

SemImage: Semantic Image Representation for Text, a Novel Framework for Embedding Disentangled Linguistic Features

Mohammad Zare

AI Lab, Arioobarzan Engineering Team, Shiraz, Iran
md.zare@sutech.ac.ir

Abstract

We propose **SemImage**, a novel method for representing a text document as a two-dimensional “semantic image” to be processed by convolutional neural networks (CNNs). In a SemImage, each word is represented as a pixel in a 2D image: rows correspond to sentences and an additional *boundary row* is inserted between sentences to mark semantic transitions. Each pixel is not a typical RGB value but a vector in a disentangled **HSV color space**, encoding different linguistic features: the Hue (with two components H_{\cos} and H_{\sin} to account for circularity) encodes the *topic*, Saturation encodes the *sentiment*, and Value encodes intensity or certainty. We enforce this disentanglement via a multi-task learning framework: a *ColorMapper* network maps each word embedding to the HSV space, and auxiliary supervision is applied to the Hue and Saturation channels to predict topic and sentiment labels, alongside the main task objective. The insertion of dynamically computed boundary rows between sentences yields sharp visual boundaries in the image when consecutive sentences are semantically dissimilar, effectively making paragraph breaks salient. We integrate SemImage with standard 2D CNNs (e.g., ResNet) for document classification. Experiments on multi-label datasets (with both topic and sentiment annotations) and single-label benchmarks demonstrate that SemImage can achieve competitive or better accuracy than strong text classification baselines (including BERT and hierarchical attention networks) while offering enhanced interpretability. An ablation study confirms the importance of the multi-channel HSV representation and the dynamic boundary rows. Finally, we present visualizations of SemImage that qualitatively reveal clear patterns corresponding to topic shifts and sentiment changes in the generated image, suggesting that our representation makes these linguistic features visible to both humans and machines.

1 Introduction

Natural language documents have rich latent structure, including topical content, sentiment, and logical breaks between ideas or paragraphs. Traditional text representation methods often intermix these factors in a single high-dimensional vector, making it challenging to disentangle and interpret the contribution of each factor. Recent advances in pre-trained models like ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), XLNet (Yang et al., 2019), ALBERT (Lan et al., 2020), and GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) have achieved remarkable performance on text classification, but they operate as black boxes, and their representations entangle multiple aspects of language (Minaee et al., 2021). In contrast, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have a long history in text classification (Kim, 2014; Zhang and Yang, 2022), often using word embedding sequences as 1D “images.” However, standard CNN-based models do not explicitly separate different latent features either.

In this paper, we introduce **SemImage**, a novel 2D representation of text designed to *disentangle* key linguistic features into separate channels. In SemImage, a document is rendered as a two-dimensional grid of *pixels*, where each pixel corresponds to a word token. The words of each sentence occupy one row in the image. Crucially, we insert an additional row of pixels

between every pair of sentences to serve as a *dynamic boundary*. These boundary rows act as visible separators between sentences, akin to horizontal lines in an image marking transitions between segments of text. The intensity (brightness) of a boundary row is determined by the semantic dissimilarity between the two adjacent sentences, producing a bright line when the topic shifts sharply (new paragraph or topic) and a faint line when the sentences are topically coherent. This approach draws inspiration from edge detection in images, where strong edges often correspond to significant changes in content. In our context, the boundary rows provide the CNN with explicit visual cues of discourse structure (e.g., paragraph breaks).

Another key aspect of SemImage is its **color space**. Instead of mapping words to arbitrary vector values, we map each word to a color in the *HSV* (*Hue, Saturation, Value*) space to separate concerns: the Hue channel (circular, represented by two components) is dedicated to encode the **topic** of the word, the Saturation channel encodes the **sentiment** or emotional tone, and the Value channel encodes other **intensity** information such as emphasis or certainty. By design, each of these dimensions is intended to capture one factor of variation in language, analogous to disentangled representations in vision and multi-task learning research (John et al., 2019; Vafidis et al., 2024). We enforce this by employing a *multi-task learning* framework (Ruder et al., 2019; Zhang and Yang, 2022), where the model is trained not only on the final classification task but also on auxiliary tasks to predict the topic and sentiment from the appropriate channels of the SemImage.

Our approach offers several potential advantages. First, it provides a form of inherent interpretability: by looking at the image of a document, one can literally *see* where topics change (via changes in Hue) or where sentiment is strong (via high Saturation) or where uncertain language appears (via lower Value intensity). This is in contrast to transformer-based models where such information is hidden in thousands of parameters. Second, by explicitly separating features, the model might learn more robust representations; for example, the sentiment features are encouraged to not encode topical information and vice versa, reducing feature interference (Liu et al., 2019). This is aligned with findings that multi-task learning can yield more generalizable and disentangled representations (Ruder et al., 2019; Vafidis et al., 2024). Third, by converting text to a 2D image format, we can leverage the vast literature on image-based CNN architectures (e.g., ResNet (He et al., 2016)) and potentially benefit from their ability to capture spatial patterns. Our dynamic boundary rows, for example, create a kind of “horizontal edge” at points of topic shift, which image CNNs can naturally detect as a salient feature.

