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## Introduction

（1）这 是 我 给 他 后来 亩
zhe shi wo gei ta houlai hua

This is I for he later draw

| 出来 | 最好 |
| :--- | :--- |
| chulai | zuihao |
| out | best |


| 的 | —幅 | 画像。 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| de | yifu | huaxiang |
| DE | one | drawing |

＂This is the best portrait I drew for him later on．＂
（2）［我］六 岁 时，大人们 使 我 对
wo liu sui shi darenmen shi wo dui
［1］Six year old grown－ups make I towards my
＂When I was six，grown－ups made me lose courage in my painter career．＂

| （3） | ［我］ | 除了 | 画 | 过 | 开着 | 肚皮 | 和 | 闭着 | 肚皮 | 的 | 蟒蛇， |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| wo | chule | hua | guo | kaizhe | dupi | he | bizhe | dupi | de | mangshe |  |
|  | $[1]$ | except | draw | PASS | opening | belly | and | closing | belly | DE | boa |

＂Except that I had drawn boas with opening and closing belly，＂

| （4） | ［我］ | 后来 | 再 | 没有 | 学 | 过 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 画。 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| wo | houlai | zai | meiyou | xue | guo | hua |
|  | ［I］ | afterwards | again not | learn | PASS draw |  |
|  | ＂I had never learned drawing afterwards．＂ |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Introduction


＂When I was six，grown－ups made me lose courage in my painter career．＂
＂Except that I had drawn boas with opening and closing belly，＂
（4）

| ［我］ | 后来 | 再 | 没有 | 学 | 过 | 画。 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wo | houlai | zai | meiyou | xue | guo hua |  |
| $[I]$ | afterwards | again not | learn | PASS draw |  |  |
| ＂I had | never learned drawing afterwards．＂ |  |  |  |  |  |


（3）［我］除了 画 过 开着 胿皮 和 闭着 肚皮 的 蟒蛇，
wo chule hua -guo －kaizhe dupi he bizhe dupi de mangshe

## Introduction


＂When I was six，grown－ups made me lose courage in my painter career．＂
$\begin{array}{llllllll}\text {（3）［我］} & \text { 除了 } & \text { 画 } & \text { 过 } & \text { 开着 } & \text { 肚皮 } & \text { 和 } \\ \text { wo chule hua } & \text { guo } & \text { kaizhe } & \text { dupi he } \\ \text {［I］except draw } & \text { PASS opening belly and } \\ \text {＂Except that I had drawn boas with opening and closing belly，＂}\end{array}$
＂I had never learned drawing afterwards．＂

## Introduction

## Assumption:

Compared to non-zero pronouns, zero pronouns have higher discourse coherence supporting them to be resolvable, so that we would expect their verb-usage continuity to be higher than the non-zero cases.

## Method

|  | BERT <br> "Bidirectional <br> Encoder <br> Representations from <br> Transformers" | GloVe <br> "Global Vectors for <br> word representation" | Word2Vec <br> "Word to vector" |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vector size | 768 base model | 300 | 300 |
| Training task | Masked LM, Next <br> sentence prediction | Aggregated global <br> word-word <br> co-occurrence <br> statistics from a <br> corpus | Local statistics, <br> whether words <br> appear in similar <br> contexts <br> (Window size = 5) |
| Feature catching | Bidirectional and <br> contextual features | Global statistical <br> features | Local statistical <br> features |

## Roadmap




Salience \& Dropping Predictions pro-drop vs. non-pro-drop

## Roadmap



## Method

- Discourse material:
- Chinese translation of Saint-Exupéry's The Little Prince
- 2802 clauses, 16010 words
- Each of the clauses includes a main verb, and they were divided by ending with punctuations (i.e. ", . ; ? !")


