

HiLight: A Hierarchy-aware Light Global Model with Hierarchical Local ConTrastive Learning

Zhijian Chen, Zhonghua Li, Jianxin Yang, Qi Ye
Huawei Technologies Ltd. Co.
{chenzhijian13,lizhonghua3,yangjianxin4,ye.qi}@huawei.com

Abstract

Hierarchical text classification (HTC) is a special sub-task of multi-label classification (MLC) whose taxonomy is constructed as a tree and each sample is assigned with at least one path in the tree. Latest HTC models contain three modules: a text encoder, a structure encoder and a multi-label classification head. Specially, the structure encoder is designed to encode the hierarchy of taxonomy. However, the structure encoder has scale problem. As the taxonomy size increases, the learnable parameters of recent HTC works grow rapidly. Recursive regularization is another widely-used method to introduce hierarchical information but it has collapse problem and generally relaxed by assigning with a small weight (ie. $1e-6$). In this paper, we propose a **H**ierarchy-aware **L**ight **G**lobal model with **H**ierarchical local **con**Trastive learning (HiLight), a lightweight and efficient global model only consisting of a text encoder and a multi-label classification head. We propose a new learning task to introduce the hierarchical information, called Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning (HiLCL). Extensive experiments are conducted on two benchmark datasets to demonstrate the effectiveness of our model.

1 Introduction

Hierarchical text classification (HTC) is a special sub-task of multi-label text classification whose taxonomy is constructed as a tree, commonly appears on structured databases like news (Lewis, 2004; Sandhaus, 2008) and academic paper (Kowsari, 2017). In HTC, each text is assigned with at least one path in the taxonomy tree. In order to make a more precise prediction, the hierarchical information should be taken into consideration during training or prediction, which is ignored in vanilla multi-label text classification. In a word, HTC is a kind of multi-label text classification task that




Figure 1: Learnable parameter size (in MB) of recent HTC works at taxonomy sizes. All models adopt BERT as text encoder.

make prediction based on textual and hierarchical information.

Latest HTC models consist of 3 modules: a text encoder, a structure encoder and a multi-label classification head. The text encoder is used to encode textual feature and the structure encoder (typically GCN (Thomas N. Kipf, 2017)) is designed to encode hierarchy. Recent researches focus on improving the network of structure encoder or the interaction between text encoder and structure encoder. Zhou (2020) is the first method to introduce structure encoder and proposes two interaction architectures between text encoder and structure encoder. Deng et al. (2021) proposes an information maximization task and Chen et al. (2021) proposes two semantic matching tasks to improve text-label alignment and the label embedding learnt by structure encoder. Zhu (2023) proposes a tree isomorphism network to improve parameter efficiency of structure encoder. However, introducing a structure encoder will increase learnable parameters and have scaling problem. As the taxonomy size increases, the learnable parameters of recent HTC works grow rapidly as shown in Fig-

ure 1. Meanwhile, we doubt that is it necessary to introduce a clumsy structure encoder? On one hand, the taxonomy is tree-like and the connection is sparse (Zhou, 2020). On the other hand, when the model is trained, the hierarchical information is static for different texts and the structure encoder is like a memory unit. Wang et al. (2022) proposes hierarchy-guided contrastive learning to remove structure encoder during inference by embedding the hierarchy into text encoder. However, Wang et al. (2022) still need a structure encoder to help generate contrastive samples during training. We wonder if there is a better way to introduce the hierarchical information without structure encoders?

Recursive regularization is another widely-used method to introduce the hierarchical information. Gopal (2013) assumes that if two classifiers are close to each other in the parameter space, their behavior will be more consistent. Based on that assumption, Gopal (2013) proposes the recursive regularization, which minimizes the distances between a classifier and its children classifiers in the parameter space. Recursive regularization tackles HTC just with a text encoder and a multi-label classification head, which can achieve rather good parameter efficiency. However, such regularization has transitivity and it may cause all classifiers collapse at some points in the parameter space. In order to maintain the discrimination, it is generally relaxed by assigning with a small weight, ie. $1e-6$ (Zhou, 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Zhu, 2023). We argue that such relaxation can't fix the above defect completely and a better learning task is still required.