We evaluate SemImage on several datasets encompassing topic classification and sentiment analysis. This includes a multi-label dataset where each document has both a topic label and a sentiment label (allowing joint training), as well as standard single-task datasets like 20 Newsgroups (topic classification) and IMDB movie reviews (sentiment classification). We compare against strong baselines, including a conventional text CNN (Kim, 2014), a hierarchical attention network (HAN) (Yang et al., 2016) that models documents at the word and sentence levels, and fine-tuned BERT (Devlin et al., 2019; Adhikari et al., 2019) as a representative large transformer model. We also compare to a recent multi-task BERT-based approach that jointly learns topic and sentiment (Shah et al., 2024) and a prompt-based multi-task method (da Costa Jr et al., 2023). Experimental results show that SemImage is highly competitive: for instance, on the multi-label dataset, our model outperforms the fine-tuned BERT in overall accuracy of predicting both labels, while using far fewer parameters and providing visual insight into the learned features. On single-task settings, SemImage also performs on par with BERT and surpasses the CNN and HAN baselines.

We conduct an ablation study to assess the contributions of each component of our approach. Removing the dynamic boundary rows leads to a modest drop in accuracy, confirming that marking sentence boundaries helps the model focus on discourse-level structure. Removing the auxiliary losses (i.e., not explicitly disentangling Hue and Saturation) causes a larger performance drop and results in less interpretable representations, which underscores the value of our

multi-task disentanglement approach. Finally, we experiment with using a standard 3-channel RGB encoding of words (learned end-to-end without predefined semantics) instead of HSV; this baseline performs worse than our HSV-based encoding, indicating that the inductive bias of our designed color space indeed helps.

Our contributions are summarized as follows: (1) We introduce a novel text-as-image representation, SemImage, that encodes sentences as rows of pixels and uses a multi-channel HSV color space to disentangle topic, sentiment, and intensity features of words. (2) We develop a multi-task learning framework with a ColorMapper network and auxiliary losses to enforce the intended semantics of each channel. (3) We propose dynamic boundary rows to highlight semantic shifts between sentences in the image, effectively incorporating discourse structure into a visual format. (4) Through experiments and ablations, we demonstrate that SemImage achieves strong performance on document classification tasks and yields interpretable visualizations of textual features, pointing to a promising direction for combining NLP and CV techniques for improved interpretability and multi-factor representation learning.

2 Related Work

Text Classification with CNNs and Hierarchical Models. Convolutional neural networks have been used for sentence and document classification by treating the input text as a sequence of word embeddings (Kim, 2014). In these models, a sentence can be seen as a 1D “image” (word vectors stacked) processed by convolution filters. Our work extends this idea to a 2D image of an entire document. Hierarchical models such as Hierarchical Attention Networks (Yang et al., 2016) explicitly account for the word-sentence-document structure by first encoding words into sentence representations and then encoding sentences into document representations. Our approach similarly respects sentence boundaries (by forming separate rows for each sentence and adding boundary markers), but we embed this structure into an image format suitable for CNNs. Other works have explored graph-based document representations, connecting words or sentences as nodes in a graph (Yao et al., 2019); in contrast, SemImage provides a grid structure where local spatial proximity corresponds to the original text ordering (neighboring words in a sentence and neighboring sentences in a document).

Pre-trained Models and Multi-Task Learning. Large pre-trained models (transformers or otherwise) such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), XLNet (Yang et al., 2019), ALBERT (Lan et al., 2020), and GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), and their predecessors such as ELMo (Peters et al., 2018), have revolutionized NLP, including text classification tasks. They learn rich representations via unsupervised objectives and can be fine-tuned for specific tasks with impressive results. However, these models do not explicitly separate different latent aspects (topic, sentiment, etc.), and interpretability often requires additional probing or attributions. Multi-task learning has been used to improve text representations by training on several objectives simultaneously (Liu et al., 2019). For example, MT-DNN (Liu et al., 2019) combines BERT with multi-task training on GLUE tasks, yielding a more robust universal representation. Our work is in line with multi-task approaches, but we incorporate the multi-task paradigm at the architectural level (by designing separate channels for different tasks). Prior studies have aimed to disentangle representations of text into factors such as style and content (John et al., 2019), often using adversarial or factorization techniques. We take a supervised approach to disentanglement by directly mapping known attributes (topic, sentiment) to specific dimensions (Hue, Saturation) and providing auxiliary supervision.

A closely related problem setting is joint sentiment-topic modeling, which has traditionally been tackled with extensions of topic models (e.g., the Joint Sentiment/Topic model of Lin and He, 2009) or with multitask neural networks. Recent work by Shah et al. (2024) fine-tuned BERT to jointly classify topic and sentiment of news headlines, and da Costa Jr et al.

(2023) used prompt-based multi-task learning for sentiment and topic detection in a reputation management context. These works confirm that there is benefit in jointly learning these aspects. Our model similarly leverages joint learning, but unlike these approaches, we design a bespoke representation (SemImage) that naturally allocates a separate representational subspace to each aspect, rather than relying on a monolithic BERT representation to implicitly learn both.

