

# LLM Reading Tea Leaves: Automatically Evaluating Topic Models with Large Language Models

Xiaohao Yang<sup>◇</sup> He Zhao<sup>†</sup> Dinh Phung<sup>◇</sup> Wray Buntine<sup>‡</sup> Lan Du<sup>◇</sup>

<sup>◇</sup>Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

<sup>†</sup>CSIRO's Data61, Sydney, NSW, Australia

<sup>‡</sup>VinUniversity, Hanoi, Vietnam

he.zhao@data61.csiro.au, wray.b@vinuni.edu.vn,  
{xiaohao.yang; dinh.phung; lan.du}@monash.edu

## Abstract

Topic modeling has been a widely used tool for unsupervised text analysis. However, comprehensive evaluations of a topic model remain challenging. Existing evaluation methods are either less comparable across different models (e.g., perplexity) or focus on only one specific aspect of a model (e.g., topic quality or document representation quality) at a time, which is insufficient to reflect the overall model performance. In this paper, we propose WALM (Words Agreement with Language Model), a new evaluation method for topic modeling that comprehensively considers the semantic quality of document representations and topics in a joint manner, leveraging the power of large language models (LLMs). With extensive experiments involving different types of topic models, WALM is shown to align with human judgment and can serve as a complementary evaluation method to the existing ones, bringing a new perspective to topic modeling. Our software package will be available at [https://github.com/Xiaohao-Yang/Topic\\_Model\\_Evaluation](https://github.com/Xiaohao-Yang/Topic_Model_Evaluation), which can be integrated with many widely used topic models.

## 1 Introduction

Topic modeling (Blei et al., 2003), a popular unsupervised text analysis technique, has been applied to various domains, including information retrieval (Yi and Allan, 2009), marketing analysis (Reisenbichler and Reutterer, 2019), social media analysis (Laureate et al., 2023), bioinformatics (Liu et al., 2016), and more. A topic model typically learns a set of global topics to interpret a text corpus and the topic proportion of a document as its semantic representation.

Although topic models have been time-tested for two decades, as an unsupervised technique,

comprehensive evaluations of a topic model remain challenging (Zhao et al., 2021). Originally, topic models are implemented as probabilistic graphical models such as Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) (Blei et al., 2003) and many of its Bayesian extensions. For these models, it has been common practice to measure the log-likelihood or perplexity of a model on held-out test documents. While log-likelihood or perplexity provides a straightforward quantitative comparison between models, several issues still persist: As topic models are not primarily designed for predicting words in documents but rather for semantically learning interpretable topics and document representations, these metrics do not measure these qualities. Furthermore, estimating the predictive probability is often intractable for Bayesian models, and different papers may employ different sampling or approximation techniques (Wallach et al., 2009; Buntine, 2009). For recently proposed neural topic models (NTMs) (Zhao et al., 2021), the computation of log-likelihood is even more inconsistent.

In addition to log-likelihood or perplexity, document representation quality and topic quality are evaluated separately. For document representation quality, downstream task performance is typically used as a metric, such as document classification (Yang et al., 2023), clustering (Zhao et al., 2021), and retrieval (Larochelle and Lauly, 2012). For topic quality, the ultimate evaluation method is human evaluation, which is time-consuming and expensive. Thus, various automatic metrics have been proposed, such as topic coherence (Lau et al., 2014), which measures how semantically coherent the representative words in a topic are, and topic diversity (Dieng et al., 2020), which measures how diverse discovered topics are. To comprehensively evaluate the performance of a topic model, one needs to report multiple metrics on both document representation and topic qualities.

However, these metrics can be contradictory; e.g., a topic model with good topic quality may not preserve good quality on document representation, and vice versa. This discrepancy complicates the model selection process for topic models in practice.

In this paper, we aim to develop a new evaluation approach for topic modeling that comprehensively considers the semantic quality of document representations and topics in a joint manner, leveraging the power of large language models (LLMs). Our key idea is as follows: After being trained, a topic model can infer a document’s distribution over topics and each topic is a distribution over vocabulary words. With these two distributions, a model can generate a set of “topical” words given a document, such as by looking at its representative topics and the representative words of each topic. The generation of the topical words takes both the topic distribution of a document and the word distributions of the topics into account, which captures the semantic summary of the document and is expected to align with the keywords identified by humans. Thus, the quality of the generated topical words of documents informatively and comprehensively reflects the quality of a topic model. As human evaluation is typically costly, we propose querying LLMs with appropriate prompts as a proxy to generate keywords for the document and then compare them with the topical words generated by a topic model. Finally, to quantify the agreement between the words from the topic model and the LLM, a series of WALM (Words Agreement with Language Model) metrics are proposed. WALM has the following appealing properties:

- It is a joint metric that evaluates both document representation and topic qualities.
- It measures how well a topic model captures a document’s semantics, which is the focus of topic modeling.
- It can be compared across different kinds of topic models.

To examine WALM series metrics, we conduct extensive experiments using various popular topic models on different datasets, comparing them with other widely used topic model evaluation metrics. Moreover, human evaluation is also conducted to demonstrate the alignment of WALM with human judgment.

