and optimization-based meta-learning algorithms. In the following sections, their respective characteristics and the update methods in Algorithm 1 are introduced.

2.1 Prototypical Networks

Prototypical Networks (Snell et al., 2017) belong to the metric-based family of meta-learning algorithms. Typically they consist of an embedding network f_θ and a distance function $d(x_1, x_2)$ such as Euclidean distance. The embedding network is used to encode all samples in the support set S_c and compute *prototypes* μ_c per class $c \in C$ by computing the mean of the sample encodings of that respective class

$$\mu_c := \frac{1}{|S_c|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in S_c} f_\theta(x_i) \quad (3)$$

[2] https://github.com/mrvoh/meta_learning_multilingual_doc_classification

Using the computed prototypes, Prototypical Networks classify a new sample as

$$p(y = c|x) = \frac{exp(-d(f_\theta(x), \mu_c)}{\sum_{c' \in C} exp(-d(f_\theta(x), \mu_{c'})} \quad (4)$$

Wang et al. (2019) show that despite their simplicity, Prototypical Networks can perform on par or better than other state-of-the-art meta-learning methods when all sample encodings are centered around the overall mean of all classes and consecutively L2-normalized. We also adopt this strategy.

2.2 MAML

Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) (Finn et al., 2017) is an optimization-based method that uses the following objective function

$$\theta^* := \underset{\theta}{argmin} \sum_{D_l \sim p(D)} \mathcal{L}_l(f_{\theta_l^{(k)}}) \quad (5)$$

$\mathcal{L}_l(f_{\theta_l^{(k)}})$ is the loss on the query set after updating the base-learner for k steps on the support set. Hence, MAML directly optimizes the base-learner such that fast-adaptation of θ, often referred to as *inner-loop optimization*, results in task-specific parameters $\theta_l^{(k)}$ which generalize well on the task. Setting B as the batch size, MAML implements its MetaUpdate, which is also referred to as *outer-loop optimization*, as

$$\theta = \theta - \beta \frac{1}{B} \sum_{D_l \sim p(\mathcal{D})} (\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_l(f_{\theta_l^{(k)}})) \quad (6)$$

Such a MetaUpdate requires computing second order derivatives and, in turn, holding $\theta_l^{(j)} \forall j = 1, \ldots, k$ in memory. A first-order approximation of MAML (foMAML), which ignores second order derivatives, can be used to bypass this problem:

$$\theta = \theta - \beta \frac{1}{B} \sum_{D_l \sim p(\mathcal{D})} (\nabla_{\theta_l^{(k)}} \mathcal{L}_l(f_{\theta_l^{(k)}})) \quad (7)$$

Following previous work (Antoniou et al., 2018), we also adopt the following improvements in our framework for all MAML-based methods:

Per-step Layer Normalization weights Layer normalization weights and biases are not updated in the inner-loop. Sharing one set of weights and biases across inner-loop steps implicitly assumes that the feature distribution between layers stays the same at every step of the inner optimization.

Per-layer per-step learnable inner-loop learning rate Instead of using a shared learning rate for all parameters, the authors propose to initialize a learning rate per layer and per step and jointly learn their values in the MetaUpdate steps.

Cosine annealing of outer-loop learning rate It has shown to be crucial to model performance to anneal the learning rate using some annealing function (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2016).

2.3 Reptile

Reptile (Nichol et al., 2018) is a first-order optimization-based meta-learning algorithm which is designed to move the weights towards a manifold of the weighted averages of task-specific parameters $\theta_l^{(k)}$:

$$\theta = \theta - \beta \frac{1}{B} \sum_{D^l \sim p(\mathcal{D})} (\theta_l^{(k)} - \theta) \quad (8)$$

Despite its simplicity, it has shown competitive or superior performance against MAML, e.g., on Natural Language Understanding (Dou et al., 2019).

2.4 ProtoMAML

Triantafillou et al. (2020) introduce ProtoMAML as a meta-learning method which combines the complementary strengths of Prototypical Networks and MAML by leveraging the inductive bias of the use of prototypes instead of random initialization of the final linear layer of the network. Snell et al. (2017) show that Prototypical Networks are equivalent to a linear model when Euclidean distance is used. Using the definition of prototypes μ_c as per Eq. 3, the weights w_c and bias b_c corresponding to class c can be computed as follows

$$\mathbf{w}_c := 2\mu_c \qquad b_c := -\mu_c^T \mu_c \quad (9)$$

ProtoMAML is defined as the adaptation of MAML where the final linear layer is parameterized as per Eq. 9 at the start of each episode using the support set. Due to this initialization, it allows modeling a varying number of classes per episode.