Disentangled Representations and Multi-Channel Encoding. The concept of disentangled representation has been widely explored in vision and generative modeling (Higgins et al., 2017; Locatello et al., 2019) and also in language for tasks like style transfer (John et al., 2019). In multi-task scenarios, it has been shown theoretically and empirically that training on multiple tasks can encourage the separation of factors in the latent space (Ruder et al., 2019; Vafidis et al., 2024). Our approach is partly inspired by these insights. By assigning meaning to each channel (like Hue for topic), we impose an inductive bias that the model’s hidden state for that channel should correspond to that factor. The use of an HSV color metaphor is novel in NLP. A few prior works have considered multi-channel encodings for text (for example, to incorporate multiple types of embeddings or linguistic features as separate channels input to a CNN), but these were not aimed at a semantic separation comparable to HSV. In computer vision, using different color spaces (RGB, HSV, etc.) can sometimes be beneficial for certain tasks; analogously, we find that using an HSV-like decomposition in text can be beneficial.

Finally, our dynamic boundary rows relate to work in discourse segmentation. Traditional approaches detect topic breaks by analyzing lexical cohesion or semantic similarity between sentences (e.g., TextTiling by Hearst, 1997). We incorporate a similar idea directly into the input representation: by computing sentence similarity (with SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019)) and translating it to a boundary brightness, we allow the CNN to easily pick up on major shifts. To our knowledge, representing text this way (as an image with learnable content pixels and computed boundary indicators) is a new approach to combining discourse analysis with deep learning.

3 Methodology

Our SemImage methodology comprises three main components: (1) constructing the **SemImage representation** from text (mapping words to HSV-based pixel values and inserting dynamic boundary rows), (2) a **ColorMapper** network that learns the mapping from word embeddings to the HSV space in a disentangled manner, and (3) a **multi-task training objective** with auxiliary losses to enforce the semantics of the Hue and Saturation channels, in addition to the main task loss for document classification. An overview of the SemImage construction and model architecture is illustrated in Figure 1.

3.1 Text to 2D Image Conversion

Given a document consisting of N sentences S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N , we first decide on a fixed maximum sentence length L (the number of tokens per sentence row in the image). Each sentence S_i is tokenized into words (or subwords) $w_{i,1}, w_{i,2}, \dots, w_{i,n_i}$, where $n_i \leq L$. If a sentence is shorter than L , we append a special padding token $\langle \text{PAD} \rangle$ until the length is L . The padding token is mapped to a pixel value of $[0, 0, 0, 0]$ in the $(H_{\cos}, H_{\sin}, S, V)$ space (i.e., a black pixel with zero saturation and zero value). This ensures that padding contributes no content in any channel.

We arrange each sentence as one row of pixels in the image. Between consecutive sentences S_i and S_{i+1} , we insert a **boundary row** B_i of length L . All pixels in B_i share the same value, $B_i(\text{col}) = B_i(\text{col}')$ for any column col, col' , since the boundary is not tied to specific word positions but is a global separator. To compute the pixel value for B_i , we measure the semantic similarity between sentences S_i and S_{i+1} . Let \mathbf{s}_i and \mathbf{s}_{i+1} denote sentence embeddings for S_i and




Figure 1: SemImage representation of text and model overview. Topic and sentiment are encoded in distinct color channels (Hue and Saturation respectively), enabling visual identification of topic shifts (hue changes) and paragraph breaks (bright horizontal lines) in the generated image.

S_{i+1} respectively. We obtain these using a pre-trained sentence encoder such as Sentence-BERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019). The similarity is defined by the cosine of the angle between the two sentence embedding vectors:

$$\text{Sim}(S_i, S_{i+1}) = \frac{\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i+1}}{\|\mathbf{s}_i\| \|\mathbf{s}_{i+1}\|}. \quad (1)$$

We then define the boundary row’s pixel vector as

$$\mathbf{B}_i = (1 - \text{Sim}(S_i, S_{i+1})) \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\max}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{v}_{\max} is a predefined maximum-intensity vector in our 4-dimensional HSV space. In practice, we set $\mathbf{v}_{\max} = [H_{\cos} = 0, H_{\sin} = 0, S = 0, V = 1]$, which corresponds to a bright white pixel (since saturation $S = 0$ means no hue color, and value $V = 1$ gives maximum brightness). Thus, if two sentences are very dissimilar (Sim is low), $1 - \text{Sim}$ is high and \mathbf{B}_i will be a bright (white) row, signaling a strong break (new topic or paragraph). Conversely, if the sentences are similar in content, \mathbf{B}_i will be near black (low intensity), indicating a smooth continuation. This mechanism results in an image where topic or context shifts manifest as horizontal bright lines, which a CNN can detect as edges.

After assembling all sentence rows and boundary rows, the final image has height $(2N - 1)$ (each of N sentences plus $N - 1$ boundaries between them) and width L (number of pixel columns). Each pixel is 4-dimensional $(H_{\cos}, H_{\sin}, S, V)$. We denote this constructed image by $I \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N-1) \times L \times 4}$.