## 2 Related Work

As an unsupervised technique for uncovering hidden themes in text, evaluating topic models remains challenging. Early evaluations of a topic model rely on the log-likelihood or perplexity of held-out documents (Blei et al., 2003), which measures how well the model predicts the words of documents. As the computation of predictive probability is often intractable for conventional Bayesian topic models, various sampling or approximation techniques have been proposed (Walach et al., 2009; Buntine, 2009). Apart from the inconsistent estimation, held-out likelihood is regarded as not correlated with the interpretability of topics from a human perspective (Chang et al., 2009), prompting the direct evaluation of topics and document representation quality.

As for the evaluation of topics, Chang et al. (2009) design the word and topic intrusion tasks for human annotators, where high-quality topics or document representations are those where annotators can easily identify the intruders. Newman et al. (2010) and Mimno et al. (2011) evaluate topic coherence by direct ratings from human experts. Although human judgment is commonly regarded as the gold standard, it is expensive and impractical for large-scale evaluation. Automated evaluation of topic coherence is more practical, such as Normalized Pointwise Mutual Information (NPMI) (Lau et al., 2014), which relies on the co-occurrence of the topic’s top words in the reference corpus to measure topic coherence, with the underlying assumption that a large reference corpus such as Wikipedia can capture prevalent language patterns. Although they automate the evaluation of topics and strongly correlate with human judgment (Newman et al., 2010), counting word co-occurrence in a large reference corpus is still relatively expensive. Recent works propose leveraging word embeddings (Nikolenko, 2016) or contextualized embeddings (Hoover et al., 2021) for efficiently evaluating topic coherence, incorporating semantics from pre-trained embeddings. Due to common posterior collapse issues (Lucas et al., 2019) in the growing field of neural topic models (Zhao et al., 2021), recent works also consider topic diversity (Dieng et al., 2020) during evaluation, which measures how distinct the top words of each topic are.

As for the evaluation of document representation, early works focus on how well the topic pro-

portion of a document represents the document content, assessed through a topic intrusion task by human annotators (Chang et al., 2009), which is further extended as automated metrics (Bhatia et al., 2017, 2018). Recent topic models often use the topic proportions as document representations, the quality of which is commonly investigated through downstream tasks, including their use as features for document classification (Nguyen and Luu, 2021), clustering (Zhao et al., 2020), and retrieval (Larochelle and Lauly, 2012). Recently, the generalization ability of topic models is investigated by evaluating their quality of document representations across different unseen corpora (Yang et al., 2023).

In the era of large language models (LLMs) (Thoppilan et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2022; Touvron et al., 2023a,b), recent research has begun leveraging LLMs to evaluate topic models, such as using ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022) as a proxy for human annotators for word intrusion and topic rating tasks for evaluating topic coherence (Rahimi et al., 2023; Stammbach et al., 2023). The focus of these works is still on topic quality only.

In this work, we propose new evaluation metrics for topic models, differing from previous works in the following ways: (1) Unlike evaluations that focus on only sub-components of a topic model (i.e., topics or document representations), our evaluation metrics offer a joint approach to topic model evaluation, considering both topics and document representations together. (2) Compared with log-likelihood or perplexity, which also evaluate based on documents, our evaluation metrics consider semantics from documents and align with the focus of topic modeling. (3) Different from recent LLM-based evaluations that use LLMs for topic quality evaluation, ours is a more comprehensive method that considers both topic quality and document representation quality and our use of LLMs is quite different from previous works.

### 3 Background

Given a document collection  $\mathcal{D} := \{d_1, \dots, d_M\}$  with  $V$  vocabulary words, a topic model is typically trained on their Bag-of-Words (BOWs), e.g.,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^V$ . The topic model can infer a distribution over  $K$  topics for each document by running its inference process:

$$\mathbf{z} := f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta$  denotes the model parameters of the inference process;  $\mathbf{z} \in \Delta^K$  ( $\Delta$  denotes the probability simplex) indicates the proportion of each topic present in the document and is commonly used as its semantic representation. Besides, the topic model also discovers  $K$  global topics for the corpus (i.e.,  $\mathbf{T} := \{t_1, \dots, t_K\}$ ), where each topic  $t \in \Delta^V$  is a distribution over  $V$  vocabularies. Ideally, each topic captures a semantic concept that can be interpreted by its top-weighted words. To train a topic model, one often needs to generate or reconstruct the word distribution of the document from  $\mathbf{z}$  by running its generative process:

$$\mathbf{w} := f_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{T}), \quad (2)$$

where  $\phi$  are the model parameters of the generative process;  $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^V$  is the per-document word distribution from which  $\mathbf{x}$  is sampled. Let  $\mathbf{Z} := \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}$  be the semantic representations of  $N$  test documents and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the  $K$  learned topics, current evaluation of a topic model is commonly conducted based on either  $\mathbf{Z}$  or  $\mathbf{T}$  separately.

