

---

# On the Sequence Evaluation based on Stochastic Processes

---

**Tianhao Zhang\***  
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities  
zhan7594@umn.edu

**Zhexiao Lin\***  
University of California, Berkeley  
zhexiaolin@berkeley.edu

**Zhecheng Sheng\***  
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities  
sheng136@umn.edu

**Chen Jiang\***  
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities  
jian0649@umn.edu

**Dongyeop Kang**  
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities  
dongyeop@umn.edu

## Abstract

Modeling and analyzing long sequences of text is an essential task for Natural Language Processing. Success in capturing long text dynamics using neural language models will facilitate many downstream tasks such as coherence evaluation, text generation, machine translation and so on. This paper presents a novel approach to model sequences through a stochastic process. We introduce a likelihood-based training objective for the text encoder and design a more thorough measurement (score) for long text evaluation compared to the previous approach. The proposed training objective effectively preserves the sequence coherence, while the new score comprehensively captures both temporal and spatial dependencies. Theoretical properties of our new score show its advantages in sequence evaluation. Experimental results show superior performance in various sequence evaluation tasks, including global and local discrimination within and between documents of different lengths. We also demonstrate the encoder achieves competitive results on discriminating human and AI written text.

## 1 Introduction

Nowadays, generative models are becoming increasingly popular in Natural Language Processing (NLP) [Zou et al., 2023, Yang et al., 2023, Yi et al., 2024], and integrating stochastic processes with these models has gained traction due to their proven effectiveness. However, we find that stochastic representations of the latent space can encode not only the target domain features but also a common dynamic structure across most articles within the domain. Inspired by this, we observe that stochastic representations can exhibit superior performance in multiple downstream tasks, such as evaluating long text coherence. Furthermore, while similar methods may heavily rely on the training domain Lai and Tetreault [2018], Jeon and Strube [2022], our approach shows significant potential in out-of-domain tasks, likely benefiting from the stochastic representation’s robust generative properties.

---

\*Equal contribution.

In practice, this capability can be realized by fine-tuning the evaluation function on a small dataset without changing any parameters in the encoder.

Learning a stochastic representation typically needs to balance between achieving higher generative ability and fitting the target stochastic processes better. In application, we can either use the likelihood, or a likelihood-free method, the contrastive learning van den Oord et al. [2018], Durkan et al. [2020]. In this work, we utilize the contrastive learning method from Wang et al. [2022] and design new likelihood-based methods. Comparing between these two methods. We found that the contrastive learning may be effective for evaluating coherence but may not adequately learn the target stochastic process representation, which can limit its performance on other tasks, e.g. out-of-domain tasks.

To assess the coherence of long texts, we utilize the idea from linguistic theory and stochastic processes. Notice that there are always some common properties among coherent articles, for example, (1) a main theme should be maintained throughout the text; (2) sentences near the beginning and end of the article should emphasize the main idea; and (3) sentences in the middle can deviate slightly from the main idea but should remain controlled by the theme. This provides an ideal scenario for the Brownian bridge (abbr. BB), which is a special stochastic process with a “fixed” starting and ending position Øksendal and Øksendal [2003], and has shown superior performance in many areas: e.g. text generation Wang et al. [2022], human mobility analysis Krumm [2021], and animal migration studies Horne et al. [2007]. Therefore, Sheng et al. [2024] proposed a heuristic BB-based method, which showed better performance on multiple tasks. However, it was limited to simple coherence evaluation tasks and lacked a good interpretation of the latent space dimensions.

In this paper, unlike the settings in Wang et al. [2022] and Sheng et al. [2024], we fully utilize the temporal and spatial dependencies of the stochastic process by incorporating  $\Sigma$  and  $\Sigma_T$ , as described in Section 3. We derive the log-likelihood of the unknown parameter  $\Sigma$  based on the observed sequences. As a direct result, we design a BB encoder that minimizes the negative log-likelihood. This encoder maps the sequence to a general BB while preserving important information from the sequence, which in application shows a better performance on out-of-domain test. By leveraging the stochastic process structure of the sequence, we propose a new BBScore to evaluate the sequence. This new BBScore is supported by theory and has demonstrated strong performance across various downstream tasks and it improve performance by 20% on global coherence discrimination tasks and 10% on local coherence discrimination tasks. Additionally, it overcomes previous limitations and enabling comparisons among different articles. Furthermore, benefit from the fact that  $\hat{\Sigma}$  can encode domain-specific property, we designed a training-free method to implement human-AI discrimination task, and achieving 70% accuracy.

## 2 Related work

Stochastic processes have demonstrated their robust capability in modeling complex tasks across various fields, including biology Horne et al. [2007], and finance Øksendal and Øksendal [2003]. Recently, when integrated with machine learning and deep learning techniques, methods inspired by stochastic processes have proven exceptionally effective in handling noisy, high-dimensional real-world data. Notably, they excel in generation tasks, such as image generation Lim et al. [2023], video generation Zhang et al. [2023], and long text generation Wang et al. [2022]. A critical aspect of these tasks is learning the stochastic representation from a given dataset. Traditionally, if the target stochastic processes are well-defined, one can directly construct a likelihood function and train the system. Recently, a likelihood-free training paradigm can be employed Durkan et al. [2020]—specifically, the contrastive learning method—which has shown significant power and potential in handling high-dimensional data van den Oord et al. [2018]. This approach provides a way to learn about the predictive density indirectly, rather than through direct reconstruction Mathieu et al. [2021]. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that a properly constructed contrastive learning task can estimate the transition kernel in some diffusion modeling problems Liu et al. [2021], offering further theoretical support for its impressive empirical performance.