To this end, we propose Hierarchy-aware Light Global model with Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning (HiLight). HiLight only consists of a text encoder and a multi-label classification head, which can achieve good parameter efficiency. Besides, we propose a new learning task to introduce the hierarchical information, called Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning (HiLCL). HiLCL consists of Local Contrastive Learning task (LCL) and Hierarchical Learning strategy (HiLearn), which are designed to enhance the discriminative ability of classifiers at same path in similar direction and consequently share similar behavior.

The main contribution of our work can be summarized as follows:

- We propose HiLight model, a lightweight and efficient global model with a new effective

learning task, which has no scaling problem.

- We propose HiLCL task, which enhances the discriminative ability of classifiers at same path in similar direction by proposed Local Contrastive Learning task (LCL) and Hierarchical Learning strategy (HiLearn).
- Extensive experiments are conducted on two benchmark datasets to demonstrate the effectiveness of our model.

2 Related Work

2.1 Hierarchical Text Classification

Existing works in HTC could be categorized into local and global approaches. Local approaches build models for each node or each level in the hierarchy, which has parameter redundant problem. Meanwhile, global model treats HTC as a multi-label text classification task and only one model will be built, which has well parameter efficiency and becomes the mainstream. Traditional multi-label text classification treats each class independently and the activation of one class will not affect the other classes. However, classes in HTC are not independent. A class is predicted positive if at least one of its children is positive.

In order to improve behavioral consistency along a path in the hierarchy, early works try to constrain classifiers via regularization (Gopal (2013)), reinforcement learning (Yuning Mao (2019)) and meta-learning (Jiawei (2019)). Later on, Zhou (2020) introduces structure encoder to encode the hierarchy of taxonomy and proposes two interaction architecture between text encoder and structure encoder. Following Zhou (2020), recent works focus on improving the network of structure encoder or the interaction between text encoder and structure encoder. Deng et al. (2021) proposes an information maximization task and Chen et al. (2021) proposes two semantic matching tasks to improve text-label alignment and the label embedding learnt by structure encoder. Zhu (2023) proposes a tree isomorphism network to improve parameter efficiency of structure encoder.

2.2 Hard Negative Sampling

Negative sampling is a commonly used machine learning technique (Mikolov, 2013; Mao, 2021; Galanopoulos, 2021), which reduces computational




Figure 2: Illustration of HiLight. Given an input text, HiLight infers label probabilities by a text encoder and a multi-label classification head. With the inferred label probabilities and positive labels, HiLight conducts label space learning with MLC and HiLCL task. HiLCL is our proposed method and it divides the multi-label classification learning into multiple single-label classification learning. Then, HiLCL improves contrastive learning on each single-label classification learning with Local Hard Negative Sampling, which introduces negative labels from sibling and descendant label set of the positive label. Those negative labels outside the sibling and descendant label set are masked out during learning. HiLCL schedules learning with Hierarchical Learning strategy, which adopts a fine-to-coarse learning strategy to improve the discrimination of finest-grained labels.

costs and accelerates convergence speed by sampling a subset of negative samples. Different negative sampling methods adopt its own strategy. Hard negative sampling is the one that adopts the strategy of mining the negative examples closest to the anchor or positive examples. These negatives are the most confusing for the model and drive the model to improve its discriminative ability.

In HTC, Chen et al. (2021) also introduces negative sampling to select negative labels. For each positive label, Chen et al. (2021) select its parents, one of siblings and a random label from the hierarchy as negative label set. Our proposed method is different from Chen et al. (2021) in three ways. Firstly, we do not introduce a structure encoder to generate label representations; Secondly, we adopt softmax loss instead of margin loss as the loss function, which can see more negatives at one training step; Lastly, for each positive label, we select all of its negative siblings and negative descendant labels as the negative label set. Since the hierarchy of HTC is tree-like, classifiers on the same path will share similar hard negatives, which will drive them to have similar discriminative ability.

3 Problem Definition

Given an input text $x = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, hierarchical text classification (HTC) aims to predict a subset $y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$ from the label set of taxonomy $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_C\}$, where n donates

the text length, m donates the size of ground truth label subset and C donates the taxonomy size. The taxonomy is predefined and organized as an acyclic graph $G = (Y, E)$, where E is the set of edge connecting a node and its parents. Since a non-root node has only one parent, the taxonomy graph can be converted to a tree. When the max depth of taxonomy tree reduces to one, the HTC will be degraded to the vanilla multi-label classification (MLC). Elements of y come from at least one path in G . Behavioral consistency is defined as follows: a class is predicted as positive if at least one of its children is positive; and negative if all its children are negative. Formally,

$$\begin{cases} P(y_i) \geq \theta, & \exists e_{ij} \in E, P(y_j) \geq \theta \\ P(y_i) < \theta, & \forall e_{ij} \in E, P(y_j) < \theta \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where θ is the activation threshold.

