

# An Evaluation of Sindhi Word Embedding in Semantic Analogies and Downstream Tasks

Wazir Ali<sup>1</sup>, Saifullah Tumrani<sup>2</sup>, Jay Kumar<sup>3</sup>, Tariq Rahim Soomro<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> College of Computer Science and Information Systems, Institute of Business Management, 75190 Karachi, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup> Department of Bioinformatics, Heidelberg University, Germany

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Computer Science, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada

aliwazirjam@gmail.com

## Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new word embedding based corpus consisting of more than 61 million words crawled from multiple web resources. We design a preprocessing pipeline for the filtration of unwanted text from crawled data. Afterwards, the cleaned vocabulary is fed to state-of-the-art continuous-bag-of-words, skip-gram, and GloVe word embedding algorithms. For the evaluation of pretrained embeddings, we use popular intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation approaches. The evaluation results reveal that continuous-bag-of-words and skip-gram perform better than GloVe and existing Sindhi fastText word embedding on both intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation approaches.

**Keywords:** Language Resources, Corpus Acquisition, Sindhi Language, Neural Networks, Word Embeddings

## 1. Introduction

Sindhi is a rich morphological, multi-script, and multi-dialectal language. It belongs to the Indo-Aryan language family (Cole, 2006), with significant cultural and historical background. Presently, it is recognized as an official language (Motlani, 2016) in Sindh province of Pakistan, also being taught as a compulsory subject in schools and colleges. Sindhi is also recognized as one of the national languages in India (Ali et al., 2015). It is spoken by nearly 75 million people (Motlani, 2016). Persian-Arabic is the standard script of Sindhi, which was officially accepted in 1852 by the British government<sup>1</sup>. However, the Sindhi-Devanagari is also a popular writing system in India being written in left to right direction like Hindi language. Sindhi stands among the low-resource languages due to the scarcity of core language resources (LRs) of the unlabelled corpus, which can be utilized for training word embeddings or state-of-the-art language models.

Language resources are fundamental elements for the development of high-quality natural language processing (NLP) systems. The development of such resources has received great research interest for the digitization of human languages (Ali et al., 2020). Such LRs include written or spoken corpora, lexicon, and annotated corpora. Many world languages are rich in such LRs, including English (Honnibal and Montani, 2017; Bird et al., 2009; Manning et al., 2014), Chinese (Che et al., 2010) and other languages (Popel and Žabokrtský, 2010; Padró et al., 2010). Sindhi is still at its developing phase for its basic LRs (Ali et al., 2021b). Only a few resources have been introduced for Sindhi Persian-Arabic including raw corpus (Rahman, 2010; Bhatti et al., 2014; Dootio and Wagan, 2019a; Motlani, 2016), labelled corpus (Ali and Wagan, 2017; Dootio and Wagan, 2019b; Ali et al., 2020; Ali et al., 2021b; Ali et

al., 2021a). Unfortunately, the existing raw corpora are not sufficient to train word embeddings and developing language-independent NLP applications for statistical Sindhi language processing such as semantic, semantic analysis and automatic development of WordNet.

More recently, neural network based models (Otter et al., 2020) yield state-of-the-art performance in NLP with the word embeddings (Pennington et al., 2014; Mikolov et al., 2018; Grave et al., 2018). One of the advantages of such techniques is they use unsupervised approaches for learning representations and do not require annotated corpus, which is rare for low-resourced Sindhi language.

In this paper, we address the problem of corpus scarcity by crawling a large corpus of more than 61 million words from multiple web resources using the web-scraping. Afterwards, the corpus is utilized to train Sindhi word embeddings using state-of-the-art GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), SG and CBoW (Mikolov et al., 2013a; Mikolov et al., 2013b; Mikolov et al., 2018) algorithms. The popular intrinsic (Schnabel et al., 2015) and extrinsic (Nayak et al., 2016) evaluation methods are employed for the performance evaluation of the proposed and existing fastText (Grave et al., 2018) Sindhi word embeddings. The synopsis of our novel contributions is listed as follows:

- We crawl a large corpus of more than 61 million words obtained from multiple web resources and reveal a list of Sindhi stop-words.
- We generate word embeddings using CBoW, SG, and GloVe. Evaluate them using the popular intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation approaches.
- We evaluate Sindhi fastText word representations and compare them with our proposed Sindhi word embeddings.

<sup>1</sup><https://www.britannica.com/topic/Sindhi-language>

## 2. Related work

Abundant LRs are available for resource enriched languages which are integrated in the software tools such as Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) for English (Bird et al., 2009) that provides more than 50 lexical resources and corpora for classification, tokenization, stemming, tagging, parsing, and semantic reasoning with an easy-to-use interfaces. In contrast, Sindhi language is at early stage (Dootio and Wagan, 2019a) for the development of such resources and software tools.