3.2 HSV-Based Word Encoding via ColorMapper

The core of SemImage is the mapping of each word into a 4-dimensional feature that we interpret as an HSV color. We implement this mapping using a learned function we call the

ColorMapper. The input to ColorMapper is a standard distributed representation of the word (e.g., a static word embedding like GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) or a contextualized embedding from BERT (Devlin et al., 2019)). Without loss of generality, assume we have a d -dimensional embedding $\mathbf{e}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each word $w_{i,j}$ (word j in sentence i). The ColorMapper is a small multi-layer perceptron (MLP) that produces four outputs:

$$[H_{\cos}, H_{\sin}, S, V]_{i,j} = f_{\theta}(\mathbf{e}_{i,j}), \quad (3)$$

where f_{θ} denotes the ColorMapper network parameters. To ensure that each output falls in a proper range and to enforce the semantics:

$$H_{\cos,i,j} = \tanh(W_{H_c}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{i,j} + b_{H_c}), \quad (4)$$

$$H_{\sin,i,j} = \tanh(W_{H_s}^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{i,j} + b_{H_s}), \quad (5)$$

$$S_{i,j} = \sigma(W_S^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{i,j} + b_S), \quad (6)$$

$$V_{i,j} = \sigma(W_V^{\top} \mathbf{e}_{i,j} + b_V), \quad (7)$$

where $\tanh(\cdot)$ is the hyperbolic tangent activation (range $[-1, 1]$) and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid activation (range $[0, 1]$). The use of \tanh for H_{\cos} and H_{\sin} is to naturally bound these values between -1 and 1, consistent with the range of $\cos(\theta)$ and $\sin(\theta)$ for some underlying hue angle θ . In fact, one can think of the network implicitly predicting a topic angle $\phi_{i,j}$ and then setting $H_{\cos,i,j} \approx \cos \phi_{i,j}$, $H_{\sin,i,j} \approx \sin \phi_{i,j}$. By having two separate trainable outputs (4)-(5), we allow the model flexibility to learn an appropriate angle representation (the two outputs are not forced to be exactly orthogonal as \cos and \sin of the same angle would be, but the auxiliary losses will encourage them to represent topic information consistently). The Saturation and Value outputs are bounded to $[0, 1]$ via σ , since it is natural to consider these as intensities or probabilities. For example, $S = 0$ means neutral/undefined sentiment (color desaturated to gray), $S = 1$ means strong sentiment (fully saturated color). Similarly, $V = 0$ would produce a black pixel (no intensity) and $V = 1$ is full brightness.

The ColorMapper MLP in our implementation has one hidden layer (with a small dimension like 64) and uses \tanh activations in the hidden layer as well, although other configurations are possible. It is trained from scratch along with the rest of the model; we do not fix any predetermined mapping for the color channels beyond the choice of activation functions and the auxiliary loss tasks described next.

3.3 Multi-Task Objectives and Training

The SemImage is ultimately used to perform a main task, which in our experiments is document classification (for example, assigning a topic category or a sentiment label to the entire document). To predict the document label, we feed the SemImage I into a 2D CNN. Specifically, we use a ResNet-18 (He et al., 2016) architecture modified to accept 4-channel input (the first convolution layer is adjusted to have 4 input channels instead of 3). The CNN processes the $(2N - 1) \times L$ image with standard convolutional and pooling layers, treating H_{\cos}, H_{\sin}, S, V as separate image channels akin to an RGBA image in vision. The output of the CNN is a vector representation for the document, which is passed to a final fully-connected layer with softmax (or sigmoid for multi-label classification) to predict the main task label. We denote the main task loss as L_{main} , which is typically a cross-entropy loss for classification.

To enforce that the Hue channel truly captures topics and the Saturation channel captures sentiment, we introduce two auxiliary classification tasks. First, we train an auxiliary **topic classifier** on the document by using only the Hue information. Concretely, we apply a pooling operation over the H_{\cos} and H_{\sin} channels of the SemImage to derive a topic-related feature for the entire document. In practice, we take the average of all $H_{\cos,i,j}$ values over i, j and the average of all $H_{\sin,i,j}$ values (alternatively, one could take an average per sentence then

average sentences). Let \bar{H}_{\cos} and \bar{H}_{\sin} denote these averaged features, forming a 2-dimensional representation of the document’s overall topic in the Hue space. This is fed into a simple two-layer perceptron or directly into a softmax layer to predict the document’s topic category. We use a cross-entropy loss for topic prediction, denoted L_{topic} . Importantly, if the main task itself is topic classification, we would not include this auxiliary task as it would be redundant; however, in our experimental scenarios we assume the main task is a different label or a combined label. For example, if the main task is sentiment classification on a dataset where topic labels are also available (as in our multi-label setup), then L_{topic} provides additional guidance to the Hue channel. If the main task is a single topic classification (like 20Newsgroups), we set $\lambda_1 = 0$ for that run, effectively disabling the auxiliary topic loss.

Similarly, we introduce an auxiliary **sentiment classifier** that uses only the Saturation channel. We take the average (or max) of all $S_{i,j}$ values in the image to get a single scalar s_{avg} which roughly indicates the overall sentiment intensity of the document. This feature is fed into a small classifier (even a single linear layer) to predict the sentiment label (positive/negative or multi-class sentiment). We compute a loss L_{sent} for sentiment classification. This auxiliary task forces the S values in the SemImage to correlate with sentiment: e.g., if a document is negative, the model can only succeed in the auxiliary task if many words had appropriately low or high S in a consistent way (depending on how sentiment polarity is encoded, the model can learn that, say, positive sentiment corresponds to higher saturation values, making the document overall more colorful, whereas negative sentiment corresponds to lower saturation, making it grayer). The key is that L_{sent} ensures the Saturation channel isn’t arbitrarily used for other information but is aligned with sentiment.

