

# Revealing the Numeracy Gap: An Empirical Investigation of Text Embedding Models

Ningyuan Deng, Hanyu Duan, Yixuan Tang, Yi Yang

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

ningyuandeng@ust.hk, hduanac@connect.ust.hk

ytangch@connect.ust.hk, imyiyang@ust.hk

## Abstract

Text embedding models are widely used in natural language processing applications. However, their capability is often benchmarked on tasks that do not require understanding nuanced numerical information in text. As a result, it remains unclear whether current embedding models can precisely encode numerical content, such as numbers, into embeddings. This question is critical because embedding models are increasingly applied in domains where numbers matter, such as finance and healthcare. For example, “Company X’s market share grew by 2%” should be interpreted very differently from “Company X’s market share grew by 20%,” even though both indicate growth in market share. This study aims to examine whether text embedding models can capture such nuances. Using synthetic data in a financial context, we evaluate 13 widely used text embedding models and find that they generally struggle to capture numerical details accurately. Our further analyses provide deeper insights into embedding numeracy, informing future research to strengthen embedding model-based NLP systems with improved capacity for handling numerical content.

## 1 Introduction

Text embedding models transform words and sentences into dense vectors that machines can understand and compare (Zhang et al., 2025a). These vectors have become essential infrastructure for modern NLP systems; they power semantic search (Muennighoff, 2022), enable retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) (Fan et al., 2024), and support countless downstream applications. Recent advances, particularly those leveraging large language models like E5-Mistral-7B (Wang et al.,

2023), have achieved impressive performance on standard benchmarks including MTEB (Muennighoff et al., 2023) and BEIR (Thakur et al., 2021). Despite these successes, current benchmarks often overlook evaluating embedding models’ capability to handle nuanced numerical content in text. Yet, there is a clear need to assess how well embedding models capture numerical details, especially in areas like finance, healthcare, and scientific research, where numerical precision matters.

For example, consider clinical triage notes that record a patient’s blood pressure. Sentences such as “blood pressure is 120/80 mmHg” and “blood pressure is 180/110 mmHg” are nearly identical in wording, yet they indicate very different levels of risk. When these notes are transformed into embeddings to support clinical automation, the numeric values must be faithfully preserved so that the system can distinguish normal readings from dangerous ones. Without this capability, embeddings may not be able to support, or could even mislead, decision-making in essential clinical tasks, such as alerting clinicians when a patient’s condition exceeds safe thresholds.

This work aims to fill this evaluation gap. To support the evaluation, we introduce EmbedNum-1K, a financial domain-specific dataset designed to test whether numerical information in text is sufficiently preserved in embeddings. The dataset contains 1,000 synthetic samples, each comprising a question ( $Q$ ) and two candidate answers ( $A^+$  and  $A^-$ ). For example, a sample may look like:

- $Q$ : “Who owns over 15% of the company?”
- $A^+$ : “Investor Alice owns a 20% stake.”
- $A^-$ : “Investor Alice owns a 5% stake.”

Given that each pair of candidate answers differs only in their numeric values, we would expect

that an ideal embedding model should encode the question ( $Q$ ) closer to the correct answer ( $A^+$ ) than to the incorrect one ( $A^-$ ) in the embedding space. This reflects the fact that 20% satisfies the condition of “over 15%,” whereas 5% does not. This task resembles a classic retrieval problem in NLP, but with a critical uniqueness: correctness is determined by the numerical details rather than by overall semantic meaning. Thus, achieving higher accuracy<sup>1</sup> on this task indicates that the embedding model more reliably preserves numerical details together with their surrounding context.

Using EmbedNum-1K, we experiment with 13 widely used text embedding models, including BERT-like ones, LLM-based ones, and general-purpose and financial-domain specific ones, either open-source or via commercial API calls. To enable fine-grained evaluation, we vary the numeric format of numbers. For example, numbers can appear in different formats, such as integers (e.g., 6), decimals (e.g., 0.6), percentages (e.g., 6%), and written numbers (e.g., “six”).

We find that embedding models generally struggle to capture numerical details in text, with accuracy slightly better than chance on average. Notably, LLM-based embedding models show a clear advantage over encoder-based ones. In addition, models interpret numbers differently depending on their numeric format; for example, values such as 8% and 0.08 are treated distinctly. Furthermore, our closer examination reveals that improved textual literacy in models does not necessarily translate into better numeracy, and out-of-vocabulary (OOV) numbers pose a particular challenge. Finally, and interestingly, we show that just as humans face higher cognitive load and are more prone to errors when processing numbers with many digits, embedding models also struggle with long, high-precision numbers.

Later in this paper, we conduct additional analyses to gain deeper insights into embedding numeracy. We examine how embedding models handle different types of numeric reasoning, compare numeric values in digit form (e.g., “24”) versus written form (e.g., “twenty-four”), and assess the impact of surrounding linguistic context, to see whether it helps or weakens the model’s ability to capture precise numerical information. We also

---

<sup>1</sup>Accuracy on this task is calculated as the proportion of samples where the model correctly ranks  $A^+$  closer to  $Q$  than  $A^-$ .

investigate whether frequent exposure to numbers during training helps gain numeracy and evaluate whether probing test results reliably predict numeracy in downstream tasks. Together, these analyses provide key insights for improving embedding models’ numerical capabilities.

This work makes three main contributions.