The corpus construction for NLP mainly involves important steps of acquisition, preprocessing, and tokenization. Little work exists on the corpus construction for Sindhi. Initially, (Rahman, 2010; Khoso et al., 2019) discussed the morphological structure and challenges concerned with the corpus development along with orthographic and morphological features in Persian-Arabic script. (Bhatti et al., 2014) utilized the raw corpus for Sindhi word segmentation using a dictionary-based approach. (Motlani, 2016) crawled raw corpus for the annotation purpose. (Dootio and Wagan, 2017) proposed a basic preprocessing model for lemmatization and stemming for Sindhi Persian Arabic. (Nathani et al., 2019) also proposed lemmatizer for Sindhi-Devanagari. (Shah et al., 2018) build a corpus of more than 1 million words by crawling news, books, magazines, and blogs for the ongoing annotation project for Sindhi using XML tagging approach. The corpus lacks open-source availability, and the statistics do not show the text analysis. (Dootio and Wagan, 2019a) collected and analyzed text corpus from multiple web resources. The analysis is performed by using N-grams for term frequency-inverse document frequency and document term matrix. We present the gist of existing and proposed resources in Table ?? on the corpus development and word embeddings, respectively.

Word embeddings such as fastText (Bojanowski et al., 2017; Mikolov et al., 2018), Word2Vec (Mikolov et al., 2013b; Mikolov et al., 2013a), and GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) are popular and key methods to solving many NLP problems.

The recent use cases of word embeddings are not only limited to boost statistical NLP applications but can also be used to develop other LRs, such as automatic construction of WordNet (Khodak et al., 2017) using the unsupervised approach. The performance of word embeddings is evaluated using the intrinsic evaluation methods (Schnabel et al., 2015; Pierrejean and Tanguy, 2018) and extrinsic evaluation methods (Nayak et al., 2016). The intrinsic approach is used to measure the internal quality of word embeddings, such as by querying nearest neighboring words (Pierrejean and Tanguy, 2018) and calculating the semantic or syntactic similarity between similar word pairs. The key advantage of that method is to reduce bias and create insight to find data-driven relevance judgment. An extrinsic evaluation approach is used to evaluate the performance in

	Paper	Resource
Corpus	(Rahman, 2010)	4.1M tokens
	(Bhatti et al., 2014)	1,575K tokens
	(Motlani, 2016)	Wiki-dumps (2016)
	(Shah et al., 2018)	100K tokens
	(Dootio and Wagan, 2019a)	31K tokens
Embedding	(Grave et al., 2018) (fastText)	Wiki-dumps (2016)
	This work (SG, CBoW, GloVe)	61.39M tokens
	This work	340 stop words
	Sindhi WordSim	347 word pairs

Table 1: Comparison of the existing and proposed work on Sindhi corpus construction and word embeddings. The stop-words were filtered from the entire vocabulary for the training of GloVe model.

downstream NLP tasks, such as POS tagging or named-entity recognition (Schnabel et al., 2015). But Sindhi lacks the unlabelled corpus, which can be utilized for training word embeddings.

## 3. Corpus Acquisition

The corpus is a collection of human language text (Schäfer and Bildhauer, 2013) built with a specific purpose. We initiate this study from scratch by crawling large corpus from multiple web resources. This section presents the employed methodology in detail for corpus acquisition, preprocessing, statistical analysis. In fact, realizing the necessity of large text corpus for Sindhi, we started this research by collecting raw corpus from multiple web resource using web-scrapy framework<sup>2</sup> for extraction of news columns of daily Kawish<sup>3</sup> and Awami Awaz<sup>4</sup> Sindhi newspapers, Wikipedia dumps<sup>5</sup>, short stories and sports news from Wichaar<sup>6</sup> social blog, news from Focus Word press blog<sup>7</sup>, historical writings, novels, stories, books from Sindh Salamat<sup>8</sup> literary websites, novels, history and religious books from Sindhi Adabi Board<sup>9</sup> and tweets regarding news and sports are collected from twitter<sup>10</sup>.

### 3.1. Preprocessing

The preprocessing of text corpus obtained from multiple web resources is a challenging task especially

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/scrapy/scrapy>

<sup>3</sup><http://kawish.asia/Articles1/index.htm>

<sup>4</sup><http://www.awamiawaz.com/articles/294/>

<sup>5</sup><https://dumps.wikimedia.org/sdwiki/20180620/>

<sup>6</sup><http://wichaar.com/news/134/>

<sup>7</sup><https://thefocus.wordpress.com/>

<sup>8</sup><http://sindhsalamat.com/>

<sup>9</sup>[http://www.sindhadiadabiboard.org/catalogue/History/Main\\_History.HTML](http://www.sindhadiadabiboard.org/catalogue/History/Main_History.HTML)

<sup>10</sup><https://twitter.com/dailysindhetimes>

Source	Category	Sentences	Vocabulary	Unique words
Kawish	News columns	473,225	13,733,379	109,366
Awami awaz	News columns	107,326	7,487,319	65,632
Wikipedia Social Blogs	Miscellaneous	844,221	8,229,541	245,621
	Stories, sports	7,018	254,327	10,615
	History, News	3,260	110,718	7,779
Focus word press	Short Stories	63,251	968,639	28,341
	Novels	36,859	998,690	18,607
	Safarnama	138,119	2,837,595	53,193
Sindh Salamat	History	145,845	3,493,020	61,993
	Religion	96,837	2,187,563	39,525
	Columns	85,995	1,877,813	33,127
	Miscellaneous	719,956	9,304,006	168,009
Sindhi Adabi Board	History books	478,424	9,757,844	57,854
Twitter	News tweets	10,752	159,130	9,794
Total		3,211,088	61,399,584	908,456

Table 2: Statistics of crawled corpus from multiple web resources

it becomes more complicated when working on low-resourced language like Sindhi due to the lack of open-source preprocessing tools such as NLTK (Bird et al., 2009) for English. Therefore, we design a preprocessing pipeline for the filtration of unwanted data and vocabulary of other languages such as English in order to prepare input for word embedding models. Moreover, we reveal the list of Sindhi stop-words, which is a labor-intensive task and requires human judgment as well. Hence, the most frequent and least important words are classified as stop-words with the help of a Sindhi linguistic expert.