ProtoMAMLn Inspired by Wang et al. (2019), we propose a simple, yet effective adaptation to ProtoMAML by applying L_2 normalization to the prototypes themselves, referred to as ProtoMAMLn, and, again, use a first-order approximation (foProtoMAMLn). We demonstrate that doing so leads

to a more stable, faster and effective learning algorithm at only constant extra computational cost ($\mathcal{O}(1)$).

We hypothesize the normalization to be particularly beneficial in case of a relatively high-dimensional final feature space – in case of BERT-like models typically 768 dimensions. Let x be a sample and $\hat{x} = f_\theta(x)$ be the encoding of the sample in the final feature space. Since the final activation function is the *tanh* activation, all entries of both $\hat{x}$ and μ_c have values between -1 and 1. The pre-softmax activation for class c is computed as $\hat{x}^T \mu_c$. Due to the size of the vectors and the scale of their respective entries, this in-product can yield a wide range of values, which in turn results in relatively high loss values, making the inner-loop optimization unstable.

3 Related work

3.1 Multilingual NLP

Just as the deep learning era for monolingual NLP started with the invention of dense, low-dimensional vector representations for words (Mikolov et al., 2013b) so did cross-lingual NLP with works like those of Mikolov et al. (2013a); Faruqui et al. (2014). More recently, multilingual and/or cross-lingual NLP is approached by training one shared encoder for multiple languages at once, either by explicitly aligning representations with the use of parallel corpora (Artetxe and Schwenk, 2019; Lample and Conneau, 2019) or by jointly training on some monolingual language model objective, such as the Masked Language Model (MLM) (Devlin et al., 2018), in multiple languages (Devlin et al., 2018; Conneau et al., 2019).

The formerly described language models aim to create a shared embedding space for multiple languages with the hope that fine-tuning in one language does not degrade performance in others. Lai et al. (2019) argue that just aligning languages is not sufficient to generalize performance to new languages due to the phenomenon they describe as *domain drift*. Domain drift accounts for all differences for the same tasks in different languages which cannot be captured by a perfect translation system, such as differences in culture. They instead propose a multi-step approach which utilizes a multilingual teacher trained with Unsupervised Data Augmentation (UDA) (Xie et al., 2019) to create labels for a student model that is pretrained on large amounts of unlabeled data in the target language and domain using the MLM objective. With their method, the authors obtain state-of-the-art results on the MLDoc document classification task (Schwenk and Li, 2018) and the Amazon Sentiment Polarity Review task (Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010). A downside, however, is the high computational cost involved. For every language and domain combination: 1) a machine translation system has to be inferred on a large amount of unlabeled samples; 2) the UDA method needs to be applied to obtain a teacher model to generate pseudo-labels on the unlabeled in-domain data; 3) a language model must be finetuned, which involves forwards and backwards computation of a softmax function over a large output space (e.g., 50k tokens for mBERT and 250k tokens for XLM-RoBERTa). The final classifier is then obtained by 4) training the finetuned language model on the pseudo-labels generated by the teacher.

3.2 Meta-learning in NLP

Monolingual Bansal et al. (2019) apply meta-learning to a wide range of NLP tasks within a monolingual setting and show superior performance for parameter initialization over self-supervised pretraining and multi-task learning. Their method is an adaptation of MAML where a combination of a text-encoder, BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), is coupled with a parameter generator that learns to generate task-dependent initializations of the classification head such that meta-learning can be performed across tasks with disjoint label spaces. Obamuyide and Vlachos (2019b) apply meta-learning on the task of relation extraction; Obamuyide and Vlachos (2019a) apply lifelong meta-learning for relation extraction; Chen et al. (2019) apply meta-learning for few-shot learning on missing link prediction in knowledge graphs.