First, we introduce EmbedNum-1K, a dataset that fills an important evaluation gap by testing how well current embedding models preserve subtle numerical differences in embeddings, which are often overlooked in existing benchmarks. For example, current benchmarks may treat the embeddings of “Investor Alice owns a 20% stake.” and “Investor Alice owns a 5% stake.” as equally good matches to the embedding of “Who owns over 15% of the company?”. In contrast, our evaluation explicitly differentiates such cases, testing whether embeddings capture the precise numerical relationships implied in the text.

Second, we reveal a key limitation of current embedding models: they often fail to accurately preserve subtle numerical information in their embeddings. This suggests that simply scaling up model size or training data, as is common in current embedding model training practices, is not sufficient. Targeted designs that explicitly account for fine-grained information, such as the numerical details studied here, are also necessary.

Third, our experiments generate key insights that may help to develop numeracy-aware text embedding models in the future. We believe this has important implications for advancing number-intensive NLP applications, such as RAG-based systems in finance and healthcare (Wong et al., 2025; Yepes et al., 2024), where accurate numerical understanding is critical. We will make the datasets and experimental code publicly available to ensure reproducibility.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Benchmarking Embedding Models and the Evaluation Tasks

Numerous benchmarks have been introduced to evaluate embedding models. A well-known example is the Massive Text Embedding Benchmark (MTEB) (Muennighoff et al., 2023). Others include, but are not limited to, MMTEB (Enevoldsen et al., 2025), which expands the original MTEB to cover more languages, and FinMTEB (Tang and Yang, 2025), which adapts MTEB for

domain-specific settings such as finance. These benchmarks typically include a broad set of evaluation tasks for embedding models to perform. Generally, models more capable of encoding similar texts into similar embeddings tend to achieve higher scores on these tasks.

Although current benchmarks have achieved great diversity in evaluation tasks, it remains unclear how well embedding models handle cases where numerical understanding matters. Case in point, consider clustering research papers on arXiv<sup>2</sup> into categories such as Physics and Computer Science (based on their abstracts), a task included in MTEB (Muennighoff et al., 2023). In this case, the clustering results are largely driven by the overall topic and keyword patterns in the text, while numerical details, such as years, equation numbers, or statistics mentioned in the abstract, play little role in determining the results.

Even in FinMTEB (Tang and Yang, 2025), a recently developed benchmark tailored to the financial domain where numbers clearly play a critical role, the evaluation of embedding models’ ability to deal with nuanced numerical content is not explicitly considered. Our work contributes to this line of research by highlighting this important evaluation dimension and curating a dataset to assess how well embedding models capture, preserve, and interpret numerical details in text.

## 2.2 Numeracy in Embeddings

Numeracy refers to the ability to understand and work with numbers. In NLP, interest in whether embeddings capture numeracy can be traced back as early as 2019, with pioneering works by Naik et al. (2019) and Wallace et al. (2019). At that time, the focus was primarily on word embeddings such as GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) and word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013). Later, several follow-up works developed approaches that produce number embeddings with improved numeracy preservation (Sundararaman et al., 2020; Duan et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2020; Sivakumar and Moosavi, 2025).

Our work falls within this line of research examining numeracy in embeddings and extends it by focusing on large-scale modern text embedding models, such as the Qwen and Mistral embedding series (Zhang et al., 2025b; Li et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024; Meng et al., 2024), going beyond

<sup>2</sup><https://arxiv.org/>

traditional word embeddings. This extension is meaningful in the following two key aspects.

First, the interpretation of a number in text can vary greatly depending on its surrounding linguistic context. For instance, investors may respond very differently to “Stock A *rose* by 2%” versus “Stock A *fell* by 2%,” even though the magnitude of the change is the same. Additionally, a model’s ability to understand numbers can, in turn, enhance its interpretation of the surrounding context (Thawani et al., 2021). Unlike word embedding models, which typically encode numbers in a context-free manner, text embedding models enable the examination of numeracy in context (i.e., context-dependent) by embedding entire sentences or paragraphs that contain numbers. Given that real-world NLP applications rarely handle numbers in isolation, our examination of numeracy in context enables a more realistic setting.

Second, compared to traditional word embedding models, text embedding models (often powered by LLMs) serve more prominently as core components in modern NLP systems, especially in RAG settings (Fan et al., 2024). Therefore, we argue that investigating numeracy in text embedding models is of greater practical relevance.

## 3 Dataset Construction

We describe the curation of EmbedNum-1K in the following four steps; the overall workflow is illustrated in Figure 1.

**Step 1: Seed Data Construction.** We construct our seed data by filtering the English portion of the BULL dataset.<sup>3</sup> This dataset consists of 4,966 natural language question-SQL pairs collected from real-world financial industry settings and was originally curated for financial Text-to-SQL benchmarking (Zhang et al., 2024). A question-SQL pair may look like: **Question:** “Which stocks have a P/E ratio above 200?” **SQL:** “select chinameabbr from qt\_monthdata where pettm > 200;”.

Here, we are interested only in the **Question** entries, specifically those whose **SQL** query counterparts meet the following three criteria: (1) the query includes either the “>” or “<” operator, (2) it does not reference any time-related fields,<sup>4</sup> and (3) it contains exactly one numeric value. This yields

<sup>3</sup><https://bull-text-to-sql-benchmark.github.io>

<sup>4</sup>Time (date) comparisons are excluded due to their higher complexity.




