

# OpenMSD: Towards Multilingual Scientific Documents Similarity Measurement

Yang Gao<sup>◇</sup>, Ji Ma<sup>◇</sup>, Ivan Korotkov<sup>◇</sup>, Keith Hall<sup>†</sup>, Dana Alon<sup>◇</sup> and Don Metzler<sup>◇</sup>

<sup>◇</sup>Google Research, <sup>†</sup>Sizzle AI

{gaostayyang, maji, ivankr, danama, metzler}@google.com  
khallobobo@gmail.com

## Abstract

We develop and evaluate multilingual *scientific documents similarity measurement* models in this work. Such models can be used to find related works in different languages, which can help multilingual researchers find and explore papers more efficiently. We propose the first multilingual scientific documents dataset, *Open-access Multilingual Scientific Documents* (OpenMSD), which has 74M papers in 103 languages and 778M citation pairs. With OpenMSD, we pretrain science-specialized language models, and explore different strategies to derive “related” paper pairs to fine-tune the models, including using a mixture of *citation*, *co-citation*, and *bibliographic-coupling* pairs. To further improve the models’ performance for non-English papers, we explore the use of *generative language models* to enrich the non-English papers with English summaries. This allows us to leverage the models’ English capabilities to create better representations for non-English papers. Our best model significantly outperforms strong baselines by 7-16% (in mean average precision).

## 1 Introduction

Although English is the predominant language in scientific publications (Liu, 2017), *diversity and internationalization* in the scientific community has attracted more attention in recent years (Uzuner, 2008; Márquez and Porras, 2020). Over 75% of researchers use English as a foreign language (Baskaran, 2016), and they often need to search related papers in both their native languages and in English. Think tanks and decision-making agencies also need to find related works in different languages on the same topic, e.g., natural resource management and biodiversity studies, to ensure their analyses and decisions are unbiased and consider all affected countries (Steigerwald

et al., 2022). As the volume of non-English papers has rapidly grown since 2000, steadily accounting for 5-10% of all scientific publications (Fortunato et al., 2018; Bornmann et al., 2021; Moskaleva and Aкоеv, 2019), the scientific community has an ever stronger need for multilingual *scientific documents similarity measurement* (SDSM) models, so as to help researchers find, discover, and explore scientific publications in different languages more efficiently. This paper focuses on the development and evaluation of multilingual SDSM models.

The state-of-the-art SDSM models, e.g. (Cohan et al., 2020; Ostendorff et al., 2022; Mysore et al., 2022), use Transformer-based (Vaswani et al., 2017) text encoders to create dense representations for the papers. Starting from a *pretrained science-specialized language model* (e.g., SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019)), they fine-tune a *dual encoder model* (Gillick et al., 2018) with *contrastive learning objectives* (Chopra et al., 2005; Wu et al., 2018), by using “related” and “unrelated” pairs of papers derived from citation-based heuristics or *graph embedding* algorithms (Perozzi et al., 2014; Lerer et al., 2019). These models show promising performance on several SDSM tasks, e.g., citation prediction and paper recommendation. However, all of these SDSM models were trained with English data (e.g., the S2ORC (Lo et al., 2020) dataset) and hence only work for English papers.

We identify three main challenges to develop multilingual SDSM models. **(i)** There are no multilingual scientific documents datasets to train and evaluate multilingual SDSM models. **(ii)** There are no science-specialized multilingual language models. **(iii)** As the citation graphs’ structures for English and multilingual papers are very different (e.g., non-English papers have much fewer citation links than English papers, see (Di Bitetti and Ferreras, 2017) and Table 1), it is unclear whether the “related” and “unrelated” pairs extracted by the existing methods are still effective for training

	#Papers	
	• w/ abstracts	74M
	• w/ citations	53M
Papers	• w/ full content	38M
(74M)	• in English	65M
	#Abstract avg tokens	288
	#Content avg tokens	5448
	#Total tokens	228B
	#Languages	103
	#Categories	340
Citation	#En→En	759M
Pairs	#En→nonEn	6M
(778M)	#nonEn→En	11M
	#nonEn→nonEn	2.5M

Table 1: Key statistics of the OpenMSD dataset.

multilingual SDSM models.

In this paper, we propose both data and novel methods for the *multilingual SDSM* problem. For data, we build the *Open-access Multilingual Scientific Documents* (OpenMSD) dataset, which has 74M papers and 778M citations. Key statistics of OpenMSD are presented in Table 1. Three SDSM tasks – *citation*, *co-citation* (Small, 1973), and *bibliographic-coupling* (Kessler, 1963) prediction – are derived from OpenMSD. To the best of our knowledge, OpenMSD is the first multilingual scientific documents and citation relations dataset. Scripts for reconstructing the OpenMSD dataset are available at <https://github.com/google-research/google-research/tree/master/OpenMSD>.<sup>1</sup>

To develop multilingual SDSM models, we make explorations on three directions. **(i)** Since there are no science-specialized multilingual language models, we systematically explore different training objectives and data sources for developing such models, and benchmark their performance on multilingual SDSM tasks. **(ii)** We systematically investigate the effectiveness and limitations of the latest SDSM models, e.g., Specter (Cohan et al., 2020) and SciNCL (Ostendorff et al., 2022), in the multilingual setup, and propose new methods to enhance their performance, e.g., use a mixture of different citation-based heuristics to create training examples. **(iii)** To further improve the performance for non-English papers, we propose to use generative language models to create English summaries for non-English papers, and concatenate

<sup>1</sup>We did not directly release the dataset due to copyright and license restrictions.

the summaries to the original (non-English) text, so as to leverage the model’s English capabilities to create better representations for non-English papers. Our best models significantly outperform strong baselines (SOTA SDSM models on translated text) by 7-16% (in mean average precision).

## 2 Related Works

**Scientific documents dataset.** Several scientific documents datasets have been compiled with open-access papers. The *arXiv Dataset* (arXiv.org, 2023) contains the metadata and PDFs of 1.7M papers, and the *PMC Open Access Subset* (Bethesda, 2003) contains the full contents of 8M papers from PubMed. Papers on the *ACL Anthology*<sup>2</sup> have also been used to build datasets, e.g., the *ANN dataset* (Radev et al., 2009) with 14K papers and 55K citations, the *ACL ACR dataset* (Bird et al., 2008) with 11K papers, and the upcoming *ACL 60-60 dataset* (Diab and Yifru, 2022), which will provide machine translation of 10K paper titles and abstracts randomly selected from the ACL Anthology from 2017-2021, and all the titles and abstracts from ACL 2022 (1.3K) into 60 languages. The Allen AI Institute has published the *S2ORC* dataset (Lo et al., 2020) with 81M papers, the *Sci-Docs* dataset (Cohan et al., 2020) with over 120K papers and several categories of scientific tasks (classification, SDSM, recommendation), and the *S2AG API* (Kinney et al., 2023), which allows registered users to get access to the metadata (e.g., title, authors, abstract, but no full content) of 206M papers and their citations (2.5B). However, these datasets either lack citations (the PubMed- and arXiv-based datasets), or only include English papers (the other mentioned datasets).