## Roadmap



## Method

－Dependency parsing
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { ID } & \text { word } & \text { S } & \text { V } & \text { O } & \text { V－agent } & \text { V－patient } & \text { character } & \text { det＿character } \\ \hline 56 & \begin{array}{c}\text { 这些 } \\ \text { this }\end{array} & & & & & & & \\ \hline 57 & \begin{array}{c}\text { 蟆蛇 } \\ \text { boa }\end{array} & \text { 蟆蛇 } & & & & & \text { ch2＿boa } & \\ \hline 58 & \begin{array}{c}\text { 他 } \\ \text { BA }\end{array} & & & & & & & \\ \hline 59 & \begin{array}{c}\text { 它们 } \\ \text { them }\end{array} & & & & & & & \\ \hline 60 & \begin{array}{c}\text { 的 } \\ \text { DE }\end{array} & & & & & & & \\ \hline 61 & \begin{array}{c}\text { 猎获物 } \\ \text { prey }\end{array} & & & \text { 猎获物 }\end{array}\right)$

Table 1：Annotation columns

## Method

－Semantic Role annotation

| ID | word | S | V | 0 | V－agent | V－patient | character | det＿character |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | 这些 <br> this |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57 | 蟒蛇 <br> boa | 蟒蛇 |  |  |  |  | ch2＿boa |  |
| 58 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 把 } \\ & \text { BA } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59 | 它们 them |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 的 } \\ & \mathrm{DE} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 | 猎获物 prey |  |  | 猎获物 |  |  |  | ch2 boa |
| 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 不 } \\ & \text { not } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 加 } \\ \text { add } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 64 | 咀嚼 <br> chew |  | 咀嚼 |  | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ \text { boa } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ \text { prey } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 65 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 地 } \\ & \text { DI } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 66 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 囫图 } \\ & \text { roughly } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 67 | 忝 swalllow |  | 吞 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 57 \\ \text { boa } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $61$ prey |  |  |
| 68 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 下 } \\ \text { down } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 1

## Method

－Character Role annotation

| ID | word | S | V | 0 | V－agent | V－patient | character | det＿character |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 这些 } \\ & \text { this } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57 | 蟒蛇 boa | 蟒蛇 |  |  |  |  | ch2＿boa |  |
| 58 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 把 } \\ & \text { BA } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59 | 它们 them |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 的 } \\ & \mathrm{DE} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 | 猎获物 prey |  |  | 猎获物 |  |  |  | ch2 boa |
| 62 | 不 not |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 加 } \\ \text { add } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 64 | 咀嚼 <br> chew |  | 咀嚼 |  | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ \text { boa } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 61 \\ \text { prey } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 65 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 地 } \\ & \text { DI } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 66 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 囫囵 } \\ & \text { roughly } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 67 | 吞 swalllow |  | 吞 |  | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ \text { boa } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ \text { prey } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 68 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 下 } \\ \text { down } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 1：Annotation columns

## Method

- Character Role annotation
- Pro-drop annotation
- Among all agent cases, 422 of them are dropped; only 16 cases of patient were dropped.
- In the following analyses, we focused on the agent cases.
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## Method

－Dynamic Character－Verb Usage Table

| verb | 回来 |
| :---: | :---: |
| verb＿id | 16008 |
| agent＿character | ch4 |
| prodrop | False |
| ch1＿prev＿verbs | （［只有，看到，想，用，画，画，让，画，放，放弃，当，泄，得，给，．． |
| ch2＿prev＿verbs | （［咀嚼，吞，动弹，消化，消化，开，闭，闭，危险，闭，开，开，闭］，．．． |
| ch3＿prev＿verbs | （［理解，看，懂，需要，解释，劝，靠，弄，懂，有，谈，认识，大人们，．．． |
| ch4＿prev＿verbs | （［朝，望，出现，给，像，没有，像，干，有，说道，回答，说，没有，．．． |
| ch5＿prev＿verbs | （［病，需要，像，睡，去，用，跑，跑，跑，到，跑，走，走，吃，吃．．． |
| ．．． | ．．． |
| ch30＿prev＿verbs | （［运载，发，往，朝着，开，过］，［12123，12128，12133，1．．． |
| ch31＿prev＿verbs | （［寻找，回来，满意，住，追随，追随，睡觉，打哈欠，拥挤，知道，寻找，．．． |
| ch32＿prev＿verbs | （［说道，贩卖，卖，说］，［12334，12339，12359，12372］）． |