Coherence, as described by Reinhart [1980], defines the discourse structure of a text, where high-quality text should present a logical flow with well-connected ideas and topics. Previous studies have reported that neural language models, such as transformers, often struggle to effectively capture coherence structures [Deng et al., 2022]. To better guide language models in learning the dynamics of long text, methods that construct latent spaces have been developed [Bowman et al., 2016, Gao

et al., 2021]. These methods aim to model sentence embeddings by leveraging information from neighboring utterances. However, most of these approaches yield static representations and overlook the dynamics of the entire text. In a recent study, Wang et al. [2022] proposed a method utilizing the BB as an objective to model long-range text dependencies, achieving notable performance in generating long coherent texts from the learned latent plans. Despite advancements in coherence modeling, automatically assessing coherence for any given text remains a challenge. Maimon and Tsarfaty [2023] Sheng et al. [2024] designed a likelihood-based score metric for coherence assessment, built upon the unsupervised learning approach from Wang et al. [2022]. This score demonstrated strong performance on artificial shuffle tasks and downstream tasks such as Human-AI discrimination. Shuffle tasks have long been used as a standard approach for coherence evaluation [Barzilay and Lapata, 2005]. In shuffle tasks, the model is asked to recognize a shuffled document from its original copy. Shuffling documents with different sentence block sizes provides insights into a model’s ability to discern global coherence. A more challenging variant of the shuffle task is the local window shuffle [Moon et al., 2019], where only a small set of consecutive sentences is shuffled within the original document, and the model is asked to detect these shuffled articles from the unshuffled ones.

### 3 Method

#### 3.1 Setup

In this section, we introduce the setup of our method. We model the sequences using BBs, which are among the most commonly used stochastic processes. First, we introduce the standard BB  $\{B(t) : t \in [0, T]\}$  with  $B(0) = 0$  and  $B(T) = 0$ . For any  $t \in [0, T]$ , the process  $B(t)$  follows a normal distribution  $B(t) \sim N(0, \frac{t(T-t)}{T})$ . Additionally, for  $s, t \in [0, T]$  with  $s < t$ , the covariance structure is given by  $\text{Cov}(B(s), B(t)) = \frac{s(T-t)}{T}$ . The general BB can then be constructed using  $a + \frac{t}{T}(b - a) + \sigma B(t)$ , where  $a$  and  $b$  are arbitrary fixed start and end points, respectively, and  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation of the process.

For an input sequence  $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = (s_0, \dots, s_T)$  where  $s_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for  $t \in [T]$ , we use standard BBs to capture temporal dependence. To account for spatial dependence, we consider  $d$  independent standard BBs  $B_1(t), \dots, B_d(t)$  over the interval  $[0, T]$ . For any  $t \in [T]$ , the sequence is modeled as  $s_t = \mu_t + \mathbf{W}(B_1(t), \dots, B_d(t))^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the transformation matrix and  $\mu_t = s_0 + \frac{t}{T}(s_T - s_0)$  represents the mean at time  $t$ . Let  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{T-1})$  be the sequence excluding the start and end points, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{T-1})$  be the corresponding means.

The encoder and the BBScore are based on the likelihood function of the input sequence  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ . The following theorem presents the likelihood function.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\Sigma_T \in \mathbb{R}^{(T-1) \times (T-1)}$  be the covariance matrix with  $[\Sigma_T]_{s,t} = \frac{s(T-t)}{T}$ . Let  $\Sigma = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top$ . Then the log-likelihood function is given by

$$\ell(\Sigma|\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = -\frac{d(T-1)}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{d}{2} \log(|\Sigma_T|) - \frac{(T-1)}{2} \log(|\Sigma|) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top).$$

Generally, for  $n$  independent input sequence  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n$  with lengths  $T_1 + 1, \dots, T_n + 1$ , generated by the same  $\mathbf{W}$  (or  $\Sigma$ ), the log-likelihood function is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\Sigma|\{\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i\}_{i=1}^n) &= \frac{d \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1)}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{d}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(|\Sigma_{T_i}|) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1)}{2} \log(|\Sigma|) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1, we obtain the log-likelihood function of the sequence, enabling us to derive the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) of  $\Sigma$ .

**Theorem 2.** Under the setting of Theorem 1, the MLE for  $\ell(\Sigma|\bar{\mathbf{s}})$  is

$$\hat{\Sigma} = (T-1)^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top,$$

and the MLE for  $\ell(\Sigma|\{\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i\}_{i=1}^n)$  is

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \right).$$

The training of the encoder and the definition of BBScore are based on the MLE of  $\Sigma$ .

### 3.2 Encoders

The encoder architecture consists of a frozen, pretrained GPT-2 model from Huggingface and a trainable MLP network. The GPT-2 model’s last layer hidden state corresponding to the end-of-sentence (EOS) token is extracted, and a 4-layer MLP is trained on top of this hidden state. The purpose of the encoder is to learn a nonlinear mapping from the raw input space to the latent space, denoted as  $f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ . In practice, we use two loss functions to train the encoder: the contrastive learning loss  $L_{CL}$  and the negative log-likelihood loss  $L_{NLL}$ . The  $L_{CL}$  loss is primarily designed for the prediction task van den Oord et al. [2018], promoting the encoder to distinguish between positive and negative samples from the data. On the other hand, the  $L_{NLL}$  loss is designed directly to enforce the output to follow a certain distribution given by the likelihood, ensuring that the latent space representations are well-structured and meaningful. While Wang et al. [2022] utilized contrastive learning for the encoder, the negative log-likelihood loss exhibits certain advantages over contrastive learning, both theoretically and empirically.