OpenMSD is the first dataset with both multilingual papers and their citations. Compared to *S2ORC*, OpenMSD has a comparable number of papers (74M in OpenMSD vs 81M in *S2ORC*) but 3x more full-content papers (38M in OpenMSD vs 12M in *S2ORC*) and 2x more citation pairs (759M in OpenMSD vs 381M in *S2ORC*).

**Multilingual Language Models.** With the huge success of Transformer-based (Vaswani et al., 2017) language models for English tasks, a number of multilingual variants have also been proposed. They mostly follow the same recipe (e.g., architecture, learning objectives, etc.) as their

<sup>2</sup><https://aclanthology.org/>

original English versions, but are pretrained with multilingual texts. Widely used models include encoder-only models like mBERT (Devlin et al., 2019), XLM-R (Conneau et al., 2020) and mDeBERTa (He et al., 2021), encoder-decoder models like mT5 (Xue et al., 2021) and mBART (Tang et al., 2020), and decoder-only models like XGLM (Lin et al., 2021) and BLOOM (Scao et al., 2022). These models are benchmarked on multilingual datasets like XTREME (Hu et al., 2020) and SuperGLUE (Wang et al., 2019), which include a wide range of tasks like named entity recognition, natural language inference, and question answering. Some of them have also been fine-tuned to tackle downstream science-related tasks, e.g., multilingual acronym extraction in scientific papers (Veyseh et al., 2022), and multilingual bias evaluation in social science papers (Talat et al., 2022). However, there are no pretrained multilingual language models specialized for scientific documents, and there are no datasets to benchmark their performance on multilingual SDSM tasks.

**SDSM models.** A classic method to measure the similarity and relatedness between papers is *citation analysis* (Zunde, 1971; Nicolaisen, 2007). Based on the citation links between papers, heuristics have been developed, e.g., *co-citation* (two papers both cited by some common papers (Small, 1973)), and *bibliographic-coupling* (two papers both cite some common papers (Kessler, 1963)) to find related papers. However, these methods do not work well for papers with sparse citation links, e.g., papers that are newly published, in less-studied topics, or in non-English languages.

Neural-based SDSM methods use different strategies to derive “related” and “unrelated” pairs from the citation relations, and use them to fine-tune science-specialized language models, e.g., SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019). For example, in the Specter (Cohan et al., 2020) method, if paper A cites paper B, B cites C but A does not cite C, then (A, B) is used as a positive pair while (A, C) is used as a negative pair. Ostendorff et al. (2022) proposed the *Scientific documents Neighborhood Contrastive Learning* (SciNCL) method, which learns *graph embeddings* (Lerer et al., 2019) from S2ORC’s citation network; with the learned embeddings, they can measure the distance between papers on the citation graph, and hence derive “related” and “unrelated” papers. Mysore et al. (2022) proposed the *Aspire* method, which con-

siders the papers that are co-cited in the same sentence as positive pairs, because close proximity provides a more precise indication of the relatedness of the papers. Furthermore, as the citing sentences typically describe how the co-cited papers are related, they use the citing sentences as an additional signal to guide the model to learn on which aspects the papers are related. However, *Aspire* requires tools to parse the citations in papers content, which are unavailable for multilingual scientific documents. Also, all these methods are designed for English SDSM; it remains unclear whether they can be used to train multilingual SDSM models.

### 3 The OpenMSD Dataset

**Data sources.** The scientific documents in OpenMSD are extracted from two open-access data sources: the 202203 version of *Unpaywall snapshot*<sup>3</sup> (with 140M data entries) and the 2022 April snapshot of the *CrossRef Metadata* (Crossref, 2022) (with 134M data entries). Each data entry includes the title, Digital Object Identifier (DOI), URLs and some additional meta information for a scientific publication. 130 million papers occur in both data sources, by matching DOIs. We scrape and clean the contents from the URLs, and remove the papers for which no text is scraped; 74M papers are retained, among which 38M have full content. Citation relations in OpenMSD are extracted from the 2022 October snapshot of the *OpenCitations* dataset (Peroni and Shotton, 2020). It has 1.4 billion unique citation pairs, each pair identified by the DOIs of its citing and cited paper. 96% of the DOIs appear in OpenCitations can be found in Unpaywall or CrossRef. We only keep paper pairs that have both the citing and cited papers’ abstract extracted (as papers without abstracts cannot be used to train SDSM models; see §5), obtaining 778M citation pairs in the end.

**Languages & Categories.** We use *cld3*<sup>4</sup> to detect the languages from papers’ titles and abstracts. 103 languages were found, with English (65M) being the predominant language. Fig. 1 shows the sizes of the top 20 languages. Papers’ category labels are extracted from CrossRef; 76% papers have category labels, with each paper

<sup>3</sup><https://unpaywall.org/products/snapshot>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/google/cld3>.




Figure 1: Top 20 languages in OpenMSD.




Figure 2: Top 20 categories in OpenMSD.

having 1.4 category labels on average. 340 categories are found in total, and the size of the top 20 categories are presented in Fig. 2.

We note that OpenMSD is dominated by English resources, which account for 88% papers and 98% of citation pairs (see Table 1). A common strategy to mitigate the data imbalance is to down-sample the English papers (Conneau et al., 2020), but it only works well in very large datasets like *mC4* (Xue et al., 2021), with 6.6B pages and 6.3T tokens). Recent works, e.g., (Wang et al., 2022b), even suggest that the English-predominance in the training set does not necessarily hurt the multilingual performance, because fine-tuning multilingual models only with English data can yield strong performance on multilingual tasks. For these reasons, we do not perform any down-sampling over the English resources in OpenMSD. Also, as scientific papers share many common characteristics regardless of their categories, we do not manipulate the category distributions in OpenMSD.

**Data split.** To use OpenMSD to develop and evaluate multilingual SDSM models, we first remove all papers that do not have citation links with any other papers, as we cannot find their “related” papers; this leaves us with 53M papers in 65 languages. To split these papers into train and test sets, a simple strategy is to randomly sample papers with a predefined ratio (e.g., 10000:1). However, the test set built with this strategy will be dominated by English papers and citations (see Table 1) and hence can hardly be used to evaluate models’ performance for non-English papers. Also, the *variance* of the evaluation results on such test sets will be high, because some small languages only have a few examples in the test set. Furthermore, such test sets cannot be used to evaluate how well the multilingual models can generalize to unseen languages, because most languages will appear in both train and test.

To tackle the aforementioned problems, we split the data into train, *in-distribution test* (IDT), and *out-of-distribution test* (ODT) sets. To create the train and IDT sets, we sample papers in the top-30 languages according to their distributions in the papers pool, and ensure that train and IDT has the same set of languages. The remaining papers in the top-30 languages, together with the all the papers in the other (35) languages (around 5.5K), are used to build the ODT. In addition, to avoid English-predominance in the ODT set, for English papers, we only keep those that are citing or cited by some non-English papers in the ODT set. The final train, IDT, and ODT sets have 53M, 247K and 85K papers, respectively. The languages in each split are presented in Table 2. With this split strategy, IDT can be used to evaluate the performance of multilingual models in a more “realistic” setup (as its language distribution is close to the real language distribution of the scientific documents), while ODT can be used to benchmark the models’ performance for papers in non-English and unseen languages.

