

Supplementary materials

Table 1: Performance comparison of KNNs with different feature representations. (p-values are shown in the parentheses)

Method	MiP	MiR	MiF	EBP	EBR	EBF	MaP	MaR	MaF
KNN _{TFIDF}	0.4369 (2.95E-39)	0.4455 (2.09E-39)	0.4412 (2.48E-39)	0.4362 (9.30E-34)	0.4547 (3.96E-29)	0.4317 (1.59E-32)	0.3274	0.2960	0.3109
KNN _{W2V}	0.4133 (2.40E-70)	0.4215 (1.30E-70)	0.4174 (1.66E-70)	0.4083 (1.05E-69)	0.4216 (5.55E-73)	0.4027 (1.92E-71)	0.1438 (5.06E-92)	0.1230 (6.25E-92)	0.1326 (1.15E-93)
KNN _{WW2V}	0.4477	0.4565	0.4521	0.4444	0.4616	0.4394	0.2332	0.2126	0.2225
KNN _{W2P}	0.4027 (6.11E-78)	0.4106 (7.22E-78)	0.4066 (5.82E-78)	0.3968 (2.79E-76)	0.4098 (7.88E-79)	0.3914 (4.72E-78)	0.1201 (1.59E-92)	0.1018 (1.32E-92)	0.1102 (8.53E-94)
KNN _{WW2P}	0.4392 (5.47E-45)	0.4478 (5.73E-45)	0.4435 (5.57E-45)	0.4351 (6.09E-44)	0.4515 (3.74E-45)	0.4300 (9.24E-45)	0.1970 (6.05E-81)	0.1786 (3.59E-80)	0.1873 (1.28E-81)
KNN _{D2V}	0.4271 (4.24E-59)	0.4355 (1.82E-59)	0.4313 (2.74E-59)	0.4207 (4.10E-59)	0.4361 (1.30E-59)	0.4156 (6.20E-60)	0.1726 (5.06E-86)	0.1450 (1.80E-86)	0.1576 (1.16E-87)

Table 2: Performance comparison of KNNs with the combination of different feature representations. (p-values are shown in the parentheses)

Method	MiP	MiR	MiF	EBP	EBR	EBF	MaP	MaR	MaF
KNN _{W2V-TFIDF}	0.4526 (3.84E-72)	0.4615 (7.60E-73)	0.4570 (1.55E-72)	0.4516 (3.21E-72)	0.4710 (6.78E-72)	0.4472 (3.26E-72)	0.3359 (6.80E-42)	0.3027 (1.12E-50)	0.3185 (2.71E-49)
KNN _{WW2V-TFIDF}	0.4602 (2.32E-64)	0.4693 (1.63E-64)	0.4647 (1.84E-64)	0.4593 (2.24E-62)	0.4793 (3.38E-61)	0.4549 (3.94E-62)	0.3412 (5.74E-25)	0.3091 (1.63E-37)	0.3244 (9.08E-34)
KNN _{W2P-TFIDF}	0.4750 (1.30E-30)	0.4844 (1.23E-30)	0.4797 (1.26E-30)	0.4752 (3.25E-27)	0.4951 (1.26E-25)	0.4702 (3.71E-27)	0.3371 (1.36E-37)	0.3054 (3.43E-45)	0.3205 (2.33E-43)
KNN _{WW2P-TFIDF}	0.4768 (1.30E-18)	0.4862 (1.25E-18)	0.4814 (1.27E-18)	0.4764 (7.57E-20)	0.4963 (1.99E-19)	0.4714 (2.02E-20)	0.3398 (5.73E-27)	0.3095 (3.65E-33)	0.3239 (2.52E-31)
KNN _{D2V-TFIDF}	0.4784	0.4878	0.4831	0.4783	0.4983	0.4733	0.3468	0.3171	0.3313

Table 3: Comparison of binary relevance approaches with different features. (p-values are shown in the parentheses)

Method	MiP	MiR	MiF	EBP	EBR	EBF	MaP	MaR	MaF
BC _{D2V}	0.4395 (1.99E-101)	0.4482 (1.51E-103)	0.4438 (3.11E-103)	0.4339 (1.00E-99)	0.4519 (3.09E-100)	0.4294 (1.06E-100)	0.1627 (1.16E-101)	0.1706 (4.48E-102)	0.1666 (8.15E-101)
BC _{TFIDF}	0.5584 (2.68E-78)	0.5694 (3.46E-78)	0.5638 (2.52E-78)	0.5575 (1.39E-77)	0.5892 (1.68E-75)	0.5556 (4.82E-77)	0.4662 (2.52E-30)	0.4970	0.4811
BC _{normTFIDF}	0.5716 (5.80E-71)	0.5829 (1.69E-70)	0.5772 (8.98E-71)	0.5704 (9.55E-70)	0.5991 (1.44E-69)	0.5667 (1.06E-69)	0.4463 (9.72E-56)	0.4402 (1.98E-76)	0.4432 (2.13E-66)
BC _{D2V-TFIDF}	0.5974	0.6092	0.6033	0.5983	0.6280	0.5943	0.4741	0.4633 (1.26E-60)	0.4686 (4.44E-41)

Table 4: Performance improvement of MeSHRanker by incorporating deep semantic representation (p-values are shown in the parentheses)

Method	MiP	MiR	MiF	EBP	EBR	EBF	MaP	MaR	MaF
MITIDF	0.5753 (9.79E-65)	0.5526 (1.21E-85)	0.5637 (4.89E-80)	0.5838 (1.89E-60)	0.5737 (3.06E-86)	0.5566 (5.74E-79)	0.4939 (1.31E-63)	0.5140 (6.01E-62)	0.5037 (1.22E-64)
BC _{D2V} -TFIDF	0.5974 (1.23E-67)	0.6092 (1.94E-67)	0.6033 (1.46E-67)	0.5983 (2.73E-68)	0.6280 (1.90E-68)	0.5943 (9.79E-69)	0.4741 (8.21E-74)	0.4633 (5.35E-86)	0.4686 (9.07E-82)
MeSHRanker	0.6067 (4.56E-55)	0.6187 (1.65E-55)	0.6126 (2.73E-55)	0.6091 (4.86E-50)	0.6400 (6.68E-51)	0.6053 (5.32E-51)	0.5249 (6.30E-46)	0.5400 (1.93E-46)	0.5323 (1.02E-47)
+ Step 2 of DeepMeSH	0.6156 (1.29E-17)	0.6278 (1.28E-17)	0.6216 (1.30E-17)	0.6180 (3.21E-16)	0.6492 (3.18E-18)	0.6141 (2.84E-17)	0.5361 (3.20E-19)	0.5476 (1.38E-30)	0.5418 (3.88E-27)
+ Steps 1 and 2 of DeepMeSH	0.6164	0.6286	0.6224	0.6188	0.6501	0.6149	0.5380	0.5505	0.5442