

Towards Effective Time-Aware Language Representation: Exploring Enhanced Temporal Understanding in Language Models

JIXIN WANG, South China University of Technology, China

ADAM JATOWT, University of Innsbruck, Austria

YI CAI, South China University of Technology, China

In the evolving field of Natural Language Processing, understanding the temporal context of text is increasingly crucial. This study investigates methods to incorporate temporal information during pre-training, aiming to achieve effective time-aware language representation for improved performance on time-related tasks. In contrast to common pre-trained models like BERT, which rely on synchronic document collections such as BookCorpus and Wikipedia, our research introduces BiTimeBERT 2.0, a novel language model pre-trained on a temporal news article collection. BiTimeBERT 2.0 utilizes this temporal news collection, focusing on three innovative pre-training objectives: Time-Aware Masked Language Modeling (TAMLM), Document Dating (DD), and Time-Sensitive Entity Replacement (TSER). Each objective targets a unique aspect of temporal information. TAMLM is designed to enhance the understanding of temporal contexts and relations, DD integrates document timestamps as chronological markers, and TSER focuses on the temporal dynamics of "Person" entities, recognizing their inherent temporal significance. The experimental results consistently demonstrate that BiTimeBERT 2.0 outperforms models like BERT and other existing pre-trained models, achieving substantial gains across a variety of downstream NLP tasks and applications where time plays a pivotal role.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Content analysis and feature selection**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: language models, temporal information, news archives

ACM Reference Format:

Jixin Wang, Adam Jatowt, and Yi Cai. 2018. Towards Effective Time-Aware Language Representation: Exploring Enhanced Temporal Understanding in Language Models. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 25 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the digitization of news archives has significantly improved our access to historical data. Digital archives offer a comprehensive perspective of past events, societal shifts, and cultural evolution, assisting researchers and historians in identifying pivotal moments and trends that have played a major role in shaping today's society [37].

Furthermore, incorporating the chronological data into Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Information Retrieval (IR) systems has become increasingly crucial. This has spurred the development of Temporal Information Retrieval, a specialized branch of IR that concentrates on the time-related aspects of queries and documents. Beyond information retrieval, temporal information has found applications across a wide range of tasks, presenting exciting avenues for research and innovation. Examples include web content analysis [10, 43], social media trends analysis [14, 35], temporal reasoning [26, 74], timeline summarization [12, 58], event detection and ordering [17, 59], event time prediction [66], question answering [47, 64], content trustworthiness analysis [72] and semantic change detection [53, 54]. These

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

applications underscore the broad and varied impact of temporal information in numerous research domains and practical applications.

Pre-trained language models like BERT [18], T5 [51], and GPT-3 [9] have revolutionized NLP by enabling deeper, context-aware linguistic representations. These models exhibit remarkable performance in diverse NLP tasks, including text classification, sentiment analysis, and machine translation. However, they often struggle to capture essential domain-specific information, primarily due to their reliance on training on general-purpose corpora like English Wikipedia and training objectives not tailored to domain-specific characteristics. In scenarios where understanding temporal dynamics is crucial, most existing language models face challenges in effectively integrating temporal information, such as temporal expressions and document timestamps. This capability is particularly vital in processing news articles and in the aforementioned applications where time is an important factor. Developing language models that are not only context-aware but also adept at comprehending temporal aspects would promise a more refined and accurate interpretation of temporal information, thereby significantly enhancing their effectiveness in time-related tasks.

In this study, we present BiTimeBERT 2.0, a novel language model pre-trained on a temporal news collection with three training objectives: *time-aware masked language modeling* (TAMLM), *document dating* (DD), and *time-sensitive entity replacement* (TSER), as depicted in Figure 1a. Each objective targets a distinct aspect of temporal information. The first dimension, known as *document timestamp*, serves as a chronological marker, indicating the creation date of each document and establishing a definite temporal reference. The second dimension, *content time*, relates to the temporal expressions within the text, shedding light on the temporal context and the period of the events discussed. These two explicit temporal dimensions have proven valuable across various applications, such as temporal web search [29, 57], summarization [2, 6], and event ordering [24], all benefiting from a nuanced understanding of temporal aspects. Lastly, *time-sensitive entity*, involves dynamic entities like individuals, which often imply specific timeframes [1, 21, 52, 70]. For example, mentioning Sam Altman likely indicates a period around 2022 or later, coinciding with the emergence and significant impact of ChatGPT. This is in contrast to temporally static entities like "Location" entities or "Organization" entities, which generally remain unchanged over time, as illustrated by [1]. Notably, our study places a particular emphasis on "Person" entities, due to their inherent temporal significance. Although other time-sensitive entities like EVENT (e.g., WWII) or PRODUCT (e.g., iPhone 15) also convey implicit temporal references, they are comparatively rarer or pose greater challenges in precise identification and thus are not the primary focus of this research.

In the experimental evaluation, we conduct extensive experiments to thoroughly assess the effectiveness of the proposed pre-training tasks. The results from these experiments unequivocally demonstrate that BiTimeBERT 2.0, harnessing the three distinct types of temporal information through its pre-training tasks, yields remarkably effective time-aware representations. Furthermore, our findings underscore the substantial potential of BiTimeBERT 2.0 to significantly enhance performance across a wide spectrum of time-related downstream tasks, showcasing its versatility and applicability in various applications.

This paper represents a substantial extension of our earlier work presented in [67], introducing significant advancements to the BiTimeBERT model. Firstly, the time-aware masked language modeling (TAMLM) task is refined to include the masking of temporal signals that indicate temporal relations, such as "before", "after", and "during". This refinement allows for a deeper comprehension of temporal contexts compared to the previous approach, which focused solely on masking temporal information. Secondly, we introduce the time-sensitive entity replacement (TSER) objective, with a particular focus on dynamic "Person" entities. This objective is designed to further enrich the model's comprehension of temporal dynamics associated with individuals. Additionally, BiTimeBERT 2.0 is pre-trained on a smaller, more focused temporal news collection, which excludes sentences lacking temporal information. This strategy effectively

halves the training costs, reducing GPU hours from 80 to 38, without compromising the quality of our results in most cases. Furthermore, this paper explores various methodologies in employing temporal information, experimenting with different training objectives to enhance our understanding. These enhancements enable our study to provide a more thorough exploration of time-aware language representations, demonstrating a significant leap in both efficiency and effectiveness, thereby contributing to advancement of temporal modeling within the realm of language models.

To sum up, we make the following contributions in this work:

- (1) We thoroughly explore the impact of integrating three distinct types of temporal information into pre-trained language models. Our findings reveal that infusing language models with temporal information notably improves their performance across various downstream time-related tasks, highlighting the importance of temporal context.
- (2) We introduce BiTimeBERT 2.0, a novel time-aware language model specifically trained through three new pre-training tasks. In addition, we implement several strategic enhancements to achieve more effective time-aware representations, including the refinement of the time-aware masked language modeling, the introduction of time-sensitive entity replacement objectives, efficient training with a more focused temporal news collection.
- (3) We conduct extensive experiments on a variety of time-related tasks, showcasing BiTimeBERT 2.0’s superiority over existing language models in comprehending temporal information. This empirical validation not only underscores our model’s enhanced ability in generating effective time-aware representations, but also demonstrates its practical efficiencies in real-world applications.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Temporal Dimensions of Text

According to Campos et al. [11], there are two key temporal dimensions of a document or a query: timestamp and content time (or focus time). The document timestamp refers to the time when the document was created, whereas the content time refers to the time mentioned or implicitly referred to in the document’s content (e.g., a document published today¹ about WWII would have its timestamp as January 29, 2024, and the content time as 1939-1945). Similarly, the query timestamp indicates the time when the query was issued, and its content time relates to the time period associated with the query (e.g., a "Winter Olympics 1978" query issued three month ago would have its timestamp as October 2023, and would refer to the time period when the winter sports took place in Edmonton, Alberta in 1987). Additionally, as a document usually contains sentences related to different events that take place in different time points, the document’s content time is typically represented by a set of time intervals [27]. For readers, timestamp information aids in quickly locating the content on a timeline and helps assessing the document’s up-to-dateness. On the other hand, content time can help to strengthen our understanding of particular parts of document content. For example, the development of events and their causal relations can be understood by analyzing the relations between different content temporal information scattered throughout text content. Recently, exploiting these two kinds of temporal information in documents and queries has been gaining increased importance in IR and NLP. Their interplay can be utilized to develop time-specific search and exploration applications [4, 11, 31], such as temporal web search [29, 57], temporal question answering [64, 65], search results diversification [8, 60] and clustering [3, 61], summarization [2, 6], historical event ordering [24] and so on.

In addition to the two temporal dimensions previously discussed, many named entities inherently carry implicit temporal information. Research has demonstrated that incorporating temporal information into named entity recognition

¹We use "2024/01/29" as the exact date of "today" being the submission deadline.

can significantly improve accuracy [21, 52, 70], thereby confirming that named entities are closely tied to specific time periods. Furthermore, Agarwal et al. [1] show that integrating temporal information into named entity disambiguation yields impressive results, particularly for "Person" type entities. While "Location" and "Organization" entities experience moderate performance improvements, "Person" entities demonstrate a substantial increase in accuracy, from 9.63% to 39.91%. This significant improvement can be attributed to the relatively shorter life spans (or activity time spans) of person entities, making them more time-sensitive compared to other entity types. Motivated by these findings, our study places special emphasis on "Person" entities, recognizing their inherent temporal significance. Although other time-sensitive entities such as products (e.g., iPhone 15) do carry implicit temporal references, they are comparatively rarer and present more challenges in terms of precise identification.