## 4 Method

### 4.1 Motivation

Both topics and document representations are important components of a topic model. To comprehensively evaluate a topic model, it is common practice to report the performance of both parts. This can be done by measuring topic quality using metrics such as NPMI and assessing document representation quality through downstream classification accuracy (ACC) (see section 5.1 for details of metrics calculation). However, a model that prioritizes topic quality (e.g., NPMI) may not perform well in terms of document representations (e.g., ACC), and vice versa, which creates difficulty during model selection, as illustrated in Figure 1. This inconsistency in the performance of the two components is also indicated by Bhatia et al. (2017). Therefore, evaluating a topic model based on sub-components only is insufficient to reveal the entire model’s performance. Recent topic models usually focus on improving topic quality, such as clustering-based topic models in Sia et al. (2020); Grootendorst (2022), but they do not evaluate their performance for document representation. In this work, we aim to introduce a novel evaluation method for topic modeling that jointly assesses the semantic quality of both topics and




Figure 1: Performance rankings of topic quality (NPMI) and document representation quality (ACC) during model selection. The best model can be determined using either NPMI or ACC as the selection criterion. However, it can be observed that the rankings for topic quality and document representation quality are inconsistent under the same selection criteria. Experiments are conducted five times, with the number of topics set to 50.

document representations, with the help of large language models.

## 4.2 Key Idea

We propose to conduct the evaluation in a joint manner that considers both document representations and topics, rather than evaluating them separately as in previous works. To do so, we obtain the document-word distribution  $w$  for a given document from the topic model by running both its inference and generative process:

$$w := f_{\phi}(f_{\theta}(x))^1. \quad (3)$$

The inference process infers the document representation  $z$  for a given document  $x$ , as in Eq. 1; the generative process generates or reconstructs the word distribution  $w$  based on the document representation  $z$  and topics  $T$ , as in Eq. 2. Therefore, the evaluation based on  $w$  involves both document representations and topics.

Next, we take the top-weighted words  $w$  from the word distribution  $w$  generated by the topic model as the “topical” words of the document. Those topical words can be regarded as a semantic summary of the document from the target topic model’s perspective. To generate high-quality topical words for a document, a topic model should learn good global topics as well as good document representations. Now, the evaluation of the topic model can be converted to the evaluation of the quality of the topical words. Suppose the true representative words  $k$  of document  $x$  are given, then

<sup>1</sup>We omit topics  $T$  here as they are considered part of the parameters of the generative process  $\phi$ .

Prompt
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <p>&lt;s&gt;[INST] &lt;&lt;SYS&gt;&gt;</p> <p>You are an assistant in understanding the content of documents. You need to provide 30 keywords that capture the main information of the document. The word you provide should be single-word. You can use words that are not in the original document. Format your words in a list like this: [word1, word2, word3].</p> <p>&lt;&lt;/SYS&gt;&gt;</p> </div> <div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;"> <p>Instruction:</p> </div> </div>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <p>Eastwood High School (El Paso Texas). Eastwood High School is a high school in the city of El Paso Texas USA. [/INST] [eastwood, school, texas, usa, city, education, institution, students, campus, high]</p> <p>&lt;/s&gt;</p> </div> <div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;"> <p>In-Context Example:</p> </div> </div>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <p>&lt;s&gt;[INST]</p> <p>Getting Played. Getting Played is a 2005 television film directed by David Silberg starring Vivica A. Fox Bill Bellamy Carmen Electra and Stacey Dash. The film is about three beautiful women who decide on a bet to select and seduce a total stranger. [/INST]</p> </div> <div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px;"> <p>Queried Document:</p> </div> </div>
Output
<p>Sure, here are 30 keywords that capture the main information of the document:</p> <p>[bet, women, seduce, stranger, film, television, directed, starred, vivica, fox, bill, bellamy, carmen, electra, stacey, dash]</p>

Figure 2: An example prompt and output of using LLAMA2 for document keywords summarization.

we can formulate our evaluation task as:

$$S(w, k), \quad (4)$$

where  $S(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a score function (Sec. 4.4) to quantify the agreement between  $w$  and  $k$  (Sec. 4.3).

## 4.3 Document summarization by LLM

Following our evaluation task in Eq. 4, the ideal representative words  $k$  are from human summary of the document. However, this is expensive and impractical for large-scale evaluation. With the recent advancements in LLMs, which have demonstrated performance akin to human capabilities in

various NLP tasks, including text summarization (Wang et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024), we propose to leverage LLMs by prompting to extract key words of documents:

$$\mathbf{k} := \text{LLM}(\text{Prompt}(\mathbf{d})). \quad (5)$$

Specifically, we query keywords  $\mathbf{k}$  for a given document  $\mathbf{d}$  from an LLM by proposing the prompt shown in Figure 2. The prompt consists of a task instruction, an in-context example (Liu et al., 2021), and the queried document.

#### 4.4 Choices of the Score Function

For the score function  $S(\cdot, \cdot)$  in Eq. 4, we propose different ways to calculate it: (1) Overlap-based, which computes the number of overlapping words between  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$ , and (2) Embedding-based, which calculates the overall semantic similarity between the two word sets using pre-trained word embeddings.