- **Input:** The first part of the preprocessing pipeline consists of the input of collected text documents after concatenation.
- **Replacement symbols:** The punctuation marks, such as comma, quotation, exclamation, colon, and semi-colon are replaced with white space for authentic tokenization. Without replacing these symbols with white space, the words were joined with their next or previous corresponding words.
- **Tokenization:** The punctuation marks, *except full stop and question mark*, special symbols were replaced with white space for authentic tokenization. Afterwards, the white spaces and punctuation markers *full stop and question mark* are used as word boundaries for the tokenization.
- **Filtration of noisy data:** The text acquisition from web resources contains a huge amount of noisy data. After the tokenization process, the noisy data is filtered out, such as the rest of the punctuation marks, special characters, HTML tags, all types of numeric entities, math symbols, email, and web addresses.
- **Normalization:** In this step, we normalize the

text to lower-case for the filtration of English vocabulary, and duplicate words.

- **Output:** We obtain the cleaned vocabulary after employing preprocessing pipeline on the crawled data.

## 4. Corpus Statistics

The large corpus acquired from multiple resources is rich in vocabulary. We present the complete statistics of collected corpus (see Table 2) with number of sentences, words and unique tokens.

### 4.1. Letter occurrences

The length of words is analyzed, which is essential to develop NLP systems, including learning of word embeddings to choose the minimum or maximum length of subwords for character-level representation learning (Mikolov et al., 2018). The table Table 3 shows that bi-gram words are most frequent, mostly consist of stop-words. Secondly, 4-gram words have a higher frequency in the corpus.

### 4.2. Stop words

The most frequent and least important words in NLP are often classified as stop-words. The removal of such words can boost the performance of the NLP model (Pandey and Siddiqui, 2009), such as sentiment analysis and text classification. But the construction of such a word list is time-consuming and requires user decisions. Firstly, we determined Sindhi stop-words by counting their term frequencies, and secondly, by analyzing their grammatical status with the help of Sindhi linguistic expert because all the frequent words are not stop-words (see Figure ??). After determining the importance of such words with human judgment, we placed them in the list of stop-words. The total number of detected stop-words is 340 in our developed corpus. The partial list of most frequent Sindhi stop-words is

n-grams	Frequency	% in corpus
Uni-gram	936,301	1.52889
Bi-gram	19,187,314	31.3311
Tri-gram	11,924,760	19.472
4-gram	14,334,444	23.4068
5-gram	9,459,657	15.4467
6-gram	3,347,907	5.4668
7-gram	1,481,810	2.4196
8-gram	373,417	0.6097
9-gram	163,301	0.2666
10-gram	21,287	0.0347
11-gram	5,892	0.0096
12-gram	3,033	0.0049
13-gram	1,036	0.0016
14-gram	295	0.0004
Total	61,240,454	100

Table 3: Length of letter n-grams in words, along-with frequency and percentage in corpus

depicted in Table 4 along with their frequency. The filtration of stop-words is an essential preprocessing step for learning GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) word embedding. However, the sub-sampling approach (Bojanowski et al., 2017; Mikolov et al., 2018) is used to discard such most frequent words in CBoW and SG models.

## 5. Word embedding models

The embedding models can be broadly categorized into predictive and count-based methods, being generated by employing co-occurrence statistics, NN based, and probabilistic algorithms. The GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) treats each word as a single entity in the corpus and generates a vector of each word. However, CBoW and SG (Mikolov et al., 2013a; Mikolov et al., 2013b), later extended (Bojanowski et al., 2017; Mikolov et al., 2018), rely on simple two-layered NN architecture which uses linear activation function in hidden layer and softmax in the output layer.

### 5.1. GloVe

The GloVe is a log-bilinear regression (Pennington et al., 2014) model, which combines two local context window and global matrix factorization methods. It weights the contexts using the harmonic function for training word embeddings from given input vocabulary in an unsupervised way.