2.2 General Pre-trained Language Models

The field of Natural Language Processing (NLP) has witnessed a transformative change with the advent of pre-trained language models. Early models such as Word2Vec [44] and GloVe [48] lay the groundwork by capturing word-level representations, but it is the introduction of contextual models such as ELMo [49] that first enable a deeper understanding of word usage within specific contexts. The emergence of Transformer-based models, notably BERT [18], T5 [51], and GPT [50], mark a pivotal shift. These models, leveraging the Transformer architecture [63], are typically trained on large general-purpose corpora of text and then fine-tuned for specific NLP tasks, which offer advanced context-aware capabilities. BERT, in particular, utilizes masked language modeling (MLM) and next sentence prediction (NSP) to enhance understanding of text sequences. RoBERTa [42] further refines BERT's approach by optimizing key hyperparameters and removing the NSP task, while ALBERT [39] introduces sentence order prediction (SOP), achieving higher performance with fewer parameters. Further innovations include XLM [38], which incorporates translation language modeling (TLM) for cross-lingual training, XLNet [30] with its permuted language modeling (PLM), and SpanBERT [30], which extends BERT by masking contiguous spans and employing a span boundary objective. Despite these advancements, a notable limitation of these language models is their reliance on general-purpose text corpora, and training objectives not tailored for specific domains, which restricts their effectiveness in domain-specific applications.

2.3 Language Models for Specific Domains

To address the limitations of general-purpose language models, there has been a trend towards developing models tailored to specific domains, leading to enhanced performance in domain-specific tasks. Some studies adapt pre-trained models to specific domains by directly applying BERT's pre-training tasks on domain-specific corpora. For instance, SciBERT [7] is trained on scientific texts, BioBERT [40] on biomedical documents, ClinicalBERT [25] on clinical records, LegalBERT [13] on legal documents. These domain-adapted models have shown remarkable effectiveness in their respective fields, such as BioBERT's improved accuracy in biomedical entity recognition and biomedical relation extraction. Furthermore, there is a growing focus on continually pre-training existing models for targeted applications using specific training objectives. SentiLARE, proposed by Ke et al. [34], continually pre-trains the RoBERTa model with a label-aware masked language model for sentiment analysis. WKLM (Weakly Supervised Knowledge-Pretrained Language Model) [69], another adaptation, enhances BERT for entity-related tasks through an entity replacement objective, improving the model's understanding of real-world entities. Similarly, Althammer et al. [5] introduce linguistically informed masking (LIM), a domain adaptive objective for the patent domain and perform continual pre-training on BERT and SciBERT. These models are increasingly refined for specific domains and tasks, facilitating more precise and effective language

representation. The trend towards domain-specific adaptations underscores the importance of tailoring language models to the intricacies of specialized fields, thereby enhancing their performance and applicability.

2.4 Incorporating Temporal Information into Language Models

In recent years, the integration of temporal information into language models has garnered considerable research interest, leading to various innovative approaches aimed at enhancing these models' temporal understanding [15, 19, 20, 53, 54]. One notable example is the work of Dhingra et al. [19], who modified the pre-training process by incorporating timestamp information into the masked language modeling (MLM) objective. This approach facilitates the acquisition of temporally-scoped knowledge, showing improved performance in tasks like question answering. Similarly, Cole et al. [15] propose the Temporal Span Masking task (TSM), an adaptation of Salient Span Masking (SSM) [22]. TSM specifically focuses on masking temporal expressions in sentences and trains the model to reconstruct these expressions. In contrast to these models, which predominantly use Transformer encoder-decoder architectures, other studies have explored the utility of Transformer encoder-only models. These models have proven effective in semantic change detection, a task that requires the model to identify and understand the extent of semantic shifts in words over time. In this domain, Giulianelli et al. [20] propose the first unsupervised approach, utilizing contextualized embeddings from BERT for semantic change detection. Further advancements include the work of [54] and [53]. Rosin and Radinsky [54] enhances self-attention mechanisms [63] by integrating timestamp data to compute attention scores. On the other hand, [53] introduces TempoBERT, a time-aware variant BERT model. TempoBERT pre-processes input texts by appending timestamp information and masking these tokens during training, achieving state-of-the-art results in semantic change detection.

The integration of temporal information into language models, while leading to significant advancements, still faces several challenges that limit their applicability and effectiveness. A primary weakness is that existing time-aware models focus on either content temporal information or document timestamps, overlooking the necessity of integrating both dimensions for a comprehensive temporal understanding. Additionally, the pre-training of these models often relies on coarse temporal granularity, such as years or decades, lacking the necessary precision for finer granularities like months. This shortcoming is particularly evident in tasks requiring detailed time-sensitive analysis, for instance, in web content analysis [10, 43]. Moreover, existing models, while innovative in their approach, often fall short in delivering effective time-aware language representations. For instance, in experiments involving sentence time prediction tasks, e.g., Rosin et al. [53] show that TempoBERT exhibits a performance decline when compared to a fine-tuned BERT model.

Compared with the aforementioned approaches, our model effectively exploits both timestamp and content time during its pre-training phase on a temporal news collection. This extended work takes a step further by utilizing temporal signals, specifically the words that indicate temporal relations like "before", "after", and "during". Moreover, we place a special emphasis on time-sensitive entities, with a particular focus on the "Person" entity type during pre-training. In our experimental evaluations, we demonstrate that BiTimeBERT 2.0 not only delivers more effective time-aware language representations but also outperforms existing language models in tasks requiring a comprehensive understanding of temporal contexts.

3 METHOD

In this section, we introduce BiTimeBERT 2.0, the proposed time-aware language model built on the Transformer encoder [63], with its training process illustrated in Figure 1a. BiTimeBERT 2.0 differentiates itself from existing language models such as BERT [18] and TempoBERT [53] in four critical ways, each contributing to its enhanced time-aware




Fig. 1. A comprehensive overview of the BiTimeBERT 2.0 model training process, incorporating the TAMLML, DD, and TSER tasks, along with an illustrative input example during the pre-training phase.

representation capabilities. Firstly, unlike general pre-trained language models that rely on synchronic datasets such as Wikipedia or web crawls, BiTimeBERT 2.0 is trained on a news article collection that spans over two decades.² While models like RoBERTa [42] do include news datasets in their training (e.g., CC-NEWS [45]), they often fail to adequately prioritize or leverage the temporal dimensions of their documents. Note that we employ a more focused temporal news collection in this work, deliberately excluding sentences lacking temporal content, significantly reducing training costs while maintaining most high-quality results³. Secondly, BiTimeBERT 2.0 employs a novel *time-aware masked language modeling* (TAMLML) strategy. Unlike traditional random token masking, TAMLML prioritizes the masking of temporal information within the text. This technique not only incorporates the inherent domain knowledge but also enriches the model's comprehension of temporal information embedded in the document content. The TAMLML has been further refined to specifically mask temporal signals that indicate temporal relations, such as "before", "after", and "during", enhancing the model's understanding of temporal contexts. Third, BiTimeBERT 2.0 replaces the conventional Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) objective with a *document dating* (DD) task, effectively integrating timestamp information during training. As document dating involves time prediction, this objective enriches the model with both time-related and task-oriented knowledge, potentially aiding in improving the performance in other time-related tasks. Lastly, this extended work introduces the *time-sensitive entity replacement* (TSER) objective, with a specific emphasis on dynamic "Person" entities. This addition significantly enhances the model's capacity to analyze and interpret temporal dynamics, thereby increasing its overall temporal sensitivity. Figure 1a illustrates the three proposed objectives: TAMLML, DD, and

²The temporal news collection utilized in both this study and the previous one is the New York Times Annotated Corpus (NYT corpus), encompassing 1.8 million news articles spanning from January 1, 1987, to June 19, 2007.

³Details regarding the pre-training corpus processing are provided in Section 4.1.

TSER, whereas Figure 1b provides an illustrative example of the input for the model during the pre-training phase.⁴ BiTimeBERT 2.0 is jointly trained on these tasks, incorporating three distinct additional layers based on the output of its Transformer network. All objectives employ cross entropy as the loss function.

It is important to note that in our exploration of BiTimeBERT 2.0, we also experiment with additional pre-training tasks that harness temporal information in different ways, namely Time-Sensitive Entity Masked Language Modeling (TSEMLM) and Temporal Relation Word Replacement (TRWR). TSEMLM is designed to mask "Person" entities in text following the masking of content time. TRWR, on the other hand, involves replacing temporal signals within the text: in 50% of the cases, the temporal signals are substituted with alternatives of a different temporal nature, such as changing "before" to "after" or "during". Both TSEMLM and TRWR, detailed in Section 4.4, were conceived with the goal of examining whether incorporating "Person" entities and temporal signals via different designed objectives could enhance model performance. However, as our experimental results will later reveal, while they have shown promising results in certain downstream tasks, they are found to be less effective compared to the combined impact of TAMLM, DD, and TSER in BiTimeBERT 2.0. Subsequent sections will provide detailed elaborations on these three objectives of BiTimeBERT 2.0.

3.1 Time-aware Masked Language Modeling

The first pre-training objective, Time-Aware Masked Language Modeling (TAMLM), integrates both content time and temporal signals during pre-training. Content time refers to explicit temporal information embedded within the document’s content, while temporal signals are specific words that indicate temporal relations. Following [28], we classify temporal signals into three types, each representing a different temporal relation: BEFORE, AFTER, and OVERLAP. For instance, BEFORE type includes words like "before" and "prior to", AFTER type includes words such as "after" and "following", and OVERLAP type includes words like "during" and "in". Both content time and temporal signals are instrumental in understanding event developments and discerning relationships between events mentioned in texts, as evidenced in applications like timeline summarization [73] and temporal question answering [64, 65].

Consider a token sequence $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, where each x_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) represents a token in the vocabulary. First, we identify temporal expressions within the document content using spaCy,⁵ as highlighted in deep pink in Figure 1a. These recognized temporal expressions form the set $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$, where each t_i ($1 \leq i \leq m$) represents a specific temporal expression found in the text. Second, based on the temporal signals list taken from [28] and the extracted temporal expressions, we locate temporal signals within the text, as indicated by the light pink font at the bottom of Figure 1a. These signals form the temporal signal set S . Third, unlike BERT’s masking scheme where 15% of the sequence tokens are randomly sampled directly, we prioritize the extracted temporal expressions and temporal signals. Specifically, we randomly sample 30% of the entire temporal expressions in T and 30% of the entire temporal signals in S , as exemplified by "the 1990s" and "Before" in Figure 1a. This choice of 30% was determined through experimentation, as it yielded the best performance in most cases. Subsequently, we continue to randomly sample other tokens that are not part of T or S , until a total of 15% of the tokens are sampled. For instance, in Figure 1a, "born" and "figure" are sampled and masked, while the temporal signal "during" and temporal expression "2006" are not allowed to be sampled. Finally, similar to the BERT methodology, 80% of the sampled tokens are replaced with "[MASK]", 10% with random tokens, and 10% with the original tokens. For instance, in Figure 1b, which provides a more detailed input example

⁴The selected news article, titled "Add a Drunken-Driving Charge to Busta Rhymes’s Troubles," is published in The New York Times on 2007/05/04.