With the data splits, we derive three types of related paper pairs in each data split: *direct citations* (DC), *co-citations* (CC) and *bibliographic-coupling* (BC) (see §2 for definitions). These relations are widely used in citation analysis (Nicolaisen, 2007) as indicators for related documents. We remove pairs between papers across different splits to avoid data leakage. Also, we remove all English to English pairs in ODT, to make sure that



Split	Languages
Train (53M) & IDT (247K)	En, De, Fr, Ja, Es, Pt, Tr, Ru, Id, It, Nl, Pl, Uk, Ko, Nn, Zh, Cs, Hu, Lt, Da, Sv, Hr, Af, Ms, Vi, Sl, Fi, Ro, Ar, Gl,
ODT (85K)	En, Sr, De, Fr, He, Es, Pt, Ja, Fa, Ca, Lv, Tr, La, Sk, Su, Zh, Ru, It, Eu, Pl, Nl, Id, Et, Ko, Cs, Bg, Hu, Sq, Is, No, Hi, Uk, Tl, Az, Af, Lt, Bs, Hr, Ms, Sv, Be, Da, Eo, Mi, Oc, Vi, Cy, Fi, Ia, Kk, Ku, Mk, Ro, Sl, Gl, Ga, Aa, Co, Fo, Ka, El, Ky, Sw, Th, Uz

Table 2: Languages (ISO 639-1 code) in different splits of OpenMSD, ordered by their sizes in each split.

		Train	IDT	ODT
DC	#En→En	759M	229K	0
	#En→nonEn	6M	2K	3K
	#nonEn→En	11M	2K	6K
	#nonEn→nonEn	3M	2K	3K
CC	#En↔En	12B	117K	0
	#En↔nonEn	208M	2K	1K
	#nonEn↔nonEn	21M	0.4K	1K
BC	#En↔En	63B	1M	0
	#En↔nonEn	1B	11K	7K
	#nonEn↔nonEn	29M	0.4K	1K

Table 3: Sizes of direct citation (DC), co-citation (CC) and bibliographic-coupling (BC) pairs in each data split. DC is a directed relation (denoted by  $\rightarrow$ ), while CC/BC are non-directional relations (denoted by  $\leftrightarrow$ ).

ODT is focused on pairs involving non-English papers. The numbers of mono-lingual and cross-lingual pairs of each relation type and in each data split are presented in Table 3.

We note that finding the related papers in IDT and ODT is much more challenging than in existing datasets like SciDocs (Cohan et al., 2020) (see §2). In SciDocs’ SDSM tasks (cite, co-cite, co-view and co-read), papers are segmented into small groups, each with an anchor paper, five related papers to the anchor, and 25 randomly sampled papers; at evaluation time, models need to find the related papers for the anchor just from its group. But in IDT/ODT, papers are not segmented into groups; hence, for each paper, the models need to find its related papers from the whole paper pool (247K papers for IDT and 85K papers for ODT). We believe the setup used in IDT/ODT can better reflect the real use cases.

## 4 Pretraining Multilingual Science-Specialized Language Models

In this section, we develop science-specialized language models, which can be used as starting points to fine-tune multilingual SDSM models. We use *mT5* (Xue et al., 2021) as the baseline and our initial checkpoint, as it is one of the SOTA multilingual language models and its encoder can be easily used in the SDSM task. *mT5* is pre-trained on the *mC4* dataset with the *corrupted span recovery* (CSR) objective. In CSR, consecutive spans of input tokens are replaced with a mask token and the model is trained to reconstruct the masked-out tokens. We use *mT5*-base because the same size of SciBERT is used in existing SDSM models (Cohan et al., 2020; Ostendorff et al., 2022).

**Further Pretraining.** As our target task is SDSM, we aim to develop multilingual language models optimized for SDSM. Hence, besides CSR, we also consider the *contrastive loss* (CL) with sampled in-batch negative (Henderson et al., 2017). CL encourages the model to push the positive examples closer and the negative examples apart. Formally, let  $\{(p_i, q_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be a training batch with size  $n$ , where  $(p_i, q_i)$  is the  $i$ th pair of related documents; CL is then defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{CL}(\theta) = \frac{-\exp[(f_\theta(p_i) \cdot f_\theta(q_i))/\tau]}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp[(f_\theta(p_i) \cdot f_\theta(q_j))/\tau]}, \quad (1)$$

where  $f$  is a neural encoder parameterized by  $\theta$ , ‘ $\cdot$ ’ denotes vector dot-product, and  $\tau$  is the softmax temperature. CL has shown strong performance in both pretraining (Lee et al., 2019) and fine-tuning (Giorgi et al., 2021; Izacard et al., 2022) dense representation models. To construct the training example pairs  $(p_i, q_i)$ , we randomly extract snippets from the abstracts and contents of all the documents in the train set, and the length of each snippet is between 10 and 256 *mT5*-sentence-piece tokens. Snippets extracted from the same document are treated as positive example pairs. We apply average-pooling to the output of the top transformer layer to get the document representation.

With the two learning objectives (CSR and CL) and two available datasets (*mC4* and OpenMSD), we consider four setups to further pretrain *mT5*, as summarized in Table 4. We use the same hyper-parameters as in *mT5*: the initial learning rate is 0.001 and decayed using the inverse square-root

Name	InitCkpt	Obj.	Data	Notes
mT5	Random	CSR	mC4	Vanilla mT5
mT5CL	mT5	CL	mC4	mT5 optimized for generic text similarity measurement
mT5Sci	mT5	CSR	OM	mT5 optimized for scientific texts
mT5SCL	mT5	CL	OM	mT5 optimized for scientific similarity measurement
mT5CL2	mT5CL	CL	OM	Further pretrain mT5CL with scientific documents

Table 4: Comparing mT5 and its further pretrained models. *OM* stands for OpenMSD.

strategy, the batch size is 1K, the temperature  $\tau$  is 1, and the models are trained with 1M steps. 0.1% of the training data are randomly sampled and left out as the dev set; the checkpoints with the best performance on the dev set are used as the final models. All our experiments are performed on a cloud machine with eight TPUv3s.

**Results.** We compare the mT5-based models against SciBERT-base (Beltagy et al., 2019). To use SciBERT on multilingual papers, we translate the non-English papers’ titles and abstracts to English with the Google Translate API<sup>5</sup>, and use SciBERT to encode the translated text. In line with (Cohan et al., 2020; Ostendorff et al., 2022), we use the title and abstract of each document as input to the pretrained models, and measure the performance of the models by their mean average precision (MAP) and nDCG@10.

Results on the OpenMSD’s IDT and ODT sets are presented in the top blocks in Table 5 and 6, respectively.<sup>6</sup> First, we find that vanilla mT5 outperforms SciBERT, and we believe it is mainly because mT5 is trained with more data: SciBERT was pretrained with 3.17B tokens, while mT5 was pretrained with 6.3T tokens. Second, all further pretrained mT5-based models outperform the vanilla mT5, suggesting that all the considered data-objective combinations can benefit mT5’s performance on the downstream SDSM tasks. Third, we find that the CL objective only works well with large data; this is reflected by the large performance boost from mT5 to mT5CL

<sup>5</sup><https://cloud.google.com/translate>.

