

---

# NoLBERT: A No Lookahead(back) Foundational Language Model for Empirical Research

---

**Ali Kakhbod**

Haas school of business  
University of California, Berkeley  
akakhbod@berkeley.edu

**Peiyao Li**

Haas school of business  
University of California, Berkeley  
ojhfklsjhl@berkeley.edu

## Abstract

We present NoLBERT, a lightweight, timestamped foundational language model for empirical research in social sciences, particularly in economics and finance. By pre-training exclusively on 1976–1995 text, NoLBERT avoids both *lookback* and *lookahead* biases that can undermine econometric inference. It exceeds domain-specific baselines on NLP benchmarks while maintaining temporal consistency. Applied to patent texts, NoLBERT enables the construction of firm-level innovation networks and shows that gains in innovation centrality predict higher long-run profit growth.

## 1 Introduction

Text-based methods have become increasingly central to empirical research in social sciences. In econometric settings that require time-consistent inference and backtesting, however, temporal biases can arise when language models are trained on corpora spanning long horizons: *lookahead bias* (implicit learning from future information) and *lookback bias* (conflation of meanings across eras), both of which can undermine temporal consistency.

We introduce NoLBERT, a timestamped, domain-ready encoder. Built on the DeBERTa architecture introduced in He et al. [2020], NoLBERT is pre-trained exclusively on 1976–1995 data, with validation on 1996. This narrow training horizon eliminates both *lookback* and *lookahead* biases while keeping the model compact (109M parameters), enabling large-scale text analysis on modest academic infrastructure. NoLBERT achieves higher performance on GLUE tasks relative to domain models such as FinBERT, while offering temporal constraints essential for empirical research.

To illustrate its applicability in economic research, we apply NoLBERT to the study of firm innovation and performance. We fine-tune the model on *patent texts* to construct firm-level innovation networks, compute centrality measures, and link these to firm profit growth. Our econometric analysis shows that increases in innovation centrality are significantly associated with higher medium- and long-run profit growth. Together, these results highlight NoLBERT’s potential as a foundational tool for economic research: it combines strong language modeling performance with the temporal discipline necessary for credible econometric inference.

## 2 Pre-training NoLBERT

### 2.1 Base architecture and pre-training data

For economists, a language encoder should (i) produce embeddings that are informative for downstream econometrics and (ii) be portable enough to run at scale on modest GPUs. We therefore adopt *DeBERTa v3 base* and pre-train it on text from 1976–1995, balancing compact size with strong language-modeling performance.

Our pre-training corpus is curated to satisfy this time window while covering diverse, timestamped domains. We combine (a) popular-culture sources (movie scripts, TV dialogues, magazines, novels, blogs), (b) formal prose (parliamentary debates, campaign materials, news, academic papers), and (c) economics-relevant materials (FOMC transcripts, patents). See Appendix A.2 for dataset construction details.

### 2.2 Pre-training procedure and benchmark performance

We pre-train our base model using data from 1976 to 1995 and use 1996 as validation data to track performance. To strictly prevent temporal biases, we first train a custom ByteLevelBPE tokenizer from scratch with a vocabulary size of 30,000 tokens and a minimum frequency threshold of 2, incorporating standard special tokens for masked language modeling. We then train our model with mixed precision over 15 epochs.

We evaluate the performance of our model on the GLUE benchmark, including CoLA, SST2, QQP, MNLI, and QNLI. As shown in Table 1, NoLBERT achieves the highest average performance when compared with similar models, FinBERT and StoriesLM, and it dominates the other two models in tasks other than CoLA (Araci [2019], Sarkar [2025]).

Table 1: Performance comparison of financial language models across benchmark tasks.

Model	Vocabulary (K)	#Params (M)	CoLA	SST2	QQP	MNLI	QNLI
FinBERT	30	110	0.29	0.89	0.87	0.79	0.86
StoriesLM	30	110	0.49	0.90	0.87	0.80	0.87
NoLBERT	30	109	0.43	0.91	0.91	0.82	0.89

### 3 Lookback and lookahead biases

#### 3.1 Avoiding lookahead and lookback biases using timestamped pre-training

*Lookahead bias* occurs when models trained on future information contaminate predictions. For instance, when predicting stock returns from news articles, a model trained on data including future outcomes may simply retrieve memorized return patterns rather than genuinely inferring from text content. This renders predictions invalid for periods beyond the training data. We eliminate this bias by pre-training/validation exclusively on 1976-1996 data, ensuring no lookahead when backtesting strategies from 1997 onward.

*Lookback bias* arises when models trained across long time periods produce representations that conflate different historical contexts. For example, the phrase "*running a program*" meant organizing an event in the early 1900s, but executing computer code by the late 20th century. Models trained on century-spanning data create ambiguous representations that may mischaracterize texts from specific periods. We avoid this by restricting training to the narrow 1976-1995 window, with validation strictly from 1996, ensuring temporal consistency in our text representations.