⁵Note that in this step, we also identify "Person" entities, which will be utilized in the TSER objective.

during pre-training, "clear" is sampled and remains unchanged, "music" is sampled and replaced with the random token "next", and other sampled tokens are replaced with "[MASK]".

Through the TAMLM masking scheme, BiTimeBERT 2.0 is explicitly prompted to incorporate both the inherent domain knowledge embedded in the news article collection and the explicit temporal information, encompassing content time and temporal signals. This strategy fosters the model's ability to integrate knowledge about interrelated events and understand the connections among various temporal expressions. Specifically, this approach forces the model to consider the contextual relationships of surrounding, unmasked temporal details when predicting tokens for masked temporal expressions or signals. For instance, consider the example illustrated in Figure 1b, where the model is presented with a text involving masked temporal expressions pertaining to the career of Mr. Smith, a notable figure in the rap music. The text indicates that his influential career spanned during a masked period, and before a specific year (masked as "[MASK] 2006"). To accurately reconstruct these masked tokens, BiTimeBERT 2.0 must infer from the available context that Mr. Smith's major career phase likely occurred in the 1990s and that a notable shift in his stance on violence and criminality emerged around 2006. This example clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of the TAMLM scheme in compelling the model to utilize both context and surrounding temporal cues. This fosters precise predictions of masked temporal elements, thereby significantly enriching the model's grasp of temporal dynamics and enhancing its overall temporal understanding.

3.2 Document Dating

The second pre-training objective, Document Dating (DD), is specifically designed to integrate the timestamp information during its pre-training phase. In news archives, each article is typically annotated with a timestamp denoting its publication date. As discussed earlier, the timestamp plays an important role in numerous applications, particularly in temporal information retrieval [33, 41, 65].

In the DD objective, the [CLS] token is inserted at the beginning of the input sequence, and its representation, $h_{[CLS]}$, serves as the contextual representation for the entire sequence. However, different from the conventional approach of binary classification for next sentence prediction (e.g., BERT), the [CLS] token is employed to predict the document timestamp, as indicated in green font in Figure 1a. An important hyper-parameter in this task is the granularity of the timestamp, which can vary from decade, year, month, to day temporal granularity. For instance, the timestamp of the news article in Figure 1a can be represented as "2007/05" under month granularity and simply "2007" under year granularity. It is noteworthy that existing models like TempoBERT [53] typically adopt broader temporal granularities, such as years or decades, in their pre-training phase. While this approach facilitates easier and more accurate timestamp predictions during pre-training, it often falls short in challenging time-related downstream tasks or in time-sensitive applications, such as event occurrence time prediction [66] and web content analysis [10, 43]. Our prior research has demonstrated that utilizing month granularity yields the most effective results across a variety of downstream tasks. Therefore, we have continued to employ month granularity in this work. However, an interesting observation from our studies is that the use of day granularity often leads to relatively poorer performance. We attribute this to the increased complexity of predicting timestamps at such a fine granularity. To illustrate, in the New York Times Annotated Corpus used in our studies, which covers the period from 1987/01/01 to 2007/06/19, the class number for document dating under day granularity is a staggering 7,475, compared to just 246 under month granularity. This exponential increase in class number necessitates a more extensive pre-training dataset to achieve effective training outcomes.

The DD objective, focused on predicting temporal aspects, significantly augments the model by infusing it with time-related and task-specific knowledge. This empowers the model on downstream time-related tasks, especially those

constrained by small dataset sizes that are typically insufficient for effective training using task-agnostic language models. Similar ideas have been extensively employed in other studies where language models are adapted to task-specific knowledge through task-oriented pre-training objectives, leading to improved model performance. For instance, Xu et al. [71] continually train BERT through a reading comprehension objective, achieving improved results in review reading comprehension tasks. Likewise, Ke et al. [34] propose the Sentilare model, which is trained to classify sentence sentiment during pre-training, and demonstrates strong performance on sentiment analysis tasks. Moreover, Han et al. [23] employ MLM during pre-training alongside the proposed utterance relevance classification objective, demonstrating good results in response selection tasks.

3.3 Time-sensitive Entity Replacement

The third and final pre-training objective of BiTimeBERT 2.0, Time-sensitive Entity Replacement (TSER), which concentrates on dynamic entities, marks a noteworthy improvement from our previous work [67]. This objective is inspired by the recognition that named entities, especially "Person" entities, inherently carry temporal significance. Previous research has demonstrated that integrating temporal information into named entity recognition can significantly enhance accuracy [21, 52, 70], affirming the close association between named entities and specific time periods. Agarwal et al. [1] also illustrate that the integration of temporal information into named entity disambiguation yields impressive results, particularly for entities of the "Person" type. Building upon this insight, the TSER objective in BiTimeBERT 2.0 specifically focuses on "Person" entities, given their pronounced temporal sensitivity.

In the TSER objective, we first construct a set of "Person" entities for each month within the pre-training corpus, comprising individuals mentioned in documents published in that specific month⁶. The identification of these entities is performed using spaCy, concurrently with the recognition of temporal expressions for the TAMLM task. Subsequently, for a given token sequence processed through the TAMLM's masking procedure, we focus on "Person" entities that have not been sampled. For example, in Figure 1b, entities like "Smith" and "Tupac Shakur" are considered, whereas "Notorious B.I.G." is excluded as its tokens are partially masked in TAMLM. Next, in 50% of cases, unsampled "Person" entities are replaced with others randomly selected from the same month's "Person" entity set, while no replacement is done for the other 50%. An example of this can be observed in Figure 1b, where "Tupac Shakur" is replaced by "Antonin Scalia" from the same month's set, while "Smith" is left unchanged. Finally, the model uses the concatenated boundary word representations of each "Person" entity to make a binary prediction ("replaced" vs. "not replaced"), akin to the methodology in WKLM [69].

By incorporating the TSER objective into BiTimeBERT 2.0, we aim to enhance the model's ability to analyze and interpret temporal nuances associated with dynamic entities, particularly "Person" entities. This capability is crucial in understanding the evolving context of these entities over time. Accurate identification and contextualization of "Person" entities within their specific temporal frames also enable BiTimeBERT 2.0 to offer in-depth insights into how related historical events and cultural evolution are framed in news texts. For example, a mention of Sam Altman is likely to point to a period around 2022 or later, coinciding with the notable development and influence of ChatGPT. Thus, by capturing the temporal information inherent in "Person" entities, BiTimeBERT 2.0 could provide a more dynamic and time-aware analysis of news content.

⁶Given that the New York Times Annotated Corpus spans 246 months from January 1987 to June 2007, this yields a collection of 246 distinct monthly "Person" entity sets.

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETTINGS

4.1 Pre-training Corpus Preprocessing and BiTimeBERT 2.0 Implementation

In this study, we utilize the New York Times Annotated Corpus (NYT corpus) [55] for pre-training BiTimeBERT 2.0. This corpus, encompassing over 1.8 million news articles from January 1987 to June 2007, stands as a well-established temporal news collection and has been widely used in Temporal Information Retrieval research [11, 32]. Building upon our previous findings [67], which demonstrated the corpus’s efficacy in generating time-aware language representations, we further refine this dataset to optimize our model’s training efficiency and effectiveness. This refined dataset, termed the Refined NYT (RNYT) corpus, specifically excludes sentences that lack content time. Consequently, articles devoid of any content time are omitted, resulting in a more focused corpus of approximately 1.4 million articles. This strategic refinement substantially reduces the training costs, cutting GPU hours from 80 to 38, without notably compromising the quality of the outcomes in most cases. We note that before the corpus pre-processing, 50,000 original articles were randomly sampled and removed from the NYT corpus. This subset is exclusively designated for experiments on the document dating downstream task, as detailed in Section 4.2. Therefore, these articles are excluded from the Refined NYT (RNYT) corpus to ensure the validity of our experiments.

As our method is applicable to all Transformer encoder-based language models, we adopt BERT [18] as the base framework. To mitigate the high costs of training from scratch, we initiate BiTimeBERT 2.0 with the parameters of the pre-trained $BERT_{BASE}$ (cased) model, which serves as a robust starting point for further training. BiTimeBERT 2.0 is continually pre-trained on the RNYT corpus for 10 epochs, incorporating the TAMLM, DD, and TSER tasks⁷. In the pre-training phase, we configure the model with a maximum sequence length of 512 and a batch size of 8. The optimization is performed using the AdamW optimizer [36], with a learning rate set to $3e-5$ and gradient accumulation fixed at 8.

4.2 Downstream Tasks

We rigorously evaluate BiTimeBERT 2.0 across six datasets, encompassing three distinct time-related downstream tasks: *event occurrence time estimation*, *document dating*, and *semantic change detection*. These tasks have significant implications in various domains of NLP and IR, such as enhancing the accuracy of historical event timelines [12, 58, 73], improving the precision of content retrieval based on specific time frames [64], and tracking the evolution of language and meanings in digital archives [62, 68]. Each task is designed to test a specific aspect of the model’s temporal understanding capabilities. For the task of event occurrence time estimation, we utilize the EventTime dataset [66] and the WOTD dataset [24]. This task focuses on accurately predicting the occurred time of specific events. In the document dating task, aimed at determining the publication timestamps of documents, we employ the NYT-Timestamp dataset and the TDA-Timestamp dataset. Finally, the task of semantic change detection aims to determine whether and to what extent the meanings of a set of target words have changed over time. For this task, we leverage the LiverpoolFC dataset [16] and the SemEval-English dataset [56], both of which are time-annotated corpora specifically curated for assessing semantic evolution. To determine how well a model can detect changes in the meaning of words over time, we measure its performance by comparing the model’s assessment of semantic shift for each target word to the semantic index (i.e., the ground truth).