<sup>6</sup>We also test all models on SciDocs; the results are presented in Table 8 in Appendix A.

(which uses the large mC4 data) and the relatively small improvement from mT5 to mT5SCL (which uses the smaller OpenMSD data). The improvement from mT5CL to mT5CL2 is mostly negligible, which also suggests that the model fails to learn much from the second round of CL training with the (relatively small) OpenMSD data. Given that said, mT5CL2 is still the model with the best average performance, and hence we will use it as the initial checkpoint to fine-tune our SDSM models in the remainder of the paper,

## 5 Multilingual Specter Models

Specter (Cohan et al., 2020) is the first Transformer-based method specialized for English scientific NLP tasks, including SDSM. It uses the *triplet hinge loss* to fine-tune SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019). Formally, given a triplet  $(p_i, q_i^+, q_i^-)$ , where  $p_i$  is the anchor paper,  $q_i^+$  the positive example to the anchor, and  $q_i^-$  the negative example, the loss function is

$$\mathcal{L}_{TL}(\theta) = \max\{0, [\text{sim}(f_\theta(p_i), f_\theta(q_i^-)) - \text{sim}(f_\theta(p_i), f_\theta(q_i^+)) + m]\}, \quad (2)$$

where the hyper-parameter  $m$  denotes the margin, and the training examples are derived with citation-based heuristics (see §2).

To get multilingual SDSM models, we use the Specter strategy to fine-tune mT5CL2 (see §4). To further improve its performance, instead of only using direct citations (DCs) to extract positive pairs, we explore using co-citations (CCs) and bibliographic-couples (BCs) in addition to DCs.

- **Use the union of DC, CC, and BC pairs.** For example, we can use both DC and CC pairs as positives, denoted as  $DC \cup CC$ . Because in the train set, the number of CC/BC pairs is much larger than DC (see Table 3), we down-sample the over-represented relations so as to have the same number of pairs from each relation type.
- **Use the intersection of DC, CC, and BC pairs.** Suppose a paper A cites paper B and they are both cited by another paper C, then (A, B) is both a DC and CC pair. Pairs fall into more than one relation types at the same time may have higher similarity level, compared to the pairs that only fall into one type of relation. We consider all (four) possible intersection combinations of the relation pairs

Method	Citation		Co-citation		Bib-couple		Average	
	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG
<b>Pretrained Language Models</b>								
SciBERT w/ translate	0.81	1.13	0.42	0.90	0.44	1.38	0.56	1.14
mT5	0.95	1.32	0.47	1.01	0.47	1.47	0.63	1.27
mT5Sci	1.41	1.93	0.71	1.48	0.66	2.01	0.93	1.81
mT5SCL	1.35	1.86	0.62	1.33	0.62	1.92	0.86	1.70
mT5CL	10.11	13.28	<b>4.26</b>	<b>7.82</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>5.97</b>	9.83
mT5CL2	<b>10.24</b>	<b>13.38</b>	4.20	7.78	3.48	8.37	<b>5.97</b>	<b>9.84</b>
<b>SOTA Baselines</b>								
(Cohan et al., 2020) w/ translation	<b>17.87</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>7.16</b>	<b>12.23</b>	<b>6.15</b>	<b>12.30</b>	<b>10.39</b>	<b>15.76</b>
(Ostendorff et al., 2022) w/ translation	10.33	13.58	4.41	8.04	3.64	8.42	6.13	10.01
<b>Multilingual Specter (mSpt)</b>								
mSpt <sub>DC</sub>	18.52	23.51	7.38	12.52	6.23	12.41	10.71	16.15
mSpt <sub>CC</sub>	16.83	21.48	7.19	12.05	5.91	11.57	9.98	15.03
mSpt <sub>BC</sub>	13.05	16.99	5.49	9.61	4.97	10.27	7.84	12.29
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>CC</sub>	<b>19.06</b>	<b>24.15</b>	<b>7.67</b>	<b>12.81</b>	<b>6.38</b>	<b>12.44</b>	<b>11.04</b>	<b>16.47</b>
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>BC</sub>	18.70	23.73	7.29	12.34	6.16	12.14	10.72	16.07
mSpt <sub>CC<math>\cup</math>BC</sub>	15.38	19.74	6.69	11.35	5.54	11.10	9.20	14.06
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>CC<math>\cup</math>BC</sub>	17.77	22.61	7.24	12.21	6.07	11.94	10.36	15.59
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cap</math>CC</sub>	18.73	23.77	7.28	12.41	6.02	12.31	10.68	16.10
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cap</math>BC</sub>	18.67	23.73	7.20	12.27	6.08	12.18	10.65	16.06
mSpt <sub>CC<math>\cap</math>BC</sub>	17.30	22.07	7.17	12.13	6.14	11.99	10.20	15.40
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cap</math>CC<math>\cap</math>BC</sub>	18.62	23.66	7.25	12.39	6.06	12.15	10.64	16.07
<b>mSpt + Enriched Documents</b>								
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>CC</sub> + TopNSumm <sub>64</sub>	19.03	24.13	7.47	12.53	6.33	12.33	10.94	16.33
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>CC</sub> + PaLM2Summ <sub>64</sub>	19.08	24.19	7.64	12.82	<b>6.39</b>	12.43	11.04	16.48
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>CC</sub> + TopNSumm <sub>128</sub>	19.09	24.21	7.67	12.88	6.38	12.44	11.05	16.51
mSpt <sub>DC<math>\cup</math>CC</sub> + PaLM2Summ <sub>128</sub>	<b>19.22</b>	<b>24.38</b>	<b>7.70</b>	<b>12.92</b>	6.38	<b>12.45</b>	<b>11.10</b>	<b>16.58</b>

Table 5: Performance (in %) on IDT. All results are averaged over 5-10 runs with different random seeds.

to build positive pairs:  $DC \cap CC$ ,  $DC \cap BC$ ,  $CC \cap BC$ , and  $DC \cap CC \cap BC$ .

We use the same strategy as Specter to extract the hard negatives. But instead of using hinge loss (Eq. (2)), we use the CL objective (Eq. (1)) during fine-tuning, because CL can contrast each positive pair with more negative examples (as all other documents in the batch are used as negatives). Research has shown that replacing hinge loss with CL can significantly improve the performance (Giorgi et al., 2021; Izacard et al., 2022), especially when the batch size is large (Chen et al., 2020). We denote the resulting models *Multilingual Specter (mSpt)*, as they are multilingual models extending and generalizing Specter.

**Baselines.** We compare the mSpt models against two SOTA baselines: Specter (Cohan et al., 2020) and SciNCL (Ostendorff et al., 2022), both applied to the translated texts. To ensure a fair comparison, we re-implement these models, re-

place SciBERT with T5CL2 (the English-version of mT5CL2, based on T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) and further pretrained with C4 and English papers in OpenMSD), and fine-tune it with OpenMSD’s training data using the CL objective. When implementing SciNCL, we increase the graph embedding dimension from 768 (their original setup) to 2048, as the larger dimension size yields better performance and 2048 is the largest dimension we manage to train with reasonable time and resources. More discussions about the SciNCL implementations are in §6. Our preliminary experiments show that the re-implemented versions outperform the original versions by more than 30% in both MAP and nDCG. We do not re-implement *Aspire* (Mysore et al., 2022) because its reported performance is close to SciNCL and it needs to use papers cited in the same sentence as positive pairs (see §2); we are not aware of tools that can reliably parse such information from multilingual papers.