Figure 1: Workflow of the EmbedNum-1K dataset construction process.

a total of 545 questions.

**Step 2: Question Augmentation.** To expand the seed set, for each question obtained from Step 1, we create a paired variant. For example, the question “Which stocks have a P/E ratio *above* 200?” could be augmented with “Which stocks have a P/E ratio *below* 200?”. This flips the numerical comparison in the original question while keeping the context unchanged. We approach this by prompting the DeepSeek-V3.1 model (DeepSeek-AI, 2024)<sup>5</sup> in non-thinking mode. Then, from the augmented data pool, we randomly select 500 sentences to create 1,000 questions, while ensuring a balanced distribution between the “above” and “below” cases.

**Step 3: Answer Generation.** For each of the 1K questions (Q), we create two candidate answers (by again calling DeepSeek-V3.1 (DeepSeek-AI, 2024)):  $A^+$ , which satisfies the condition stated in the question Q, and  $A^-$ , which differs from  $A^+$  only in its numeric value and does not satisfy the condition. For example, take Q: “Which stocks have a P/E ratio above 200?”; the candidate answers could be:

- $A^+$ : “Stock ABC has a P/E of 220.”
- $A^-$ : “Stock ABC has a P/E of 180.”

<sup>5</sup><https://api-docs.deepseek.com>

Up to this point, we have created the original version of EmbedNum-1K, comprising 1K such  $\langle Q, A^+, A^- \rangle$  triples, where all numeric values involved are integers ranging from 1 to 999.

**Step 4: Numeric Format Variation.** Following the approach described in (Sivakumar and Moosavi, 2023), we construct 17 additional variants of the original EmbedNum-1K (numbers as integers) by changing the format in which numbers are presented. These variants include numbers expressed as decimals (e.g., 0.5), percentages (e.g., 5%), and other formats. A detailed description of all variants is provided in Table 1.

Format Category	Description	Example
Orig	Integer ranging from 1 to 999	235
(a) Integers	(a1) Single-digit integer	8
	(a2) Two-digit integer	77
	(a3) Three-digit integer	719
	(a4) Four-digit integer	3035
(b) Decimals	(b1) One decimal place	8.3
	(b2) Two decimal places	8.67
	(b3) Three decimal places	8.868
	(b4) Four decimal places	8.7713
(c) Scaled Down	(c1) 1-digit scaled down by 10	0.8
	(c2) 1-digit scaled down by 100	0.08
	(c3) 1-digit scaled down by 1000	0.008
(d) Scaled Up	(d1) 1-digit scaled up by 10	80
	(d2) 1-digit scaled up by 100	800
	(d3) 1-digit scaled up by 1000	8000
(e) Others	(e1) Written with “percentage”	8 percentage
	(e2) Written with % symbol	8%
	(e3) Comma-separated integer	3,035

Table 1: Descriptions of numeric formats used in the experiments with examples.

Altogether, we obtain 18 datasets, including the original EmbedNum-1K and its 17 variants, which represent numbers in different formats. The prompts used throughout the data curation process are provided in Appendix A.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Task Description.** Based on the EmbedNum-1K dataset, we formulate a retrieval task. Specifically, given an instance  $\langle Q, A^+, A^- \rangle$  from the dataset and a chosen embedding model, the aim of the task is to retrieve the correct answer  $A^+$  from the two candidate answers based on the question  $Q$ . To do this, we first encode the question and both candidate answers into dense embedding vectors using the model under evaluation. We then compute the cosine similarity between the question embedding and each of the two candidate answer embeddings, yielding one similarity score per answer. The retrieved answer is then determined as the one with the higher similarity score.

**Evaluation Metric.** We use Accuracy as the evaluation metric for the above described retrieval task. Here, Accuracy is defined as the proportion of instances in which the model under evaluation correctly retrieves  $A^+$  over  $A^-$  across the dataset. A higher accuracy score indicates the model is more faithful in encoding numerical information from the text into embeddings, as whether a candidate answer meets the question depends entirely on the numeric values in the text.

**Embedding Models.** We evaluate a broad range of text embedding models. This includes transformer encoder-based models, such as RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), finance-embedding<sup>6</sup>, SimCSE-BERT-unsup (Gao et al., 2021), MiniLM-L6<sup>7</sup>, and MPNet (Song et al., 2020), as well as LLM-based models, including gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct (Li et al., 2023), Linq-Embed-Mistral (Kim et al., 2024), Qwen3-Embedding-8B (Zhang et al., 2025b), SFR-Embedding-Mistral (Meng et al., 2024), e5-mistral-7b-instruct (Wang et al., 2023), and NV-Embed-v2 (Lee et al., 2024). Additionally, we consider two proprietary embedding models, Fin-E5 (Tang and Yang, 2025) and

text-embed-3-small (OpenAI, 2025).

### 4.2 Main Results

We report the performance of all evaluated embedding models on the EmbedNum-1K retrieval task in Table 2. Our main findings are summarized below. **Overall, embedding models struggle to capture numerical details in text.** The retrieval accuracy, averaged over the 13 embedding models under evaluation, is merely 0.54, slightly above random guessing (0.5).