The details of the six datasets are discussed below:

⁷This process takes approximately 38 hours on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU, significantly reducing the time compared to our prior research using the entire NYT corpus (80 hours).

Table 1. Statistics of six datasets across three distinct downstream tasks.

Dataset	Size	Time Span	Source	Granularity	Task
EventTime	22,398	1987-2007	Wikipedia & "On This Day" Website	Year, Month, Day	Event Occurrence Time Estimation
WOTD	6,809	1302-2018	Wikipedia Website	Year	Event Occurrence Time Estimation
NYT-Timestamp	50,000	1987-2007	News Archive	Year, Month, Day	Document Dating
TDA-Timestamp	50,000	1785-2009	News Archive	Year, Month, Day	Document Dating

(a) Statistics of event occurrence time estimation datasets and document dating datasets.

Dataset	Target Words	C1 Source	C1 Time Period	C2 Source	C2 Time Period
LiverpoolFC	97	Reddit	2011-2013	Reddit	2017
SemEval-English	37	CCOHA	1810-1860	CCOHA	1960-2010

(b) Statistics of semantic change detection datasets.

Table 2. Sample data from six datasets across three distinct downstream tasks.

Dataset	Text (Event Description or Document Content)	Time
EventTime	Mary Kay LeTourneau, 36, former teacher, who violated probation by seeing 14 year old father of her baby, sentenced to 7 years.	2006-09
WOTD	Louis XVI of France gives his public assent to Civil Constitution of the Clergy during the French Revolution.	1790
NYT-Timestamp	NASA managers said Wednesday that they would probably "never know for sure" what caused unexpected and mysterious debris to appear around the space shuttle Atlantis in the past two days ...	2006-09
TDA-Timestamp	Sir,-When a guest some 50 rears ago at an indigo factory in Bihar, I remember two Moslems paving mv host a visit accompanied by a \" wolf-child ' that was on a lead and progressed on her arms from ...	1927-04

(a) Sample data from event occurrence time estimation datasets and document dating datasets.

Dataset	Target Words with their Corresponding Shift Indices
LiverpoolFC	toxic (0.857); f5 (0.556); arrangement (0.413); vomit (0) ...
SemEval-English	plane (0.882); tip (0.678); attack (0.143); chairman (0) ...

(b) Sample data from semantic change detection datasets.

(1) **EventTime** [66]: This dataset contains descriptions and occurrence times of 22,398 events from January 1987 to June 2007, sourced from Wikipedia year pages⁸ and "On This Day" website.⁹ Since the compared SOTA method [66] performs search on the entire NYT corpus, we introduce an additional dataset named EventTime-WithTop1Doc. The aim is to simulate a comparable input setting to [66]. In the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset, we extract the top-1 relevant document for each event in the NYT corpus using the same retrieval method (BM25). Following this, the new model input is constructed by integrating the target event description alongside the appended timestamp and text content of the top-1 document.

(2) **WOTD** [24]: This dataset was scraped from Wikipedia's "On this day" webpages,¹⁰ comprising 6,809 short event descriptions along with their occurrence year information. WOTD encompasses 635 classes, each corresponding to a

⁸https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_years

⁹<https://www.onthisday.com/dates-by-year.php>

¹⁰https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:On_this_day/Today, accessed 01/2024.

different occurrence year. The earliest year is 1302, and the latest is 2018, with a median year of 1855.0 and a mean of 1818.7. Additionally, the authors provide contextual information (CI) about each event, consisting of relevant sentences extracted from Wikipedia through a series of carefully designed filtering steps, including key entity extraction and sentence filtering.¹¹ For testing purposes, we evaluate two versions of this dataset: one with contextual information (CI) and the other without (No_CI). It is important to note that only year information is provided as gold labels, limiting the models to predicting time at the year granularity. Furthermore, the time span of the WOTD dataset (1302-2018) significantly exceeds that of the NYT corpus (1987-2007) used for pre-training. This allows us to assess the models' robustness when confronted with a dataset spanning a much longer and older time range.

(3) **NYT-Timestamp**: NYT-Timestamp is employed for evaluating the models in the document dating task, utilizing 50,000 separate news articles from the NYT corpus [55], as discussed in Section 4.1.

(4) **TDA-Timestamp**¹²: We also evaluate document dating on the Times Digital Archive (TDA), which contains over 12 million news articles published across more than 200 years (1785-2012),¹³ Similar to NYT-Timestamp, we randomly sample 50,000 articles from the TDA corpus, with the time spans of the sampled articles ranging from "1785/01/10" to "2009-12-31". Similar to the WOTD dataset, this extended time span aids in comparing the robustness of different models. Such a long time span, akin to the WOTD dataset, aids in comparing the robustness of different models.

(5) **LiverpoolFC** [16]: The LiverpoolFC corpus, composed of Reddit posts from the Liverpool Football Club subreddit, is tailored for short-term meaning shift analysis in online communities. The data spans two distinct periods: 2011-2013 and 2017. In our study, we perform minimal text pre-processing, mainly removing URLs, following the methodology of Rosin et al. [53]. The semantic change evaluation utilizes a set of 97 words from this corpus, each annotated with semantic shift labels by the members of the LiverpoolFC subreddit [16]. These labels, ranging from 0 to 1, represent the degree of semantic change, with the average judgement serving as a gold standard semantic shift index.

(6) **SemEval-English** [56]: In contrast to the LiverpoolFC dataset, the SemEval-English dataset from SemEval-2020 Task 1 focuses on long-term semantic change detection, covering two centuries. SemEval-English dataset spans two distinct periods: 1810-1860 and 1960-2010. This task comprises two subtasks: binary classification of whether a word sense has been gained or lost (subtask 1) and ranking a list of words according to their degree of semantic change (subtask 2). We utilize the dataset for subtask 2, consisting of 37 target words accompanied by graded labels indicating semantic shift. These target words are carefully balanced in terms of part of speech (POS) and frequency. Same as prior work [53], we omit POS tags from both the corpus and the evaluation set.

Table 1 provides a summary of the basic statistics for the six datasets, containing two subtables for ease of reference. Table 1a details the four datasets utilized for event occurrence time estimation and document dating tasks, while Table 1b focuses on the two datasets employed for semantic change detection. Notably, the WOTD and TDA-Timestamp datasets encompass significantly longer time spans compared to the pre-training NYT corpus. Similarly, the SemEval-English dataset spans across two centuries, extending far beyond the NYT corpus timeframe. The LiverpoolFC corpus, meanwhile, contains text from a timeframe not covered in the NYT corpus.

Table 2 includes sample data from each of the six datasets. As shown in Table 2a, the datasets for EventTime, NYT-Timestamp, and TDA-Timestamp include detailed occurrence time or timestamp information. This allows the

¹¹The contextual information of the WOTD example in Table 2 contains sentence like "French forces were rebuilt, and feeling bitter about having lost many of France's overseas colonies to the British Empire during the Seven Years' War, Louis XVI was eager to give the American rebels financial and military support."

¹²https://www.gale.com/binaries/content/assets/gale-us-en/primary-sources/intl-gps/ghn-factsheets-fy18/ghn_factsheet_fy18_website_tda.pdf

¹³Note that despite TDA containing more articles and spanning a longer time period, the high number of OCR errors in TDA led us to use it only for testing, not for pre-training. In comparison with the NYT, errors are relatively common in TDA, especially in the early years [46]. The average error rate from 1785 to 1932 was found to be above 30%, with the highest rate reaching about 60%.

models tested on these datasets to be fine-tuned for estimating time with various temporal granularities (e.g., year or month). Conversely, models fine-tuned on WOTD are restricted to predicting time at a year granularity. The complexity of the task increases when estimating time at finer granularities, such as months, due to the substantial increase in the number of possible labels. For instance, the TDA dataset, when considered at month granularity, comprises 2,688 distinct labels corresponding to the total number of months covered. Furthermore, Table 2b offers examples of target words along with their semantic shift indices, illustrating the extent of semantic change over time. For example, the word "plane" exhibits a notable semantic shift from the 1810-1860 period to 1960-2010. In the earlier period, it predominantly referred to a flat surface, with the first successful powered airplane only being invented in 1903. However, by 1960-2010, its meaning expanded to include the now-common definition of a flying vehicle.

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

In our study, the first two downstream tasks involve time prediction. For these, we adopt accuracy (ACC) and mean absolute error (MAE) as our evaluation metrics, same as the approach in [66, 67]. For the semantic shift detection, we measure performance based on the correlation between the ground truth semantic shift index and the model's assessment for each word in the evaluation set. Thus, we utilize both Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients for this task, aligning with the methodology in [53]. These metrics are explained as follows:

- 1) **Accuracy (ACC)**: This metric calculates the percentage of events for which the model correctly predicts the occurrence time.
- 2) **Mean absolute error (MAE)**: MAE represents the average of the absolute differences between the model's predicted time and the actual occurrence time of events, tailored to the specified temporal granularity¹⁴.
- 3) **Pearson**: Pearson correlation assesses the linear correlation between the predicted semantic shifts and the ground truth. It evaluates how well the model's predictions mirror the actual changes in word meanings, considering the exact predicted values.
- 4) **Spearman**: Unlike Pearson, Spearman coefficient considers the rank order of the words. It evaluates how well the relationship between the predicted semantic shifts and the ground truth can be described using a monotonic function.

It is important to note that, with the exception of the WOTD dataset which only contains year information, all models in our study could potentially be evaluated under three different temporal granularities (day, month, and year), for both the event occurrence time estimation and document dating tasks. However, we observed that all the pre-trained language models exhibited relatively poor performance when evaluated at the day granularity level. Given this consistent underperformance across models, we have chosen not to include the results evaluated at day granularity in our analysis.