#### 3.2 Validity check

We empirically evaluate whether NoLBERT’s knowledge is temporally bounded to its pre-training window (1976–1995). To do so, we design two paired *t*-tests: one for *lookahead bias* and another for *lookback bias*.

For lookahead bias, we construct 20 test words whose meanings shifted between 1976–1995 (old era) and 2020–present (new era). Using GPT-5, we generate sentence pairs in which the focal word is masked—one reflecting the old sense and the other the new. For example, the word “*token*” appears as “*He offered a <mask> of gratitude in the form of flowers.*” (old) versus “*She invested in a governance <mask> for the new DAO.*” (new). If the model is free from lookahead bias, it should predict the masked word more accurately in the context of its training era.

For lookback bias, we repeat the procedure with another 20 words, where the “new” era is 1976–1995 and the “old” era is the 19th century. This tests whether the model’s understanding of language leans towards older meaning (lookback bias).

Formally, let  $P_{\text{old}}(w_i)$  and  $P_{\text{new}}(w_i)$  denote the probabilities of predicting the masked word  $w_i$  in old versus new contexts. We conduct one-sided paired *t*-tests on

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\log P_{\text{old}}(w_i) - \log P_{\text{new}}(w_i)] = 0,$$

with the alternative hypothesis positive for lookahead (favoring old meanings) and negative for lookback (favoring newer meanings).

Table 2: Validity checks against lookahead and lookback biases.

New era	Old era	Difference	<i>t</i> -stat	<i>p</i> -value
2020–present	1976–1995	−2.78	−5.56	< 0.01
1976–1995	19th century	2.53	4.60	< 0.01

As shown in Table 2, the tests strongly reject the null of equal predictive accuracy across eras, confirming that NoLBERT is temporally localized: it favors contexts aligned with its training horizon and underperforms outside it.

## 4 Applications

In this section, we present an end-to-end application where we use NoLBERT to form text representations and then conduct econometric analysis of the relationship between a firm’s centrality in the innovation network and its profit growth.

### 4.1 Fine-tuning NoLBERT via contrastive learning and patent text data

We adopt a bottom-up approach to estimate firm-pair innovation similarities by fine-tuning NoLBERT with a contrastive learning objective. Our aim is to ensure that the document-level “[CLS]” embedding captures information relevant to innovation-specific textual similarity.

More specifically, for each patent, we randomly split its text into two chunks, denoted  $A$  and  $B$ . We then construct a balanced dataset as follows: in 50% of the cases, chunk  $A$  is paired with chunk  $B$  from the same patent (labeled 1, representing 100% similarity), while in the remaining 50% of the cases, chunk  $A$  is paired with a chunk from a different patent (labeled 0). The model is trained to predict whether a given pair of chunks originates from the same patent.

We repeat this procedure on an annual basis, fine-tuning NoLBERT separately for patents granted in each year. For each year, we randomly split the data into training and test sets in a 70/30 ratio and train the model for one epoch. Across years, the classifier achieves an average accuracy of 98%, indicating that the fine-tuned “[CLS]” embeddings provide a strong representation of patent-level similarity.

Then, we use the trained model in year  $t$  to construct the patent-level embeddings in year  $t$ . Let  $S_A^t$  and  $S_B^t$  be the set of embeddings of all patents granted to firm A and B in year  $t$ , the similarity between firms A and B in year  $t$  is computed as

$$\text{sim}(A, B, t) = \cos(\bar{s}_A^t, \bar{s}_B^t), \tag{1}$$

where  $\bar{s}_A^t$  and  $\bar{s}_B^t$  are the average embeddings of  $S_A^t$  and  $S_B^t$ .

## 4.2 Innovation centrality and firm growth

For each year  $t$ , we first construct a sparse, weighted firm–firm innovation similarity network  $G_t$  whose nodes are firms and whose (undirected) edges carry weights equal to the pairwise similarity. This graph is represented by a sparse adjacency matrix  $A_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  where the  $(i, j)$ th entry captures the similarity between firms  $i$  and  $j$ . We then form the row-stochastic transition matrix  $P_t = D_t^{-1} A_t$ , where  $D_t = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$  with  $d_i = \sum_j A_{t,ij}$ . Finally, firms’ page rank centralities are computed by power iteration with damping: starting from  $p^{(0)} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}$ , we iterate

$$p^{(k+1)} = \alpha P_t^\top p^{(k)} + (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1},$$

with damping factor  $\alpha = 0.85$ , until  $\|p^{(k+1)} - p^{(k)}\|_1 < \text{tol}$  or a maximum of `max_iter` iterations is reached. We show the summary statistics in Appendix A.3.2.