Figure 1: Training framework.

#### 3.2.1 Contrastive Learning Encoder (CL Encoder)

In the context of Wang et al. [2022], a structure assumption  $\Sigma = I_d$  was imposed, where  $I_d$  is the  $d$ -dimensional identity matrix. For an arbitrary start point  $s_0$  at time  $t = 0$  and end point  $s_T$  at time  $t = T$ , the marginal distribution of  $s_t$  at time  $t$  is given by  $s_t | s_0, s_T \sim N((1 - \frac{t}{T})s_0 + \frac{t}{T}s_T, \frac{t(T-t)}{T}I_d)$ . Consider any triplet observations  $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$  with  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathcal{X}$ . The goal was to ensure that  $f_\theta(x_2)$  follows the above marginal distribution with the starting point  $f_\theta(x_1)$  and the end point  $f_\theta(x_3)$ . For a sequence of observations  $(x_0, \dots, x_T)$ , let  $B = \{(x_0, x_t, x_T)\}$  be a set of batches consisting of randomly sampled positive triplets  $(x_0, x_t, x_T)$  with  $0 < t < T$ . Then, the contrastive learning loss function is defined as:

$$L_{CL} = E \left[ -\log \frac{\exp(d(x_0, x_t, x_T; f_\theta))}{\sum_{(x_0, x_{t'}, x_T) \in B} \exp(d(x_0, x_{t'}, x_T; f_\theta))} \right]$$

with  $d(x_0, x_t, x_T; f_\theta) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|f_\theta(x_t) - (1 - \frac{t}{T})f_\theta(x_0) - \frac{t}{T}f_\theta(x_T)\|_2^2$ ,  $\sigma^2 = t(T-t)/T$ .

There are two theoretical drawbacks to this contrastive learning approach. First, the assumption  $\Sigma = I_d$  implies independence and homogeneity for each dimension of the output from the encoder. Second, the use of the marginal distribution ignores the covariance structure of the stochastic process. Empirically, it has been observed that only a few dimensions of the encoder’s output are effective, which is not desirable. To address these issues and incorporate both spatial and temporal dependence, we propose our new Brownian-Bridge Encoder, which minimizes the negative log-likelihood loss.

#### 3.2.2 Brownian-Bridge Encoder (BB Encoder)

Consider the multi-domain problem where we have  $m$  domains  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$ . For each domain  $\mathcal{D}_j$ , we consider  $n_j$  independent raw inputs  $\mathbf{x}_{j1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{jn_j}$ . Let  $\bar{s}_{ji}^\theta = f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{ji})$  for  $j \in \llbracket m \rrbracket$  and

$i \in \llbracket n_j \rrbracket$ . When  $\theta$  reaches its optimal value  $\hat{\theta}$ , the sequences  $[\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{ji}^\theta]_{i=1}^{n_j}$  should be i.i.d. from the BBs and share the same true parameters  $\Sigma_j$  for each domain  $\mathcal{D}_j$ .

We use negative log-likelihood as the loss function. Note that for each  $\theta$ , the negative log-likelihood in Theorem 1 for domain  $\mathcal{D}_j$  depends on  $\Sigma_j$  and  $[\mathbf{x}_{ji}]_{i=1}^{n_j}$  by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (T_i - 1) \log(|\Sigma_j|) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \text{tr}(\Sigma_j^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta) \Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta)^\top).$$

We consider the following training process. We divide the  $[\mathbf{x}_{ji}]_{i=1}^{n_j}$  into several batches. For each batch  $\mathcal{B}$ , we consider the loss within the batch as

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_j^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta) \Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta)^\top),$$

where  $\widehat{\Sigma}_j$  is the current estimation for  $\Sigma_j$ .

In cases where  $T_i$  might be large, we consider randomly sampling a triplet from  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . For a random sample  $t = (t_1, t_2, t_3)$  with  $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq T_i - 1$ , we let  $[\mathbf{s}_i^\theta]_t$  and  $[\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta]_t$  be the  $d \times 3$  sub-matrices corresponding to  $t$  from  $\mathbf{s}_i^\theta$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta$ , respectively. Let  $[\Sigma_{T_i}]_t$  be the  $3 \times 3$  sub-matrix corresponding to  $t$  from  $\Sigma_{T_i}$ . The corresponding loss for each  $i$  will be

$$\text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_j^{-1}([\mathbf{s}_i^\theta]_t - [\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta]_t) [\Sigma_{T_i}]_t^{-1}([\mathbf{s}_i^\theta]_t - [\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta]_t)^\top),$$

and the within-batch loss will be the sum over all  $i \in \mathcal{B}$ .