4.4 Compared Models

BiTimeBERT 2.0 is evaluated against a range of models to establish its effectiveness in various time-related tasks. The compared models include:

- (1) **RG**: The results are estimated through random guess. We compute the average performance across 1,000 random selections to establish a lower-bound benchmark for our datasets.

¹⁴For example, an MAE of 1 at year granularity implies an average temporal distance error of 1 year, whereas at month granularity, it implies an average error of 1 month.

(2) **SOTA-EOTE**: The state-of-the-art results for event occurrence time estimation on the EventTime and WOTD datasets, as reported in [66] and [24], respectively. Note that the two methods are not based on language models, and both consist of complex rules or steps of searching and filtering results to obtain the features for estimating the correct date. Thus, due to their task-specific nature, these methods may not be easily or quickly applicable in similar tasks.

(3) **BERT Variants**:

- **BERT-Orig**: The original $BERT_{BASE}$ (cased) model [18], trained on the BooksCorpus [75] and English Wikipedia.
- **BERT-NYT**: This variant is the BERT model continually pre-trained on the full NYT corpus for 10 epochs, employing Masked Language Modelling (MLM) and Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) tasks.
- **BERT-RNYT**: Similar to BERT-NYT, but pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus.

(4) **BERT+TIR**: This model, as explored in our previous work [67], represents an alternative approach to incorporating content temporal information. BERT+TIR involves the continuous pre-training of the BERT model on the NYT corpus for 10 epochs, utilizing both MLM and TIR (temporal information replacement) tasks. TIR specifically entails the replacement of temporal expressions within the input sequence. In 50% of the instances, these temporal expressions are substituted with others that maintain the same temporal granularity. This method aims to explore a different facet of using content time information.

(5) **TempoBERT**: TempoBERT [53] is a time-aware BERT model that incorporates timestamp information by prepending texts with timestamps and masking them during training, as discussed in Section 2.4. We compare our model to TempoBERT in the semantic change detection task, where TempoBERT is primarily focused. Rosin et al. [53] have also demonstrated that TempoBERT experiences a performance decline when compared to a fine-tuned BERT model in time prediction tasks.

(6) **BiTimeBERT Variants**:

- **BiTimeBERT**: Our previous version of BiTimeBERT, continually pre-trained on the NYT corpus for 10 epochs using TMLM and DD tasks [67].
- **BiTimeBERT-RNYT**: This variant of BiTimeBERT undergoes pre-training on the Refined NYT corpus, incorporating MLM and NSP tasks.
- **BiTimeBERT+TSEMLM**: This variant incorporates the TSEMLM (time-sensitive entity masked language modeling) task alongside TMLM and DD, and is pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus. The TSEMLM task specifically targets the masking and subsequent prediction of "Person" entities in the text after content temporal information is masked. By masking 30% of "Person" entities, TSEMLM aims to enhance the model's sensitivity to the temporal dynamics associated with individuals. This additional focus on "Person" entities is implemented to explore whether an alternative approach to incorporating time-sensitive entity information can yield improved performance.
- **BiTimeBERT+TRWR**: This variant extends the original BiTimeBERT by including the (temporal relation word replacement) task, alongside the TMLM and DD tasks, and is pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus. TRWR specifically focuses on replacing temporal signals within the text: in 50% of instances, it replaces these signals with alternatives of a different temporal nature (e.g., substituting "before" with "after" or "during"). This task challenges the model to accurately identify and adapt to these altered temporal contexts. The primary goal of incorporating TRWR is to assess whether this approach of temporal signal replacement can further improve the model's performance.

- **BiTimeBERT 2.0:** Our latest version of BiTimeBERT, continually pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus. This version incorporates the improvements from the TAMLM, DD, and TSER tasks, with an enhanced emphasis on the interpretation of temporal signals during the TAMLM process.

4.5 Fine-tuning Setting

For the tasks of event occurrence time prediction and document dating, we fine-tune the aforementioned language models using their respective datasets. In each language model, the final hidden state of the first token, denoted as $h_{[CLS]}$, is utilized as the representative vector for the entire sequence. A softmax classifier, parameterized by a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times H}$ where K is the number of categories in the dataset, is then appended. For all settings, a dropout rate of 0.1 is applied. The cross-entropy loss is optimized using the Adam optimizer, with a learning rate of $2e-5$ and a batch size of 16. Considering the nature of the input data, the maximum sequence length for fine-tuning on the EventTime and WOTD datasets is set to 128, as these typically involve shorter event descriptions. In contrast, for EventTime-WithTop1Doc, NYT-Timestamp, and TDA-Timestamp, where input sequences can be significantly longer, we set the maximum length to 512.

Regarding semantic change detection, we first adapt the language models to their respective domains using either the LiverpoolFC corpus or the SemEval-English corpus, depending on the dataset in focus. To ensure a fair comparison with TempoBERT [53], we adopt the same training hyperparameters. Specifically, for LiverpoolFC, we set the learning rate to $1e-7$ and train for one epoch, whereas for SemEval-English, we use a learning rate of $1e-6$ and train for two epochs. To ensure uniformity in domain adaptation, all models are continually trained using Masked Language Modeling (MLM). It is important to note that, due to the sentence-level nature of these corpora which typically lack content time information, we do not test Time-Aware Masked Language Modeling (TAMLM) in this phase. After the language models are trained and adapted to the specific domains, we employ TempoBERT’s methodology to generate representations of target words for each time period. These representations are then used to assess the degree of semantic change of the words, by using cosine distance (cos_dist). Specifically, Pearson’s correlation coefficient and Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient are calculated to evaluate the model’s effectiveness. Additionally, we report results using the "time-diff" distance method, which is tailored to TempoBERT, as introduced by Rosin et al. [53].

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

5.1 Main Results

5.1.1 Event Occurrence Time Estimation. Table 3 presents the results of various models in estimating event occurrence time, using the EventTime and WOTD datasets. Notably, BiTimeBERT 2.0 consistently outperforms other models pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus in terms of ACC and MAE across different settings, including year/month granularities, with/without top-1 document and with/without contextual information. When compared to state-of-the-art event occurrence time estimation (SOTA-EOTE) methods, BiTimeBERT 2.0 generally achieves superior results, with the exception of the ACC metric for EventTime-WithTop1Doc under month granularity. Interestingly, despite being trained on a significantly smaller corpus, BiTimeBERT 2.0 exhibits comparable performance to the original BiTimeBERT [67], which was pre-trained using the full corpus. Moreover, BiTimeBERT 2.0 achieves state-of-the-art performance on EventTime-WithTop1Doc under year granularity and excels in the WOTD dataset cross different settings. This highlights the effectiveness of our refined training approach, which also significantly reduces pre-training time. Additionally, we observe that BERT-Orig yields poor results compared to the other two BERT variants, and

Table 3. Performance comparison of different models on the event occurrence time estimation task, evaluated across two distinct datasets under different settings. Bold font indicates the best performing model while underline is used to mark the second best one.

Model	EventTime				EventTime-WithTop1Doc				WOTD		WOTD-WithCI	
	Year		Month		Year		Month		ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE
	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE				
RG	4.77	6.92	0.41	81.60	4.77	6.92	0.40	81.70	0.16	217.72	0.15	217.57
SOTA-EOTE	-	-	-	-	40.93	3.01	30.89	36.19	11.40	-	13.10	-
BERT-Orig	21.65	3.47	5.09	43.81	35.98	3.89	5.98	37.95	7.20	52.58	9.69	41.16
<i>Models Pre-trained using the NYT corpus</i>												
BERT-NYT	21.25	3.56	5.18	43.50	34.46	4.45	8.21	34.14	8.08	53.75	19.97	36.47
BERT+TIR	25.40	3.23	6.83	40.45	36.47	3.54	17.01	31.72	10.13	54.92	18.36	35.99
BiTimeBERT	31.91	3.12	12.99	34.79	<u>41.96</u>	2.40	<u>25.76</u>	28.86	<u>11.60</u>	<u>48.51</u>	<u>23.05</u>	33.70
<i>Models Pre-trained using the Refined NYT corpus</i>												
BERT-RNYT	23.44	3.37	5.91	43.30	34.69	2.72	12.46	34.92	8.08	49.46	19.24	33.40
BiTimeBERT-RNYT	28.48	3.24	8.84	38.43	39.22	2.67	19.55	30.34	10.28	52.71	21.73	35.11
BiTimeBERT+TSEMLM	28.21	3.22	9.33	39.95	38.66	2.58	18.48	31.80	10.28	57.00	21.15	36.19
BiTimeBERT+TRWR	27.68	<u>3.17</u>	9.11	38.45	40.31	<u>2.31</u>	19.87	<u>29.74</u>	10.72	53.84	22.17	<u>31.84</u>
BiTimeBERT 2.0	<u>29.29</u>	<u>3.17</u>	<u>10.71</u>	<u>36.85</u>	42.01	2.25	20.27	30.15	12.33	46.63	24.82	30.30

Table 4. Performance comparison of different models on the document dating task, evaluated using the NYT-Timestamp and TDA-Timestamp datasets.

Model	NYT-Timestamp				TDA-Timestamp			
	Year		Month		Year		Month	
	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE
RG	4.77	7.06	0.41	81.79	0.45	75.39	0.04	873.88
BERT-Orig	35.00	1.64	2.56	22.74	15.84	44.87	0.80	632.66
<i>Models Pre-trained using the NYT corpus</i>								
BERT-NYT	38.74	1.41	8.24	18.35	15.04	45.16	0.66	669.02
BERT+TIR	48.06	1.09	20.30	13.54	17.72	43.53	1.26	589.69
BiTimeBERT	58.72	0.80	31.10	9.54	<u>19.00</u>	40.11	<u>2.38</u>	<u>580.25</u>
<i>Models Pre-trained using the Refined NYT corpus</i>								
BERT-RNYT	39.00	1.49	12.76	19.37	15.92	45.89	0.78	624.63
BiTimeBERT-RNYT	50.06	1.08	23.62	13.26	16.44	43.59	1.04	583.49
BiTimeBERT+TSEMLM	49.64	1.13	23.22	13.40	17.64	42.86	1.08	613.07
BiTimeBERT+TRWR	52.18	1.15	25.38	12.88	17.40	42.97	1.36	597.26
BiTimeBERT 2.0	<u>54.48</u>	<u>1.05</u>	<u>28.92</u>	<u>10.36</u>	19.86	<u>42.26</u>	2.46	569.09

BERT-RNYT, despite being trained on a substantially smaller corpus, outperforms BERT-NYT in most cases. This suggests that, for temporal news collections, a more focused and refined dataset like the Refined NYT corpus may yield more effective results when applying BERT objectives. Furthermore, BiTimeBERT variants incorporating TSEMLM and TRWR objectives also demonstrate commendable performance, surpassing BERT+TIR which is trained on the complete NYT corpus using the temporal information replacement task. These findings also suggest the potential benefits of integrating time-sensitive entities and temporal signals in training.