To find the optimal hyper-parameters, we have

Method	Citation		Co-citation		Bib-couple		Average	
	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG
<b>Pretrained Language Models</b>								
SciBERT w/ translate	1.53	1.95	0.81	1.41	0.40	0.62	0.91	1.33
mT5	1.62	2.07	0.99	1.73	0.46	0.72	1.02	1.51
mT5Sci	1.97	2.48	1.34	2.13	0.59	0.94	1.30	1.85
mT5SCL	2.02	2.52	1.27	2.05	0.56	0.85	1.28	1.81
mT5CL	<b>7.83</b>	<b>9.51</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>5.92</b>	1.61	2.55	4.49	5.99
mT5CL2	7.81	9.45	4.01	5.81	<b>1.77</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>6.00</b>
<b>SOTA Baselines</b>								
(Cohan et al., 2020) w/ translation	<b>16.54</b>	<b>19.91</b>	<b>6.89</b>	<b>9.58</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>5.02</b>	<b>8.97</b>	<b>11.50</b>
(Ostendorff et al., 2022) w/ translation	7.92	9.62	4.11	6.00	1.76	2.71	4.60	6.11
<b>Multilingual Sptect (mSpt)</b>								
mSpt <sub>DC</sub>	17.64	21.15	7.15	9.89	3.70	5.33	9.50	12.12
mSpt <sub>CC</sub>	15.21	18.39	6.41	8.92	3.22	4.71	8.28	10.67
mSpt <sub>BC</sub>	11.72	14.35	5.08	7.28	3.00	4.33	6.60	8.65
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub>	<b>18.03</b>	<b>21.63</b>	<b>7.42</b>	<b>10.11</b>	3.65	5.26	<b>9.70</b>	<b>12.33</b>
mSpt <sub>DCUBC</sub>	17.77	21.35	7.09	9.69	<b>3.73</b>	5.28	9.53	12.11
mSpt <sub>CCUBC</sub>	14.32	17.32	6.13	8.48	3.22	4.70	7.89	10.17
mSpt <sub>DCUCCUBC</sub>	17.03	20.40	6.75	9.34	3.63	5.20	9.14	11.65
mSpt <sub>DCnCC</sub>	17.29	20.84	6.85	9.55	3.51	5.08	9.22	11.82
mSpt <sub>DCnBC</sub>	17.51	21.00	6.97	9.69	3.74	<b>5.42</b>	9.41	12.04
mSpt <sub>CCnBC</sub>	15.19	18.24	6.41	8.75	3.28	4.70	8.29	10.56
mSpt <sub>DCnCCnBC</sub>	16.87	20.16	6.59	9.37	3.53	5.10	9.00	11.54
<b>mSpt + Enriched Documents</b>								
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + TopNSumm <sub>64</sub>	18.30	22.02	7.23	9.87	3.74	5.35	9.76	12.41
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + PaLM2Summ <sub>64</sub>	18.85	22.68	7.29	9.97	3.97	5.68	10.04	12.78
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + TopNSumm <sub>128</sub>	18.55	22.31	7.23	9.88	3.99	5.72	9.92	12.64
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + PaLM2Summ <sub>128</sub>	<b>19.46</b>	<b>23.40</b>	<b>7.64</b>	<b>10.53</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>5.81</b>	<b>10.38</b>	<b>13.24</b>

Table 6: Performance (in %) on ODT. All results are averaged over 5-10 runs with different random seeds.

used batch sizes 256, 512, 1K, 2K and 4K, and initial learning rates  $10^{-n}$ , where  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 7$ . The inverse square-root learning rate decay strategy is used, with decay factor  $5 \times 10^{-5}$ , and the minimum learning rate is set to  $10^{-8}$ . We find that batch sizes  $\geq 1K$  yield similar performance, and learning rate  $10^{-2}$  yields the best performance on the dev set. Each model (including mSpt and the re-implemented SOTA baselines) is fine-tuned for up to 100K steps, in which the first 1.5K steps are used for warm-up. Checkpoints with the best performance on the dev set are used in the end.

**Results.** The results on IDT and ODT are presented in Table 5 and 6, respectively. We find that the mSpt models’ performance is significantly better<sup>7</sup> than all pretrained models, suggesting that using either DC, CC or BC to fine-tune mT5CL2 can

benefit the performance.<sup>8</sup> Compared to the SOTA baselines, on both IDT and ODT, the best mSpt model yields significantly better performance. In particular, on IDT, the best mSpt model is around 5% better than the best baseline, while on ODT the margin is increased to 8%, suggesting that mSpt performs particularly better for non-English and unseen-language papers. Among the mSpt models, using both DC and CC as positives (i.e., *DCUCC*) yields the best performance, better than using of any of the relation types alone or in intersections. We believe this is because different citation relations have complementary characteristics; learning from a proper mixture of relations can help the model learn from each relation type, yielding more robust performance even with out-of-distribution data. This finding is significant as existing works only use DC (Cohan et al., 2020) or

<sup>7</sup>We use double-tailed t-test  $p < 0.05$  as the significance test throughout this paper.

<sup>8</sup>As an additional ablation, we also implement a *random baseline*, which uses random pairs as positive examples. Its performance is consistently 0 across all tasks and metrics.



CC (Mysore et al., 2022) pairs as positive training examples.

## 6 The Applicability of SciNCL on Multilingual SDSM

Although SciNCL (Ostendorff et al., 2022) is reported to achieve the SOTA performance in the (English-only) SciDocs benchmark, our experiments in §5 show that it significantly underperforms the other fine-tuned models on multilingual SDSM. We investigate the reason in this section.

SciNCL uses *graph embedding* models to derive training pairs. They first run BigGraph (Lerer et al., 2019) on the citation graph in S2ORC, so as to learn an embedding for each node (i.e., paper). With the nodes’ embeddings, they use fast nearest neighbor search algorithms (e.g., (Xiong et al., 2020)) to find the top- $K$  neighbors for each node, and extract positive and negative nodes therefrom: For example, for each paper, its  $i$ -th closest to  $(i + n)$ -th closest papers are used as positives, while its  $k$ -th to  $(k + n)$ -th closest papers are used as (hard) negatives, where  $i, k, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$  are hyper-parameters. With systematic hyper-parameter search, they find that  $i = 20$ ,  $k = 2000$  and  $n = 5$  yield the best performance. When we re-implement SciNCL, we explore some other hyper-parameters but find the ones used in the original work yield the best performance.