4 Hierarchy-aware Light Global Model

As depicted in Figure 2, we propose the **H**ierarchy-aware **L**ight **G**lobal model with **H**ierarchical local con**T**rastive learning (HiLight). HiLight consists of a text encoder and a multi-label classification head. Meanwhile, we propose **H**ierarchical **L**ocal **C**on**T**rastive **L**earning (HiLCL) task to introduce hierarchical information. Details will be described as follows.




Figure 3: An Example of HiLCL with target size of 3. Firstly, HiLCL divides the multi-label classification learning into 3 single-label classification learning. For each positive label, HiLCL conducts LCL task, which masks out outputs of other positive labels as well as easy negative labels and then contrasts the output of current positive label with outputs of hard negative labels. Meanwhile, HiLCL schedules the LCL learning with HiLearn, which learns finest-grained positive labels at early epochs and adds coarse-grained positive labels gradually.

4.1 Text Encoder

TextRCNN(Lai et al., 2015) and BERT(Devlin et al., 2019) are two popular text encoders adopted by recent HTC works (Zhou, 2020; Deng et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022; Zhu, 2023). BERT is a pre-trained model that absorbs rich common knowledge and hence masters strong semantic understanding ability. Recent state-of-the-art results(Deng et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022; Zhu, 2023) are achieved by adopting BERT as text encoder. In order to build a lightweight and efficient model, we need a strong text encoder and thus we adopt BERT as text encoder. Given an input text:

$$x = \{[CLS], x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, [SEP]\} \quad (2)$$

where [CLS] and [SEP] are two special tokens indicating the beginning and the end of the sequence. The length of the sequence will be taken as n for convenience. The text encoder maps each token into a hidden state:

$$H = BERT(x) \quad (3)$$

where $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_h}$ and d_h is the hidden state size. Among all hidden states, the one of [CLS] has the best awareness of global context. Therefore, we take it as the global hidden state of the input text $h = H_{[CLS]}$.

4.2 Multi-label Classification Head

The multi-label classification head performs a mapping from hidden state space to label space as shown in Figure 2. The distance between the input text and a class in label space will be regarded as label probability. We adopt a linear layer with a sigmoid activation function as the classification head. We also add dropout to the hidden state to improve

generalization like previous works (Jie et al., 2022; Zhu, 2023):

$$P = \sigma(W \cdot Dropout(h) \cdot +b) \quad (4)$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times d_h}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^C$. The predicted label set y is a set of labels whose probabilities are greater than the predefined threshold θ :

$$y = \{y_i | P_i \geq \theta, y_i \in Y\} \quad (5)$$

where P_i is the i -th output of P .

4.3 Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning

In HTC, the key of label probabilities inference is maintaining behavioral consistency as defined in section 3. Previous works encode the hierarchy with structure encoder while we propose to use the hierarchy to mine local hard negative labels. Here we propose a new learning task, called Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning task (HiLCL) as shown in Figure 3. HiLCL consists of Local Contrastive Learning task (LCL) and Hierarchical Learning strategy (HiLearn).

4.3.1 Local Contrastive Learning

Contrastive learning is a powerful representative space learning task in CV (He, 2020; Chen, 2020) and NLP (Gao, 2021; Kim, 2021). The target of contrastive learning is to encourage the distances of positive pairs smaller than the distances to a bunch of negative samples. Similarly, the goal of HTC is to make the input text close to the positive labels and far away from the negative labels in the label space. The difference is that in HTC, the positive labels are hierarchically related and their behavior should be consistent with their relationship. Thus, we propose Local Contrastive Learning task (LCL), which improves the consistency of contrastive learning by Local Hard Negative Sampling.