After iterating over all the batches, we update the estimate for  $\Sigma_j$  as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_j = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (T_i - 1) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta) \Sigma_{T_i}^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta)^\top \right),$$

and then move on to the next domain. To stabilize the training process, we shift  $\widehat{\Sigma}_j$  towards the identity matrix. We compute  $\widehat{\sigma}_j^2$ , and update  $\widehat{\Sigma}_j$  as following, given some small  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_j^2 &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (T_i - 1) d \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \text{tr}((\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta) \Sigma_{T_i}^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta)^\top) \right), \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_j &= (1 - \epsilon) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (T_i - 1) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta) \Sigma_{T_i}^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta)^\top \right) + \epsilon \widehat{\sigma}_j^2 \mathbf{I}_d. \end{aligned}$$

After iterating over all the domains, the total empirical loss function is

$$L_{\text{NLL}} = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (T_i - 1) \log(|\Sigma_j|) + \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \text{tr}(\Sigma_j^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta) \Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i^\theta - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^\theta)^\top).$$

### 3.3 BBScore

From Sheng et al. [2024], the BBScore therein imposed a structural assumption  $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I_d$ , where  $I_d$  is the  $d$ -dimensional identity matrix. This assumption implies that different coordinates are independent and share the same variance. Additionally, Sheng et al. [2024] assumed the observations  $s_t$  are independent for different  $t$ . The final BBScore was defined as the log-likelihood with a maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) for  $\sigma^2$ .

We define a new BBScore with improvements in two key aspects. First, we incorporate temporal dependence through  $\Sigma_T$ . Second, we incorporate spatial dependence through  $\Sigma$ .

Consider the sequence  $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = (s_0, \dots, s_T)$ , with  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  defined as before. We assume  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$  follows a BB with an unknown parameter  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\widehat{\Sigma}$  be the estimate of  $\Sigma$  from Theorem 2. A natural generalization of Sheng et al. [2024] is to construct the BBScore based on the log density in Theorem 1:

$$\log p(\bar{\mathbf{s}} | \widehat{\Sigma}) = -\frac{d(T-1)}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{d}{2} \log(|\Sigma_T|) - \frac{(T-1)}{2} \log(|\widehat{\Sigma}|) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top).$$

However, the log density  $\log p(\bar{\mathbf{s}}|\widehat{\Sigma})$  is not scale-invariant with respect to  $T$ . This means that for two sequences of different lengths generated by the same  $\Sigma$ , the log densities are not comparable. Additionally, the log density can range over the entire real space, while a positive score is desirable. To address these issues, we define the new BBScore, motivated by hypothesis testing in statistics.

Note that  $\text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim N(0, \Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma)$ , where  $\text{vec}(\cdot)$  is the vectorization operator and  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma]^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) &\sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_{(T-1) \times d}), \\ \|[ \Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma ]^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\|^2 &= \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top [ \Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma ]^{-1} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim \chi_{(T-1) \times d}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\chi_{(T-1) \times d}^2$  is the chi-square distribution with  $(T-1) \times d$  degrees of freedom. Notice that

$$\text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top [ \Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma ]^{-1} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top),$$

we can thus define the new BBScore.

**Theorem 3.** *The BBScore is defined as*

$$B(\bar{\mathbf{s}}|\widehat{\Sigma}) = \text{tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top) / [(T-1)d].$$

This BBScore is always positive, and a larger value implies that the sequence is less likely to have been generated by the given covariance matrix.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Problems

In the experimental section, we begin by comparing the heuristic BBScore, defined in Sheng et al. [2024], on coherence evaluation tasks. We then demonstrate that this new BBScore performs better on multiple tasks, including out-of-domain tasks, highlighting its significant potential. Moreover, we illustrate that our new score enables comparisons among different articles, achieving excellent results. Following this, we present results from the BB encoder, which show similar outcomes to the contrastive learning results. Although it does not surpass them in coherence evaluation tasks, it shows a better fitting to the target distribution (BB). Finally, we demonstrate that our computation scheme can be used for human-AI differentiation tasks.

### 4.2 Datasets

**WikiSection** We use dataset introduced in [Arnold et al., 2019] which contains selected Wikipedia articles on the topic of global cities and have clear topic structures. Each article in this collection follows a pattern certain sections such as abstract, history, geographics and demographics. The training split contains 2165 articles and the test split has 658 articles.

**WikiText** WikiText language modeling dataset [Merity et al., 2016] is a much larger set of verified good and featured articles extracted from Wikipedia compared to WikiSection. We used *WikiText-103-v1* collection in specific for experiments. This dataset encompass over 100 million tokens from 29,061 full articles. The dataset is assessible through Huggingface <sup>1</sup>

**GCDC** This benchmark dataset [Lai and Tetreault, 2018] is specifically for evaluating text coherence and each text in the dataset is annotated by human judges for coherence (low, middle, high). These annotations provide reliable ground truth for evaluating the performance of a coherence model. However, the average article length is much smaller comparing to wikipedia articles.

**HC3** The Human ChatGPT Comparison Corpus (HC3) Guo et al. [2023] includes comparative responses from human experts and ChatGPT, covering questions from various fields such as open-domain, finance, medicine, law, and psychology.

<sup>1</sup>[https://huggingface.co/datasets/EleutherAI/WikiText\\_document\\_level](https://huggingface.co/datasets/EleutherAI/WikiText_document_level)

### 4.3 Evaluation methods

**Global and Local discrimination** Evaluation through discrimination tasks has been a widely adopted approach in coherence evaluation. In global discrimination tasks, we shuffle the entire article with varying shuffle sentence block sizes (1, 2, 5, and 10). For local discrimination tasks, we followed the practice in Moon et al. [2019] and randomly sampled a set of windows, denoted as  $w$ , from each article. Each window consists of a fixed size of 3 sentences. We then shuffle sentences within each window to create perturbed copies. For each article and each task, we randomly create 20 shuffled copies and discard any duplicates.