From the analyses above, we can view the graph embedding model as a *teacher model* and SciNCL as the *student*. Hence, to understand why the student models perform poorly, we benchmark the teacher model by running the graph embedding algorithm on the train set of OpenMSD, and evaluate its performance on ODT. Table 7 presents the performance with different graph embedding sizes. Comparing their performance with other systems on ODT (see Table 6), even with dimension size 2048 (the largest dimension size we can run in reasonable time), the graph embedding’s performance is worse than all the other fine-tuned models, and we believe this causes the poor performance of the student SciNCL model. We speculate a reason for the poor performance of the graph embedding models is that the citation graph in OpenMSD is highly *heterogeneous*: For example, the citation graph is much denser in the areas with English papers (each English paper, on average, has 12 out-going and in-going citation links, respectively; see Table 1) than the areas with non-

English papers (each non-English paper, on average, has only one out-going and in-going citation link in OpenMSD). Hence, the related/unrelated pairs derived from the graph embeddings fail to generalize well to papers in different languages. More rigorous investigations are required to better understand the reasons, e.g., analyzing the topological structures of the citation graphs, and systematically comparing different graph embedding algorithms. It is beyond the scope of this work and we encourage future works on it.

## 7 Enrich the Non-English Documents with English Summaries

Because OpenMSD is dominated by English papers and pairs (see §3), models trained with OpenMSD are exposed more to English training examples. We aim to leverage the model’s (relatively stronger) English capabilities to improve its (relatively weaker) performance on non-English documents. To this end, inspired by the recent works on *cross-lingual summarization* (Zhu et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2022a), we propose to create English summaries for the non-English papers, and concatenate the summaries to the original (non-English) text to create *enriched documents*.

As there are no cross-lingual scientific documents summarization datasets or models available, we decide to use two *zero-shot* methods to generate English summaries. (i) Using the English translation of the top- $N$  tokens as the summary. This is a simple yet strong baseline widely used in summarization (Gao et al., 2020; Bao et al., 2022). (ii) Prompting a large generative language model to write English summaries. We use *Flan-PaLM2* (Anil et al., 2023) (version *Otter* on Google Cloud API<sup>9</sup>), because recent work by Zhang et al. (2023) suggests that even smaller Flan-tuned language models can generate high-quality summaries, better than their larger but non-Flan-tuned counterparts. The English summary is then concatenated to the original text in the following format: *Title: {title\_text}. Abstract: ({English\_summary\_text}) {abstract\_text}*. Note that English papers are not augmented with any summaries.

We consider summaries with two different lengths: 64 and 128 tokens. To get the top- $N$  translation summaries, we simply truncate the translated abstracts to the target lengths. To prompt Flan-PaLM2 to generate summaries, we exper-

<sup>9</sup><https://cloud.google.com/vertex-ai>

GraphEmbd Dim.	Citation		Co-citation		Bib-couple		Average	
	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG
128	1.29	1.98	0.51	1.17	2.09	3.66	1.30	2.27
256	1.33	2.25	0.75	1.88	2.79	4.90	1.62	3.01
512	2.89	4.48	1.86	4.60	4.26	8.05	3.00	5.71
1024	4.94	7.16	3.52	8.32	5.94	11.94	4.80	9.14
2048	<b>8.78</b>	<b>11.91</b>	<b>6.32</b>	<b>13.61</b>	<b>8.05</b>	<b>17.38</b>	<b>7.72</b>	<b>14.30</b>

Table 7: Performance (in %) of the BigGraph (Lerer et al., 2019) embeddings on ODT, with different dimension sizes. We have also tried DeepWalk (Perozzi et al., 2014) and InstantEmbedding (Postăvaru et al., 2020) and they yield similar performance and trend. The performance in IDT is in a similar trend and hence omitted.

iment with a few prompts and finally use two prompts to generate the short and long summaries, respectively: **(i)** *Summarize the passage below with no more than 30 words in English.* **(ii)** *Extract the three most important findings from the passage below, and translate them to English.* We find that the model tends to generate over-length summaries: the average token numbers of the summaries generated with the two prompts above are 71 and 138, respectively. Over-length tokens are removed to get the final summaries.

The enriched documents are used to train and test  $mSpt_{DCUCC}$ , the strongest variant of  $mSpt$ . The results of the proposed method on IDT and ODT are presented in Table 5 and 6, respectively. Firstly, we find that using the Flan-PaLM2-generated summaries consistently yields better performance than the top-N translation summaries; we believe this is because Flan-PaLM2 considers the whole abstract when generating the summaries, and hence its summaries are more informative and comprehensive than the top-N translation summaries. Secondly, compared to the SOTA baselines, using the enriched documents significantly boosting the MAP scores by 7% and 16% in IDT and ODT, respectively. Compared to the vanilla  $mSpt_{DCUCC}$ , using Flan-PaLM2-generated summaries yields marginally (not significantly) better performance in IDT, and significantly better performance in ODT. These results suggest that enriching the non-English papers with high-quality English summaries can significantly improve the multilingual models’ performance for papers in non-English and unseen languages.

## 8 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed both datasets and novel methods for the multilingual *scientific documents similarity measurement* (SDSM) problem. For

data, we built *OpenMSD*, the first multilingual scientific documents dataset, and derived three SDSM tasks therefrom. For methods, we developed science-specialized multilingual language models optimized for the SDSM tasks, and fine-tuned them with related paper pairs derived from different strategies. Unlike existing works that use either citation (Cohan et al., 2020) or co-citation (Mysore et al., 2022) pairs alone, we found that using the mixture of them yields better performance. To further improve the model’s performance for non-English documents, we explored the use of *generative language models* to enrich the non-English papers with English summaries. Compared to SOTA baselines, our best model improves the performance by 7-16% in MAP.

Our dataset and methods can be applied to other tasks beyond SDSM. For example, *OpenMSD* can be used to pretrain general-purpose large language models to improve their performance in reasoning and science-related tasks (Taylor et al., 2022; Singhal et al., 2022). The technique of enriching non-English documents with English summaries can be applied to tasks like *multilingual document clustering* (Wei et al., 2008) and *cross-lingual information retrieval* (Vulić and Moens, 2015). More generally, we believe it provides a novel paradigm to leverage generative models to enhance the text similarity measurement models; we hope this work can encourage more research on this direction.

## References

Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang,

- Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland, Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui, Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Kenealy, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Moussalem, Zachary Nado, John Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Castro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone, Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang, Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. 2023. [PaLM 2 Technical Report](#).
- arXiv.org. 2023. [arXiv Dataset](#).
- Forrest Sheng Bao, Ruixuan Tu, and Ge Luo. 2022. Docasref: A pilot empirical study on repurposing reference-based summary quality metrics reference-freely. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10013*.
- Angathevar Baskaran. 2016. UNESCO science report: Towards 2030. *Institutions and Economies*, pages 125–127.
- Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. [SciBERT: A pretrained language model for scientific text](#). 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 3615–3620, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bethesda. 2003. PMC Open Access Subset. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/tools/openftlist>. [Online; accessed 23-June-2023].
- Steven Bird, Robert Dale, Bonnie J Dorr, Bryan R Gibson, Mark Thomas Joseph, Min-Yen Kan, Dongwon Lee, Brett Powley, Dragomir R Radev, Yee Fan Tan, et al. 2008. The ACL Anthology Reference Corpus: A Reference Dataset for Bibliographic Research in Computational Linguistics. In *LREC*.
- Lutz Bornmann, Robin Haunschild, and Rüdiger Mutz. 2021. Growth rates of modern science: a latent piecewise growth curve approach to model publication numbers from established and new literature databases. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1):1–15.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR.
- Sumit Chopra, Raia Hadsell, and Yann LeCun. 2005. Learning a similarity metric discriminatively, with application to face verification. In *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'05)*, volume 1, pages 539–546. IEEE.
- Arman Cohan, Sergey Feldman, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Daniel Weld. 2020. [SPECTER: Document-level representation learning using citation-informed transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2270–2282, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Édouard Grave, Myle

- Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451.
- Crossref. 2022. [April 2022 public data file from crossref](#).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Mario S Di Bitetti and Julián A Ferreras. 2017. Publish (in English) or perish: The effect on citation rate of using languages other than English in scientific publications. *Ambio*, 46:121–127.
- Mona Diab and Martha Yifru. 2022. ACL 2022 D&I Special Initiative: 60-60, Globalization via Localization. <https://www.2022.aclweb.org/dispecialinitiative>. [Online; accessed 23-June-2023].
- Santo Fortunato, Carl T Bergstrom, Katy Börner, James A Evans, Dirk Helbing, Staša Milojević, Alexander M Petersen, Filippo Radicchi, Roberta Sinatra, Brian Uzzi, et al. 2018. Science of science. *Science*, 359(6379):eaao0185.
- Yang Gao, Wei Zhao, and Steffen Eger. 2020. Supert: Towards new frontiers in unsupervised evaluation metrics for multi-document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1347–1354.
- Daniel Gillick, Alessandro Presta, and Gaurav Singh Tomar. 2018. End-to-end retrieval in continuous space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08008*.
- John Giorgi, Osvald Nitski, Bo Wang, and Gary Bader. 2021. Declutr: Deep contrastive learning for unsupervised textual representations. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 879–895.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09543*.
- Matthew Henderson, Rami Al-Rfou, Brian Strope, Yun-Hsuan Sung, László Lukács, Ruiqi Guo, Sanjiv Kumar, Balint Miklos, and Ray Kurzweil. 2017. Efficient natural language response suggestion for smart reply. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00652*.
- Junjie Hu, Sebastian Ruder, Aditya Siddhant, Graham Neubig, Orhan Firat, and Melvin Johnson. 2020. Xtreme: A massively multilingual multi-task benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual generalisation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4411–4421. PMLR.
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Maxwell Mirton Kessler. 1963. Bibliographic coupling between scientific papers. *American documentation*, 14(1):10–25.
- Rodney Kinney, Chloe Anastasiades, Russell Authur, Iz Beltagy, Jonathan Bragg, Alexandra Buračzynski, Isabel Cachola, Stefan Candra, Yoganand Chandrasekhar, Arman Cohan, Miles Crawford, Doug Downey, Jason Dunkelberger, Oren Etzioni, Rob Evans, Sergey Feldman, Joseph Gorney, David Graham, Fangzhou Hu, Regan Huff, Daniel King, Sebastian Kohlmeier, Bailey Kuehl, Michael Langan, Daniel Lin, Haokun Liu, Kyle Lo, Jaron Lochner, Kelsey MacMillan, Tyler Murray, Chris Newell, Smita Rao, Shaurya Rohatgi, Paul Sayre, Zejiang Shen, Amanpreet Singh, Luca Soldaini, Shivashankar Subramanian, Amber Tanaka, Alex D. Wade, Linda Wagner, Lucy Lu Wang, Chris Wilhelm, Caroline Wu, Jiangjiang Yang, Angele Zamarron, Madeleine Van Zuylen, and Daniel S. Weld. 2023. [The Semantic Scholar Open Data Platform](#). *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2301.10140.



- Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6086–6096.
- Adam Lerer, Ledell Wu, Jiajun Shen, Timothee Lacroix, Luca Wehrstedt, Abhijit Bose, and Alex Peysakhovich. 2019. [PyTorch-BigGraph: A Large-scale Graph Embedding System](#). *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1903.12287.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shruti Bhosale, Jingfei Du, et al. 2021. Few-shot learning with multilingual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10668*.
- Weishu Liu. 2017. The changing role of non-english papers in scholarly communication: Evidence from web of science’s three journal citation indexes. *Learned Publishing*, 30(2):115–123.
- Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, Mark Neumann, Rodney Kinney, and Daniel Weld. 2020. [S2ORC: The semantic scholar open research corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4969–4983, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Melissa C Márquez and Ana Maria Porras. 2020. Science communication in multiple languages is critical to its effectiveness. *Frontiers in Communication*, page 31.
- Olga Moskaleva and Mark Akoev. 2019. Non-english language publications in citation indexes—quantity and quality. In *17th International Conference on Scientometrics and Informetrics, ISSI 2019*, pages 35–46. International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics.
- Sheshera Mysore, Arman Cohan, and Tom Hope. 2022. [Multi-vector models with textual guidance for fine-grained scientific document similarity](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4453–4470, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jeppe Nicolaisen. 2007. Citation analysis. *Annual review of information science and technology*, 41(1):609–641.
- Malte Ostendorff, Nils Rethmeier, Isabelle Augenstein, Bela Gipp, and Georg Rehm. 2022. [Neighborhood contrastive learning for scientific document representations with citation embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11670–11688, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Silvio Peroni and David Shotton. 2020. [OpenCitations, an infrastructure organization for open scholarship](#). *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1):428–444.
- Bryan Perozzi, Rami Al-Rfou, and Steven Skiena. 2014. Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 701–710.
- Ștefan Postăvaru, Anton Tsitsulin, Filipe Miguel Gonçalves de Almeida, Yingtao Tian, Silvio Lattanzi, and Bryan Perozzi. 2020. Instantembedding: Efficient local node representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.06992*.
- Dragomir R. Radev, Pradeep Muthukrishnan, and Vahed Qazvinian. 2009. [The ACL Anthology network](#). In *Proceedings of the 2009 Workshop on Text and Citation Analysis for Scholarly Digital Libraries (NLP4DL)*, pages 54–61, Suntec City, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. 2022.

- Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. 2022. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.13138*.
- Henry Small. 1973. Co-citation in the scientific literature: A new measure of the relationship between two documents. *Journal of the American Society for information Science*, 24(4):265–269.
- Emma Steigerwald, Valeria Ramírez-Castañeda, Débora YC Brandt, Andrés Báldi, Julie Teresa Shapiro, Lynne Bowker, and Rebecca D Tarvin. 2022. Overcoming language barriers in academia: machine translation tools and a vision for a multilingual future. *BioScience*, 72(10):988–998.
- Zeera Talat, Aurélie Névéol, Stella Biderman, Miruna Clinciu, Manan Dey, Shayne Longpre, Sasha Luccioni, Maraim Masoud, Margaret Mitchell, Dragomir Radev, Shanya Sharma, Arjun Subramonian, Jaesung Tae, Samson Tan, Deepak Tunuguntla, and Oskar Van Der Wal. 2022. [You reap what you sow: On the challenges of bias evaluation under multilingual settings](#). In *Proceedings of BigScience Episode #5 – Workshop on Challenges & Perspectives in Creating Large Language Models*, pages 26–41, virtual+Dublin. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuqing Tang, Chau Tran, Xian Li, Peng-Jen Chen, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Jiatao Gu, and Angela Fan. 2020. Multilingual translation with extensible multilingual pretraining and finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00401*.
- Ross Taylor, Marcin Kardas, Guillem Cucurull, Thomas Scialom, Anthony Hartshorn, Elvis Saravia, Andrew Poulton, Viktor Kerkez, and Robert Stojnic. 2022. Galactica: A large language model for science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09085*.
- Sedef Uzuner. 2008. Multilingual scholars’ participation in core/global academic communities: A literature review. *Journal of English for academic Purposes*, 7(4):250–263.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Nicole Meister, Seunghyun Yoon, Rajiv Jain, Franck Dernoncourt, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2022. [MACRONYM: A large-scale dataset for multilingual and multi-domain acronym extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3309–3314, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Ivan Vulić and Marie-Francine Moens. 2015. Monolingual and cross-lingual information retrieval models based on (bilingual) word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 38th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 363–372.
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2019. Super-glue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Jiaan Wang, Fandong Meng, Duo Zheng, Yunlong Liang, Zhixu Li, Jianfeng Qu, and Jie Zhou. 2022a. A survey on cross-lingual summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:1304–1323.
- Yau-Shian Wang, Ashley Wu, and Graham Neubig. 2022b. English contrastive learning can learn universal cross-lingual sentence embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06127*.
- Chih-Ping Wei, Christopher C Yang, and Chia-Min Lin. 2008. A latent semantic indexing-based approach to multilingual document clustering. *Decision Support Systems*, 45(3):606–620.
- Zhirong Wu, Yuanjun Xiong, Stella X Yu, and Dahua Lin. 2018. Unsupervised feature learning via non-parametric instance discrimination.

In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3733–3742.

Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul N Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. 2020. Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tianyi Zhang, Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Percy Liang, Kathleen McKeown, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. [Benchmarking Large Language Models for News Summarization](#). *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2301.13848.

Junnan Zhu, Qian Wang, Yining Wang, Yu Zhou, Jiajun Zhang, Shaonan Wang, and Chengqing Zong. 2019. [NCLS: Neural cross-lingual summarization](#). 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 3054–3064, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Pranas Zunde. 1971. Structural models of complex information sources. *Information storage and retrieval*, 7(1):1–18.

## A Performance on SciDocs

We consider four tasks in SciDocs: *cite*, *co-cite*, *co-view* and *co-read*. Each task has a pool of 30K papers, grouped into 1K clusters. Each cluster has one anchor paper, five positive examples (e.g., in the *co-view* task, a positive example is a paper that is often co-viewed with the anchor) and 25 negative examples. However, existing evaluations on SciDocs (Cohan et al., 2020; Ostendorff et al., 2022; Mysore et al., 2022) have shown the *ceiling effect*: their nDCG performance are all 90%+ and the gaps between different methods are rather small (less than 2 percentage points). This is because papers are organized into clusters at test time: given an anchor paper, models only need to find the five positives from the cluster (30 papers). To solve this problem, we merge the paper pools of all four tasks and ignore the clusters at test time; i.e., the models need to rank all 120K papers in the merged paper pool to find the five positives. The results are presented in Table 8.

Method	Citation		Co-citation		Co-read		Co-view		Average	
	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG	MAP	nDCG
<b>Pretrained Language Models</b>										
SciBERT	0.52	2.48	0.51	2.58	0.91	3.60	1.21	5.26	0.79	3.48
mT5	0.31	1.41	0.47	2.31	0.49	1.99	0.92	3.89	0.55	2.40
mT5Sci	0.56	2.70	0.56	2.83	0.98	3.87	1.30	5.72	0.85	3.78
mT5SCL	0.68	3.31	0.77	3.85	0.93	3.83	1.36	5.77	0.94	4.19
mT5CL	3.67	12.34	<b>3.95</b>	12.12	4.42	12.63	5.34	15.13	4.35	13.06
mT5CL2	<b>4.21</b>	<b>14.53</b>	3.85	<b>12.71</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>13.12</b>	<b>6.23</b>	<b>16.96</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>14.33</b>
<b>SOTA Baselines</b>										
(Cohan et al., 2020)	5.51	15.96	<b>5.76</b>	<b>16.22</b>	6.96	<b>17.32</b>	<b>9.47</b>	<b>22.43</b>	6.93	<b>17.98</b>
(Ostendorff et al., 2022)	<b>5.92</b>	<b>18.04</b>	5.62	14.37	<b>7.56</b>	16.72	9.24	21.65	<b>7.09</b>	17.70
<b>Multilingual Specter (mSpt)</b>										
mSpt <sub>DC</sub>	5.60	16.88	5.61	14.87	<b>7.06</b>	16.67	9.16	22.22	6.86	17.66
mSpt <sub>CC</sub>	4.75	14.66	5.43	14.43	6.42	14.94	8.59	20.12	6.30	16.04
mSpt <sub>BC</sub>	4.18	13.48	4.37	13.17	5.84	14.35	7.13	17.56	5.38	14.64
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub>	5.57	16.75	<b>5.80</b>	14.57	<b>7.06</b>	16.27	<b>9.23</b>	22.40	<b>6.92</b>	17.50
mSpt <sub>DCUBC</sub>	<b>5.86</b>	17.31	5.68	<b>15.27</b>	6.97	16.26	9.06	21.81	6.89	17.66
mSpt <sub>CCUBC</sub>	4.41	13.62	5.00	14.06	6.31	14.77	8.33	19.73	6.01	15.55
mSpt <sub>DCUCCUBC</sub>	5.56	17.03	5.29	14.05	6.98	16.37	8.66	21.38	6.62	17.21
mSpt <sub>DCnCC</sub>	5.63	<b>17.55</b>	5.55	14.89	7.00	<b>16.75</b>	8.92	<b>22.75</b>	6.78	<b>17.99</b>
mSpt <sub>DCnBC</sub>	5.67	17.23	5.30	14.82	6.28	15.69	9.19	22.69	6.61	17.61
mSpt <sub>CCnBC</sub>	4.76	14.72	5.05	14.65	6.65	15.03	8.16	20.13	6.16	16.13
mSpt <sub>DCnCCnBC</sub>	5.52	17.25	5.34	14.78	6.61	16.04	8.70	21.57	6.54	17.41
<b>mSpt + Enriched Documents</b>										
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + TopNSumm <sub>64</sub>	5.40	16.36	<b>5.79</b>	<b>15.84</b>	7.31	16.69	9.32	22.08	6.96	17.74
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + PaLM2Summ <sub>64</sub>	5.41	<b>16.40</b>	5.75	15.80	7.26	16.74	9.33	22.07	6.94	17.75
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + TopNSumm <sub>128</sub>	5.49	16.38	5.77	15.73	7.44	16.94	<b>9.35</b>	22.38	7.01	17.86
mSpt <sub>DCUCC</sub> + PaLM2Summ <sub>128</sub>	<b>5.58</b>	16.37	<b>5.79</b>	15.70	<b>7.55</b>	<b>17.13</b>	9.30	<b>22.51</b>	<b>7.06</b>	<b>17.93</b>

Table 8: Performance (in %) on SciDocs (English-only). All results are averaged over 5-10 runs with different random seeds.