Table 3：Example of Verb－Character table

Method

| verb | Come back |
| :--- | :--- |
| verb_id | 16008 |
| agent_character | ch4 |
| pro_drop | False - Non-pro-drop |
| ch1_prev_verbs | Only have, see, want, use, draw, draw, let, ... |
| ch2_prev_verbs | chew, swallow, move, digest, digest, open, ... |
| ch3_prev_verbs | Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,... |
| ch4_prev_verbs | Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike, ... |
| ch5_prev_verbs | Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat... |
| $\ldots$ |  |
| ch30_prev_verbs | Carry, send, towards, drive, pass |
| ch31_prev_verbs | Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,... |
| ch32_prev_verbs | Say, sell, sell, say |
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Method


Method

| verb | Come back |
| :---: | :---: |
| verb_id | $16008$ |
| agent_character | ch4 verb similarity |
| pro_drop | False - Non-pro-drop |
| ch1_prev_verbs | Only have see, want, use, draw, draw, let, ... |
| ch2_prev_verbs | chew, swallow, move, digest, digest, open, ... |
| ch3_prev_verbs | Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,... |
| ch4_prev_verbs | Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike, ... |
| ch5_prev_verbs | Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat... |
| $\cdots$ |  |
| ch30_prev_verbs | Carry, send, towards, drive, pass |
| ch31_prev_verbs | Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,... |
| ch32_prev_verbs | Say, sell, sell, say |

## Method

- Verb similarity
- = cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors

$$
R\left(v_{\text {prev }}, v_{\text {curr }}\right)=\frac{v_{\text {prev }} \cdot v_{\text {curr }}}{\left\|v_{\text {prev }}\right\|\left\|v_{\text {curr }}\right\|}
$$

Cosine Distance/Similarity
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## Method

- Verb similarity
= cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors

$$
R\left(v_{\text {prev }}, v_{\text {curr }}\right)=\frac{v_{\text {prev }} \cdot v_{\text {curr }}}{\left\|v_{\text {prev }}\right\|\left\|v_{\text {curr }}\right\|}
$$

- Verb-chain similarity

$$
\begin{array}{r}
R_{\text {weighted }}\left(\left[v_{\text {prev_ } 1}, \ldots, v_{\text {prev_ }}\right], v_{\text {curr }}\right)= \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega\left(c l_{-} p r e v_{-} i, c l_{-} \text {curr }\right) * R\left(v_{\text {prev_ }} i, v_{\text {curr }}\right) \tag{3}
\end{array}
$$

## Method

- Verb similarity
= cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors


## $R\left(v_{\text {prev }}, v_{\text {curr }}\right)=\frac{v_{\text {prev }} \cdot v_{\text {curr }}}{\left\|v_{\text {prev }}\right\|\left\|v_{\text {curr }}\right\|}$

- Verb-chain similarity

$$
\begin{gather*}
R_{\text {weighted }}\left(\left[v_{\text {prev_1_ } \left.\left., \ldots, v_{\text {prev_n }}\right], v_{\text {curr }}\right)=}^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega\left(c l_{-} \text {prev_i,cl_curr }\right) * R\left(v_{\text {prev_i }}, v_{\text {curr }}\right)}\right.\right.
\end{gather*}
$$

## Method

## - Verb similarity

= cosine similarity between two word embedding vectors


- Verb-chain similarity

$$
\begin{gathered}
R_{\text {weighted }}\left(\left[v_{\text {prev_1_, } \left.\left.^{1}, v_{\text {prev_ }}\right], v_{\text {curr }}\right)}=\right.\right. \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \begin{array}{c}
\omega\left(c l_{-} \text {prev_} \quad i, c l_{\_} \text {curr }\right)
\end{array} * R\left(v_{\text {prev_i } \left., v_{\text {curr }}\right)}^{\omega(j, k)=1 /(d+1)}\right. \\
d=|j-k|
\end{gathered}
$$