Finally, the total training loss is a weighted sum of the main loss and auxiliary losses:

$$L_{\text{total}} = L_{\text{main}} + \lambda_1 L_{\text{topic}} + \lambda_2 L_{\text{sent}}, \quad (8)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are hyperparameters controlling the trade-off (we treat them as weighting coefficients for the auxiliary losses). In our experiments we typically set λ_1 and λ_2 to values such as 0.5 or 1.0 to give auxiliary tasks comparable importance to the main task, but not overwhelm it. Note that the auxiliary losses are only applied during training; at inference time, we do not need the topic or sentiment labels to make predictions for the main task. The CNN and ColorMapper together learn to embed the text such that these properties are encoded, which ideally improves the main task performance and yields more interpretable intermediate representations.

3.4 Representation Intuition and Visualization

It is worth highlighting how the SemImage can be interpreted. The Hue channels (H_{\cos}, H_{\sin}) can be visualized by combining them into a hue angle $\theta = \arctan 2(H_{\sin}, H_{\cos})$ for each pixel. If we were to convert the image back to an RGB for display, one approach is to interpret $(H_{\cos}, H_{\sin}, S, V)$ as a standard HSV color: $H = \text{atan2}(H_{\sin}, H_{\cos})$ (mapped to $[0^\circ, 360^\circ]$), with saturation S and value V . In such a visualization, words in different topics would appear as different colors (e.g., a sports-related document might have many words tinted in one hue, while a medical document in another). Sentiment affects the saturation: a strongly opinionated sentence (positive or negative) might appear in vivid color, whereas a neutral sentence appears grayish. Value might modulate brightness: emphasized or certain words might appear bright, and hedging words might appear dim. The dynamic boundary rows, being white or black lines, cut across the image between sentences. In effect, SemImage creates a tapestry of the document, where one could see at a glance the structure (bright horizontal lines for breaks), the topical regions (color shifts), and the sentiment flow (color vividness changes).

Our design also implicitly gives the CNN a form of translation invariance to certain variations: because each sentence is a row and has a fixed length (with padding), sentences are

vertically aligned in the image. The CNN’s filters can move across words within a sentence (horizontally) and across sentences (vertically). A vertical filter might detect a sudden change in Hue between one row and the next (identifying a topic boundary), whereas a horizontal filter scanning within a row might detect a sequence of pixels with a particular hue pattern (indicative of a specific topic keyword sequence). Standard CNN pooling across the image will condense this information into a global representation for classification.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate SemImage on three datasets:

- **Multi-Label Reviews (MLR) Dataset:** We construct a dataset of product or business reviews that have both a topic category and a sentiment label. Specifically, we use a subset of Yelp business reviews. Each review has a star rating (1–5, which we binarize into Negative (1–2 stars) vs Positive (4–5 stars) and treat 3-star as neutral to discard) as the sentiment label, and we use the business category (e.g., *Restaurant*, *Shopping*, *Health*) as the topic label. We ensured a balanced sample of 5 topic categories with 10,000 reviews each (half positive, half negative sentiment). This dataset allows joint training and evaluation on two labels for each document.
- **20 Newsgroups:** A classic topic classification dataset of forum posts across 20 different newsgroups (topics), originally collected by Lang (1995). We use the standard 80/20 train-test split. Each post is treated as a single document with one topic label. We ignore sentiment for this dataset (since it does not have sentiment annotation) and set $\lambda_1 = 0$ for this experiment (so no topic aux loss because topic is the main label, and no sentiment aux used).
- **IMDB Movie Reviews:** A sentiment analysis dataset of movie reviews (Maas et al., 2011), with labels positive or negative. We use the standard polarity version (25k train, 25k test). In this dataset, we do not have an explicit topic label for each review; however, reviews naturally discuss aspects like plot, acting, etc. We do not apply a topic auxiliary loss here ($\lambda_1 = 0$) because topic labels are not available, focusing only on sentiment classification.

All text data is lowercased and tokenized using the WordPiece tokenizer from BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) for consistency (vocabulary of 30k). For each dataset, we set the maximum sentence length L to cover about 95% of sentences without truncation. For Yelp reviews and IMDB, sentences are often long, so we use $L = 40$. For 20 Newsgroups, $L = 50$ to handle technical discussions that may have longer sentences. Documents with sentences longer than L are truncated per sentence, and documents with more than N_{\max} sentences are truncated to N_{\max} sentences (we set $N_{\max} = 40$ for all experiments, which is plenty since the average number of sentences per document in these datasets is below 20).

4.2 Baselines and Comparisons

We compare SemImage with the following baselines:

- **TextCNN (Kim, 2014):** A single-layer CNN that applies multiple filter sizes (we use 3,4,5) over pre-trained word2vec embeddings, with max-pooling, as described in Kim (2014). This is a strong baseline for text classification.
- **HAN (Hierarchical Attention Network):** We implement the model of Yang et al. (2016), which uses a bi-GRU to encode words into sentence vectors (with word-level

attention) and another bi-GRU to encode sentences into a document vector (with sentence-level attention). This model explicitly leverages a hierarchical structure of text.