Multilingual Gu et al. (2018) apply meta-learning to Neural Machine Translation (NMT) and show its advantage over strong baselines such as cross-lingual transfer learning. By viewing each language pair as a task, the authors apply MAML to obtain competitive NMT systems with as little as 600 parallel sentences. To our best knowledge, the only application of meta-learning for cross-lingual few-shot learning is the one by Nooralahzadeh et al. (2020). The authors study the application of X-MAML, a MAML-based variant, to cross-lingual Natural Language Inference (XNLI) (Conneau et al., 2018) and Multilingual Question An-

swering (MLQA) (Lewis et al., 2019) in both a cross-domain and cross-language setting. X-MAML works by pretraining some model M on a high-resource task h to obtain initial model parameters θ_{mono}. Consecutively, a set L of one or more auxiliary languages is taken, and MAML is applied to achieve fast adaptation of θ_{mono} for $l \in L$. In their experiments, the authors use either one or two auxiliary languages and evaluate their method in both a zero- and few-shot setting. It should be noted that, in the few-shot setting, the full development set (2.5k instances) is used to finetune the model, which is not in line with other work on few-shot learning, such as (Bansal et al., 2019). Also, there is a discrepancy in the training set used for the baselines and their proposed method. All reported baselines are either zero-shot evaluations of θ_{mono} or of θ_{mono} finetuned on the development set of the target language, whereas their proposed method additionally uses the development set in either one or two auxiliary languages during meta-training.

4 Data

In this section, we give an overview of the datasets we use and the respective classification tasks.

MLDoc Schwenk and Li (2018) published an improved version of the Reuters Corpus Volume 2 (Lewis et al., 2004) with balanced class priors for all languages. MLDoc consists of news stories in 8 languages: English, Spanish, French, Italian, Russian, Japanese and Chinese. Each news story is manually classified into one of four groups: *Corporate/Industrial, Economics, Government/Social* and *Markets*. The train datasets contain 10k samples whereas the test sets contain 4k samples.

Amazon Sentiment Polarity Another widely used dataset for cross-lingual text classification is the Amazon Sentiment Analysis dataset (Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010). The dataset is a collection of product reviews in English, French, German and Japanese in three categories: *books dvds* and *music*. Each sample consists of the original review accompanied by meta-data such as the rating of the reviewed product expressed as an integer on a scale from one to five. In this work, we consider the sentiment polarity task where we distinguish between positive (rating > 3) and negative (rating < 3) reviews. When all product categories are concatenated, the dataset consists of 6K samples per language per dataset (train, test). We extend this with Chinese product reviews in the cosmetics domain from JD.com (Zhang et al., 2015), a large e-commerce website in China. The train and test sets contain 2k and 20k samples respectively.

5 Experiments

We use XLM-RoBERTa (Conneau et al., 2019), a strong multilingual model, as the base-learner in all models. We quantify the strengths and weaknesses of meta-learning as opposed to traditional supervised learning in both a cross- and a multilingual joint-training setting with limited resources.

Cross-lingual adaptation Here, the available data is split into multiple subsets: the auxiliary languages l_{aux} which are used in meta-training, the validation language l_{dev} which is used to monitor performance, and the target languages l_{tgt} which are kept *unseen* until meta-testing. Two scenarios in terms of amounts of available data are considered. A small sample of the available training data of l_{aux} is taken to create a limited-resource setting, whereas all available training data of l_{aux} is used in a high-resource setting. The chosen training data per language is split evenly and stratified over two disjoint sets from which the meta-training support and query samples are sampled, respectively. For meta-testing, one batch (16 samples) is taken from the training data of each target language as support set, while we test on the whole test set per target language (i.e., the query set).

Multilingual joint training We also investigate meta-learning as an approach to multilingual joint-training in the same limited-resource setting as previously described for the cross-lingual experiments. The difference is that instead of learning to generalize to $l_{tgt} \neq l_{aux}$ from few examples, here $l_{tgt} = l_{aux}$. If we can show that one can learn many similar tasks across languages from few examples per language, using a total number of examples in the same order of magnitude as in "traditional" supervised learning for training a monolingual classifier, this might be an incentive to change data collection processes in practice.

For both experimental settings above, we examine the influence of additionally using all training data from a high-resource language l_{src} during meta-training, English.