**Word Overlap** A straightforward choice of the score function is directly counting the overlaps between  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$ . Considering the potential variant in forms of the same word, we convert each word to its root form before counting, formulated as:

$$S_{\text{overlap}} := C(f_{\text{root}}(\mathbf{w}) \cap f_{\text{root}}(\mathbf{k})) \times f_n(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}), \quad (6)$$

where  $C(\cdot)$  and  $f_{\text{root}}(\cdot)$  are the counting and rooting (e.g., stemming or lemmatization) operation, respectively;  $f_n(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}) := 1/(N + M)$  returns the normalising factor based on two input word sets, where  $N$  and  $M$  are the number of words in  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$ , respectively.

**Synset Overlap** Considering the case that different words may describe the same or similar concept (e.g., both ‘‘puppy’’ and ‘‘dog’’), we leverage the synset of WordNet (Miller, 1995) when counting the number of overlaps: if there is an overlap between two words’ synsets, then it is considered as an overlap, formulated as:

$$S_{\text{synset}} := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}(C(f_{\text{synset}}(\mathbf{w}_i) \cap f_{\text{synset}}(\mathbf{k}_j)) > 0) \times f_n(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$  denotes the indicator function;  $f_{\text{synset}}(\cdot)$  is a function that returns the synset for a given word.

**Word Optimal Assignment** We consider another choice of  $S$ , which measures the overall semantic similarity between two sets of words with pre-trained word embeddings (Mikolov et al., 2013; Pennington et al., 2014). Since the alignments between words from  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$  are unknown, directly measuring similarity between word embeddings is not feasible. To automatically find the alignment for each word of  $\mathbf{w}$  to each word of  $\mathbf{k}$ , we formulate it as the following optimal assignment (OA) problem and solve it using the Hungarian algorithm (Kuhn, 1955): Given a word set  $\mathbf{w}$  that has  $N$  words:  $\mathbf{w} := \{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_N\}$  and their embedding vectors  $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{w}} := \{e^{\mathbf{w}_1}, e^{\mathbf{w}_2}, \dots, e^{\mathbf{w}_N}\}$ ; and another word set  $\mathbf{k}$  that has  $M$  words:  $\mathbf{k} := \{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \dots, \mathbf{k}_M\}$  with related embedding vectors  $\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{k}} := \{e^{\mathbf{k}_1}, e^{\mathbf{k}_2}, \dots, e^{\mathbf{k}_M}\}$ . Define a cost matrix  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{N \times M}$  whose entry  $C_{i,j} := \text{CosD}(e^{\mathbf{w}_i}, e^{\mathbf{k}_j})$ , where  $\text{CosD}(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the cosine distance function; and a binary matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$  whose entry  $A_{i,j} = 1$  if word  $\mathbf{w}_i$  is assigned to word  $\mathbf{k}_j$ , and 0 otherwise. The goal is to solve the following optimal assignment problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{A}} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M C_{i,j} \times A_{i,j}, \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^M A_{i,j} = 1, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^N A_{i,j} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By finding the optimal binary matrix  $\mathbf{A}^*$ , we obtain the distance between  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$  by:

$$S_{\text{oa}} := D_{\text{oa}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M C_{i,j} \times A_{i,j}^*. \quad (9)$$

**Word Optimal Transport** Considering that both  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$  are top words of probability distributions, where each word essentially retains a portion of probability mass. Our previous calculations ignore the probability mass of words and treat each word in the set as equal. Now we include the probability mass and formulate the similarity calculation between  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{k}$  as an optimal transport (OT) problem: Given two discrete distributions  $\mu(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w})$  and  $\mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k})$ , where  $\mathbf{w} := \{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_N\}$  and  $\mathbf{k} := \{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \dots, \mathbf{k}_M\}$  are

the supports of those two distributions;  $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^N$  and  $\mathbf{k} \in \Delta^M$  are their related probability vectors<sup>2</sup>; following the same construction of cost matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  in the previous OA problem, the OT problem between  $\mu(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w})$  and  $\mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k})$  is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{P}} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M C_{i,j} \times P_{i,j}, \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^M P_{i,j} = \mathbf{w}_i, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^N P_{i,j} = \mathbf{k}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{N \times M}$  is the transport plan, whose entry  $P_{i,j}$  indicates the amount of probability mass moving from  $\mathbf{w}_i$  to  $\mathbf{k}_j$ . Similarly, by finding the optimal transport plan  $\mathbf{P}^*$  using solvers such as those in Flamary et al. (2021), the OT distance between  $\mu(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w})$  and  $\mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k})$  is obtained by:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{ot}} &:= D_{\text{ot}}(\mu(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}), \mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k})) \\ &:= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M C_{i,j} \times P_{i,j}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Compared with our OA and OT formulations for WALM, they are similar in that they both construct the cost matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  using cosine distance between pre-trained word embeddings. However, they differ in the following ways: (1) OA treats words in the set as equal, while OT considers probability mass of each word. (2) OA can be viewed as a ‘‘hard’’ assignment problem between two word sets because the entries of  $\mathbf{A}$  are binary. In contrast, OT can be regarded as a ‘‘soft’’ assignment because of the spread of probability mass in  $\mathbf{P}$ .