Local Hard Negative Sampling. As mentioned in section 2.2, hard negative sampling adopts a strategy of sampling the nearest negative samples, which are challenging for the model. In HTC, given an input text and one of its positive labels, the closet labels are the sibling and descendant of the positive label as shown in Figure 3. Thus, we propose to sample the negative sibling and negative descendant labels as the hard negative label set, called Local Hard Negative Sampling. Intuitively, these negative labels are challenging because they are different aspects of same category. They share common characteristics with the positive label but there are also subtle differences; On the contrary, those negative labels outside the sibling and descendant set, share less characteristics with the positive label and easier to distinguish, which are treated as easy negative labels and masked out during learning as shown in Figure 3. Formally,

$$Hard(y_i) = \{v_j | v_j \in Sibling(y_i) \cup SubTree(y_i), v_j \notin y\} \quad (6)$$

$$Sibling(y_i) = \{v_j | \exists v_k \in Y, e_{ki} \in E, e_{kj} \in E\} \quad (7)$$

$$SubTree(y_i) = \{v_j | \forall v_k \in (y_i, \dots, v_j), e_{kk+1} \in E\} \quad (8)$$

where $Hard(y_i)$, $Sibling(y_i)$ and $SubTree(y_i)$ are the hard negative label set, the sibling label set and the descendant label set of y_i correspondingly.

Combining contrastive learning and Local Hard Negative Sampling, we propose Local Contrastive Learning task (LCL). Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{LCL}(y_i) &= -\log \frac{\exp(P_i)}{\exp(P_i) + \sum_{v_j \in Hard(y_i)} \exp(P_j)} \\ &= -\log \frac{\exp(\sigma(W_i h + b_i))}{\exp(\sigma(W_i h + b_i)) + \sum_{v_j \in Hard(y_i)} \exp(\sigma(W_j h + b_j))} \\ &\sim -\log \frac{\exp(W_i h + b_i)}{\exp(W_i h + b_i) + \sum_{v_j \in Hard(y_i)} \exp(W_j h + b_j)} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where W_i and b_i are the weight of classifier i .

Since the positive labels are located within same sub-space, their hard negative labels are largely overlapped. Conducting LCL on the corresponding classifiers, their discriminative ability will be enhanced in similar direction and consequently share similar behavior.

4.3.2 Hierarchical Learning

Hierarchical Learning is the scheduling strategy for LCL. Intuitively, HTC is a coarse-to-fine classification process and correspondingly the behavior of classifiers at same path is a coarse-to-fine label space division process. The scopes of label spaces

along any path degrade gradually and eventually the label spaces at leaf level are the finest-grained division of the whole space. LCL adopts negative labels from lower levels and the space division learning of finer-grained labels will be affected due to suppression of softmax loss in Eq.9.

In order to improve the discrimination of finest-grained labels, we propose a fine-to-coarse learning strategy, called Hierarchical Learning (HiLearn). For each training sample (x, y) , HiLearn samples a subset of y as the target set at each epoch ep and enlarges the target set every k epoch by adding labels from higher levels. Formally,

$$HiLearn(y, ep) = \{y_i | D_{rev}(y_i) \leq \lfloor ep/k \rfloor, y_i \in y\} \quad (10)$$

where $D_{rev}(\cdot)$ is the reverse depth function starting from leaf and the depth of a leaf node is 0 and $k \in N$ is the scheduling parameter of HiLearn.

4.3.3 Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning

Combining LCL and HiLearn, we propose Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning task (HiLCL). HiLCL divides the multi-label classification learning into multiple single-label classification learning as shown in Figure 3. Then, HiLCL conducts LCL on each classifier (Eq.9) and schedules the learning with HiLearn (Eq.10), which adopts a fine-to-coarse strategy. Formally,

$$L_{HiLCL}(y, ep) = \sum_{y_i \in HiLearn(y, ep)} L_{LCL}(y_i) \quad (11)$$

4.4 Multi-label Classification Learning

Besides HiLCL, we also adopt MLC task to instruct model learning. We use the Binary Cross-Entropy loss (BCE) as loss function. Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{BCE}(y) &= -\frac{1}{|y|} \sum_{y_i \in y} \log(P_i) \\ &= -\frac{1}{|y|} \sum_{y_i \in y} \log \frac{\exp(W_i h + b_i)}{1 + \exp(W_i g + b_i)} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Thus, the final loss function can be formulated as:

$$L = L_{BCE} + \lambda \cdot L_{HiLCL} \quad (13)$$

where λ is the balancing factor.