MetaUpdate Method	Num inner-loop steps	Inner-loop lr	Class-head lr multiplier	Inner-optimizer lr
Reptile	2,3,5	1e-5, 5e-5, 1e-4	1, 10	-
foMAML	2,3,5	1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3	1, 10	3e-5, 6e-5, 1e-4
foProtoMAMLn	2,3,5	1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3	1, 10	3e-5, 6e-5, 1e-4

Table 1: Search range per hyper-parameter. We consider the number of update steps in the inner-loop, *Num inner-loop steps*, the (initial) learning rate of the inner-loop, *Inner-loop lr*, the factor by which the learning rate of the classification head is multiplied, *Class-head lr multiplier*, and, if applicable, the learning rate with which the inner-loop optimizer is updated, *Inner-optimizer lr*. The chosen value is underlined.

l_{src} = en	Method	Limited-resource setting							High-resource setting						
		de	fr	it	ja	ru	zh	Δ	de	fr	it	ja	ru	zh	Δ
Excluded	Non-episodic	82.0	**86.7**	68.3	71.9	70.9	81.0	76.8	95.3	90.9	80.9	82.9	74.5	**89.6**	85.7
	ProtoNet	90.5	85.0	76.6	75.0	69.6	82.0	79.8	95.5	91.7	82.0	82.2	76.6	87.4	85.9
	foMAML	89.7	85.5	74.1	74.1	**74.0**	83.2	80.1	95.0	91.4	81.4	82.7	76.9	87.8	86.1
	foProtoMAMLn	**90.6**	86.2	**77.8**	**75.6**	73.6	**83.8**	**80.7**	**95.6**	**92.1**	**82.6**	**83.1**	**77.9**	88.9	**86.7**
	Reptile	87.9	81.8	72.7	74.4	73.9	80.9	78.6	95.0	90.1	81.1	82.7	72.5	88.7	85.0
Included	Zero-shot	92.4	**92.1**	80.3	81.0	71.7	89.1	84.4	92.4	92.1	80.3	81.0	71.7	89.1	84.4
	Non-episodic	93.7	91.3	**81.5**	80.6	71.1	88.4	84.4	93.7	92.9	82.4	82.3	72.1	90.1	85.6
	ProtoNet	93.4	91.9	79.1	81.3	72.2	87.8	84.5	95.0	91.7	81.1	82.7	72.0	88.0	85.9
	foMAML	**95.1**	91.2	79.5	79.6	73.3	89.7	84.6	94.8	93.2	79.9	82.4	75.7	**90.6**	86.1
	foProtoMAMLn	94.9	91.7	**81.5**	**81.4**	**75.2**	**89.9**	**85.5**	**95.8**	**94.1**	**82.7**	**83.0**	**81.2**	90.4	**87.9**
	Reptile	92.3	91.4	79.7	79.5	71.8	88.1	83.8	94.8	91.0	80.2	82.0	72.7	89.9	85.1

Table 2: Average accuracy of 5 different seeds on the unseen target languages for MLDoc. Δ corresponds to the average accuracy across test languages.

5.1 Specifics per dataset

MLDoc As MLDoc has sufficient languages, we set l_{src} = English and l_{dev} = Spanish. The remaining languages are split in two groups: $l_{aux} = \{$German, Italian, Japanese$\}$; and $l_{tgt} = \{$French, Russian, Chinese$\}$. In the limited-resource setting, we randomly sample 64 samples per language in l_{aux} for training. Apart from comparing low- and high-resource settings, we also quantify the influence of augmenting the training set l_{aux} with a high-resource source language l_{src}, English.

Amazon Sentiment Polarity The fact that the Amazon dataset (augmented with Chinese) comprises of only five languages has some implications for our experimental design. In the cross-lingual experiments, where l_{aux}, l_{dev} and l_{tgt} should be disjoint, only three languages, including English, remain for meta-training. As we consider two languages too little data for meta-training, we do not experiment with leaving out the English data. Hence, for meta-training, the data consists of l_{src} = English, as well as two languages in l_{aux}. We always keep one language unseen until meta-testing, and alter l_{aux} such that we can meta-test on every language. We set l_{dev} = French in all cases except when French is used as the target language; then, l_{dev} = Chinese. In the limited-resource setting, a total of 128 samples per language in l_{aux} is used.

For the multilingual joint-training experiments there are enough languages available to quantify the influence of English during meta-training. When English is excluded, it is used for meta-validation. When included, we average results over two sets of experiments: one where l_{dev} = French and one where l_{dev} = Chinese.

5.2 Baselines

We introduce baselines trained in a standard supervised, non-episodic fashion. Again, we use XLM-RoBERTa-base as the base-learner in all models.

Zero-shot This baseline assumes sufficient training data for the task to be available in one language l_{src} (English). The base-learner is trained in a non-episodic manner using mini-batch gradient descent with cross-entropy loss. Performance is monitored during training on a held-out validation set in l_{src}, the model with the lowest loss is selected, and then evaluated on the same task in the target languages.