When examining the performance on the original EventTime dataset, BiTimeBERT 2.0 shows impressive gains over BERT-RNYT, ranging from 24.95% to 81.21% in ACC and from 5.93% to 14.89% in MAE across year and month granularities. The original BiTimeBERT, trained with TAMLM and DD objectives, maintains a strong performance, validating the effectiveness of these objectives in capturing detailed temporal information within the news collection.

BiTimeBERT 2.0, while not quite matching BiTimeBERT, still achieves commendable second-best results, illustrating the successful integration of the enhancements.

In evaluating the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset, wherein the top-1 relevant document is considered, significant improvements are observed with BiTimeBERT 2.0 compared to BERT-RNYT models trained using the entire NYT corpus. Specifically, at the month granularity, BiTimeBERT 2.0 exhibits a substantial enhancement of 146.89% and 11.68% in ACC and MAE, respectively. In addition, its superiority over BERT-Orig is even more pronounced, achieving an impressive improvement of 246.15% and 20.55% in ACC and MAE at the month granularity, respectively. Notably, the SOTA method involves a time-consuming preparation of input for time estimation, relying on multivariate time series constructed from the top-50 retrieved documents through complex steps like sentence similarity computation. In contrast, our approach utilizes the simpler top-1 document ranked by BM25. We believe that the performance of BiTimeBERT 2.0 could be further enhanced by incorporating more useful information through advanced information retrieval techniques. Additionally, in comparison with BiTimeBERT, BiTimeBERT 2.0 excels particularly under year granularity, while being less effective in the month granularity.

Nonetheless, when considering the WOTD dataset, BiTimeBERT 2.0 demonstrates superior performance across different settings. Specifically, the improvements in ACC and MAE for WOTD, compared to BiTimeBERT, are 6.29% and 3.38%, respectively. This performance further enhances to 7.67% and 10.08% when incorporating contextual information.¹⁵ The noteworthy achievement of BiTimeBERT 2.0 on WOTD, a challenging dataset with a timespan significantly longer than that of the pre-training corpus, underscores its robust generalization ability.

5.1.2 Document Dating. Table 4 presents the results of the document dating task. Notably, all language models exhibit poor performance under month granularity for TDA-Timestamp, likely due to the challenge posed by the 2,627 month labels and the broad timestamp range spanning from 1785 to 2009 across 50,000 articles in TDA-Timestamp. Consequently, our primary comparison focuses on NYT-Timestamp at both year and month granularities, along with TDA-Timestamp at year granularity. Similarly, BiTimeBERT consistently outperforms other language models pre-trained with the Refined NYT corpus. For example, when evaluating using NYT-Timestamp at year and month granularities, the improvement over BERT-RNYT ranges from 39.69% to 122.64% in terms of ACC. For TDA-Timestamp at year granularity, the ACC and MAE improvements are 24.74% and 7.91%, respectively. Additionally, BiTimeBERT+TSEMLM and BiTimeBERT+TRWR also yield relatively favorable results on document dating, surpassing BERT+TIR but falling short of BiTimeBERT 2.0. However, when comparing with the original BiTimeBERT, BiTimeBERT outperforms the second-best BiTimeBERT 2.0 on the NYT-Timestamp dataset, while being less effective on the TDA-Timestamp dataset in most cases. This could be attributed to BiTimeBERT being trained on the significantly larger NYT articles corpus, encompassing articles published in similar time periods as those in the NYT-Timestamp dataset, potentially causing information leakage during the pre-training phase.

5.1.3 Semantic Change Detection. In the semantic change detection task, as presented in Table 5, we assess the extent to which the meanings of target words have evolved over time using the relevant corpora. BiTimeBERT 2.0 is compared with TempoBERT [53], a time-aware BERT variant that introduces timestamps into texts and masks these during training. Contrasting with TempoBERT that only integrates timestamp information, BiTimeBERT 2.0 additionally leverages content temporal information and time-sensitive entity data. While TempoBERT’s evaluation involves its tailored time-diff and cosine distance (cos_dist) methods, other models, including BiTimeBERT 2.0, primarily use

¹⁵As elucidated in Section 4.2, contextual information comprises relevant sentences extracted from Wikipedia, serving as external knowledge.

Table 5. Performance comparison of different models on the semantic change detection task, evaluated using the LiverpoolFC and SemEval-Eng datasets.

Model	LiverpoolFC		SemEval-Eng	
	Pearson	Spearman	Pearson	Spearman
BERT-Orig	0.414	0.454	0.483	0.416
TempoBERT (cos_dist)	0.371	0.451	0.538	0.467
TempoBERT (time-diff)	0.637	0.620	0.208	0.381
<i>Models Pre-trained using the NYT corpus</i>				
BERT-NYT	0.431	0.463	0.510	0.422
BiTimeBERT	0.468	0.476	<u>0.616</u>	<u>0.476</u>
<i>Models Pre-trained using the Refined NYT corpus</i>				
BERT-RNYT	0.437	0.453	0.555	0.415
BiTimeBERT-RNYT	0.435	0.457	0.585	0.403
BiTimeBERT+TSETAAML	0.431	0.425	0.586	0.468
BiTimeBERT+TRWR	0.472	0.429	0.606	0.427
BiTimeBERT 2.0	<u>0.493</u>	<u>0.498</u>	0.635	0.506

cos_dist to calculate Pearson and Spearman correlation scores. Focusing on cos_dist, BiTimeBERT 2.0 demonstrates superior performance, particularly on the long-term SemEval-English corpus, with statistically significant correlations ($p < 0.005$). For instance, in comparison to TempoBERT on SemEval-English, BiTimeBERT 2.0 shows an enhancement of 18.29% and 8.35% in Pearson and Spearman scores, respectively. Additionally, it surpasses the original BiTimeBERT’s performance on the same corpus by 3.08% (Pearson) and 6.30% (Spearman), and on LiverpoolFC by 5.34% (Pearson) and 4.62% (Spearman). Interestingly, while TempoBERT, using its tailored time-diff method, attains the best results on the short-term LiverpoolFC corpus, it undergoes a significant performance drop on the long-term SemEval-English corpus when applying the same method. In contrast, BiTimeBERT maintains relatively stable and robust results across various corpora types using cos_dist. This observation underscores the necessity of selecting the appropriate measurement method (cos_dist or time-diff) based on the temporal span of the corpus (long-term or short-term) for effective semantic change detection with TempoBERT.

5.2 Additional Analysis

5.2.1 Ablation Study. To assess the impact of the three objectives in BiTimeBERT 2.0, we perform an ablation analysis and present the results in Table 6 and Table 7. This analysis involves comparing four distinct model configurations, each combining different pre-training tasks, and testing them across four datasets. Notably, we exclude the TDA-Timestamp dataset at month granularity from our tests due to its poor performance in this setting. *MLM*, *TAML*M, *DD* and *TSER* indicate the corresponding models trained using only MLM, TAML, DD or TSER tasks, respectively. *TAML*M+*DD* means the model utilizing both the TAML and the DD objectives, aligning with the original BiTimeBERT model’s approach. The *TAML*M+*TSER* model integrates the TAML with the TSER objectives, and the *DD*+*TSER* model combines the DD with the TSER objectives. Lastly, the *TAML*M+*DD*+*TSER* configuration encompasses all three proposed objectives, representing the complete BiTimeBERT 2.0 model. To ensure a fair and effective comparison, all model variants are continually pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus for 3 epochs, using *BERT*_{BASE} model as their starting point.

As shown in Table 6 and Table 7, TAML+DD+TSER, which uses the three pre-training tasks of BiTimeBERT 2.0, consistently achieves superior results across the four datasets. This underscores the collective contribution of the TAML, DD, and TSER objectives to the model’s performance, facilitating the generation of effective time-aware language representations. When examining models that incorporate only two of the three objectives, we observe a

Table 6. Ablation test on event occurrence time estimation task. All models are pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus for 3 epochs.

Model	EventTime				EventTime-WithTop1Doc				WOTD		WOTD-WithCI	
	Year		Month		Year		Month		ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE
	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE				
MLM	20.79	3.62	5.22	44.52	37.42	2.94	11.47	32.10	7.66	58.08	16.74	33.49
TAMLM	22.28	3.42	6.73	43.42	38.46	2.74	12.59	30.50	8.64	54.22	18.21	30.38
DD	23.54	3.66	8.01	41.74	39.73	2.73	15.39	32.11	9.69	62.90	17.47	43.53
TSER	20.71	3.69	5.15	48.03	36.96	2.83	8.40	34.88	6.02	54.06	14.78	42.91
TAMLM+DD	25.98	3.28	8.44	38.22	39.38	2.69	19.69	29.77	10.28	55.61	22.03	32.70
TAMLM+TSER	23.54	3.46	7.40	42.42	<u>40.27</u>	<u>2.66</u>	16.21	<u>29.91</u>	9.84	<u>53.29</u>	22.03	<u>33.00</u>
DD+TSER	25.62	3.43	8.17	40.07	40.09	2.57	17.86	31.35	<u>11.16</u>	56.91	<u>22.61</u>	38.43
TAMLM+DD+TSER	27.19	3.19	10.05	<u>38.48</u>	41.96	2.71	19.80	29.99	11.89	50.57	23.49	33.51

Table 7. Ablation test on document dating task. All models are pre-trained on the Refined NYT corpus for 3 epochs.