### 5.2. Continuous bag-of-words

The standard CBoW is the inverse of SG (Mikolov et al., 2013a) model, which predicts input word on behalf of the context. The length of an input to the CBoW model depends on the setting of context window size ( $ws$ ), which determines the distance to the left and right of the target word. Hence the context is a window that contains neighboring words. The objective of the

Word	Freq:	Word	Freq:	Word	Freq:
جي	2068791	سندن	50219	دوران	21351
جو	980764	۽	49856	ويندا	20829
ته	895430	ويندو	49060	وغيره	20214
تي	528745	رهيا	46609	پوء	20132
به	538301	هوندو	45822	جاري	192667
سان	409252	منهنجي	43204	هلي	19200
ان	397751	ها	42837	ورتو	18996
نه	397393	بي	42508	لفظ	18026
هو	393941	هنن	38121	۾	17784
جا	291307	توهان	37991	مطلب	16773
هن	283280	بعد	37032	هجن	16602
مان	231711	هوندي	36961	اسين	16308
اهو	192158	نالو	35774	مثال	15405
جنهن	183937	صفحو	35711	ويون	15278
ويو	165138	اتي	34695	ايندو	14814
انهن	156051	تمام	33882	خود	14702
اسان	151600	وارن	33303	ايترو	13837
يا	150984	نالي	32736	جيان	13797
سندس	129866	هتي	32449	آهن	13514
واري	120907	تنهن	32343	بس	12823
مون	108985	تان	31957	باوجود	12656
اها	101799	سو	31562	ثابت	12620
آهي	100484	بابت	30835	تو	12601
هي	87537	يعني	30146	چو	12592
هتي	82867	ويندي	28525	معني	12408
جن	80650	اوهان	27497	رهيون	10941
رهيو	77724	ارا	27030	عنوان	10889
هر	74937	هيون	26425	باري	10875
وري	62225	صرف	25442	مليو	10844
رهي	60474	سي	25271	جلد	10791
ته	59968	تون	24903	تنهنجي	10790
ويا	58308	هيو	24871	وي	10339
هجي	51691	اي	24656	ويهي	10337
وارو	51501	فقط	22149	ايندا	10167

Table 4: Partial list of Sindhi stop-words in the corpus from most to less frequent. Freq: denotes the frequency of each word

CBoW is to maximize the probability of given neighboring words.

### 5.3. Skip-gram

The SG model predicts surrounding words by giving input word (Mikolov et al., 2013b) with the training objective of learning good word embeddings that efficiently predict the neighboring words. The goal of skip-gram is to maximize average log-probability of words across the entire training corpus.

## 6. Evaluation methods

We employ intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation approaches for the performance analysis of proposed word embeddings. The intrinsic evaluation is based on semantic, syntactic similarity (Schnabel et al., 2015) in word embeddings. The word similarity approach states (Levy et al., 2015) that the words are similar if they appear in a similar context. The intrinsic evaluation is based on the nearest neighboring words, word pair relationship, and Sindhi WordSim-347.

For the extrinsic evaluation, we use the word embedding clusters as features for two NLP tasks of part-of-speech tagging and named entity recognition. SiPOS (Ali et al., 2021b) and SiNER (Ali et al., 2020) datasets are used for experiments following the suggested standard split, respectively. In the extrinsic evaluation of proposed word embeddings, we use them as input features to a downstream task of POS tagging and NER, measure the performance specific to that task. We exploit recently proposed neural model (Ali et al., 2021b) based on bidirectional long short-term memory (BiLSTM) network, self-attention (SA), and sequential conditional random field (CRF).

## 7. Experiments and Results

The embedding models are trained on the corpus after employing preprocessing pipeline to the crawled data. In the training phase, the optimal hyper-parameters (Schnabel et al., 2015) are more important than designing a novel algorithm. We optimize the dictionary and algorithm-based parameters of CBoW, SG, and GloVe algorithms. All the experiments are conducted on the GTX 1080-TITAN GPU machine.

### 7.1. Parameters

The state-of-the-art SG, CBoW (Mikolov et al., 2013a; Mikolov et al., 2013b; Bojanowski et al., 2017; Mikolov et al., 2018) and GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) word embedding algorithms are exploited for the development of Sindhi word embeddings by parameter tuning. These parameters can be categorized into a dictionary and algorithm-based. Therefore, more robust embeddings became possible to train with hyper-parameters optimization. We tuned and evaluated the hyper-parameters of CBoW, SG, and GloVe algorithms

Parameter	CBoW, SG	GloVe
Epoch	100	100
Learning rate	0.25	0.25
Embedding dimension	300	300
minn char	02	–
maxn char	07	–
Window size	7	7
Negative sampling	20	–
minw	4	4

Table 5: Parameters for CBoW, SG, and GloVe models

individually, which are depicted in Table 5. The selection of minimum (*minn*) and the maximum (*maxn*) length of character  $n - grams$  is an important parameter for learning character-level representations of words in CBoW and SG (Bojanowski et al., 2017). Therefore, the n-grams from 3 – 9 were tested to analyze the impact on the performance of embeddings. We optimized the length of character n-grams from *minn* = 2 and *maxn* = 7 by keeping in view the length of letter n-grams in words, depicted in Table 3. We evaluated the range of minimum word counts from 1 to 8. It is analyzed that the size of input vocabulary is decreasing at a large scale by ignoring more words. Similarly, the vocabulary size was increasing by considering rare words. Therefore, ignoring words with a frequency of  $< 5$  in CBoW, SG, and GloVe consistently yield better results. We use hierarchical softmax for CBoW, negative sampling for SG and default loss function for GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014). The recommended verbosity level, number of buckets, threads, sampling threshold, are used for training CBoW, SG (Mikolov et al., 2018), and GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014).