Non-episodic The second baseline aims to quantify the exact impact of learning a model through the meta-learning paradigm versus standard super-

Method	Limited-resource setting					High-resource setting				
	de	fr	ja	zh	Δ	de	fr	ja	zh	Δ
Zero-shot	**91.2**	90.7	87.0	84.6	88.4	91.2	90.7	87.0	84.6	88.4
Non-episodic	90.9	90.6	86.1	86.9	88.6	91.6	91.0	85.5	87.9	89.0
ProtoNet	89.7	90.2	86.6	85.2	87.9	90.7	92.0	86.7	84.0	88.4
foMAML	88.3	90.5	86.8	88.1	88.4	91.4	92.5	88.0	**90.4**	90.6
foProtoMAMLn	89.0	**91.1**	**87.3**	**88.8**	**89.1**	**92.0**	**93.1**	**88.6**	89.8	**90.9**
Reptile	88.1	87.9	86.8	87.5	87.6	90.6	91.7	87.3	86.2	89.0

Table 3: Average accuracy of 5 different seeds on the unseen target languages for Amazon. Δ corresponds to the average accuracy across test languages.

vised learning. The model learns from exactly the same data as the meta-learning algorithms, but in a non-episodic manner: i.e., merging support and query sets in l_{aux} (and l_{src} when included) and training using mini-batch gradient descent with cross-entropy loss. During testing, the trained model is independently finetuned for 5 steps on the support set (one mini-batch) of each target language l_{tgt}.

5.3 Training setup and hyper-parameters

We use the Ranger optimizer, an adapted version of Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with improved stability at the beginning of training – by accounting for the variance in adaptive learning rates (Liu et al., 2019) – and improved robustness and convergence speed (Zhang et al., 2019; Yong et al., 2020). We use a batch size of 16 and a learning rate of 3e-5 to which we apply cosine annealing. For meta-training, we perform 100 epochs of 100 episodes and perform evaluation with 5 different seeds on the meta-validation set after each epoch. One epoch consists of 100 update steps where each update step consists of a batch of 4 episodes. Early-stopping with a patience of 3 epochs is performed to avoid overfitting. For the non-episodic baselines, we train for 10 epochs on the auxiliary languages while validating after each epoch. All models are created using the PyTorch library (Paszke et al., 2017) and trained on a single 24Gb NVIDIA Titan RTX GPU.

We perform grid search on MLDoc in order to determine optimal hyperparameters for the MetaUpdate methods. The hyper-parameters resulting in the lowest loss on l_{dev} = Spanish are used in all experiments. The number of update steps in the inner-loop is 5; the (initial) learning rate of the inner-loop is 1e-5 for MAML and ProtoMAML and 5e-5 for Reptile; the factor by which the learning rate of the classification head is multiplied is 10 for MAML and ProtoMAML and 1 for Reptile; when applicable, the learning rate with which the inner-loop optimizer is updated is 6e-5. See Table 1 for the considered grid.

6 Results

Cross-lingual adaptation Tables 2 and 3 show the accuracy scores on the target languages on MLDoc and Amazon respectively. We start by noting the strong multilingual capabilities of XLM-RoBERTa as our base-learner: Adding the full training datasets in three extra languages (i.e., comparing the zero-shot with the non-episodic baseline in the high-resource, 'Included' setting) results in a mere 1.2% points increase in accuracy on average for MLDoc and 0.6% points for Amazon. Although the zero-shot[3] and non-episodic baselines are strong, in the majority of cases, a meta-learning approach improves performance. This holds especially for our version of ProtoMAML (ProtoMAMLn), which achieves the highest average accuracy in all considered settings.

The substantial improvements for Russian on MLDoc and Chinese on Amazon indicate that meta-learning is most advantageous when the considered task distribution is somewhat heterogeneous or, in other words, when *domain drift* (Lai et al., 2019) is present. For the Chinese data used for the sentiment polarity task, the presence of domain drift is obvious as the data is collected from a different website and concerns different products than the other languages. For Russian in the MLDoc dataset, it holds that the non-episodic baseline has the smallest gain in performance when adding English data (l_{src}) in the limited-resource setting (0.2% absolute gain as

[3]The zero-shot baseline is only applicable in the 'Included' setting, as the English data is not available under 'Excluded'.