Model	NYT-Timestamp				TDA-Timestamp	
	Year		Month		Year	
	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE	ACC	MAE
MLM	32.24	1.47	6.15	18.36	13.11	44.29
TAMLM	34.98	1.32	10.01	17.01	14.46	42.90
DD	44.48	1.51	19.28	15.77	15.63	45.13
TSER	32.12	1.46	8.38	19.16	15.10	45.29
TAMLM+DD	48.22	1.17	21.76	13.64	16.64	44.83
TAMLM+TSER	39.92	1.33	19.28	14.16	17.00	41.90
DD+TSER	47.94	1.15	<u>22.22</u>	13.93	<u>17.50</u>	41.14
TAMLM+DD+TSER	50.06	<u>1.16</u>	24.22	13.52	18.02	42.41

trend where these models generally outperform those utilizing a single objective. Particularly, the TAMLM+DD model, embodying two of the original BiTimeBERT’s pre-training tasks, consistently ranks second-best in most scenarios. Interestingly, while the TAMLM+DD and DD+TSER models show relatively higher performance than TAMLM+TSER on the NYT-Timestamp dataset, their effectiveness is more evenly matched on the TDA-Timestamp dataset. This could be attributed to potential information leakage during pre-training on the NYT corpus, which may have influenced the performance on the NYT-Timestamp dataset and may not apply to the TDA dataset. Focusing on models utilizing a single objective, we find that the TAMLM model consistently surpasses the MLM model. Moreover, the DD model generally outperforms other single-objective models, particularly excelling in the document dating task. This finding confirms the benefit of aligning pre-training and downstream tasks. Although TSER alone is less effective compared to TAMLM and DD, its combination with these tasks, such as in TSER+TAMLM, consistently enhances the model’s performance, indicating the value of integrating time-sensitive entity information for a more comprehensive temporal understanding.

5.2.2 Analysis of Event Type Distribution and Prediction Accuracy in Time Estimation Tasks. In our subsequent analysis, we aim to investigate the types of events that BiTimeBERT 2.0 accurately predicts, particularly focusing on the EventTime-WithTop1Doc and WOTD datasets at year granularity. We randomly select 200 instances from each dataset and manually categorize these events into 10 distinct types: "Political and Governmental Events", "Sports and Athletic Events", "Arts, Entertainment, and Media", "Scientific and Technological Advances", "Natural Disasters and Environmental Events", "Cultural, Social, and Religious Events", "Economic and Business Events", "Legal and Judicial Events", "Military and Conflict Events", and "Miscellaneous Events". We then analyze the events correctly predicted by the BiTimeBERT




Fig. 2. Comparative analysis of sampled event types VS. event types that are accurately predicted by BiTimeBERT 2.0 in event occurrence time estimation task.

2.0. Of the 200 instances in the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset, BiTimeBERT 2.0 accurately predicts 67 instances, while in the WOTD dataset, it correctly predicts 50 instances. In Figure 2, the subfigures (a) and (b) illustrate the overall distributions of the 200 sampled events for EventTime-WithTop1Doc and WOTD, respectively, while (c) and (d) display the distributions of the event types among those correctly predicted by BiTimeBERT 2.0. To further quantify this analysis, we calculated the recall for each event type, essentially the ratio of accurately predicted events to the total number of instances for that specific category. For example, among the 200 sampled instances, there were 37 'Political and Governmental Events', of which 14 were correctly predicted by BiTimeBERT 2.0. Thus, the recall ratio for this category is 0.3783 (14 out of 37). This metric, depicted in subfigures (e) and (f) of Figure 2, provides a nuanced understanding of the model's predictive accuracy across different event types.

When comparing subfigures (a) and (b) in Figure 2, we can see that the event types within the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset are more evenly distributed, with four types each exceeding 10%. However, in both datasets, "Political and Governmental Events" and "Military and Conflict Events" are the two most prevalent categories. However, a closer analysis of the correctly predicted events, as shown in subfigures (c) and (d) of Figure 2, reveals that "Political and Governmental Events" continue to dominate, maintaining a significant proportion similar to their original distribution. Interestingly, while most event types follow a similar distribution pattern as seen in subfigures (a) and (b), a notable reduction in the representation of "Military and Conflict Events" is observed in the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset. This shift indicates a varying degree of predictive accuracy for different event types, with "Political and Governmental Events" being more consistently and accurately predicted by BiTimeBERT 2.0. The proficiency of BiTimeBERT 2.0 in accurately predicting the occurrence times across various event types becomes evident when examining Figure 2 (c) and (d), which depict the ratio of correctly predicted events to the total number of sampled events for each type. Notably, in the case of the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset, where the event times fall within the span of the pre-training corpus, BiTimeBERT 2.0 demonstrates a relatively uniform prediction accuracy across most event types. This consistency suggests the model's robust understanding and handling of temporal information within its training scope. In contrast, the prediction accuracy on the WOTD dataset, which features a broader and more varied historical scope, shows more diversity in its results. This variance in the WOTD dataset underscores the challenges and nuances associated with predicting times for events that extend beyond the temporal range encountered during the model's pre-training.




Fig. 3. Accuracy Trends of BiTimeBERT and BERT Over Time

5.2.3 Model Accuracy Trends Over Time. In this section, we delve into the accuracy trends of BiTimeBERT 2.0 and BERT-RNYT in estimating event occurrence times, based on the main results obtained in Section 5.1.1. Figure 3 plots the accuracy trends of BiTimeBERT 2.0 and BERT-RNYT on EventTime-WithTop1Doc and WOTD-WithCI under year granularity. It is important to note the distinct time span characteristics of these datasets: EventTime-WithTop1Doc aligns with the pre-training NYT corpus spanning 1987-2007, whereas WOTD-WithCI covers a broader range, extending from 1302 to 2018. For EventTime-WithTop1Doc, our analysis focuses on the models' yearly accuracy from 1987 to 2007. Conversely, for WOTD-WithCI, we assess accuracy in 50-year intervals due to its extensive time span. Our observations reveal that BiTimeBERT 2.0 generally outperforms BERT-RNYT in both datasets over time, underscoring the effectiveness of BiTimeBERT 2.0's three integrated objectives. Specifically, in the EventTime-WithTop1Doc dataset, BiTimeBERT 2.0 demonstrates notably higher accuracy in the earlier years, particularly in 1989 and 1997, with the smaller scale of improvement in later years. For WOTD-WithCI, BiTimeBERT 2.0 is either consistently better or performs same as BERT-RNYT at every time point. The largest improvement is observed from 1700 to 1850 and then from 1900 onwards, with many of these periods falling outside the pre-training corpus's temporal scope. These results underscore BiTimeBERT 2.0's robustness and adaptability, highlighting its ability to effectively handle events from a wide range of time periods, even those well beyond its training data. This trend not only reflects the model's strong generalization capabilities but also suggests that BiTimeBERT 2.0's performance could be further augmented by training on larger and more temporally diverse news collections, making it particularly suited for diverse and historically extensive datasets.

6 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have presented a novel and effective language representation model called BiTimeBERT 2.0, which is specifically designed to enhance temporal understanding of text and has demonstrates exceptional performance across various time-related tasks. BiTimeBERT 2.0 is trained over a temporal news collection through three innovative pre-training objectives: Time-Aware Masked Language Modeling (TAMLM), Document Dating (DD), and Time-Sensitive Entity Replacement (TSER). Each objective targets a unique aspect of temporal information, encompassing timestamp, content time and time-sensitive entities. In addition to these advancements, our refined approach to corpus processing, which in most cases significantly reduces the training cost without compromising the quality, further enhances the model's applicability and efficiency. Through comprehensive experiments, we have validated the effectiveness of these pre-training tasks. The findings from our study underscore that BiTimeBERT 2.0 does not only excel in generating time-aware representations but also significantly boosts performance across a spectrum of time-related downstream tasks. This demonstrates its potential as a powerful tool for temporal analysis in various NLP applications. In the future, we aim to further expand the capabilities of BiTimeBERT 2.0 by exploring the integration of additional time-sensitive entities, such as Products and Events, as these entities inherently carry temporal information.

REFERENCES

- [1] Prabal Agarwal, Jannik Strötgen, et al. 2018. Dianed: Time-aware named entity disambiguation for diachronic corpora. In *ACL*. 686–693.
- [2] James Allan, Rahul Gupta, and Vikas Khandelwal. 2001. Temporal summaries of new topics. In *Proceedings of the 24th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 10–18.
- [3] Omar Alonso, Michael Gertz, and Ricardo Baeza-Yates. 2009. Clustering and exploring search results using timeline constructions. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Information and knowledge management*. 97–106.
- [4] Omar Alonso, Jannik Strötgen, Ricardo Baeza-Yates, and Michael Gertz. 2011. Temporal Information Retrieval: Challenges and Opportunities. *Twaw* 11 (2011), 1–8.
- [5] Sophia Althammer, Mark Buckley, Sebastian Hofstätter, and Allan Hanbury. 2021. Linguistically Informed Masking for Representation Learning in the Patent Domain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05768* (2021).