### 7.2. Intrinsic Evaluation

The cosine similarity matrix (Levy et al., 2015) is a common and primary method to measure the distance between a set of words and nearest neighbors. The high cosine similarity score denotes the closer words in the embedding matrix, while the less cosine similarity score means the higher distance between word pairs. The intrinsic evaluation methods of querying nearest neighboring words, word pair relationship, and WordSim-347.

#### 7.2.1. Nearest neighboring words

Each word contains the most similar top eight nearest neighboring words in Table 6 determined by the highest cosine score. We present English translation of both query and retrieved words also discuss their English meaning for ease of relevance judgment. To take a closer look at the semantic and syntactic relationship captured in the proposed word embeddings, Table 6 shows the top eight nearest neighboring words of five different query words **Friday** (جمعو), **Spring** (بهار), **Cricket** (ڪرڪيٽ), **Red** (ڳاڙهو), **Scientist** (سائنسدان) taken from the vocabulary. As the first query word *Friday* returns the names of days *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, *Tuesday*, *Wednesday*, *Thursday* in an unordered sequence. The SdfastText returns five names of days *Sunday*, *Thursday*, *Monday*, *Tuesday* and *Wednesday*, respectively. The GloVe model also returns five names of days. However, CBoW and SG gave six names of days except *Wednesday* along with different writing forms of query word being written in Sindhi language. The CBoW and SG returned more relevant words as compare to SdfastText and GloVe. Moreover, the CBoW returned *Add* and GloVe returns *Honorary* words which are not similar to the query word. But SdfastText gave

Query	fastText	Eng. Trans.	CBoW	Eng. Trans.	SG	Eng. Trans.	GloVe	Eng. Trans.
جمعو Friday	آچر روز خميسو خميس سومر اڱارو اربع هي. اڀڙو آهي	Sunday On the day Kameeso (N) Thursday Monday Tuesday Wednesday Phrase	سومر جمعون آچر اڱارو جمعاڻي خميس ڇنڇر آچر	Monday Friday Sunday Tuesday On Friday Thursday Saturday Sunday	جمعون جمعي جمعا خميس سومر ڇنڇر آچر اڱارو	Friday Friday Fridays Thursday Monday Saturday Sunday Tuesday	جمعرات اربع ڇنڇر روز مانائتي خميس جمعي جمعون	Thursday Wednesday Saturday On the day Honorary Thursday Friday Friday
بهار Spring	بهارجو بهار دلبيهار بهارن جومشهورگلو اشبهار بودلو فرزانہ	of spring spring Dilbahar (N) Springs Phrase Ashbahar (N) Bodlo (N) Farzana (N)	بهار خزان پربهار سرهاڻ بهارن سدابهار سيارو اونهارو	Springs Autumn Mid-autumn Fragrance On Springs Ever spring Winter Summer	بهاران بهار خزان توندڙ پربهار سيارو اونهارو بهار	Springs Springs Autumn Bloom mid spring Winter summer spring	بهاري سدا خوبصورتِيءَ بهار بهارن خوشبو خزان پربهار	Comfort Ever Beauty Spring Springs Fragrance Autumn Mid spring
ڪرڪيٽ Cricket	ڪرڪيٽ. ويو ڪرڪيٽرز ڪرڪيٽرن ڪرڪيٽر 20 ٽوئنٽي عڪسلو نڪرڪ ڪيڏيو ڪيڏيل	Gone.cricket Cricketers Cricketers Cricketer T-Twenty Misspelled Played Being played	ڪبڊي ٽورنامينٽ ڪرڪيٽرن مئچ رانديگر رانديگر بٽ هاڪي	Kabadi (N) Tournament Cricketers Match Players Game Bat Hockey	ڪرڪيٽرن ڪرڪيٽر هاڪي ٽوئنٽي رانديگر مئچ فڪسنگ بال	Cricketers Cricketers Hockey Twenty Game Match Fixing Bat	ڪرڪيٽر ٽوئنٽي گرانو بن ڪرڪيٽرن ٽيسٽ مئچ ٽوئنٽي هارائي	Cricketer Twenty Grounds Cricketers Test Match Twenty Lost
ڳاڙهو Red	ڳاڙهوي ڳاڙهه ڳاڙه ڳاڙهسرو ڳاڙهائڻ ڳاڙهين ڳاڙهان هاڙهو	Reddish Red Red Reddish Light red Red's Light red Unknown	ڳاڙهي ڳاڙهوي اچو پيلو هيڊو ڳاڙه ڳاڙهسري ڳاڙهسرو	Red Reddish White Yellowish Yellowish Red Reddish Reddish	ڳاڙهوي ڳاڙهي ڳاڙه ڳاڙههريڙو ڳاڙه ڳاڙهسرو ڳاڙهان ڳاڙهان	Reddish Red Red Reddish Yellow Reddish Light red Light red	لالتين ڳاڙهان هيڊو ڳاڙهوي ڳاڙهسرو ڳاڙه ڳاڙهان ڳاڙهي	Red lamp Light red Yellowish Reddish Reddish Red Light red Red
سائنسدان Scientist	سائنسدانون سائنسدان سائنسن سائنسدانن سائنسدان نيڪوٽ سائنسي	Urdu word Scientists Sciences Misspelled Misspelled Unknown Scientific	سائنسدانن مفڪر فلاسافر اينگريميمينڊر ڪيميادان ماهر سائنس	Scientists Thinker philosopher Anaximander Chemist Expert Science	ڪيميادان سائنسدانن آئنسٽائن سائنسٽ اسٽائن سائنسدان آئنسٽائن	Chemist Scientists Einstein Scientist Stein Scientist Einstein	سوشل سائنسدان سڪالاجسٽ ڪائره گيلواني فلاسافر مفڪر	Social Scientist Psychologist Kaira (N) Gailwani Philosopher Thinker