Dataset	Y	$Avg(y_i)$	Depth	Train	Dev	Test
WOS	141	2.0	2	30,070	7,518	9,397
RCV1-v2	103	3.24	4	20,833	2,316	781,265

Table 1: Summary statistics of datasets

5 Experiment

5.1 Experiment Setup

Datasets and Evaluation Metrics Experiments are conducted on Web-of-Science (WOS) (Kowsari, 2017) and RCV1-v2 (Lewis, 2004) for comparison and analysis. WOS makes up of abstracts of published papers from Web-of-Science while RCV1-v2 consists of news passages. We follow the data processing and data partitioning of HiAGM¹ (Zhou, 2020). The statistic details of these two datasets are shown in Table 1. WOS is for the single-path HTC while RCV1-v2 includes multi-path taxonomic tags. WOS is wide and shallow while RCV1-v2 is deeper. Both datasets are representative scenarios in real-world applications. We adopt Micro-F1 and Macro-F1 as evaluation metrics like previous works.

Implementation Details We adopt bert-base-uncased² from Huggingface as text encoder. The hidden state of [CLS] is taken as the global hidden state of input text. Dropout is applied on top of the global hidden state and dropout rate is 0.1. We adopt Adam as optimizer. The learning rate of text encoder is $2e-5$ while the classification head is $1e-3$. For HiLCL, the balancing factor λ is $1e-2$ for WOS and $1e-3$ for RCV1-v2. For HiLearn, the scheduling parameter k is 3 for WOS and 2 for RCV1-v2. We train the model for 100 epochs and decay the learning rate with 0.8 if the Micro-F1 or Macro-F1 on dev does not increase for 5 epochs. In order to ensure reproducibility, we configure the random seed with 2023. Training is conducted on a NVIDIA P100 GPU and takes about 2 days for WOS and 1 day for RCV1-v2.

Baselines We choose some recent HTC global models as baselines, including HiAGM (Zhou, 2020), HTCInfoMax (Deng et al., 2021), HiMatch (Chen et al., 2021), HGCLR (Wang et al., 2022) and HiTIN (Zhu, 2023). HiAGM introduces the structure encoder and proposes two label-text interaction architectures. HTCInfoMax proposes the information maximization task to enhance HiAGM

by regularizing the label representation with a prior distribution. HiMatch proposes two embedding matching tasks to improve label-text alignment in a joint embedding space. HGCLR proposes to incorporate hierarchy into text encoder with contrastive learning and infer labels without structure encoder. HiTIN proposes a tree isomorphism network to improve the parameter efficiency of structure encoder. All approaches adopt BERT as text encoder for a fair comparison.

5.2 Experiment Results

The experimental results are shown in Table 2. Considering the scaling problem of structure encoder, we rethink the key of HTC and instead of introducing a structure encoder to encode hierarchy directly like baselines, we propose HiLCL task that uses the hierarchy to mine local hard negative labels without introducing extra parameters. By analysing previous works, we believe that it is possible to incorporate the hierarchical information with a simple learning task and the experimental results support our view. In both WOS and RCV1, our method show competitive performance comparing with baselines. Especially in WOS, our method beats all structure-encoder-based methods, which shows the effectiveness of our method. In RCV1-v2, we only fail to beat HiTIN on Macro-F1.

HiAGM is the first model to introduce a GCN structure encoder and establishes a baseline for global model. HTCInfoMax and HiMatch enhance HiAGM by introducing new learning tasks. The best result of introducing a GCN structure encoder is achieved by HiMatch. HiTIN proposes a new structure encoder, called tree isomorphism network. HiTIN beats HiMatch and introduces much less learnable parameters than HiMatch. HGCLR make a further improvement by removing structure encoder completely during inference and also beats HiMatch, which shows the possibility of introducing the hierarchical information without the structure encoder. However, HGCLR still needs a structure encoder during training and fails to beat HiTIN, which shows that there are rooms for improvement. Our model introduce the hierarchical information with the simplest model and a more effect learning task, which beats HGCLR and HiTIN (except for Macro-F1 on RCV1-v2) and proves that structure encoders is not the only way.

¹<https://github.com/Alibaba-NLP/HiAGM>

²<https://huggingface.co/bert-base-uncased>

Methods	WOS		RCV1-v2	
	Micro-F1	Macro-F1	Micro-F1	Macro-F1
HiAGM [†] (Zhou, 2020)	86.04	80.19	85.58	67.93
HTCInfoMax [†] (Deng et al., 2021)	86.30	79.97	85.53	67.09
HiMatch [†] (Chen et al., 2021)	86.70	81.06	86.33	68.66
HGCLR [†] (Wang et al., 2022)	87.11	81.20	86.49	68.31
HiTIN [†] (Zhu, 2023)	87.19	81.57	86.71	69.95
HiLight (Ours)	87.63	82.36	86.89	69.58

Table 2: Experimental results of our proposed method on several datasets. All baselines adopt BERT as the text encoder. [†] donates the results reported by Zhu’s (2023).