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets** Two widely used datasets, 20News-group (Lang, 1995) (20News), which contains long documents, and DBpedia (Auer et al., 2007), which includes short documents, are used for our experiments. We will release our pre-processed dataset along with the software package in Github.

<sup>2</sup>We assume  $\mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k})$  is a uniform distribution over the keywords  $\mathbf{k}$  from the LLM. Thus,  $\mathbf{k}$  is a uniform probability vector.

**Evaluated Models** We conduct experiments on 7 popular topic models from traditional probabilistic to recent neural topic models. (1) Latent Dirichlet Allocation (**LDA**) (Blei et al., 2003), the most popular probabilistic topic model that assumes a document is generated by a mixture of topics. (2) LDA with Products of Experts (**PLDA**) (Srivastava and Sutton, 2017), an early NTM that applies the product of experts instead of the mixture of multinomials in LDA. (3) Neural Variational Document Model (**NVDM**) (Miao et al., 2017), a pioneer NTM that uses a Gaussian as the prior distribution of topic proportions of documents. (4) Embedded Topic Model (**ETM**) (Ding et al., 2020), an NTM that involves word and topic embeddings in the generative process. (5) Neural Topic Model with Covariates, Supervision, and Sparsity (**SCHOLAR**) (Card et al., 2017), an NTM that applies a logistic normal prior on topic proportions and leverages extra information from metadata. (6) Neural Sinkhorn Topic Model (**NSTM**) (Zhao et al., 2020), a recent NTM based on an optimal transport framework. (7) Contrastive Learning Neural Topic Model (**CLNTM**) (Nguyen and Luu, 2021), a recent NTM that uses contrastive learning to regularize document representations. We keep all these models’ default settings as suggested in their implementations. All experiments are conducted 5 times with different random seeds; mean and std values are reported.

**Settings of WALM** We evaluate topic models using WALM series metrics we propose in Sec. 4.4, including  $S_{\text{overlap}}$ ,  $S_{\text{synset}}$ ,  $S_{\text{oa}}$ , and  $S_{\text{ot}}$ . As for the settings of WALM, we use the word embeddings from GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) pre-trained on Wikipedia<sup>3</sup>. We set the number of top words for a document generated by the topic model to 10; The LLM we use is LLAMA2-13b-chat (Touvron et al., 2023b), which has 13 billion parameters and is fine-tuned for chat completion; We use a 4-bit quantization<sup>4</sup> version of this model for memory efficiency and leverage the llama.cpp<sup>5</sup> library for easy inference. Notably, our evaluation metrics can be used with any LLMs. We use LLAMA2 in our study because it is open-sourced and cost-efficient.

<sup>3</sup><https://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/glove/>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/TheBloke/Llama-2-13B-chat-GGML>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/abetlen/llama-cpp-python>




Figure 3: Topic models’ performance in terms of WALM on 20News (top row) and DBpedia (bottom row).

**Settings of Existing Metrics** We also evaluate topic models with existing commonly used metrics to compare with ours. (1) Topic Coherence and Diversity: we apply **NPMI** to evaluate topic coherence using Wikipedia as the reference corpus, done by the Palmetto package<sup>6</sup> (Röder et al., 2015). Following standard protocol, we consider the top 10 words of each topic and obtain the average NPMI score of topics by selecting the top 50% coherent topics. As for topic diversity (**TD**), we compute the percentage of unique words in the top 25 words of all topics, as defined in Dieng et al. (2020). (2) Document Representation Quality: we conduct document classification and clustering to evaluate the representation capability of topic models. As for classification, we train a Random Forest classifier based on the training documents’ representation and test the accuracy (**ACC**) in the testing documents, as in previous works such as Nguyen and Luu (2021). As for clustering, we conduct K-Means clustering based on test documents’ representation and report the Purity (**KM-Purity**) and Normalized Mutual Information (**KM-NMI**), as in previous works such as Zhao et al. (2020). (3) Perplexity: we use document completion perplexity (Wallach et al., 2009) to evaluate the predictive ability of topic models.

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/dice-group/Palmetto>

We split each test document into two equal-length folds randomly. Then we compute the document completion perplexity (**DC-PPL**) on the second fold of documents based on the topic proportion inferred from the first fold, as in previous works such as Dieng et al. (2020).