Table 6: Eight nearest neighboring words of each query word. Eng. Trans. denotes the English translation of each word

two irrelevant words of *Kameeso (N)* which is a name (N) of a person in Sindhi, and *Phrase* is a combination of three Sindhi words. Similarly, second query word *Spring* retrieved accurately as names of seasons by CBoW, SG, and GloVe, respectively. However, SdfastText returned four irrelevant words of *Dilbahar (N)*, *Phrase*, *Ashbahar (N)* and *Farzana (N)* out of eight nearest neighbors. The third query word *Cricket* is the name of a popular game. The first retrieved word *Kabadi (N)*, by CBoW is the name of a popular game being played in Asia. Including *Kabadi (N)* all the returned words by CBoW, SG and GloVe are related to query word *Cricket*. However, two words are combined with a punctuation mark (.) in the first retrieved word by SdfastText, which shows the tokenization error in preprocessing step. The sixth retrieved word *Mis-*

*spelled* is a combination of three words, not related to query word. Furthermore, the fourth query word *Red* gave the names of closely related colors and different forms of query word being written in Sindhi language. The last returned word *Unknown* by SdfastText is irrelevant, not found in Sindhi dictionary for translation. The query word *Scientist* also contains semantically related words returned by CBoW, SG, and GloVe, but the first word given by SdfastText belongs to the Urdu language. Another *unknown* word returned by SdfastText does not have any meaning in Sindhi dictionary. It seems that the vocabulary of SdfastText also contains words of other languages. More interesting observations in the presented results are the diacritized words retrieved by our proposed CBoW, SG, and GloVe word embedding models. Hence, the overall performance of

the proposed SG, CBoW, and GloVe demonstrate high semantic relatedness in retrieving the top eight nearest neighbor words as compare to SdfastText.

### 7.3. Word pair relationship

The average similarity score between countries and their capitals is depicted in Table 7 along with English translation of each word pair. The SG model yields the best average score of **0.675** followed by CBoW with a 0.634 similarity score. The GloVe also yields better semantic relatedness of 0.594, and the SdfastText yields an average score of 0.391, respectively. The first query word **China-Beijing** is not available in the vocabulary of SdfastText. It shows that along with performance, the vocabulary in SdfastText is also limited as compared to our proposed word embeddings. However, the similarity score between *Afghanistan-Kabul* is lower in our proposed CBoW, SG, and GloVe models, because the word *Kabul* is the name of the capital of *Afghanistan* as well as it frequently appears as an adjective in Sindhi text which means *able*.

### 7.4. WordSim-347

We evaluate and compare the performance of our proposed word embeddings using the WordSim-353 dataset by translating English word pairs to subsequent Sindhi words. Due to vocabulary differences between English and Sindhi, we were unable to find the authentic meaning of six terms, so we left these terms untranslated. So our final Sindhi WordSim consists of 347 word pairs. Table 8 shows the Spearman correlation results on different dimensional embeddings on the translated Sindhi WordSim. The Table 8 shows complete results with the different *ws* for CBoW, SG and GloVe. The window size of 7 subsequently yield better performance. The SG model outperforms CBoW and GloVe in semantic and syntactic similarity by achieving the accuracy of **0.651**. In comparison with English (Mikolov et al., 2013a) achieved the average semantic and syntactic similarity of 0.637, 0.656 with CBoW and SG, respectively. Moreover, CBoW, SG, and GloVe models also surpass the recently proposed SdfasText (Grave et al., 2018). Therefore, despite the challenges in translation from English to Sindhi, our proposed word embeddings have efficiently captured the semantic and syntactic relationship.

### 7.5. Embedding visualization

The purpose of embeddings visualization is to keep similar words close together in 2-dimensional  $x, y$  coordinate pairs while maximizing the distance between dissimilar words. The t-SNE has a tunable perplexity (PPL) parameter to balance the data points at both the local and global levels. We visualize the 300- $D$  embeddings using  $PPL = 20$  on 5000-iterations. We use the same query words (see Table 6) by retrieving the top 20 nearest neighboring word clusters for a better understanding of the distance between similar words.