Ablation Models	Micro-F1	Macro-F1
HiLight	86.89	69.58
- <i>r.p.</i> coarse-to-fine	86.32	66.23
- <i>r.m.</i> fine-to-coarse	86.95	69.08
- <i>r.p.</i> random negatives	86.80	68.69
- <i>r.m.</i> sibling negatives	86.86	69.23
- <i>r.m.</i> subtree negatives	86.89	69.15

Table 3: Ablation study on the components of HiLight. *r.p.* stands for *replace* and *r.m.* stands for *remove*. Experiments are conducted on RCV1-v2.

5.3 Analysis

5.3.1 Ablation Study

In this section, we investigate to study the independent effect of each component in our proposed model on RCV1-v2 dataset. The results are reported in Table 3.

Firstly, we validate the influence of HiLearn strategy. After replacing HiLearn strategy with coarse-to-fine strategy, we can see a large drop on Micro-F1 and Macro-F1. We assume that learning coarse-grained classification initially will make the text encoder biased on some coarse-grained features. After that, further learning is based on previous learnt features, which may cause overfitting. Besides, we also experiment without HiLearn strategy and we can see a drop on Macro-F1 but a raise on Micro-F1, which indicates that the model may converge to some labels with more training data. Above results show that introducing HiLearn can improve the discrimination of labels with less training data.

Secondly, we validate the influence of Local Negative Sampling. By removing sibling negatives or subtree negatives or replacing them with random negatives, we can see a drop on Micro-F1 and Macro-F1, which shows that both sibling negatives and subtree negatives are necessary for LCL.




Figure 4: Learnable parameter size of recent HTC models at different taxonomy sizes. All models adopt BERT as text encoder.

5.3.2 Parameter Efficiency Study

In this section, we investigate the learnable parameter size of recent HTC works at different taxonomy sizes. As shown in Figure 4, when the taxonomy size increases from 100 to 10000, the learnable parameter size of HiLight basically remains unchanged. However, recent HTC works ((Zhou, 2020; Deng et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022; Zhu, 2023)) increase at different degrees. Among all, HGCLR (Wang et al., 2022) has the largest growth rate, which increases from 121 (MB) to 1,728 (MB). Although HGCLR removes the structure encoder during inference like us, their training cost is much higher than us.

5.3.3 Collapse Problem Study

We claim that the collapse problem is the main problem of recursive regularization. In this section, we verify our assumption by varying the weight of learning tasks. Experiments are conducted on RCV1-v2 dataset and the results are shown in Table 4. We can see that recursive regularization is sensitive to the weight. As the weight increases, Micro-




Figure 5: T-SNE visualization of label space mapping on RCV1-v2. Green dots indicate the input text. Blue dots indicate positive labels. Yellow dots indicate negative sibling and descendant labels. Yellow triangles indicate negative descendant labels. Yellow squares indicate negative sibling labels. Grey dots indicate easy negative labels.

Models	Weight	Micro-F1	Macro-F1
	1e-2	84.21	38.72
Rec Reg	1e-3	86.60	60.42
	1e-6	87.03	68.76
HiLight	1e-2	86.85	69.34
	1e-3	86.89	69.58
	1e-6	86.91	69.14

Table 4: Effect of encoding hierarchy without structure encoders. Rec Reg is Recursive Regularization (Gopal, 2013) for short. Experiments are conducted on RCV1-v2.

F1 drops slowly while Macro-F1 falls down dramatically. We plot label-wise Macro-F1 on Figure 6 and we can see that Macro-F1 of some labels drop to near zero while other remain nearly unchanged, which indicates that the model may converge to some labels with more training data. Meanwhile, the results of our model are much steadier. As the weight changes, both Micro-F1 and Macro-F1 fluctuate within a small range. Above results verify our assumption and demonstrates the effectiveness of our model.