We believe this is mainly because current embedding model training practices typically focus on capturing semantic similarities or differences at the sentence or paragraph level, with fine-grained but potentially important details, such as numbers as part of the text, often overlooked. This aligns with Liu et al. (2024), who find that embedding models generally fall short in distinguishing nuanced differences between texts. Our finding further confirms this limitation in the specific context of number-related nuances. We suggest that future work may consider not treating numbers on par with words, and should instead explore dedicated design considerations for numerical content to improve embedding models’ ability to model numbers in text.

**LLM-based embedding models show a clear advantage over encoder-based models.** We observe that LLM-based models achieve, on average, about 5 percentage points higher accuracy than encoder-based ones (0.56 vs. 0.51).

We speculate that this advantage is largely due to the pre-existing superior natural language understanding capability of an LLM prior to its adaptation for embedding purposes. However, through what mechanisms this superiority meaningfully translates into tangible gains in embedding quality is still an open question and certainly merits further investigation.

**Embedding models interpret 8% and 0.08 differently.** Our experimental results reveal that embedding models are quite sensitive to how numbers are represented in text, with accuracy varying by up to 12 percentage points depending on numeric format, doing best on 0.x numbers (e.g., 0.5, 0.8) with an accuracy of 0.62 and struggling most with 4-digit integers (e.g., 1234, 5678) at a random guessing level.

For this reason, we strongly recommend that future efforts in developing new number modeling

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/FinLang/finance-embeddings-investopedia>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2>

Model Name	Orig	(a) Integers				(b) Decimals			
		(a1)	(a2)	(a3)	(a4)	(b1)	(b2)	(b3)	(b4)
<b>Encoder-Based Models</b>									
RoBERTa	50.8	50.2	50.7	49.5	49.7	48.9	51.2	49.9	<u>50.6</u>
finance-embedding	<u>53.4</u>	<u>53.4</u>	51.2	<u>51.7</u>	<u>50.4</u>	51.4	50.1	51.2	49.9
SimCSE-BERT-unsup	51.3	51.1	<u>51.9</u>	51.0	<u>50.4</u>	51.0	50.7	50.5	50.2
MiniLM-L6	50.6	50.2	51.1	49.0	<u>50.4</u>	51.0	49.8	50.3	50.1
MPNet	51.5	53.0	49.9	50.6	50.3	<u>51.7</u>	<u>51.9</u>	<u>52.9</u>	49.7
<b>LLM-Based Models</b>									
gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	51.4	58.1	55.2	50.8	51.3	50.0	51.1	<u>52.9</u>	51.8
Linq-Embed-Mistral	51.4	58.0	52.8	50.0	48.4	50.7	50.5	50.4	49.0
Qwen3-Embedding-8B	<b>53.7</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>53.9</b>	<b>52.3</b>	51.5	<u>52.9</u>	50.9	<u>52.2</u>
SFR-Embedding-Mistral	52.1	59.0	52.4	50.1	49.2	51.8	50.6	51.4	50.9
e5-mistral-7b-instruct	51.5	59.8	51.3	50.2	49.2	52.5	51.3	49.7	50.6
NV-Embed-v2	52.1	62.0	<b>55.1</b>	50.8	49.1	<u>53.5</u>	52.2	51.2	51.2
<b>Commercial Models</b>									
Fin-E5	51.7	<u>58.6</u>	52.2	48.9	48.4	51.1	48.7	49.1	49.9
text-embedding-3-small	<u>52.7</u>	50.8	<u>54.0</u>	<u>51.1</u>	<u>50.6</u>	<b>54.2</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>54.5</b>	<b>54.9</b>
<b>Average performance</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>55.9</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>50.8</b>
Model Name	(c) Scaled Down			(d) Scaled Up			(e) Others		
	(c1)	(c2)	(c3)	(d1)	(d2)	(d3)	(e1)	(e2)	(e3)
<b>Encoder-Based Models</b>									
RoBERTa	50.4	50.2	51.6	52.4	50.8	47.3	52.5	51.9	50.7
finance-embedding	<u>54.0</u>	49.9	53.9	<u>52.7</u>	<u>53.6</u>	51.1	<u>54.2</u>	<u>54.8</u>	51.0
SimCSE-BERT-unsup	52.1	<u>53.3</u>	52.2	50.7	52.7	51.0	51.8	52.4	50.9
MiniLM-L6	51.4	50.1	49.2	52.5	50.4	51.1	50.7	51.4	50.7
MPNet	52.5	52.6	<u>55.2</u>	50.6	51.4	<u>53.2</u>	53.7	53.8	<u>51.9</u>
<b>LLM-Based Models</b>									
gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	65.3	63.9	57.8	58.3	51.0	52.9	61.9	57.4	51.3
Linq-Embed-Mistral	67.3	58.2	54.8	55.3	49.8	46.9	64.4	64.9	49.7
Qwen3-Embedding-8B	69.2	67.9	64.7	61.0	<b>55.8</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>69.9</b>	<b>53.3</b>
SFR-Embedding-Mistral	67.9	61.5	57.6	53.1	49.9	48.6	65.5	64.7	48.6
e5-mistral-7b-instruct	66.5	61.2	57.4	53.5	50.8	49.3	67.2	64.8	49.3
NV-Embed-v2	<b>74.2</b>	<b>70.6</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>61.9</b>	54.7	51.7	69.3	66.6	49.7
<b>Commercial Models</b>									
Fin-E5	62.8	58.4	54.2	54.0	<u>52.2</u>	48.6	<u>66.6</u>	<u>67.9</u>	49.3
text-embed-3-small	<u>67.6</u>	<u>59.6</u>	<u>58.0</u>	<u>57.9</u>	51.3	<u>50.2</u>	59.2	55.0	<u>50.5</u>
<b>Average performance</b>	<b>61.6</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>56.3</b>	<b>54.9</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>59.7</b>	<b>50.5</b>

Table 2: Retrieval accuracy (%) on the original EmbedNum-1K data and its 17 variants across 13 evaluated text embedding models. For each numeric format, the highest accuracy is highlighted in **bold**, and the highest accuracy within each model category is underlined. A blue-white-red color gradient is overlaid on the “Average performance” row, with warmer colors indicating higher accuracy and cooler colors indicating lower accuracy across numeric formats.

strategies carefully account for numeric formats, given their critical role in how models interpret numbers as part of text.