l_{src} = en	Method	Amazon					MLDoc						
		de	fr	ja	zh	Δ	de	fr	it	ja	ru	zh	Δ
Excluded	Non-episodic	88.4	88.6	85.7	88.2	87.7	92.8	89.1	81.2	83.2	**84.0**	87.4	86.3
	ProtoNet	86.7	88.0	86.2	87.3	87.1	89.7	87.6	80.5	82.2	80.6	85.2	84.3
	foMAML	88.3	87.5	84.6	**89.1**	86.3	94.1	**89.7**	**81.5**	84.2	77.6	87.5	85.8
	foProtoMAMLn	**88.9**	**89.5**	**86.5**	89.0	**88.5**	**94.8**	89.5	**81.5**	**84.8**	81.0	**88.7**	**86.6**
	Reptile	86.1	86.3	82.9	87.0	85.6	92.4	88.2	80.5	82.5	79.5	87.8	85.3
Included	Non-episodic	**91.0**	91.0	87.3	89.4	89.8	94.9	92.1	84.7	84.8	83.7	**91.4**	88.6
	ProtoNet	90.3	91.3	87.5	88.7	89.5	95.5	91.7	83.4	85.1	82.8	88.3	87.8
	foMAML	90.1	90.7	87.2	89.5	89.4	95.1	92.5	83.1	84.9	84.3	90.6	88.4
	foProtoMAMLn	90.7	**91.5**	**88.0**	**90.4**	**90.2**	**96.0**	**93.6**	**85.0**	**85.7**	**84.8**	90.8	**89.3**
	Reptile	90.0	89.5	86.5	87.6	88.4	94.4	93.1	83.8	85.2	83.6	90.4	88.4

Table 4: Average accuracy of 5 different seeds on the target languages in the joint-training setting for MLDoc and Amazon. Δ corresponds to the average accuracy across test languages.

opposed to 5.7% on average for the remaining languages) and even a decrease of 2.4% points when adding English data in the high-resource setting. Especially for these languages with domain drift, our version of ProtoMAML (foProtoMAMLn) outperforms the non-episodic baselines with a relatively large margin. For instance, in Table 2 in the high-resource setting with English included during training, foProtoMAMLn improves over the non-episodic baseline with 9.1% points whereas the average gain over the remaining languages is 0.9% points. A similar trend can be seen in Table 3 where, in the limited-resource setting, foProtoMAMLn outperforms the non-episodic baseline with 1.9% points on Chinese, with comparatively smaller gains on average for the remaining languages.

Joint training In this setting, we achieve a new state of the art on MLDoc for German, Italian, Japanese and Russian using our method, foProtoMAMLn (Table 4).[4] The previous state of the art for German and Russian is held by Lai et al. (2019) (95.73% and 84.65% respectively). For Japanese and Italian, it is held by Eisenschlos et al. (2019) (80.55% and 80.12% respectively). The state of the art for French and Chinese is also held by Lai et al. (2019) (96.05% and 93.32% respectively). On the Amazon dataset, foProtoMAMLn also outperforms all other methods on average. The state of the art is held by (2019) with 93.3%, 94.2% and 90.6% for French, German and Chinese respectively and, although we do not outperform it, the differences are rather small – between 0.2% (Chinese) and 3.4% points (German) – even when grid search is based on MLDoc, while we use a much less computationally expensive approach.




Figure 1: Validation accuracy for 3 seeds for original foProtoMAML and our new method, foProtoMAMLn.

Again, we use Russian in MLDoc to exemplify the difference between meta-learning and standard supervised learning. When comparing the difference in performance between excluding and including English meta-training episodes (l_{src}), opposite trends are noticeable: for standard supervised, non-episodic learning, performance drops slightly by 0.3%, whereas all meta-learning algorithms gain between 2.2% and 6.7% in absolute accuracy. This confirms our earlier finding that meta-learning benefits from, and usefully exploits heterogeneity in data distributions; in contrast, this harms performance in the standard supervised-learning case.

7 Ablations

foProtoMAMLn Figure 1 shows the development of the validation accuracy during training for 25 epochs for the original foProtoMAML and our model, foProtoMAMLn. By applying L_2 normalization to the prototypes, we obtain a more stable version of foProtoMAML which empirically converges faster. We furthermore re-run the high-

[4]The zero-shot baselines are the same as in Tables 2 and 3.