The decay function for weighted relevance

## Method



Relevance Between History Verbs and Current Verb Based on Word Embeddings

| Relevance Regressor | (Non-weighted relevance, Weighted relevance) |
| :--- | :--- |
| rel_glove_ch1 | $(81.89066125531684,0.32419914580071807)$ |
| rel_glove_ch2 | $(1.8756812506219913,0.001503683756709864)$ |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| rel_glove_ch32 | $(0.8230171383397842,0.001262691669193839)$ |
| rel_bert_ch1 | $(176.59183087820725,0.6119750732174682)$ |
| rel_bert_ch2 | $(4.919826668243348,0.0027848581443943223)$ |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| rel_bert_ch32 | $(0.867459723760406,0.001329274033713714)$ |
| rel_word2vec_ch1 | $(134.572604613474,0.4595537826115222)$ |
| rel_word2vec_ch2 | $(2.8936049625643223,0.0020496541891822087)$ |
| ... | $\ldots$ |
| rel_word2vec_ch32 | $(0.9999583161919829,0.0015334960473239322)$ |
| rel_baseline_ch1 | $(-0.771830408650495,0.008005141647819333)$ |
| rel_baseline_ch2 | $(-0.008373434318707955,5.9110606393949324 \mathrm{e}-05)$ |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| rel_baseline_ch32 | $(0.08827132539725344,0.00013526127447238275)$ |

Table A5: Example of relevance results for the last verb

## Method



Table 4: Regressors obtained after the relevance calculation
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| verb | Come back |
| :--- | :--- |
| verb_id | 16008 |
| agent_character | ch4 |
| pro_drop | False - Non-pro-drop |
| ch1_prev_verbs | Only have, see, want, use, draw, draw, let, ... |
| ch2_prev_verbs | chew , swallow, move, digest, digest, open, ... |
| ch3_prev_verbs | Understand, see, understand, need, explain, advise,... |
| ch4_prev_verbs | Towards, watch, show up, give, alike, not have, alike, ... |
| ch5_prev_verbs | Sick, need, alike, sleep, go, use, run, run, run, walk, walk, eat, eat... |
| $\ldots$ |  |
| ch30_prev_verbs | Carry, send, towards, drive, pass |
| ch31_prev_verbs | Seek, come, back, satisfy, live, follow,... |
| ch32_prev_verbs | Say, sell, sell, say |

Method


## Method

- Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(k)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{R_{\text {weighted }}(k)+1}{R_{\text {weighted }}(i)+1}\right)}{n+1} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]
## Method

- Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

$$
S(k)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\text { Correct character's accumulated Relevance }}{\left.\frac{R_{\text {weighted }}(k)+1}{R_{\text {weighted }}(i)+1}\right)}\right.}{n+1}
$$

[^1]
## Method

- Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

$$
S(k)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{R_{\text {weighted }}(k)+1}{\left[\frac{R_{\text {weighted }}(i)+1}{}\right)}\right.}{n+1_{\text {other character's accumulated Relevance }}}
$$

[^2]
## Method

- Correct character 's verb-chain-similarity salience

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(k)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{R_{\text {weighted }}(k)+1}{R_{\text {weighted }}(i)+1}\right)}{n+1} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^3]
## Method

(f)


Salience of the Correct Character based on Relevance

| Regressor | Example value |
| :--- | :--- |
| verb | 回来 (come back) |
| correct character | ch4 |
| pro-drop | False |
| salience-glove-unweighted | 45.761057 |
| salience-bert-unweighted | 57.886974 |
| salience-word2vec-unweighted | 56.125342 |
| salience-baseline-unweighted | 1.087911 |
| salience-glove-weighted | 1.206085 |
| salience-bert-weighted | 1.522071 |
| salience-word2vec-weighted | 1.427663 |
| salience-baseline-weighted | 0.979743 |

Table A6: Example of salience result of the last verb

## Methods

| Verb-id | pro-drop | Correct character salience |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | False | 1.65 |
| 2 | True | 5.86 |
| 3 | False | 1.22 |
| $\ldots$ |  |  |
| 16007 | True | 4.12 |
| 16008 | False | 3.51 |
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Salience \& Dropping Predictions pro-drop vs. non-pro-drop

## Results

(a) Salience distribution of word embedding models with verb distance weighted

- Character salience distribution:
- non-pro-drop vs. pro-drop
(b) Salience distribution of word embedding models without verb distance weighted