Figure 1: Visualization of Sindhi CBoW word embeddings




Figure 2: Visualization of the Sindhi SG word embeddings




Figure 3: Visualization of the Sindhi GloVe word embeddings




Figure 4: Visualization of the SdfastText word embeddings

Word pair	English Translation	fastText	CBoW	SG	GloVe
چائڻ-بيجينگ	China-Beijing	N.A	0.637	<b>0.764</b>	0.558
آمريڪا-نيويارڪ	America-New York	0.371	0.654	0.699	0.546
جاپان-ٽوڪيو	Japan-Tokyo	0.451	0.634	0.672	<b>0.813</b>
انڊيا-ممبئي	India-Mumbai	0.266	0.669	<b>0.768</b>	0.634
بنگلاديش-ڍاڪا	Bangladesh-Dhaka	0.428	0.647	0.661	0.598
ايران-تهران	Iran-Tehran	0.431	0.685	<b>0.774</b>	0.584
افغانستان-قابل	Afghanistan-Kabul	0.103	0.316	0.317	0.269
عراق-بغداد	Iraq-Baghdad	0.450	<b>0.716</b>	<b>0.739</b>	0.562
سعودي-رياض	Saudi-Riyadh	0.454	0.598	0.694	0.628
ملائيشيا-ڪوالالمپور	Malaysia-Kuala Lumpur	0.573	<b>0.792</b>	<b>0.753</b>	<b>0.712</b>
Average		0.391	0.634	<b>0.675</b>	0.594

Table 7: Cosine similarity score (higher is better) between country and capital. The bold results highlight the best scores between country and capital words

Embedding Model	ws	Accuracy
CBoW	3	0.596
	5	0.618
	7	<b>0.621</b>
Skip gram	3	<b>0.625</b>
	5	<b>0.649</b>
	7	<b>0.651</b>
GloVe	3	0.593
	5	0.614
	7	0.618
SdfastText		0.374

Table 8: Comparison of semantic and syntactic accuracy of proposed word embeddings using WordSim-353 dataset on 300 –  $D$  embedding, on choosing various window sizes

Every query word has a distinct color for the clear visualization of a similar group of words. The closer word clusters show the high similarity between the query and retrieved word clusters. The word clusters in SG (see Fig. 2) are closer to their group of semantically related words. Secondly, the CBoW model depicted in Fig. 1 and GloVe (Fig. 3) also show the better cluster formation of words than SdfastText (Fig. 4), respectively.

## 7.6. Extrinsic Evaluation

AdaGrad is used for training statistical models. As recommended by Levy, Goldberg, and Dagan (2015), additional experiments are conducted by concatenating the word and contextual vectors ( $w+c$ ). For the NER experiments, the highest F1-score of 86.19 is achieved by the skip-gram with negative sampling embeddings (SGNS) using the agglomerative clustering. On the other hand, the highest accuracy of 97.51 is achieved by Brown clustering (using raw text instead of embeddings). These results outperform the previous work (Pradhan et al. 2013), showing the absolute improve-

ments of 3.770.42All of the above experiments are using the maximum cluster size of 1,500. We also tested on the max cluster size of 15,000, which showed very similar results. This implies that the increase of cluster size does not improve the quality of the clusters, at least for these two tasks. For the NER task, SGNS and Brown give constant additive increase in performance regardless of the size of the training data

Embedding Model	Accuracy
CBoW	95.17
SG	95.32
GloVe	94.52
SdfastText	92.76

Table 9: Extrinsic evaluation of various embeddings on Sindhi POS tagging task using SiPOS dataset

Embedding Model	P%	R%	F1%
CBoW	90.18	90.39	89.9
SG	90.27	90.64	90.11
GloVe	88.37	89.25	88.79
fastText	84.	84.	84.

Table 10: Extrinsic evaluation of various embeddings on Sindhi NER task using SiNER dataset

Embedding Model	P%	R%	F1%
CBoW	0.18	00.39	00.9
SG	0.27	00.64	00.11
GloVe	0.37	00.25	00.79
fastText	.00	00.	00.

Table 11: Extrinsic evaluation of various pretrained word embeddings using BiLSTM-SA model on Sindhi NER task using SiNER dataset



## 8. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose word embedding based large corpus of more than 61 million tokens, list of stop-words, and Sindhi word embeddings using state-of-the-art CBoW, SG, and GloVe algorithms. The proposed word embeddings are evaluated using the popular intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation approaches. We translate English WordSim-353 to Sindhi by using the English-Sindhi bilingual dictionary for intrinsic evaluation. The empirical results demonstrate that SG yields the best performance than CBoW and GloVe models by retrieving authentic nearest neighboring words, a high average cosine similarity score of 0.660 between different word pairs, 0.675 between country and capital words, and 0.651 accuracy on WordSim-347.

In the future, we will utilize the corpus for annotation projects such as POS tagging named entity recognition and sentiment analysis. Moreover, the generated word embeddings can be utilized for the automatic construction of Sindhi WordNet. Furthermore, we will also utilize the corpus using Bi-directional Encoder Representation Transformer BERT, bi-directional language model Elmo and Generative Pretrained Transformer GPT for learning deep contextualized representations.