**Relative scores** To evaluate BBScore’s ability to compare the coherence between different articles, we introduce the following relative accuracy score.

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\sum_{A_i^1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{A_j^2 \in \mathcal{A}_2} |f(A_i^1, A_j^2)|}{|\mathcal{A}_1||\mathcal{A}_2|}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are sets of articles. In our test,  $\mathcal{A}_2$  can also consist of shuffled version of articles from  $\mathcal{A}_1$ .  $f(\cdot, \cdot)$  is defined by:

$$f(A_1, A_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{If } ((A_1 >_B A_2) \wedge (A_1 >_c A_2)) \vee ((A_1 <_B A_2) \wedge (A_1 <_c A_2)), \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where  $A_1 >_c A_2$  ( $A_1 <_c A_2$ ) means article  $A_1$  is more (less) coherent than article  $A_2$ , and  $A_1 >_B A_2$  ( $A_1 <_B A_2$ ) means article  $A_1$  is more (less) coherent than article  $A_2$  evaluated by the BBScore.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Coherence Evaluation Tasks

In global and local discrimination tasks on **WikiSection**, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, our BBScore (p-value) significantly outperforms the heuristic BBScore and matches state-of-the-art (SOTA) results. Unlike the SOTA method, which rely on pairwise training and can’t compare different articles, our BBScore stands out in this aspect. (See Appendix C for more details on methods we compared to.)

Methods	Train				Test			
	$\mathcal{D}_{b=1}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=2}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=5}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=10}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=1}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=2}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=5}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=10}$
ENTITY GRID Barzilay and Lapata [2005]	79.17	86.20	74.51	60.70	85.73	82.79	75.81	64.65
UNIFIED COHERENCE Moon et al. [2019]	<b>99.75</b>	<b>98.60</b>	<b>97.10</b>	96.21	<b>99.73</b>	<b>97.86</b>	<b>96.90</b>	<b>96.09</b>
BBScore, HEURISTIC Sheng et al. [2024]	76.29	75.12	73.04	73.12	83.39	80.71	79.36	78.66
BBScore, P-VALUE	96.35	95.90	96.54	<b>97.34</b>	95.06	94.72	95.13	95.67
BBScore, P-VALUE [RELATIVE SCORE]	<b>91.63</b>	<b>86.74</b>	<b>80.02</b>	<b>78.31</b>	<b>90.32</b>	<b>86.03</b>	<b>79.26</b>	<b>77.89</b>

Table 1: Global Discrimination Task Results on WikiSection.

Methods	Train			Test		
	$\mathcal{D}_{w=1}$	$\mathcal{D}_{w=2}$	$\mathcal{D}_{w=3}$	$\mathcal{D}_{w=1}$	$\mathcal{D}_{w=2}$	$\mathcal{D}_{w=3}$
ENTITY GRID Barzilay and Lapata [2005]	55.37	62.94	65.44	53.04	60.83	66.67
UNIFIED COHERENCE Moon et al. [2019]	<b>84.02</b>	<b>83.64</b>	<b>89.59</b>	<b>77.47</b>	<b>82.98</b>	<b>87.87</b>
BBScore, HEURISTIC Sheng et al. [2024]	47.17	55.84	63.10	50.29	60.15	64.06
BBScore, P-VALUE	55.30	68.73	74.16	56.35	68.83	74.24

Table 2: Local Discrimination Task Results on WikiSection.  $\mathcal{D}_{w=1,2,3}$  represents the joint set of all three other datasets.

We test our BBScore with global discrimination tasks on the **GCDC** dataset, which includes several human-labeled samples. This allows direct comparison with human labels. As BBScore being continuous and label-independent, we focus on two sub-tasks: 1) Discretize the BBScore based on

class labels by approximating the threshold from the training set, then compare it with true labels using Spearman rank correlation. 2) Compare relative scores between articles, defining coherence based on their human labels. As shown in Table 3, our score surpasses the baseline from Lai and Tetreault [2018], which discretizes the Flesch-Kincaid grade level using training data thresholds. Our method achieves 65% accuracy in coherence comparison against human labels, compared to the 55-58% accuracy of current SOTA models designed to predict true human labels Lai and Tetreault [2018], Jeon and Strube [2022]. Our approach emphasizes relative relationships between articles, enhancing its predictive capabilities.

Methods	Spearman				Relative acc (%)			
	Enron	Clinton	Yahoo	Yelp	Enron	Clinton	Yahoo	Yelp
BBScore, P-VALUE	0.3523	0.4394	0.4335	<b>0.5169</b>	<b>59.00</b>	<b>68.23</b>	<b>65.67</b>	<b>70.98</b>
SOTA [LAI AND TETREULT, 2018]	<b>0.454</b>	<b>0.505</b>	<b>0.519</b>	0.329	-	-	-	-
BASELINE [LAI AND TETREULT, 2018]	0.244	0.323	0.089	0.200	-	-	-	-

Table 3: GCDC 3-way classification results.