## 5.2 Results and Analysis

**Topic Model Evaluation with WALM** We assess topic models’ performance based on our evaluation metrics on both 20News and DBpedia. We have the following observations based on our results illustrated in Figure 3: (1) The WALM values of most models on DBpedia show better performance than 20News, which indicates that it is easier for topic models to generate informative topical words for short documents than long documents. (2) The performance indicated by overlap-based metrics (e.g.,  $S_{\text{overlap}}$  and  $S_{\text{synset}}$ ) and embedding-based metrics (e.g.,  $S_{\text{oa}}$  and  $S_{\text{ot}}$ ) is slightly different. The reason is that embedding-based metrics consider the semantic distance among words, which can be more flexible than the exact match in overlap-based metrics. (3) It can be observed that there is little improvement from recent NTMs over LDA and NVDM in terms of our joint metrics. The potential reason is that most contemporary NTMs primarily focus on enhancing topic coherence while neglecting the generation of docu-




Figure 4: Learning curves of topic models in terms of WALM on test sets of 20News (top row) and DBpedia (bottom row), where the number of topics is set to 50.

Document	Model	Topical Words
It's my understanding that, when you format a magneto-optical disc, (1) the formatting software installs a driver on the disc, (2) if you insert the disc in a different drive, then this driver is loaded into the computer's memory and then controls the drive, and (3) if this driver is incompatible with the drive, then the disc can not be mounted and/or properly read/written. Is that correct?	LDA_B	drive disk card controller hard mb file scsi bios power
	LDA_C	drive disk scsi hard card controller mb floppy ide sale
	NVDM_B	driver, drive, problem, card, time, file, thanks, need, email, work
	NVDM_C	drive, driver, hard, scsi, window, cd, mb, floppy, disc, work
	LLAMA2	driver format magneto-optical disc operating system communication incompatibility
Wrong World. Wrong World is a 1985 Australian film directed by Ian Pringle. It was filmed in Nhill and Melbourne in Victoria Australia.	Human	driver disc drive computer hardware software memory formatting format incompatible
	LDA_B	film american released directed football album summer played team hospital
	LDA_C	film played directed baseball league australian major drama football award
	NVDM_B	specie, album, school, known, located, north, film, directed, american, released
	NVDM_C	film, album, released, second, south, new, directed, american, australian, known
LLAMA2	wrong world film australian directed ian pringle victoria melbourne	
Human	film movie directed director australian melbourne victoria	

Table 1: Documents' topical words from topic models at the beginning phase (e.g., NVDM\_B, LDA\_B) and convergence phase (e.g., NVDM\_C, LDA\_C) according to WALM, where the number of topics is set to 50.

ments, thus showing weak performance in generating topical words of documents as indicated by WALM. (4) WALM shows consistent performance ranking across different settings of  $K$  (e.g.,  $S_{\text{overlap}}$  and  $S_{\text{synset}}$ ) for long documents, which potentially alleviates the effort of extensive model selection in terms of  $K$  during model comparison.

**Learning Curves of WALM** We illustrate the learning curves of topic models in terms of WALM in Figure 4, which clearly shows how our metrics change along with the learning of a topic model. It demonstrates that our metrics are informative for model selection.

**Qualitative Analysis on Topical Words for Documents** We qualitatively investigate the topical words of documents by topic models at different stages in Table 1, where we randomly sample one document for 20News and DBpedia, respectively. We have the following observations based on our results: (1) The topical words at the beginning phase contain less semantically related words about the documents than those at convergence, which aligns with the learning status (as in Figure 4) indicated by WALM. (2) The topical words of NVDM include more words that reveal the documents' main messages than LDA, which aligns with the ranking (as in Figure 3) sug-






Figure 5: Pearson’s correlation coefficient among evaluation metrics.

gested by WALM. (3) The words from LLAMA2 are comparable with those from human annotators in the longer document. For the short document, LLAMA2 focuses on detailed information such as the movie title (e.g., “wrong” and “world”), which human annotators ignore. Further analysis between using LLAMA2 and human judgment to obtain the “true” topical words is described in Sec. 5.4.

**Correlation to Other Metrics** We compute Pearson’s correlation coefficients among existing and WALM series metrics, similar to the correlation analysis in previous works such as Doogan and Buntine (2021) and Rahimi et al. (2023). Pearson’s correlation coefficients among the metrics are plotted in a heatmap in Figure 5. Based on the results, we observe that: (1) WALM variants are highly correlated with each other since they originate from the same mechanism. (2) Compared with DC-PPL, which also evaluates the entire model based on documents, WALM show weak correlations, suggesting a new family of evaluation metrics. (3) Compared with other types of evaluations, WALM has moderate correlations with document representation metrics (e.g., KM-Purity, KM-NMI, and ACC), and weak correlations with topic quality metrics (e.g., NPMI and TD). This indicates that our joint evaluation metrics consider both components. Those observations demonstrate the comprehensive nature of WALM, which can be used as a complementary evaluation method to the existing ones.




Figure 6: Learning curves of NVDM in terms of embedding-based metrics and their contextualized variants on 20News (top row) and DBpedia (bottom row).

### 5.3 Contextualized Embeddings for WALM

**Obtaining Contextualized Embeddings** Recall that in Eq. 9 and Eq. 11, the cost matrix  $C$  is constructed using cosine distances between word embeddings. Here, we change our construction of  $C$  from using static word embeddings from GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) to the contextualized word embeddings from LLAMA2, considering that the same word may have different semantic meanings in different contexts. We obtain the contextualized embeddings of a word given a document differently in two cases: (1) When the target word appears in the context document, we take the average embeddings of each occurrence as the contextualized embedding. (2) When there is no occurrence of the target word in the given document, we add an auxiliary sentence to the document in the following format:

“<Given Document>. This document is talking about <Target Word>.”