- [6] Cristina Barros, Elena Lloret, Estela Saquete, and Borja Navarro-Colorado. 2019. NATSUM: Narrative abstractive summarization through cross-document timeline generation. *Information Processing & Management* 56, 5 (2019), 1775–1793.
- [7] Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. Scibert: A pretrained language model for scientific text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10676* (2019).
- [8] Klaus Berberich and Srikanta Bedathur. 2013. Temporal diversification of search results. In *Proceedings of SIGIR 2013 workshop on time-aware information access*.
- [9] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165* (2020).
- [10] Maria Carla Calzarossa and Daniele Tessera. 2015. Modeling and predicting temporal patterns of web content changes. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 56 (2015), 115–123.
- [11] Ricardo Campos, Gaël Dias, Alípio M Jorge, and Adam Jatowt. 2014. Survey of temporal information retrieval and related applications. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 47, 2 (2014), 1–41.
- [12] Ricardo Campos, Arian Pasquali, Adam Jatowt, Vítor Mangaravite, and Alípio Mário Jorge. 2021. Automatic Generation of Timelines for Past-Web Events. In *The Past Web*. Springer, 225–242.
- [13] Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodrimos Malakasiotis, Nikolaos Aletras, and Ion Androutsopoulos. 2020. LEGAL-BERT: The muppets straight out of law school. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02559* (2020).
- [14] Ranganathan Chandrasekaran, Vikalp Mehta, Tejali Valkunde, and Evangelos Moustakas. 2020. Topics, trends, and sentiments of tweets about the COVID-19 pandemic: Temporal infoveillance study. *Journal of medical Internet research* 22, 10 (2020), e22624.
- [15] Jeremy R Cole, Aditi Chaudhary, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Partha Talukdar. 2023. Salient Span Masking for Temporal Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12860* (2023).
- [16] Marco Del Tredici, Raquel Fernández, and Gemma Boleda. 2018. Short-term meaning shift: A distributional exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.03169* (2018).
- [17] Leon Derczynski. 2017. *Automatically Ordering Events and Times in Text*. Vol. 677. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47241-6>
- [18] 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* (2018).
- [19] Bhuwan Dhingra, Jeremy R Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W Cohen. 2021. Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15110* (2021).
- [20] Mario Giulianelli, Marco Del Tredici, and Raquel Fernández. 2020. Analysing lexical semantic change with contextualised word representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14118* (2020).
- [21] Carlos-Emiliano González-Gallardo, Emanuela Boros, Edward Giamphy, Ahmed Hamdi, José G Moreno, and Antoine Doucet. 2023. Injecting Temporal-Aware Knowledge in Historical Named Entity Recognition. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer, 377–393.
- [22] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 3929–3938.
- [23] Janghoon Han, Taesuk Hong, Byoungjae Kim, Youngjoong Ko, and Jungyun Seo. 2021. Fine-grained Post-training for Improving Retrieval-based Dialogue Systems. In *Proceedings of the NAACL 2021: Human Language Technologies*. 1549–1558.
- [24] Or Honovich, Lucas Torroba Hennigen, Omri Abend, and Shay B Cohen. 2020. Machine reading of historical events. In *Proceedings of ACL 2020*. 7486–7497.
- [25] Kexin Huang, Jaan Altosaar, and Rajesh Ranganath. 2019. Clinicalbert: Modeling clinical notes and predicting hospital readmission. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05342* (2019).
- [26] Raghav Jain, Daivik Sojitra, Arkadeep Acharya, Sriparna Saha, Adam Jatowt, and Sandipan Dandapat. 2023. Do Language Models Have a Common Sense regarding Time? Revisiting Temporal Commonsense Reasoning in the Era of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 6750–6774.
- [27] Adam Jatowt, Ching-Man Au Yeung, and Katsumi Tanaka. 2013. Estimating Document Focus Time. In *Proceedings of CIKM 2013*. 2273–2278.
- [28] Zhen Jia, Abdalghani Abujabal, Rishiraj Saha Roy, Jannik Strötgen, and Gerhard Weikum. 2018. Tempquestions: A benchmark for temporal question answering. In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018*. 1057–1062.
- [29] Hideo Joho, Adam Jatowt, and Blanco Roi. 2013. A survey of temporal web search experience. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web*. 1101–1108.
- [30] Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Yinhan Liu, Daniel S Weld, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. 2020. Spanbert: Improving pre-training by representing and predicting spans. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 8 (2020), 64–77.
- [31] Nattiya Kanhabua and Avishek Anand. 2016. Temporal information retrieval. In *Proceedings of SIGIR 2016*. 1235–1238.
- [32] Nattiya Kanhabua, Roi Blanco, and Kjetil Nørkvåg. 2015. Temporal Information Retrieval. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 9, 2 (2015), 91–208. <https://doi.org/10.1561/15000000043>
- [33] Nattiya Kanhabua and Kjetil Nørkvåg. 2010. Determining time of queries for re-ranking search results. In *International conference on theory and practice of digital libraries*. Springer, 261–272.
- [34] Pei Ke, Haozhe Ji, Siyang Liu, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. 2019. SentiLARE: Sentiment-aware language representation learning with linguistic knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02493* (2019).

- [35] Asif Khan, Jian Ping Li, Naeem Ahmad, Shuchi Sethi, Amin Ul Haq, Sarosh H Patel, and Sabit Rahim. 2020. Predicting emerging trends on social media by modeling it as temporal bipartite networks. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 39635–39646.
- [36] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [37] Laura Korkeamäki and Sanna Kumpulainen. 2019. Interacting with Digital Documents: A Real Life Study of Historians' Task Processes, Actions and Goals. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (Glasgow, Scotland UK) (CHIIR '19). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295750.3298931>
- [38] Guillaume Lample and Alexis Conneau. 2019. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07291* (2019).
- [39] Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2019. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11942* (2019).
- [40] Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. 2020. BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics* 36, 4 (2020), 1234–1240.
- [41] Xiaoyan Li and W Bruce Croft. 2003. Time-based language models. In *Proceedings of CIKM 2003*. ACM, 469–475.
- [42] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [43] Kelly MacKay, Danielle Barbe, Christine M Van Winkle, and Elizabeth Halpenny. 2017. Social media activity in a festival context: Temporal and content analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 29, 2 (2017), 669–689.
- [44] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781* (2013).
- [45] Sebastian Nagel. 2016. Cc-news. URL: <http://web.archive.org/save/http://commoncrawl.org/2016/10/newsdatasetavailable> (2016).
- [46] Kai Niklas. 2010. Unsupervised post-correction of OCR errors. *Master's thesis. Leibniz Universität Hannover* (2010).
- [47] Marius Pasca. 2008. Towards Temporal Web Search. In *SAC*. 1117–1121.
- [48] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 1532–1543.
- [49] Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. arXiv:1802.05365 [cs.CL]
- [50] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. (2018).
- [51] 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. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21, 1 (2020), 5485–5551.
- [52] Shruti Rijhwani and Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro. 2020. Temporally-informed analysis of named entity recognition. In *ACL*. 1–13.
- [53] Guy D Rosin, Ido Guy, and Kira Radinsky. 2022. Time masking for temporal language models. In *Proceedings of WSDM 2022*. 833–841.
- [54] Guy D Rosin and Kira Radinsky. 2022. Temporal Attention for Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02093* (2022).
- [55] Evan Sandhaus. 2008. The new york times annotated corpus. LDC2008T19. *Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia* 6, 12 (2008), e26752.
- [56] Dominik Schleichweg, Barbara McGillivray, Simon Hengchen, Haim Dubossarsky, and Nina Tahmasebi. 2020. SemEval-2020 task 1: Unsupervised lexical semantic change detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.11464* (2020).
- [57] Michael Stack. 2006. Full text search of web archive collections. *Proc. of IAWAW* (2006).
- [58] Julius Steen and Katja Markert. 2019. Abstractive Timeline Summarization. In *the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*. 21–31.
- [59] Jannik Strötgen and Michael Gertz. 2012. Event-centric search and exploration in document collections. In *JCDL*. 223–232.
- [60] Andrey Styskin, Fedor Romanenko, Fedor Vorobyev, and Pavel Serdyukov. 2011. Recency ranking by diversification of result set. In *Proceedings of CIKM 2011*. 1949–1952.
- [61] Krysta M Svore, Jaime Teevan, Susan T Dumais, and Anagha Kulkarni. 2012. Creating temporally dynamic web search snippets. In *In SIGIR 2012*. 1045–1046.
- [62] Nina Tahmasebi, Gideon Zenz, Tereza Iofciu, and Thomas Risse. 2010. Terminology Evolution Module for Web Archives in the LiWA Context. In *10th International Web Archiving Workshop*. 55–62.
- [63] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 5998–6008.
- [64] Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, Michael Färber, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2020. Answering Event-Related Questions over Long-Term News Article Archives. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer, 774–789.
- [65] Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, Michael Färber, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2021. Improving question answering for event-focused questions in temporal collections of news articles. *Information Retrieval Journal* (2021), 1–26.
- [66] Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2021. Event Occurrence Date Estimation based on Multivariate Time Series Analysis over Temporal Document Collections. In *Proceedings of SIGIR 2021*. 398–407.
- [67] Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, Masatoshi Yoshikawa, and Yi Cai. 2023. Bitimebert: Extending pre-trained language representations with bi-temporal information. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 812–821.
- [68] Melvin Wevers and Marijn Koolen. 2020. Digital begriffsgeschichte: Tracing semantic change using word embeddings. *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History* 53, 4 (2020), 226–243.

- [69] Wenhan Xiong, Jingfei Du, William Yang Wang, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Pretrained encyclopedia: Weakly supervised knowledge-pretrained language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.09637* (2019).
- [70] Chengjin Xu, Fenglong Su, Bo Xiong, and Jens Lehmann. 2022. Time-aware entity alignment using temporal relational attention. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 788–797.
- [71] Hu Xu, Bing Liu, Lei Shu, and Philip S Yu. 2019. BERT post-training for review reading comprehension and aspect-based sentiment analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02232* (2019).
- [72] Yusuke Yamamoto, Taro Tezuka, Adam Jatowt, and Katsumi Tanaka. 2008. Supporting Judgment of Fact Trustworthiness Considering Temporal and Sentimental Aspects. In *Web Information Systems Engineering - WISE 2008, 9th International Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, September 1-3, 2008. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 5175)*, James Bailey, David Maier, Klaus-Dieter Schewe, Bernhard Thalheim, and Xiaoyang Sean Wang (Eds.). Springer, 206–220. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-85481-4_17
- [73] Yi Yu, Adam Jatowt, Antoine Doucet, Kazunari Sugiyama, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2021. Multi-timeline summarization (mtls): Improving timeline summarization by generating multiple summaries. In *In ACL 2021*. 377–387.
- [74] Ben Zhou, Kyle Richardson, Qiang Ning, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Dan Roth. 2020. Temporal reasoning on implicit events from distant supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12753* (2020).
- [75] Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 19–27.