### 5.2 Coherence Evaluation Tasks (O.O.D)

We evaluate BBScore on an out-of-domain dataset by training the encoder with contrastive learning and BB loss on **WikiText**, and then applying it to compute the latent trajectory of **WikiSection**. We assess performance on the global discrimination task (Table 4). The results show that BBScore achieve high performance in out-of-domain tests, with the BB encoder outperforming the CL encoder. It indicates that the BB encoder effectively learns both the distribution and the dynamics of the entire article. Additionally, the approximation of  $\hat{\Sigma}$  acts as “parameter-free fine-tuning” in our opinion.

Methods	Train				Test			
	$\mathcal{D}_{b=1}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=2}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=5}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=10}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=1}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=2}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=5}$	$\mathcal{D}_{b=10}$
BBScore, P-VALUE, (WIKI TEXT, CL)	91.26	87.11	<b>86.21</b>	<b>86.78</b>	91.30	87.22	<b>86.14</b>	88.18
BBScore, P-VALUE, (WIKI TEXT, BB)	<b>94.15</b>	<b>90.69</b>	85.26	86.65	<b>93.03</b>	<b>89.32</b>	83.02	<b>88.31</b>

Table 4: Global Discrimination Task Results on WikiSection (out of domain test)

### 5.3 Comparison between BB Encoder and CL Encoder

In this task, we conduct a comparison between the BB encoder and the CL encoder. First, as shown in Fig 2, we plot the rough shape of the latent trajectory (blue and red regions) and the target BB (green region), where we observe that the BB encoder appears to learn the target BB more accurately.




Figure 2: Contrastive learning vs BBEncoder in the latent space

We then analyze the performance of two encoders: global discrimination and article-wise comparison on **WikiSection**, and out-of-domain analysis with the encoder trained on **WikiText** and tested on **WikiSection**. As shown in Figure 3, the CL encoder excels in both global discrimination and



article-wise comparison, effectively distinguishing between shuffled and unshuffled articles as well as different articles and their shuffled counterparts. However, the BB encoder shows better performance in out-of-domain tasks. This suggests that the BB encoder captures common structures or dynamics among articles, helping it maintain performance in out-of-domain tasks.




Figure 3: Contrastive learning vs BBEncoder for different tasks on WikiSection testset

#### 5.4 Results of human-AI comparison

In this section, we operate under the assumption that comparing with AI writing, human writing exhibits similar dynamics and structure to other human-written articles. As shown in Table 5, we test our assumption using the dataset from Guo et al. [2023]. We compute the BBScore with different  $\hat{\Sigma}$  values, where the subscript indicates the dataset used for approximation. We then compare the BBScore between human and AI-generated articles, assuming human articles will have a smaller BBScore due to their similarity to other human writings. Our results show that  $\hat{\Sigma}_{wiki}$  performs best in both the Human-AI (no questions) and Human-AI (Q&A) benchmarks without any additional training. This demonstrates its potential strength, as it is training-free and based purely on comparing article dynamics and writing structure.

	Human AI comparison			Human AI comparison with Q&A		
	Human ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{human}$ )	Human ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{ai}$ )	Human ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{wiki}$ )	Human ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{human}$ )	Human ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{ai}$ )	Human ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{wiki}$ )
AI ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{human}$ )	70.07	70.55	-	69.00	69.60	-
AI ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{ai}$ )	59.98	61.52	-	58.19	59.74	-
AI ( $\hat{\Sigma}_{wiki}$ )	-	-	<b>70.67</b>	-	-	<b>69.71</b>

Table 5: Combined accuracy of human AI comparison and human AI comparison with Q&A

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we propose a new BB encoder and compare it with the traditional CL encoder, both theoretically and empirically. Our findings indicate that the BB encoder performs better on out-of-domain tasks. One reason for this improvement is that the BB encoder can more effectively learn the stochastic representation, capturing both spatial and temporal dependencies within the sequence. Building on the outputs of the BB encoder or CL encoder, we define a new BBScore with theoretical motivation, which shows significant empirical improvements over the heuristic BBScore in Sheng et al. [2024]. Using the BBScore, we explore various downstream tasks, such as comparing the relative coherence between coherent articles, beyond simple shuffling tasks, and distinguishing between AI and human-written articles.

However, there are still some limitations in our current scheme: 1) The hyperparameter search for BB encoder training is heuristic. 2) More experiments are needed on multi-domain tasks to demonstrate the benefits of our BB encoder and BBScore, aligning with the theoretical arguments in Section 3. 3) Additional empirical evidence is needed to show the advantages of our BB encoder over the CL encoder since it learns the stochastic representation with more information.

For future work, we aim to implement a more thorough analysis of how to use BBScore for multi-domain tasks, such as domain identification. Additionally, we plan to explore downstream tasks like text generation and applications with large language models, which will be of independent interest.