## 9. Bibliographical References

- Ali, M. and Wagan, A. I. (2017). Sentiment summarization and analysis of Sindhi text. *Int. J. Adv. Comput. Sci. Appl.*, 8(10):296–300.
- Ali, W., Kehar, A., and Shaikh, H. (2015). Towards Sindhi named entity recognition: Challenges and opportunities. In *1st National Conference on Trends and Innovations in Information Technology*.
- Ali, W., Lu, J., and Xu, Z. (2020). Siner: A large dataset for Sindhi named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of The 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 2953–2961.
- Ali, W., Ali, N., Dai, Y., Kumar, J., Tumrani, S., and Xu, Z. (2021a). Creating and evaluating resources for sentiment analysis in the low-resource language: Sindhi. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, pages 188–194.
- Ali, W., Xu, Z., and Kumar, J. (2021b). Sipos: A benchmark dataset for sindhi part-of-speech tagging. In *Proceedings of the Student Research Workshop Associated with RANLP 2021*, pages 22–30.
- Bhatti, Z., Ismaili, I. A., Soomro, W. J., and Hakro, D. N. (2014). Word segmentation model for Sindhi text. *American Journal of Computing Research Repository*, 2(1):1–7.
- Bird, S., Klein, E., and Loper, E. (2009). *Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit*. ” O’Reilly Media, Inc.”.
- Bojanowski, P., Grave, E., Joulin, A., and Mikolov, T. (2017). Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- Che, W., Li, Z., and Liu, T. (2010). Ltp: A chinese language technology platform. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Demonstrations*, pages 13–16. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cole, J. (2006). Sindhi. encyclopedia of language & linguistics volume8.
- Dootio, M. A. and Wagan, A. I. (2017). Automatic stemming and lemmatization process for Sindhi text. *J. Soc. Sci. Interdiscip. Res.(JSSIR), NED Univ. Eng. Technol. Karachi Sindh Pakistan*, 6(2):19–28.
- Dootio, M. A. and Wagan, A. I. (2019a). Development of Sindhi text corpus. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences*.
- Dootio, M. A. and Wagan, A. I. (2019b). Syntactic parsing and supervised analysis of Sindhi text. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences*, 31(1):105–112.
- Grave, E., Bojanowski, P., Gupta, P., Joulin, A., and Mikolov, T. (2018). Learning word vectors for 157 languages. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018)*.
- Honnibal, M. and Montani, I. (2017). Natural language understanding with bloom embeddings, convolutional neural networks and incremental parsing. *Unpublished software application*. <https://spacy.io>.
- Khodak, M., Risteski, A., Fellbaum, C., and Arora, S. (2017). Automated WordNet construction using word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Sense, Concept and Entity Representations and their Applications*, pages 12–23.
- Khoso, F. H., Memon, M. A., Nawaz, H., and Musavi, S. H. A. (2019). To build corpus of Sindhi.
- Levy, O., Goldberg, Y., and Dagan, I. (2015). Improving distributional similarity with lessons learned from word embeddings. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:211–225.
- Manning, C., Surdeanu, M., Bauer, J., Finkel, J., Bethard, S., and McClosky, D. (2014). The Stanford CoreNLP natural language processing toolkit. In *Proceedings of 52nd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: system demonstrations*, pages 55–60.
- Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., and Dean, J. (2013a). Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G. S., and Dean, J. (2013b). Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3111–3119.
- Mikolov, T., Grave, E., Bojanowski, P., Puhersch, C., and Joulin, A. (2018). Advances in pre-training distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the*

- Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018)*.
- Motlani, R. (2016). Developing language technology tools and resources for a resource-poor language: Sindhi. In *Proceedings of the NAACL Student Research Workshop*, pages 51–58.
- Nathani, B., Joshi, N., and Purohit, G. (2019). Design and development of lemmatizer for Sindhi language in Devanagri script. *Journal of Statistics and Management Systems*, 22(4):635–641.
- Nayak, N., Angeli, G., and Manning, C. D. (2016). Evaluating word embeddings using a representative suite of practical tasks. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Evaluating Vector-Space Representations for NLP*, pages 19–23.
- Otter, D. W., Medina, J. R., and Kalita, J. K. (2020). A survey of the usages of deep learning for natural language processing. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*.
- Padró, L., Collado, M., Reese, S., Lloberes, M., and Castellón, I. (2010). Freeling 2.1: Five years of open-source language processing tools. In *7th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*.
- Pandey, A. K. and Siddiqui, T. J. (2009). Evaluating effect of stemming and stop-word removal on Hindi text retrieval. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Intelligent Human Computer Interaction*, pages 316–326. Springer.
- Pennington, J., Socher, R., and Manning, C. (2014). Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- Pierrejean, B. and Tanguy, L. (2018). Towards qualitative word embeddings evaluation: Measuring neighbors variation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 32–39.
- Popel, M. and Žabokrtský, Z. (2010). Tectomt: modular nlp framework. In *International Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 293–304. Springer.
- Rahman, M. U. (2010). Towards Sindhi corpus construction. In *Conference on Language and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan*.
- Schäfer, R. and Bildhauer, F. (2013). Web corpus construction. *Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies*, 6(4):1–145.
- Schnabel, T., Labutov, I., Mimno, D., and Joachims, T. (2015). Evaluation methods for unsupervised word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 298–307.
- Shah, S. M. A., Ismaili, I. A., Bhatti, Z., and Waqas, A. (2018). Designing XML tag based Sindhi language corpus. In *2018 International Conference on Computing, Mathematics and Engineering Technologies (iCoMET)*, pages 1–5. IEEE.