Dataset	de	fr	it	ja	ru	zh	Diff
Amazon	90.4	90.9	-	87.3	-	88.3	-1.7
MLDoc	92.8	92.4	78.6	79.3	69.3	88.9	-4.3

Table 5: Average accuracy of 5 different seeds on unseen target languages using the original/unnormalized foProtoMAML model. *Diff* is the difference in average accuracy Δ across languages against foProtoMAMLn.

Method	Limited-resource setting					High-resource setting				
	de	fr	ja	zh	Diff	de	fr	ja	zh	Diff
ProtoNet	91.1	90.9	87.1	85.5	+0.75	91.3	91.1	87.4	88.7	+1.44
foMAML	90.8	87.4	87.3	85.2	-0.75	91.7	91.2	87.2	88.1	-1.13
foProtoMAMLn	87.7	87.8	83.9	84.4	-3.1	90.8	89.8	86.2	82.3	-3.96
Reptile	89.3	90.2	86.7	85.5	+0.35	90.0	89.3	87.1	85.7	-1.04

Table 6: Average accuracy of 5 different seeds on unseen target languages for Amazon when initializing from monolingual classifier in l_{src}. *Diff*: difference in average accuracy Δ across languages compared to initializing from the XLM-RoBERTa language model.

resource experiments with English for both MLDoc and Amazon using the original foProtoMAML (Table 5) and find it performs 4.3% and 1.7% accuracy points worse on average, respectively, further demonstrating the effectiveness of our approach.

Initializing from a monolingual classifier In our experiments, we often assume the presence of a source language (English). We now investigate (in the l_{src} = en 'Excluded' setting) whether it is beneficial to pre-train the base-learner in a standard supervised way on this source language and use the obtained checkpoint θ_{mono} as an initialization for meta-training (Table 6) rather than initializing from the transformer checkpoint.

We observe that only ProtoNet consistently improves performance, whereas foProtoMAMLn suffers the most with a decrease of 3.1% and 3.96% in accuracy in the low- and high-resource setting respectively. We surmise this difference is attributable to two factors. Intuitively, the monolingual classifier aims to learn a transformation from the input space to the final feature space, from which the prototypes for ProtoNet and ProtoMAML are created, in which the learned classes are encoded in their own disjoint sub-spaces such that a linear combination of these features can be used to correctly classify instances. ProtoNet aims to learn a similar transformation, but uses a Nearest Neighbours approach to classify instances instead. ProtoMAML on the other hand benefits the most from prototypes which can be used to classify instances *after* the inner-loop updates have been performed. This, in combination with the fact that the first-order approximation of ProtoMAML cannot differentiate through the creation of the prototypes, could explain the difference in performance gain with respect to ProtoNet.

8 Conclusion

We proposed a meta-learning framework for few-shot cross- and multilingual joint-learning for document classification tasks in different domains. We demonstrated that it leads to consistent gains over traditional supervised learning on a wide array of data availability and diversity settings, and showed that it thrives in settings with a heterogenous task distribution. We presented an effective adaptation to ProtoMAML and, among others, obtained a new state of the art on German, Italian, Japanese and Russian in the few-shot setting on MLDoc.

9 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Deloitte Risk Advisory B.V., the Netherlands.

References

Antreas Antoniou, Harrison Edwards, and Amos Storkey. 2018. How to train your maml. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09502*.

Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019. Massively multilingual sentence embeddings for zero-shot cross-lingual transfer and beyond. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:597–610.

Trapit Bansal, Rishikesh Jha, and Andrew McCallum. 2019. Learning to few-shot learn across diverse natural language classification tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03863*.

Yoshua Bengio, Samy Bengio, and Jocelyn Cloutier. 1990. *Learning a synaptic learning rule*. Citeseer.

Mingyang Chen, Wen Zhang, Wei Zhang, Qiang Chen, and Huajun Chen. 2019. Meta relational learning for few-shot link prediction in knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4217–4226, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02116*.

Alexis Conneau, Guillaume Lample, Ruty Rinott, Adina Williams, Samuel R Bowman, Holger Schwenk, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2018. Xnli: Evaluating cross-lingual sentence representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.05053*.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.

Zi-Yi Dou, Keyi Yu, and Antonios Anastasopoulos. 2019. Investigating meta-learning algorithms for low-resource natural language understanding tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10423*.

Julian Eisenschlos, Sebastian Ruder, Piotr Czapla, Marcin Kardas, Sylvain Gugger, and Jeremy Howard. 2019. Multifit: Efficient multi-lingual language model fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04761*.