**Improved literacy does not necessarily translate into tangible gains in numeracy.** Among the evaluated models, Fin-E5 is a financially adapted version of e5-mistral-7b-instruct, further fine-tuned on financial data. Since the evaluation data EmbedNum-1K is specific to finance, it allows us to examine whether domain-specific fine-tuning (i.e., improved financial literacy) helps models understand numbers (i.e., enhanced numeracy). By comparing their performance, we find no evidence that Fin-E5 clearly wins over the base model.

Complementary to the observation by Thawani et al. (2021) that better numeracy leads to better literacy, our finding underscores the unique difficulty of numeracy compared to literacy and again highlights the need for specialized designs directly targeting numeracy.

**OOV (out-of-vocabulary) numbers challenge embedding models.** Analyzing the results based on number formatting, we find that embedding models consistently struggle with decimal numbers (e.g., 8.67), large integers (e.g., 3035), and comma-separated numbers (e.g., 3,035). A closer look reveals that numbers in these formats are often out-of-vocabulary (OOV), meaning they are more likely to be split into multiple smaller units (tokens) during tokenization. For example, in a comma-separated number, the comma often marks a boundary, leading to a number like “1,100” being broken into “1”, “,”, and “100”.

This could be problematic because splitting a number can disrupt key information, such as its magnitude, which is essential for many downstream tasks. Thus, we believe addressing this OOV issue has great potential to improve the usefulness of current embedding models in number-intensive real-world applications.

**Number precision affects model performance, reflecting human cognition.** The consistently higher accuracies achieved on numbers such as 0.8, 0.02, 0.007, and 0.0006 prompt us to think about the potential reasons behind this pattern. Our in-depth analysis reveals an interesting phenomenon: model performance is highly correlated with the number of significant figures (s.f.) in the numbers the model processes. More specifically, as shown in Figure 2, as the number of significant figures increases, the mean accuracy over the 13

embedding models for the corresponding numbers declines.

This observation suggests that, just as humans experience higher cognitive load and are more prone to errors when processing numbers with many digits, embedding models also struggle with long, high-precision numbers. This represents an interesting research avenue in language model-brain alignment (Yu et al., 2024).




Figure 2: Each blue dot represents the mean performance across the 13 embedding models for a specific numeric format. Each numeric format is categorized by the number of significant figures in the numbers expressed under that format, shown on the X-axis.

## 5 Additional Analyses

### 5.1 Evidence of Performance Asymmetry Across Numeric Conditions

In the main experiments, we report accuracy calculated over all instances in the dataset. Here, we take a closer look and examine the model performance separately for two subsets of data, stratified by the numeric condition specified in each question (Q). Specifically, one subset includes questions asking for answers above a threshold (greater-than condition), while the other includes questions asking for answers below a threshold (less-than condition). For instance, the question “Which stocks have a P/E ratio over 200?” represents a greater-than condition, while “Which stocks have a P/E ratio under 200?” represents a less-than condition.

Figure 3 compares model performance on these two categories of data. It demonstrates clear evidence that embedding models systematically favor answering greater-than questions over less-than questions, with markedly higher accuracy.

This asymmetry suggests that **embedding models may not be equally reliable across all numeric reasoning scenarios**, and this may have significant implications in clinical and financial decision-making, where errors in certain types of numeric comparisons can have especially serious consequences. This observation serves as a reminder to apply embedding models with care in such settings.




Figure 3: Model performance by numeric condition (greater-than vs. less-than).

## 5.2 “Twenty-Four” versus “24”

We investigate whether rewriting numbers in their written form (e.g., 24 as “twenty-four”) alleviates the cognitive effort required by embedding models to interpret numerical content. Our evaluation covers integers with up to four digits (e.g., 6789) and their corresponding written forms (e.g., six thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine).

Figure 4 compares model performance on these two forms of numbers, where we observe that most models achieve higher accuracy on the written-form numbers, albeit with a minor advantage. We speculate that this marginal gain is largely because written numbers are often composed of in-vocabulary word tokens, allowing key information to be better preserved.

However, even with written numbers, overall accuracy remains low, suggesting that **representing numerical content is an inherent limitation of embedding models rather than solely an OOV issue**. This calls for more reliable approaches to overcome the challenge, beyond simply expanding the model’s vocabulary to cover numbers that were previously absent.




Figure 4: Model performance by numeric representation (digit form vs. written form).