## References

- Hao Zou, Zae Myung Kim, and Dongyeop Kang. A Survey of Diffusion Models in Natural Language Processing, 2023.
- Ling Yang, Zhilong Zhang, Yang Song, Shenda Hong, Runsheng Xu, Yue Zhao, Wentao Zhang, Bin Cui, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Diffusion Models: A Comprehensive Survey of Methods and Applications. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(4), nov 2023. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3626235. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626235>.
- Qinghua Yi, Xiaoyu Chen, Chen Zhang, Zhen Zhou, Ling Zhu, and Xin Kong. Diffusion models in text generation: a survey. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 10:e1905, 2024. doi: 10.7717/peerj-cs.1905. URL <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.1905>.
- Alice Lai and Joel Tetreault. Discourse Coherence in the Wild: A Dataset, Evaluation and Methods. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 214–223, Melbourne, Australia, July 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W18-5023. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W18-5023>.
- Sungho Jeon and Michael Strube. Entity-based Neural Local Coherence Modeling. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7787–7805, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.537. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.537>.
- Aáron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation Learning with Contrastive Predictive Coding. *CoRR*, abs/1807.03748, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03748>.
- Conor Durkan, Iain Murray, and George Papamakarios. On Contrastive Learning for Likelihood-free Inference. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2771–2781. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/durkan20a.html>.
- Rose E Wang, Esin Durmus, Noah Goodman, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Language modeling via stochastic processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pMQwKLlyctf>.
- Bernt Øksendal and Bernt Øksendal. *Stochastic differential equations*. Springer, 2003.
- John Krumm. Brownian Bridge Interpolation for Human Mobility? In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, SIGSPATIAL '21*, pages 175–183, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450386647. doi: 10.1145/3474717.3483942. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3474717.3483942>.
- Jon S Horne, Edward O Garton, Stephen M Krone, and Jesse S Lewis. Analyzing animal movements using brownian bridges. *Ecology*, 88(9):2354–2363, Sep 2007. ISSN 0012-9658 (Print); 0012-9658 (Linking). doi: 10.1890/06-0957.1.
- Zhecheng Sheng, Tianhao Zhang, Chen Jiang, and Dongyeop Kang. BBScore: A Brownian Bridge Based Metric for Assessing Text Coherence. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(13):14937–14945, 2024.
- Sungbin Lim, Eunbi Yoon, Taehyun Byun, Taewon Kang, Seungwoo Kim, Kyungjae Lee, and Sungjoon Choi. Score-based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Evolution Equations in Hilbert Spaces. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=GrElRvXnEj>.
- Heng Zhang, Daqing Liu, Qi Zheng, and Bing Su. Modeling Video As Stochastic Processes for Fine-Grained Video Representation Learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2225–2234, June 2023.

- Emile Mathieu, Adam Foster, and Yee Teh. On Contrastive Representations of Stochastic Processes. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 28823–28835. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/f19c44d068fecac1d6d13a80df4f8e96-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/f19c44d068fecac1d6d13a80df4f8e96-Paper.pdf).
- Bingbin Liu, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Andrej Risteski. Contrastive learning of strong-mixing continuous-time stochastic processes. In Arindam Banerjee and Kenji Fukumizu, editors, *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3151–3159. PMLR, 13–15 Apr 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v130/liu21h.html>.
- Tanya Reinhart. Conditions for Text Coherence. *Poetics Today*, 1(4):161–180, 1980.
- Yuntian Deng, Volodymyr Kuleshov, and Alexander Rush. Model Criticism for Long-Form Text Generation. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11887–11912, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.815. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.815>.
- Samuel R. Bowman, Luke Vilnis, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Dai, Rafal Jozefowicz, and Samy Bengio. Generating Sentences from a Continuous Space. In Stefan Riezler and Yoav Goldberg, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 10–21, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/K16-1002. URL <https://aclanthology.org/K16-1002>.
- Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. SimCSE: Simple Contrastive Learning of Sentence Embeddings. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6894–6910, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.552. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.552>.
- Aviya Maimon and Reut Tsarfaty. A Novel Computational and Modeling Foundation for Automatic Coherence Assessment. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2310.00598, October 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2310.00598.
- Regina Barzilay and Mirella Lapata. Modeling Local Coherence: An Entity-Based Approach. In Kevin Knight, Hwee Tou Ng, and Kemal Oflazer, editors, *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL’05)*, pages 141–148, Ann Arbor, Michigan, June 2005. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/1219840.1219858. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P05-1018>.
- Han Cheol Moon, Tasnim Mohiuddin, Shafiq Joty, and Chi Xu. A Unified Neural Coherence Model. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2262–2272, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1231. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1231>.
- Sebastian Arnold, Benjamin Schrauwen, Verena Rieser, and Katja Filippova. SECTOR: A Neural Model for Coherent Topic Segmentation and Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 241–253, Hong Kong, China, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1024. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1024>.
- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. Pointer Sentinel Mixture Models, 2016.
- Biyang Guo, Xin Zhang, Ziyuan Wang, Minqi Jiang, Jinran Nie, Yuxuan Ding, Jianwei Yue, and Yupeng Wu. How close is chatgpt to human experts? comparison corpus, evaluation, and detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07597*, 2023.

# Appendix

## Table of Contents

<b>A Proofs</b>	<b>12</b>
A.1 Proof of Theorem 1 . . . . .	12
A.2 Proof of Theorem 2 . . . . .	13
<b>B Training Details</b>	<b>13</b>
B.1 BB Encoder . . . . .	13
B.2 Hyper-parameter Tuning . . . . .	13
<b>C Other scores used in this paper</b>	<b>13</b>

## A Proofs

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* We fix the start and end points  $s_0$  and  $s_T$ , and calculate the likelihood function of the input sequence  $\mathbf{s}$ .

By  $s_t - \mu_t = \mathbf{W}(B_1(t), \dots, B_d(t))^\top$ , the independence between  $B_1(t), \dots, B_d(t)$ , and the properties of the standard BB, we have for any  $t, t' \in \llbracket T - 1 \rrbracket$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[s_t - \mu_t] = 0$ ,  $\text{Var}[s_t] = [\Sigma_T]_{t,t} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top$  and  $\text{Cov}[s_t, s_{t'}] = [\Sigma_T]_{t,t'} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top$ . Then we have

$$\text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim N(0, \Sigma_T \otimes (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top)),$$

where  $\text{vec}(\cdot)$  is the vectorization operator and  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product.