Then, we obtain the contextualized embedding of the target word given the document with the auxiliary sentence. By replacing the global word embeddings with contextualized word embeddings, we have new variants of our embedding-based WALM (i.e.,  $S_{\text{oa}}$  and  $S_{\text{ot}}$ ), i.e.,  $S_{\text{oa}_c}$  and  $S_{\text{ot}_c}$ .

**Observations** Since the cost of obtaining contextualized embeddings is high for LLMs, we compute  $S_{oa\_c}$  and  $S_{ot\_c}$  in a case study, where we test NVDM on 100 documents randomly sampled from the test sets of 20News and DBpedia, respectively. We plot the learning curves on test documents in Figure 6. We observe that using word embeddings or contextualized embeddings in our embedding-based scores exhibits similar trends but with different values on both datasets. Further analysis of both approaches is conducted in Sec. 5.4.

#### 5.4 Comparisons with Human Evaluation

WALM computes the difference between documents’ topical words generated by topic models and an LLM, treating the words from the LLM as the ground truth. Here, we investigate the gap between using LLM and human judgment as the true topical words in WALM. To quantify this gap, we propose the following calculation:

$$G := \frac{|S(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}^{\text{LLM}}) - S(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}^{\text{Human}})|}{S(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{k}^{\text{Human}})}, \quad (12)$$

where  $S$  is the score function we propose in Sec. 4.4 (and the contextualized variants in Sec. 5.3);  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $\mathbf{k}^{\text{LLM}}$ , and  $\mathbf{k}^{\text{Human}}$  are the topical words from the topic model, LLM and human annotators, respectively. We empirically observe that the topical words generated by topic models always differ from those identified by humans, thus the denominator in Eq. 12 will not be zero.

**Case Study Setup** As human annotation is expensive for large-scale investigation, we randomly sample 200 test documents from 20News and DBpedia as a case study. We ask human annotators to provide keywords that capture the main points of each document. Then, given a trained topic model, we compute the gap between using the words from the LLM and human judgment in our metrics using Eq. 12.

**Observations** The results are illustrated in Figure 7, where the evaluated model is NVDM with  $K = 50$  trained on 20News and DBpedia, respectively. We have the following observations based on the results: (1) Comparing the datasets, the gap between using human judgment and the LLM in 20News is lower than in DBpedia in most cases. This indicates that for long documents such as those in 20News, the topical words generated




Figure 7: Evaluation gap between using LLAMA2 and human judgment as the “true” topical words.

by the LLM are closer to human judgment than in short documents in DBpedia. (2) Comparing the metrics,  $S_{oa}$  exhibits the lowest gap among WALM metrics, with a gap value of 0.03 and 0.15 on 20News and DBpedia, respectively. This shows the effectiveness of using the LLM as a proxy for human judgment when applied in  $S_{oa}$ . (3) Comparing the embeddings, using contextualized embeddings from the LLM can further narrow the evaluation gap for  $S_{oa}$  and  $S_{ot}$  on short documents.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose WALM (Words Agreement with Language Model), a new evaluation method for topic models, which takes both topic and document representation quality into account jointly. WALM measures the agreement between the topical words generated by topic models and those from the LLM for given documents. We propose different calculations to quantify their agreement, including overlap-based and embedding-based metrics. Through extensive experiments, WALM series metrics show their effectiveness in reflecting topic models’ capability in terms of semantic summary of documents. We show that WALM metrics align with human judgment and can serve as an informative complementary method for topic model evaluation. In the future, we believe that WALM metrics can be further enhanced through improved document summarization by LLMs and word set similarity calculations, and topic models can be further optimized based on WALM series targets.