## 5.3 Does Seeing Numbers More Often Help Models Handle Them Better?

Previous studies suggest that the  $\ell^2$ -norm of a token’s embedding reflects how often that token appears in the training data (Li et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2022). Specifically, tokens with smaller  $\ell^2$ -norms tend to appear more frequently in the training data, whereas rarer tokens generally have larger embedding norms. This inspires us to examine whether higher frequency exposure to numbers can translate into tangible numeracy gains. Concretely, we stratify the evaluation data based on the  $\ell^2$ -norms of the uncontextualized number embeddings (in the model’s embedding lookup table), forming a high-frequency group from the bottom half of  $\ell^2$ -norms and a low-frequency group from the top half of  $\ell^2$ -norms. Please refer to Figure 5 for an illustration, which suggests that very small numbers (e.g., 1, 2) and very large numbers (e.g., 1800, 2000) appear more frequently in training, while mid-range values are relatively underrepresented and associated with larger embedding norms.




Figure 5: A visualization of the  $\ell^2$ -norm distribution of number embeddings from the finance-embedding token lookup table.

We present model performance across the two frequency-based groups in Figure 6. Surpris-

ingly, the results do not indicate a clear, consistent performance advantage for high-frequency numbers over low-frequency ones. This suggests that **simply making pretraining data more number-intensive is unlikely to yield meaningful gains in numeracy and might be less cost-efficient**; instead, more targeted approaches for modeling numbers are needed.




Figure 6: Model performance by number frequency (high- vs. low-frequency numbers).

#### 5.4 Does Context Hide the Numbers? A Trade-Off in Embeddings

Previous studies highlight a granularity dilemma in embeddings, where there is often a trade-off between capturing the overall semantic meaning of a text and preserving its fine-grained details (Xu et al., 2025). Inspired by this, we investigate whether a similar trade-off occurs in our numeracy-focused setting. For example, does the “P/E ratio” context in “Which stocks have a P/E ratio above 200?” weaken the numerical signal for 200 compared to a context-free question like “Which number is above 200?”

To study this, we synthesize 1000 sentences of the form “The freezing and pledging party’s largest shareholder, John Smith, holds a {X} shareholding,” where {X} takes integer values from 1 to 1000. Using Qwen3-Embedding-8B (Zhang et al., 2025b), we encode these sentences and compute the cosine similarity between embeddings of adjacent numbers (e.g., {X} and {X+1}). We present the similarity score distribution in Figure 7, comparing it to a context-free baseline where only the numbers appear, i.e., computing the cosine similarity between embeddings of {X} and {X+1}. We observe that in the context-rich setting, similarity scores collapse near one, indicating that **most of the embedding’s capacity**

**is taken up by the semantic context, weakening the representation of fine-grained numerical details.**




Figure 7: Distribution of embedding similarities by context condition (context-rich vs. context-free).

To further examine whether this effect accounts for the overall low performance on EmbedNum-1K, as reported in the main experiments, we create a context-reduced version of the original dataset, e.g., adapting “Which stocks have a P/E ratio above 200?” to “Which number is above 200?” with answers “220” and “180”.

As shown in Figure 8, we find that models generally perform better in the context-reduced setting, implying that **additional context appears to attenuate the fine-grained numerical signals in embeddings**. This confirms the granularity dilemma (Xu et al., 2025) and, in turn, suggests that expanding embedding capacity or expressivity may constitute an essential step toward enhancing the numeracy of embeddings.




Figure 8: Model performance by context condition (context-rich vs. context-reduced).

## 5.5 Can Probing Predict Downstream Numeracy Performance?

Probing has long been used to assess numeracy in word embeddings (Naik et al., 2019; Wallace et al., 2019), such as GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) or word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013), by training a simple regressor to decode numerical values from word embeddings (e.g., mapping “seven” to 7). We extend this idea to text embeddings, where numbers appear as part of sentences or paragraphs (e.g., “Stock ABC has a P/E of 220.”) rather than as individual tokens (e.g., “220”). Specifically, we train a linear regressor on 70% of EmbedNum-1K answer embeddings to predict the numerical value of the number contained in the answer, and evaluate it on the remaining 30%, reporting Adjusted  $R^2$  scores (Table 3).

Surprisingly, encoder-based models consistently yield higher Adjusted  $R^2$  scores than LLM-based models, meaning that numerical values are easier to probe from encoder embeddings.

This observation contrasts with our main finding in the earlier EmbedNum-1K retrieval task, where LLM-based models outperform encoder-based ones. This suggests that **embeddings from which numerical values are more easily decoded do not necessarily imply more faithful preservation of meaningful numeracy for downstream tasks**. This questions the reliability of probing tests as an evaluation metric in context-rich settings and highlights the need for new metrics to assess embedding numeracy in such environments.

## 6 Conclusion

In this study, we examine numeracy in text embeddings. Our work addresses an important evaluation gap, where fine-grained numerical nuances in text are often overlooked in existing embedding model benchmarking. Our experimental results reveal a significant limitation of modern text embedding models in preserving meaningful numerical details within their embeddings. This limitation is observed in both encoder-based and LLM-based models. Through further analyses, we gain deeper insights into embedding numeracy and provide potential guidance for improving embedding models’ ability to manage numerical content. We hope this work can shed light on future research to strengthen embedding-based NLP systems in number-intensive application scenarios.