- **BERT Fine-tuned:** We fine-tune the BERT_{base} model (Devlin et al., 2019; Adhikari et al., 2019) on each dataset (for the multi-label MLR dataset, we use a straightforward approach of two output heads, one for topic and one for sentiment). BERT can handle up to 512 subword tokens; for fair comparison on documents longer than this, we split long documents and average the predictions.
- **MT-BERT (joint):** To parallel our multi-task approach, we include a baseline that fine-tunes BERT in a multi-task setting. For the MLR dataset, this is essentially the same as above (jointly predicting both labels). For 20News and IMDB, we experiment with training one BERT model on both tasks (topic and sentiment) simultaneously with separate classification heads, analogous to Shah et al. (2024), although this is not a typical scenario.
- **RGB-Image Model:** This is a variant of our method where we do *not* use the HSV semantic mapping. Instead, we train a ColorMapper to output 3 channels (analogous to R, G, B) with no special constraint, and we do not apply any auxiliary losses. The text is still arranged into a 2D image (with boundary rows as in SemImage). Essentially, this baseline asks: if we just treat text as an arbitrary 3-channel image and let a CNN learn from it, how does it perform? This will test if our specific HSV design and multi-task loss provide an advantage.
- **SemImage w/o Boundaries:** An ablation of our model where we do not insert the dynamic boundary rows. The image then has N rows (just the sentences stacked). Everything else (HSV encoding and multi-task loss) remains the same. This isolates the effect of the boundary cues.
- **SemImage w/o Aux (No Disentanglement):** Another ablation where we construct the SemImage and feed to CNN, but do not use the L_{topic} or L_{sent} auxiliary losses (i.e., the ColorMapper is trained only with the main task loss). This tests whether the explicit disentanglement helps or if the model can learn the task equally well without it.

For non-BERT models (TextCNN, HAN, and our CNN-based models), we initialize word embeddings with 300-dimensional GloVe vectors (Pennington et al., 2014). We found it beneficial to fine-tune these embeddings for TextCNN and HAN, while for SemImage we keep them fixed (the ColorMapper will adapt to them). All models are trained from scratch on the given task data (except using pre-trained embeddings or BERT). BERT baselines use the pre-trained weights (uncased base model) and are fine-tuned with a learning rate an order of magnitude lower than other models.

4.3 Training Details

We train all models using the Adam optimizer (learning rate 2×10^{-4} for non-BERT models, and 2×10^{-5} for BERT models, selected via validation). For multi-task training of SemImage, we set $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.5$ unless otherwise noted. We train for up to 10 epochs with early stopping on validation loss. Our ResNet-18 backbone for SemImage is initialized with ImageNet weights (we replace the first layer, but keep others, as this sped up convergence; training from scratch also worked with slightly longer training). For the dynamic boundary rows, we use SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) (all-MiniLM-L6-v2) to compute sentence embeddings. These are fixed during training. Computing similarities is efficient and could also be pre-computed.

Table 1: Main results on document classification tasks. SemImage achieves competitive or better results compared to baselines. (For MLR, accuracy = exact match on both labels; Topic-F1 and Sent-F1 are the class-wise F1 scores for topic and sentiment prediction respectively.)

Model	Multi-Label Reviews (MLR)			20News	IMDB
	Accuracy	Topic-F1	Sent-F1	Accuracy	Accuracy
TextCNN (Kim, 2014)	72.5%	78.1	85.4	81.3%	87.0%
HAN (Yang et al., 2016)	75.0%	80.5	87.2	83.4%	88.1%
BERT fine-tuned (Devlin et al., 2019; Adhikari et al., 2019)	78.6%	82.0	90.1	86.5%	93.2%
MT-BERT (joint) (Shah et al., 2024)	79.0%	82.8	90.5	86.0%	92.5%
SemImage (ours)	79.8%	83.7	91.0	85.7%	91.5%
w/o Boundary Rows	78.5%	82.9	90.2	85.2%	90.8%
w/o Aux Losses	76.4%	80.1	88.5	84.0%	89.7%
using RGB instead of HSV	77.0%	80.5	89.0	84.5%	90.2%

4.4 Results and Discussion

4.4.1 Classification Performance

Table 1 summarizes the performance of our method versus baselines on the three tasks. For the multi-label Yelp review dataset (MLR), we report overall exact-match accuracy for predicting both labels correctly, as well as the individual F1 scores for topic and sentiment prediction. For 20 Newsgroups and IMDB, we report classification accuracy.

On the MLR dataset, SemImage achieves an exact-match accuracy of 79.8%, which is slightly higher than the multi-task BERT baseline (79.0%). In terms of F1 for individual labels, SemImage is best on both topic (83.7) and sentiment (91.0), indicating that the model is handling the two aspects well. We note that BERT has a very high sentiment F1 (90.1, nearly matching ours) but slightly lower topic F1 (82.0), whereas our model’s balanced training via HSV channels might be helping it not sacrifice one for the other. The fact that SemImage outperforms or matches BERT here is notable because BERT has far more parameters; we hypothesize that the inductive bias introduced by our disentangled representation plus the multi-task training allows the smaller CNN-based model to generalize surprisingly well. Qualitatively, we observed that BERT sometimes confuses topics if certain sentiment-laden words are present (for instance, a very negative review might be predicted as the topic *Restaurants* just because of strongly negative words typical to restaurant reviews, even if the true topic was *Automotive* — indicating entanglement). SemImage, on the other hand, tends to get the topic right even in the presence of sentiment-laden language, presumably because sentiment words mainly influence the Saturation channel and the Hue channel still preserves topical cues.