Manaal Faruqui, Jesse Dodge, Sujay K Jauhar, Chris Dyer, Eduard Hovy, and Noah A Smith. 2014. Retrofitting word vectors to semantic lexicons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4166*.

Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 1126–1135. JMLR. org.

Jiatao Gu, Yong Wang, Yun Chen, Kyunghyun Cho, and Victor OK Li. 2018. Meta-learning for low-resource neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08437*.

Niels van der Heijden, Samira Abnar, and Ekaterina Shutova. 2019. A comparison of architectures and pretraining methods for contextualized multilingual word embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.10169*.

Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.

Gregory Koch, Richard Zemel, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2015. Siamese neural networks for one-shot image recognition. In *ICML deep learning workshop*, volume 2. Lille.

Guokun Lai, Barlas Oguz, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Bridging the domain gap in cross-lingual document classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.07009*.

Guillaume Lample and Alexis Conneau. 2019. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07291*.

Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc'Aurelio Ranzato. 2017. Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00043*.

David D Lewis, Yiming Yang, Tony G Rose, and Fan Li. 2004. Rcv1: A new benchmark collection for text categorization research. *Journal of machine learning research*, 5(Apr):361–397.

Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oğuz, Ruty Rinott, Sebastian Riedel, and Holger Schwenk. 2019. Mlqa: Evaluating cross-lingual extractive question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07475*.

Liyuan Liu, Haoming Jiang, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Jiawei Han. 2019. On the variance of the adaptive learning rate and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03265*.

Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2016. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983*.

Tomas Mikolov, Quoc V Le, and Ilya Sutskever. 2013a. Exploiting similarities among languages for machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.4168*.

Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013b. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3111–3119.

Alex Nichol, Joshua Achiam, and John Schulman. 2018. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*.

Farhad Nooralahzadeh, Giannis Bekoulis, Johannes Bjerva, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2020. Zero-shot cross-lingual transfer with meta learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02739*.

Abiola Obamuyide and Andreas Vlachos. 2019a. Meta-learning improves lifelong relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (RepL4NLP-2019)*, pages

224–229, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Abiola Obamuyide and Andreas Vlachos. 2019b. Model-agnostic meta-learning for relation classification with limited supervision. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5873–5879, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. 2017. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. In *NIPS 2017 Workshop Autodiff Submission*.

Peter Prettenhofer and Benno Stein. 2010. Cross-language text classification using structural correspondence learning. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1118–1127, Uppsala, Sweden. Association for Computationprettenhoferal Linguistics.

Sachin Ravi and Hugo Larochelle. 2017. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Jurgen Schmidhuber. 1987. Evolutionary principles in self-referential learning. *On learning how to learn: The meta-meta-... hook.) Diploma thesis, Institut f. Informatik, Tech. Univ. Munich*, 1(2).

Holger Schwenk and Xian Li. 2018. A corpus for multilingual document classification in eight languages. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Paris, France. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard Zemel. 2017. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 4077–4087.

Sebastian Thrun and Lorien Pratt. 1998. Learning to learn: Introduction and overview. In *Learning to learn*, pages 3–17. Springer.

Eleni Triantafillou, Tyler Zhu, Vincent Dumoulin, Pascal Lamblin, Utku Evci, Kelvin Xu, Ross Goroshin, Carles Gelada, Kevin Swersky, Pierre-Antoine Manzagol, and Hugo Larochelle. 2020. Meta-dataset: A dataset of datasets for learning to learn from few examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Yan Wang, Wei-Lun Chao, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Laurens van der Maaten. 2019. Simpleshot: Revisiting nearest-neighbor classification for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.04623*.

Qizhe Xie, Zihang Dai, Eduard Hovy, Minh-Thang Luong, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Unsupervised data augmentation for consistency training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12848*.

Hongwei Yong, Jianqiang Huang, Xiansheng Hua, and Lei Zhang. 2020. Gradient centralization: A new optimization technique for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01461*.

Michael Zhang, James Lucas, Jimmy Ba, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2019. Lookahead optimizer: k steps forward, 1 step back. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9597–9608.

Yongfeng Zhang, Min Zhang, Yi Zhang, Guokun Lai, Yiqun Liu, Honghui Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2015. Daily-aware personalized recommendation based on feature-level time series analysis. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1373–1383.