Model Name	Embedding Dimension	Adjusted $R^2$
<b>Encoder-Based Models</b>		
RoBERTa	768	1.25
finance-embeddings	768	1.99
SimCSE-BERT-unsup	768	1.13
MiniLM-L6	384	4.98
MPNet	768	1.15
<b>LLM-Based Models</b>		
gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct	3584	1.03
Linq-Embed-Mistral	4096	1.01
Qwen3-Embedding-8B	4096	1.02
SFR-Embedding-Mistral	4096	1.01
e5-mistral-7b-instruct	4096	1.01
NV-Embed-v2	4096	1.01
<b>Commercial Models</b>		
Fin-E5	4096	1.01
text-embedding-3-small	1536	1.03

Table 3: Results of probing numerical values from text embeddings. Higher Adjusted  $R^2$  values indicate a more accurate prediction of numerical values. A blue-white-red color gradient is overlaid on the Adjusted  $R^2$  column, with warmer colors representing higher values and cooler colors representing lower values.

## 7 Limitations

Our work also has limitations that can be improved in future research. First, we focus primarily on the comparison of number magnitudes, which is a common type of numerical reasoning. Other forms of numerical reasoning, such as arithmetic operations, ratio and percentage calculations, or time comparisons, are not explored. Future work could extend our evaluation to include these more complex reasoning tasks. Second, our study relies on synthetic datasets to evaluate embedding numeracy. While synthetic data enables controlled experiments and clear analysis, it may not reflect the full complexity of real-world contexts, where numbers interact with more complex linguistic and contextual information. Future research could identify representative real-world applications and develop related benchmarks, and investigate embedding numeracy across diverse domains, such as healthcare, scientific texts, and other areas where accurate numerical understanding is essential. Finally, we focus this work primarily on sentence-level embeddings and do not investigate embeddings of larger text units, such as paragraphs or full documents. Future studies could build on our evaluation framework to examine numeracy in embeddings that encode larger contexts.

## References

- DeepSeek-AI. 2024. [Deepseek-v3 technical report](#).
- Hanyu Duan, Yi Yang, and Kar Yan Tam. 2021. Learning numeracy: A simple yet effective number embedding approach using knowledge graph. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2597–2602.
- Kenneth C. Enevoldsen, Isaac Chung, Imene Kerboua, Márton Kardos, Ashwin Mathur, David Stap, Jay Gala, Wissam Sibli, Dominik Krzemiński, Genta Indra Winata, Saba Sturua, Saiteja Utpala, Mathieu Ciancone, Marion Schaeffer, Gabriel Sequeira, Diganta Misra, Shreeya Dhakal, Jonathan Rystrøm, Roman Sergeevich Solomatn, Omer Veysel cCaugatan, Akash Kundu, Martin Bernstorff, Shitao Xiao, Akshita Sukhlecha, Bhavish Pahwa, Rafal Poswiata, G Kranthikiran, Shawon Ashraf, Daniel Auras, Bjorn Pluster, Jan Philipp Harries, Loic Magne, Isabelle Mohr, Mariya Hendriksen, Dawei Zhu, Hippolyte Gisserot-Boukhlef, Tom Aarsen, Jan Kostkan, Konrad Wojtasik, Taemin Lee, Marek vSuppa, Crystina Zhang, Roberta Rocca, Mohammed Hamdy, Andrianos Michail, John Yang, Manuel Faysse, Aleksei Vatolin, Nandan Thakur, Manan Dey, Dipam Vasani, Pranjal A. Chitale, Simone Tedeschi, Nguyen Tai, Artem Snegirev, Michael Gunther, Mengzhou Xia, Weijia Shi, Xing Han Lù, Jordan Clive, Gayatri Krishnakumar, Anna Maksimova, Silvan Wehrli, Maria Tikhonova, Henil Panchal, Aleksandr Abramov, Malte Ostendorff, Zheng Liu, Simon Clematide, Lester James Validad Miranda, Alena Fenogenova, Guangyu Song, Ruqiya Bin Safi, Wen-Ding Li, Alessia Borghini, Federico Cassano, Hongjin Su, Jimmy Lin, Howard Yen, Lasse Hansen, Sara Hooker, Chenghao Xiao, Vaibhav Adlakha, Orion Weller, Siva Reddy, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2025. [Mmteb: Massive multilingual text embedding benchmark](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2502.13595.
- Wenqi Fan, Yujuan Ding, Liangbo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. 2024. A survey on rag meeting llms: Towards retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 6491–6501.
- Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. 2021. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6894–6910. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chengyue Jiang, Zhonglin Nian, Kaihao Guo, Shanbo Chu, Yinggong Zhao, Libin Shen, and Kewei Tu. 2020. Learning numeral embedding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2586–2599.
- Junseong Kim, Seolhwa Lee, Jihoon Kwon, Sangmo Gu, Yejin Kim, Minkyung Cho, Jy yong Sohn, and Chanyeol Choi. 2024. [Linq-embed-mistral: elevating text retrieval with improved gpt data through task-specific control and quality refinement](#). Linq AI Research Blog.
- Chankyu Lee, Rajarshi Roy, Mengyao Xu, Jonathan Raiman, Mohammad Shoeybi, Bryan Catanzaro, and Wei Ping. 2024. Nv-embed: Improved techniques for training llms as generalist embedding models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17428*.
- Bohan Li, Hao Zhou, Junxian He, Mingxuan Wang, Yiming Yang, and Lei Li. 2020. [On the sentence embeddings from pre-trained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9119–9130, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zehan Li, Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, and Meishan Zhang. 2023. Towards general text embeddings with multi-stage contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiaxin Liu, Yi Yang, and Kar Yan Tam. 2024. Beyond surface similarity: Detecting subtle semantic shifts in financial narratives. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 2641–2652.

- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. *Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach*. *ArXiv*, abs/1907.11692.
- Rui Meng, Ye Liu, Shafiq Rayhan Joty, Caiming Xiong, Yingbo Zhou, and Semih Yavuz. 2024. *Sfr-embedding-mistral:enhance text retrieval with transfer learning*. Salesforce AI Research Blog.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Niklas Muennighoff. 2022. Sgpt: Gpt sentence embeddings for semantic search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08904*.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loic Magne, and Nils Reimers. 2023. *MTEB: Massive text embedding benchmark*. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2014–2037, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aakanksha Naik, Abhilasha Ravichander, Carolyn Rose, and Eduard Hovy. 2019. Exploring numeracy in word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3374–3380.
- OpenAI. 2025. Openai (august 25 version). <https://api.openai.com/v1/embeddings>.
- 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.
- Jasivan Sivakumar and Nafise Sadat Moosavi. 2023. *Fermat: An alternative to accuracy for numerical reasoning*. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.17491.
- Jasivan Alex Sivakumar and Nafise Sadat Moosavi. 2025. How to leverage digit embeddings to represent numbers? In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 7685–7697.
- Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. *Mpnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding*. *ArXiv*, abs/2004.09297.
- Dhanasekar Sundararaman, Shijing Si, Vivek Subramanian, Guoyin Wang, Devamanyu Hazarika, and Lawrence Carin. 2020. Methods for numeracy-preserving word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4742–4753.
- Yixuan Tang and Yi Yang. 2025. *Finmteb: Finance massive text embedding benchmark*. *ArXiv*, abs/2502.10990.
- Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Ruckl’e, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. *Beir: A heterogenous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models*. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.08663.
- Avijit Thawani, Jay Pujara, and Filip Ilievski. 2021. Numeracy enhances the literacy of language models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 6960–6967.
- Eric Wallace, Yizhong Wang, Sujian Li, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. Do nlp models know numbers? probing numeracy in embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5307–5315.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Linjun Yang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2023. *Improving text embeddings with large language models*. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.00368.
- Lionel Wong, Ayman Ali, Raymond M Xiong, Zejiang Shen, Yoon Kim, and Monica Agrawal. 2025. *Position: Retrieval-augmented systems can be dangerous medical communicators*. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning Position Paper Track*.
- Liyan Xu, Zhenlin Su, Mo Yu, Jiangnan Li, Fandong Meng, and Jie Zhou. 2025. Dense retrievers can fail on simple queries: Revealing the granularity dilemma of embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08592*.

Antonio Jimeno Yepes, Yao You, Jan Milczek, Sebastian Laverde, and Renyu Li. 2024. Financial report chunking for effective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05131*.

Sangwon Yu, Jongyoon Song, Heeseung Kim, Seongmin Lee, Woo-Jong Ryu, and Sungroh Yoon. 2022. [Rare tokens degenerate all tokens: Improving neural text generation via adaptive gradient gating for rare token embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 29–45, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Shaoyun Yu, Chanyuan Gu, Kexin Huang, and Ping Li. 2024. Predicting the next sentence (not word) in large language models: What model-brain alignment tells us about discourse comprehension. *Science advances*, 10(21):eadn7744.

Chao Zhang, Yuren Mao, Yijiang Fan, Yu Mi, Yunjun Gao, Lu Chen, Dongfang Lou, and Jinshu Lin. 2024. [Finsql: Model-agnostic llms-based text-to-sql framework for financial analysis](#). *Companion of the 2024 International Conference on Management of Data*.

Meishan Zhang, Xin Zhang, Xinping Zhao, Shouzheng Huang, Baotian Hu, and Min Zhang. 2025a. On the role of pretrained language models in general-purpose text embeddings: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.20783*.

Yanzhao Zhang, Mingxin Li, Dingkun Long, Xin Zhang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, An Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Junyang Lin, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2025b. Qwen3 embedding: Advancing text embedding and reranking through foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05176*.

## A Prompts Used for Data Curation

### Question Augmentation

**Transition to less than meaning**  
Task: Replace "greater than" in a sentence with "less than"  
1. Identify: Locate the word or phrase in the given sentence that conveys the meaning of greater than.  
2. Replace: Substitute the identified word or phrase that conveys the less than meaning.  
3. Output: Preserve all other text exactly as it appears and provide only the modified sentence without any additional commentary.

**Transition to large than meaning**  
Task: Replace "less than" in a sentence with "greater than"  
1. Identify: Locate the word or phrase in the given sentence that conveys the meaning of "lessthan."  
2. Replace: Substitute the identified word or phrase that conveys the greater than meaning.  
3. Output: Preserve all other text exactly as it appears and provide only the modified sentence without any additional commentary

Figure 9: Prompt used for question augmentation.

### Answer Generation

Please generate a financial sentence that answers the following question:  
Format Requirements:

The sentence must include only one specific number  
The description must be unambiguous.  
Only the sentence should be provided; no additional information is needed

Example:

Question: Which company's profit growth exceeded 15%?  
Answer: Tesla's profit in the second quarter increased by approximately 50%

Question: {question}  
Answer: “ ”

Figure 10: Prompt used for answer generation.