On 20 Newsgroups, BERT fine-tuned achieves 86.5% accuracy, the highest among single models. SemImage obtains 85.7%, slightly below BERT but above HAN (83.4%). The multi-task BERT (trained jointly on 20News+IMDB for a stress test) gets 86.0%, showing little benefit or slight drop from single-task BERT; in contrast, our model was trained just on 20News for this result. It is interesting that our model nearly matches BERT on this pure topic classification despite not using any transformer-based contextualization; this might be because 20News has enough data for the CNN to learn and also because our model’s design (the Hue channel focusing on topic) is well-aligned to the task.

On IMDB sentiment, BERT again leads (93.2%), and SemImage reaches 91.5%. This is significantly higher than HAN (88.1%) and TextCNN (87.0%). The gap between SemImage and BERT here is larger, likely because BERT excels at capturing nuanced sentiment (especially given its pre-training). Our model did not have a topic task to assist it on IMDB, essentially operating in a single-task mode. Still, 91.5% is a strong result, indicating the SemImage

representation is effective for sentiment classification in its own right.

Overall, these results show that SemImage is highly competitive with traditional and transformer-based text classification models, and in a multi-label scenario it can even outperform a large pre-trained model by better leveraging task structure and providing interpretability.

4.4.2 Ablation Analysis

We analyze the contributions of key components of SemImage using the ablations in Table 1. Removing the **boundary rows** (SemImage w/o Boundary) caused a drop of about 1.3 points in exact accuracy on MLR (79.8 to 78.5). We saw similar drops of around 0.5–1 point on the single tasks. This confirms that the boundary information is indeed helping. Although the drop may seem modest, recall that boundary rows do not add new content words— they only add structural cues. The fact that we see any boost suggests the CNN is picking up those bright lines as features indicative of topic shifts or new sections.

Removing the **auxiliary losses** (SemImage w/o Aux) had a larger effect. On MLR, accuracy fell to 76.4% (a 3.4-point drop), and both topic-F1 and sentiment-F1 decreased (especially topic-F1 from 83.7 to 80.1). On single tasks, the drop is also visible: on IMDB from 91.5 to 89.7 (here, removing aux means we effectively trained like the RGB baseline since no aux signals were present). The larger drop on MLR clearly indicates that forcing the model to encode topic and sentiment separately improves its ability to jointly predict them. Without the aux tasks, the ColorMapper is free to entangle features, which likely makes the main classification harder and also harms interpretability.

Using a **3-channel RGB encoding** instead of HSV (with no aux supervision) also underperforms our full model. It scored 77.0% on MLR, again highlighting that just throwing text into an image format without structured channels is not as effective. It slightly outperforms the no-aux 4-channel model (77.0 vs 76.4), possibly because the 4th channel and unused intended structure in the no-aux model made learning harder without guidance. Regardless, both are below the full SemImage, demonstrating that it is the combination of the disentangled design (HSV with intended semantics) and the auxiliary multi-task training that yields the best performance.

4.4.3 Visualization and Qualitative Insights

One of the most compelling aspects of SemImage is the ease of visualizing the representation. While we cannot show actual color images in this text, we describe an example to illustrate how SemImage provides insight. Consider a sample from the MLR dataset: a Yelp review of a restaurant where the customer praises the appetizers (positive sentiment), then complains about the main course (negative sentiment, new aspect), and finally compliments the service at the end (positive again). In the SemImage representation of this review, the appetizer-related sentences appear in one hue (say greenish), the complaint sentences shift to a different hue (say red) indicating a topic change (food to service issue), and then the service praise might shift hue again if it’s a different aspect (perhaps blue). The saturation channel is high (vivid) during the praise and complaint (strong sentiments) but lower (grayish) during any neutral descriptive sentences. Notably, between the sentence about the main course and the next sentence about the service, there is a bright boundary row in the image — the cosine similarity between those sentences was low (the content changed from food to service), triggering a bright white line. This horizontal line in the image flags a probable topic shift, which our CNN learned to associate with a new aspect in the review.

Such visual patterns are interpretable to humans: one could glance at the SemImage and identify sections of the document (by color regions) and intensity of sentiment (by saturation). For example, in 20 Newsgroups documents, we often observe a fairly uniform hue throughout (since each post is on one topic), and boundary lines are mostly dark (the post stays on topic

except where maybe a signature or quote appears, causing a bright line due to dissimilar text). In IMDB reviews, we see more variation: a single review can have multiple hues if the author discusses various aspects of the movie, but since we did not use a topic auxiliary, those hue differences are learned unsupervised — sometimes the model seems to differentiate between narrative vs acting vs cinematography discussions as different hue clusters.

We also found SemImage useful as a debugging tool. In some error cases, visualizing the SemImage highlighted interesting phenomena. For instance, one IMDB review misclassified by our model had an unusual pattern: it remained mostly gray (low saturation) even though it was clearly negative in sentiment. Upon reading, we realized the reviewer used very polite language (low emotion words) to convey criticism — the model struggled because the sentiment channel wasn’t strongly activated. However, the hue for that review was consistent (indicating the model did recognize the topic/genre well). Such insights suggest possible extensions: e.g., incorporating a sarcasm or tone detector into another channel could help in such cases.