## Results

- Ranged character salience group comparison:

|  |  | Correct character salience pro-drop >non-pro-drop ( $\mathrm{n}=422$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Candidates' Range |  | range $=$ all |  | range <10 clause |  | range <20 clause |  | range <30 clause |  |
|  |  | t-value | p-value | $t$-value | p-value | t-value | p-value | t-value | $p$-value |
| DistanceWeighted | GloVe | 49090.319 | 0.063 | 51137.593 | 0.012* | 52598.233 | 0.003** | 52121.241 | 0.004** |
|  | BERT | 50555.45 | 0.023* | 45310.076 | 0.029* | 52105.854 | 0.005** | 51582.819 | 0.008** |
|  | Word2Vec | 50358.954 | 0.025* | 51268.800 | 0.011* | 52747.81 | 0.002** | 52246.569 | 0.004** |
|  | Baseline | 44656.318 | 0.496 | 44737.336 | 0.483 | 49199.853 | 0.060 | 47875.291 | 0.134 |
| DistanceUnweighted | GloVe | 39345.494 | 0.959 | 44384.169 | 0.531 | 43818.383 | 0.606 | 43837.85 | 0.604 |
|  | BERT | 42867.41 | 0.724 | 45310.076 | 0.411 | 45187.343 | 0.425 | 45220.75 | 0.421 |
|  | Word2Vec | 40865.782 | 0.898 | 45236.126 | 0.420 | 44672.755 | 0.494 | 44630.117 | 0.498 |
|  | Baseline | 43149.674 | 0.690 | 45940.625 | 0.330 | 46398.831 | 0.275 | 45552.563 | 0.377 |

Table 3: Single-sided nonparametric two-sample Wilcoxon test between pro-drop and non-pro-drop salience values among three word embedding models and the baseline model: With candidates included as all candidates, candidates within 10 clauses, 20 clauses, and 30 clauses.

## Results

- Logistic regression model predicting dropping behaviour: Ranged salience results

> Logistic Regression Model

Pro-drop Prediction Accuracy

| Candidates' Range |  | range $=$ all | range <10 clause | range <20 clause | range <30 clause |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DistanceWeighted | GloVe | 0.518 | 0.535 | 0.527 | 0.539 |
|  | BERT | 0.538 | 0.532 | 0.536 | 0.546 |
|  | Word2Vec | 0.534 | 0.535 | 0.537 | 0.552 |
|  | Baseline | 0.497 | 0.489 | 0.495 | 0.498 |
| DistanceUnweighted | GloVe | 0.524 | 0.487 | 0.490 | 0.485 |
|  | BERT | 0.493 | 0.488 | 0.492 | 0.482 |
|  | Word2Vec | 0.514 | 0.485 | 0.482 | 0.473 |
|  | Baseline | 0.485 | 0.485 | 0.485 | 0.485 |

Table 4: Pro-drop prediction accuracy results of the Logistic Regression model from three word embedding models and one baseline model: salience value calculated based on all previous clauses and ranged clauses.

## Discussion

- Language models and their performances
- Group t-test and logistic regression results are consistent: showing the performance ordering as: BERT > word2vec > GloVe

1. BERT: bidirectional and contextual
2. Word2Vec: local statistical features
3. GloVe: global statistical features

- Ranged character salience improves t-test significance level and prediction accuracy
- Distance-weighted models show zero > non-zero salience effect; unweighted models do not show this effect
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## Discussion

- Language models and their performances
- Group t-test and logistic regression results are consistent: showing the performance ordering as: BERT > word2vec > GloVe

1. BERT: bidirectional and contextual
2. Word2Vec: local statistical features
3. GloVe: global statistical features

- Ranged character salience improves t-test significance level and prediction accuracy
- Distance-weighted models show zero > non-zero salience effect; unweighted models do not show this effect


## Conclusions

- This study quantifies character-verb usage continuity as an aspect of discourse that helps comprehenders resolve omitted pronouns. Omitted pronouns tend to show higher verb usage consistency compared to pronounced entities, and this effect is strengthened by clause recency.
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[^0]:    Note: the " +1 " s in this function are assigned to keep the division
    denominator as non-zero, and balanced for the numerator

[^1]:    Note: the "+1" s in this function are assigned to keep the division
    denominator as non-zero, and balanced for the numerator

[^2]:    Note: the "+1" s in this function are assigned to keep the division
    denominator as non-zero, and balanced for the numerator

[^3]:    Note: the "+1" s in this function are assigned to keep the division
    denominator as non-zero, and balanced for the numerator