5.3.4 Label Space Visualization

In this section, we try to visualize the label space distribution with T-SNE projections. Specifically, we adopt each row of the weight matrix W as the representations of classifiers and project them as well as text representation h into 2D space with T-SNE. As shown in Figure 5, the nearest negative labels are the local hard negative labels mined by us. Meanwhile, we can also see that our method can better distinguish the positive labels out of the




Figure 6: Label-wise MacroF1 on RCV1-v2. The abscissa indicates the labels and ordinate indicates the Macro-F1. Red lines indicate weight=1e-2. Green lines indicate weight=1e-3. Blue lines indicate weight=1e-6.

hard negative labels. Above findings demonstrates the effectiveness of our method.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a Hierarchy-aware Light Global Model with Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning (HiLight). We propose a new learning task to introduce the hierarchical information, called Hierarchical Local Contrastive Learning (HiLCL). HiLCL enhances the discriminative ability of classifiers at same path in similar direction by proposed Local Contrastive Learning task (LCL), which is scheduled by Hierarchical Learning (HiLearn). Comparing to previous approaches, our approach achieves competitive results on two benchmark datasets and has the best parameter efficiency and won't collapse at some points. All of the components we designed are proven to be effective.

Limitations

Since HiLCL task is text encoder-agnostic, it is easy to apply HiLCL task to a TextRCNN encoder. However, TextRCNN is an old fashion non-pre-trained model and its semantic understanding ability is quite weak. We see an obvious gap between TextRCNN and BERT in previous work (Zhu, 2023). In order to build an efficient model, we do not conduct experiments on TextRCNN.

NYTimes (Sandhaus, 2008) is also a widely used dataset but due to the business corporation problem, we can't get NYTimes dataset and experiments are not conducted on NYTimes. If we have access to NYTimes dataset in the future, we will verify our model on NYTimes.

References

- et al. Chen, Ting. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607.
- Haibin Chen, Qianli Ma, Zhenxi Lin, and Jiangyue Yan. 2021. [Hierarchy-aware label semantics matching network for hierarchical text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4370–4379, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhongfen Deng, Hao Peng, Dongxiao He, Jianxin Li, and Philip Yu. 2021. [HTCInfoMax: A global model for hierarchical text classification via information maximization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3259–3265, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- et al. Galanopoulos, Damianos. 2021. Hard-negatives or non-negatives? a hard-negative selection strategy for cross-modal retrieval using the improved marginal ranking loss. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2312–2316.
- et al. Gao, Tianyu. 2021. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6894–6910.
- et al. Gopal, Siddharth. 2013. Recursive regularization for large-scale classification with hierarchical and graphical dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*.
- et al. He, Kaiming. 2020. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9729–9738.
- et al. Jiawei, Wu. 2019. Learning to learn and predict: A metalearning approach for multi-label classification. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, page 4354–4364, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhanming Jie, Jierui Li, and Wei Lu. 2022. [Learning to reason deductively: Math word problem solving as complex relation extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5944–5955, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- et al. Kim, Taeuk. 2021. Self-guided contrastive learning for bert sentence representations. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2528–2540.
- et al. Kowsari, Kamran. 2017. Hdltext: Hierarchical deep learning for text classification. In *2017 16th IEEE international conference on machine learning and applications (ICMLA)*, pages 364–371. IEEE.
- Siwei Lai, Liheng Xu, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2015. Recurrent convolutional neural networks for text classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 29.
- et al. Lewis, David D. 2004. Rcv1: A new benchmark collection for text categorization research. *Journal of machine learning research*, 5(Apr):361–397.
- et al. Mao, Xin. 2021. Boosting the speed of entity alignment 10x: Dual attention matching network with normalized hard sample mining. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference*, pages 821–832.
- et al. Mikolov, Tomas. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26.
- Evan. Sandhaus. 2008. *The new york times annotated corpus*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.

- et al. Thomas N. Kipf. 2017. Semisupervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations Conference Track Proceedings, ICLR 2017*, Toulon, France, April 24-26.
- Zihan Wang, Peiyi Wang, Lianzhe Huang, Xin Sun, and Houfeng Wang. 2022. [Incorporating hierarchy into text encoder: a contrastive learning approach for hierarchical text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7109–7119, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- et al. Yuning Mao. 2019. Hierarchical text classification with reinforced label assignment. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, page 445–455, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- et al. Zhou, Jie. 2020. Hierarchy-aware global model for hierarchical text classification. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- et al. Zhu, He. 2023. [HiTIN: Hierarchy-aware tree isomorphism network for hierarchical text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7809–7821, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.