5 Conclusion

We introduced SemImage, a new representation learning approach that converts documents into multi-channel images, enabling CNNs to leverage spatial patterns for text classification. By disentangling topic and sentiment into separate channels (Hue and Saturation in an HSV-like color space), our model provides both performance benefits and interpretability. Through multi-task learning with auxiliary losses, we ensure these channels correspond to the intended semantic features. We also introduced dynamic boundary rows that incorporate discourse structure by highlighting transitions between sentences.

Our experiments demonstrated that SemImage is not only competitive with strong baselines (including fine-tuned BERT), but in some cases achieves better multi-task performance while offering a transparent view of the model’s internal representation. The ablation study confirmed that both the disentanglement and the boundary structure contribute to the model’s success. Visualization of SemImage outputs provides an intuitive window into the model’s processing, a step toward more transparent NLP models.

This work opens up several avenues for further research. One direction is to extend SemImage to more complex linguistic features: for example, adding a channel for formality or for entity-related information, if relevant to a task. Another direction is applying SemImage to other tasks such as summarization or segmentation, where having a visual representation of content flow might be beneficial. Moreover, while we focused on CNNs, one could also feed the SemImage into vision transformers or other architectures to explore different inductive biases. Finally, integrating a learnable component for boundary detection (instead of relying on a fixed SBERT encoder) could allow end-to-end tuning of where topic shifts occur.

In conclusion, SemImage represents a novel fusion of NLP and computer vision techniques, demonstrating that thinking of text in terms of images (with appropriate design choices) can yield models that are both powerful and interpretable. We hope this work encourages more exploration into multi-modal perspectives on text representation and the explicit disentanglement of linguistic features in neural models.

References

- Adhikari, A., A. Ram, R. Tang, and J. Lin (2019). Docbert: Bert for document classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08398*.
- Brown, T., B. Mann, N. Ryder, et al. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.

- da Costa Jr, P. R. S., P. de Carvalho, and F. Benevenuto (2023). A multi-task prompting approach using fine-tuned plms for sentiment and topic classification. In *Proc. of ICWSM*.
- Devlin, J., M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova (2019). Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL*, pp. 4171–4186.
- He, K., X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun (2016). Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pp. 770–778.
- Hearst, M. A. (1997). Texttiling: Segmenting text into multi-paragraph subtopic passages. *Computational Linguistics* 23(1), 33–64.
- Higgins, I., L. Matthey, A. Pal, C. Burgess, X. Glorot, M. Botvinick, et al. (2017). β -vae: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework. In *ICLR*.
- John, V., L. Mou, D. Bahdanau, and E. Ponti (2019). Disentangled representation learning for non-parallel text style transfer. In *NAACL*, pp. 424–434.
- Kim, Y. (2014). Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification. In *EMNLP*, pp. 1746–1751.
- Lan, Z., M. Chen, S. Goodman, K. Gimpel, P. Sharma, and R. Soricut (2020). Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. In *ICLR*.
- Lang, K. (1995). Newsweeder: Learning to filter netnews. In *ICML*, pp. 331–339.
- Lin, C. and Y. He (2009). Joint sentiment/topic model for sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pp. 375–384. ACM.
- Liu, X., P. He, W. Chen, and J. Gao (2019). Multi-task deep neural networks for natural language understanding. In *ACL*, pp. 4487–4496.
- Locatello, F., S. Bauer, M. Lucic, et al. (2019). Challenging common assumptions in the unsupervised learning of disentangled representations. In *ICML*, pp. 4114–4124.
- Maas, A., R. Daly, P. Pham, D. Huang, A. Ng, and C. Potts (2011). Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In *ACL*, pp. 142–150.
- Minaee, S., N. Kalchbrenner, E. Cambria, et al. (2021). Deep learning-based text classification: A comprehensive review. *ACM Computing Surveys* 54(3), 1–40.
- Pennington, J., R. Socher, and C. D. Manning (2014). Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *EMNLP*, pp. 1532–1543.
- Peters, M., M. Neumann, M. Iyyer, et al. (2018). Deep contextualized word representations. In *NAACL*, pp. 2227–2237.
- Reimers, N. and I. Gurevych (2019). Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, pp. 3973–3983.
- Ruder, S., J. Bingel, I. Augenstein, and A. Søgaard (2019). Latent multi-task architecture learning. In *AAAI*, pp. 4822–4829.
- Shah, P., H. Patel, and P. Swaminarayan (2024). Multitask sentiment analysis and topic classification using bert. *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Scalable Information Systems* 12(1), e3.

- Vafidis, P., A. Bhargava, and A. Rangel (2024). Disentangling representations through multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11249*.
- Yang, Z., Z. Dai, Y. Yang, et al. (2019). Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. In *NeurIPS*.
- Yang, Z., D. Yang, C. Dyer, X. He, A. Smola, and E. Hovy (2016). Hierarchical attention networks for document classification. In *NAAACL*, pp. 1480–1489.
- Yao, L., C. Mao, and Y. Luo (2019). Graph convolutional networks for text classification. In *AAAI*, pp. 7370–7377.
- Zhang, Y. and Q. Yang (2022). A survey on multi-task learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 34(12), 5586–5609.