By the likelihood function of the multivariate normal distribution, we have

$$L(\mathbf{W}|\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = (2\pi)^{-d(T-1)/2} |\Sigma_T \otimes (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top)|^{-1/2} \exp[-\text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top [\Sigma_T \otimes (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top)]^{-1} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})/2].$$

Since  $\Sigma = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top$ , the only unknown parameters are  $\Sigma$ . Note that  $|\Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma| = |\Sigma_T|^d |\Sigma|^{T-1}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top [\Sigma_T \otimes \Sigma]^{-1} \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top [\Sigma_T^{-1} \otimes \Sigma^{-1}] \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ &= \text{vec}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \text{vec}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}) = \text{tr}((\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}) \\ &= \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the likelihood function is

$$L(\Sigma|\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = (2\pi)^{-d(T-1)/2} |\Sigma_T|^{-d/2} |\Sigma|^{-(T-1)/2} \exp[-\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top)/2],$$

and then the log-likelihood function is

$$\ell(\Sigma|\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = -\frac{d(T-1)}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{d}{2} \log(|\Sigma_T|) - \frac{(T-1)}{2} \log(|\Sigma|) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\Sigma_T^{-1}(\mathbf{s} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top).$$

Then for  $n$  independent input sequence  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_n$  with lengths  $T_1 + 1, \dots, T_n + 1$ , generated by the same  $\mathbf{W}$  (or  $\Sigma$ ), we can define the corresponding  $\mathbf{s}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ , and then we have

$$L(\Sigma|\{\mathbf{s}_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n L(\Sigma|\mathbf{s}_i),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\Sigma|\{\mathbf{s}_i\}_{i=1}^n) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\Sigma|\mathbf{s}_i) \\ &= -\frac{d \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1)}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{d}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(|\Sigma_{T_i}|) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1)}{2} \log(|\Sigma|) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top). \end{aligned}$$

□

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* Maximizing  $L(\Sigma|\{\mathbf{s}_i\}_{i=1}^n)$  is equivalent to minimize

$$g(\Sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1) \log(|\Sigma|) + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top).$$

Then since  $\Sigma = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top$  is positive definite matrix, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\Sigma} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top) \\ &= -(\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \Sigma^{-1})^\top = -\Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \Sigma^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $(d/d\Sigma) \log(|\Sigma|) = (\Sigma^\top)^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1}$ . Then

$$\frac{d}{d\Sigma} g(\Sigma) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1) \right) \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \right) \Sigma^{-1}$$

By taking  $(d/d\Sigma)g(\Sigma) = 0$ , we have

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - 1) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)\Sigma_{T_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i)^\top \right).$$

□

## B Training Details

### B.1 BB Encoder

The WikiSection BB encoder was trained on 1 A100 GPU for about 10 hours using the training set of WikiSection for 100 epochs. We used SGD optimizer and set the learning rate to be  $1e-9$ . The  $\epsilon$  in the loss function  $L_{NLL}$  is chosen as  $1e-7$ . The WikiText BB encoder was trained on 4 A100 GPUs for roughly 20 hours for 4 epochs with WikiText dataset. For this dataset, we trained with AdamW optimizer with learning rate  $1e-9$  and batch size 32. The  $\epsilon$  in the loss function  $L_{NLL}$  is chosen as  $1e-3$ . Other hyperparameters can be accessed from the configuration file in the submitted code. Our empirical results show incorporating  $\hat{\sigma}_j$  into the  $\hat{\Sigma}_j$  makes no significant results in the downstream tasks, thus we disregard  $\hat{\sigma}_j$  during encoder training.

### B.2 Hyper-parameter Tuning

While training the WikiSection BB encoder, we experimented with different  $\epsilon$  in  $L_{NLL}$  to see its impact on the performance of the trained encoder. Note that  $\epsilon$  determines the perturbation added to the matrix  $\hat{\Sigma}$ . The eigenvalues of the initial  $\hat{\Sigma}$  range from  $10^{-6}$  to  $10^{-1}$ , with the majority of which lying in  $[10^{-3}, 10^{-5}]$ . Thus we tested the following three different  $\epsilon$ :

- Large  $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$  that is larger than most eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ .
- Medium  $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$  that is about the same scale of most eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ .
- Small  $\epsilon = 10^{-7}$  that is smaller than most eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ .

We choose the small  $\epsilon$  based on the performance.

## C Other scores used in this paper

**Entity Grid** Barzilay and Lapata [2005] is the most recognized entity-based approach. It creates a two-way contingency table for each input document to track the appearance of entities in each sentence. We use Stanford’s CoreNLP to annotate the documents and the implementation provided in the Coheoka library<sup>2</sup> to obtain the Entity Grid score.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/kigawas/coheoka>

**Unified Coherence** Moon et al. [2019] presents a neural-based entity-grid method that integrates sentence grammar, inter-sentence coherence relations, and global coherence patterns, achieving state-of-the-art results in artificial tasks.

**BBScore, Heuristic** Sheng et al. [2024] introduces a framework for the computation of BBScore. The score is supposed to represent the deviation from the latent Brownian trajectory from training data. (Also see 3.3)