## References

- Sören Auer, Christian Bizer, Georgi Kobilarov, Jens Lehmann, Richard Cyganiak, and Zachary Ives. 2007. Dbpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data. In *international semantic web conference*, pages 722–735. Springer.
- Shraey Bhatia, Jey Han Lau, and Timothy Baldwin. 2017. An automatic approach for document-level topic model evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05140*.
- Shraey Bhatia, Jey Han Lau, and Timothy Baldwin. 2018. Topic intrusion for automatic topic model evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 844–849.
- David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. 2003. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022.
- Wray Buntine. 2009. Estimating likelihoods for topic models. In *Asian conference on machine learning*, pages 51–64. Springer.
- Dallas Card, Chenhao Tan, and Noah A Smith. 2017. Neural models for documents with metadata. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.09296*.
- Jonathan Chang, Sean Gerrish, Chong Wang, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and David Blei. 2009. Reading tea leaves: How humans interpret topic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 22.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- Adji B Dieng, Francisco JR Ruiz, and David M Blei. 2020. Topic modeling in embedding spaces. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:439–453.
- Caitlin Doogan and Wray Buntine. 2021. Topic model or topic twaddle? re-evaluating semantic interpretability measures. In *Proceedings of the 2021 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 3824–3848.
- Rémi Flamary, Nicolas Courty, Alexandre Gramfort, Mokhtar Z Alaya, Aurélie Boisbunon, Stanislas Chambon, Laetitia Chapel, Adrien Corenflos, Kilian Fatras, Nemo Fournier, et al. 2021. Pot: Python optimal transport. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(78):1–8.
- Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*.
- Jacob Louis Hoover, Alessandro Sordani, Wenyu Du, and Timothy J O’Donnell. 2021. Linguistic dependencies and statistical dependence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08685*.
- Harold W Kuhn. 1955. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97.
- Ken Lang. 1995. Newsweeder: Learning to filter netnews. In *Machine learning proceedings 1995*, pages 331–339. Elsevier.
- Hugo Larochelle and Stanislas Lauly. 2012. A neural autoregressive topic model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25.
- Jey Han Lau, David Newman, and Timothy Baldwin. 2014. Machine reading tea leaves: Automatically evaluating topic coherence and topic model quality. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 530–539.
- Caitlin Doogan Poet Laureate, Wray Buntine, and Henry Linger. 2023. A systematic review of the use of topic models for short text social media analysis. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pages 1–33.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06804*.
- Lin Liu, Lin Tang, Wen Dong, Shaowen Yao, and Wei Zhou. 2016. An overview of topic modeling and its current applications in bioinformatics. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1):1–22.

- James Lucas, George Tucker, Roger B Grosse, and Mohammad Norouzi. 2019. Don't blame the elbo! a linear vae perspective on posterior collapse. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Yishu Miao, Edward Grefenstette, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. Discovering discrete latent topics with neural variational inference. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2410–2419. PMLR.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- George A Miller. 1995. Wordnet: a lexical database for english. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):39–41.
- David Mimno, Hanna Wallach, Edmund Talley, Miriam Leenders, and Andrew McCallum. 2011. Optimizing semantic coherence in topic models. In *Proceedings of the 2011 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 262–272.
- David Newman, Jey Han Lau, Karl Grieser, and Timothy Baldwin. 2010. Automatic evaluation of topic coherence. In *Human language technologies: The 2010 annual conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 100–108.
- Thong Nguyen and Anh Tuan Luu. 2021. Contrastive learning for neural topic model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:11974–11986.
- Sergey I Nikolenko. 2016. Topic quality metrics based on distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1029–1032.
- OpenAI. 2022. Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue. <http://web.archive.org/web/20230109000707/https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- Hamed Rahimi, Jacob Louis Hoover, David Mimno, Hubert Naacke, Camelia Constantin, and Bernd Amann. 2023. Contextualized topic coherence metrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14587*.
- Martin Reisenbichler and Thomas Reutterer. 2019. Topic modeling in marketing: recent advances and research opportunities. *Journal of Business Economics*, 89(3):327–356.
- Michael Röder, Andreas Both, and Alexander Hinneburg. 2015. Exploring the space of topic coherence measures. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 399–408.
- Suzanna Sia, Ayush Dalmia, and Sabrina J Mielke. 2020. Tired of topic models? clusters of pretrained word embeddings make for fast and good topics too! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14914*.
- Akash Srivastava and Charles Sutton. 2017. Autoencoding variational inference for topic models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.01488*.
- Dominik Stambach, Vilém Zouhar, Alexander Hoyle, Mrinmaya Sachan, and Elliott Ash. 2023. Re-visiting automated topic model evaluation with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12152*.
- Liyan Tang, Zhaoyi Sun, Betina Idnay, Jordan G Nestor, Ali Soroush, Pierre A Elias, Ziyang Xu, Ying Ding, Greg Durrett, Justin F Rousseau, et al. 2023. Evaluating large language models on medical evidence summarization. *npj Digital Medicine*, 6(1):158.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama:

- Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Hanna M Wallach, Iain Murray, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and David Mimno. 2009. Evaluation methods for topic models. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 1105–1112.
- Jiaan Wang, Yunlong Liang, Fandong Meng, Beiqi Zou, Zhixu Li, Jianfeng Qu, and Jie Zhou. 2023. Zero-shot cross-lingual summarization via large language models.
- Xiaohao Yang, He Zhao, Dinh Phung, and Lan Du. 2023. Towards generalising neural topical representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12564*.
- Xing Yi and James Allan. 2009. A comparative study of utilizing topic models for information retrieval. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 31th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2009, Toulouse, France, April 6-9, 2009. Proceedings 31*, pages 29–41. Springer.
- Tianyi Zhang, Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Percy Liang, Kathleen McKeown, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2024. Benchmarking large language models for news summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:39–57.
- He Zhao, Dinh Phung, Viet Huynh, Yuan Jin, Lan Du, and Wray Buntine. 2021. Topic modelling meets deep neural networks: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00498*.
- He Zhao, Dinh Phung, Viet Huynh, Trung Le, and Wray Buntine. 2020. Neural topic model via optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.13537*.