Next, we merge firms’ centrality scores with financial and operational characteristics from COMPUSTAT, including profit, capital stock, total assets, and employment. We further incorporate innovation value data from Kogan et al. [2017], which allows us to estimate the aggregate innovation value of each firm and industry in each year.<sup>1,2</sup>

We then estimate the following regressions to examine the relationship between changes in firms’ innovation centrality and their subsequent profit growth:

$$\Pi_{f,t+k} - \Pi_{f,t} = \alpha_1^k \Delta \text{Centrality}_{f,t}^{PR} + \beta^k Z_{f,t} + \delta_t^k + \delta_{\text{ind}}^k + \epsilon_{f,t}^k, \quad (2)$$

where  $\Pi_{f,t}$  denotes firm  $f$ ’s log profit in year  $t$ , and  $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  indexes the forecast horizon. The main independent variable  $\Delta \text{Centrality}_{f,t}^{PR}$  is the one-year log change in page rank centrality, defined as

$$\Delta \text{Centrality}_{f,t}^{PR} = \log(\text{PR}_{f,t}) - \log(\text{PR}_{f,t-1}).$$

The vector  $Z_{f,t}$  includes controls for firm-level innovation value, industry-level innovation value, and the logs of profit, employment, and capital stock.  $\delta_t^k$  and  $\delta_{\text{ind}}^k$  denote year and Fama–French 30 industry fixed effects, respectively. Standard errors are double-clustered at the industry and year level. All independent variables are standardized within industry-year cells.

As shown in Table 3, increases in the growth of innovation centrality are significantly and positively associated with profit growth in the medium to long run (years  $t + 2$  through  $t + 5$ ). Quantitatively, a one standard deviation increase in page rank centrality growth is associated with a 0.5% increase in profit growth by year 2 and a 0.3% increase by year 5. For robustness, we confirm that using two-year changes in centrality yields similar positive

<sup>1</sup>Details on data processing and merging are provided in Appendix A.2.

<sup>2</sup>See also Kakhbod et al. [2024] and references therein.

Table 3: Association between changes in innovation centrality and profit growth.

	Dependent variable: $\Pi_{t+k} - \Pi_t$				
	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$	$k = 4$	$k = 5$
$\Delta \text{Centrality}_{f,t}^{PR}$	0.001 (0.004)	0.005* (0.003)	0.007** (0.003)	0.007* (0.004)	0.003** (0.001)
Observations	20,976	18,987	17,204	15,615	14,199
R <sup>2</sup>	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.032	0.035
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.				

associations with profit growth at horizons  $t + 3$  to  $t + 5$ . Moreover, the results remain robust when we replace page rank with weighted-degree centrality as the centrality measure.<sup>3</sup>

### 4.3 Interpreting innovation centrality

In this subsection, we unpack our page rank innovation centrality measure to show how its distribution evolves over time and how it corresponds with other firm characteristics. In addition, we demonstrate one potential mechanism through which growth in centrality is associated with the focal firm’s profit growth.

#### 4.3.1 Industry concentration among the most central firms

Figure 1: Cumulative industry composition from  $t$  to 2021 of the most central firms.




Figure 1 illustrates the industries that account for the largest shares of the most central firms (defined as the top 10% in each year). Specifically, for each year  $t$ , we identify the most central firms, record their industries, and then plot the cumulative industry composition from year  $t$  through the end of our sample in 2021.

Over time, two industries increasingly dominate the set of most central firms: *Personal and Business Services* (e.g., Apple, Alphabet) and *Healthcare, Medical Equipment, and*

<sup>3</sup>Details about these robustness analyses are discussed in Appendix A.1.

*Pharmaceuticals* (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer). Correspondingly, the residual “Everything else” category shrinks. This pattern highlights a growing concentration of innovation centrality within a small set of industries, particularly those in technology-related services and healthcare.

### 4.3.2 Innovation centrality and other firm characteristics

We compute the Pearson correlations between our innovation centrality measure and a set of firm characteristics (log profit, log capital stock, log employment, firm-level innovation value, and industry-level innovation value), after standardizing all variables within each year and industry.

Table 4: Correlations of page rank centrality and log changes (standardized within year and industry) of firm characteristics.

Variable	Centrality $_{f,t}^{PR}$	$\Delta$ Centrality $_{f,t}^{PR}$ (1-year)	$\Delta$ Centrality $_{f,t}^{PR}$ (2-year)
Log of profit	0.497***	0.002	0.007
Log of capital stock	0.461***	-0.007	-0.004
Log of employment	0.483***	-0.002	0.002
Innovation value (firm)	0.404***	0.027***	0.046***
Innovation value (industry)	-0.004	0.001	0.006
Sale	0.378***	-0.007	-0.009
Cost of goods sold	0.365***	-0.006	-0.008

*Note:* \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01.

Table 4 shows that innovation centrality is strongly and significantly correlated with firm characteristics—profits, capital stock, employment, and firm-level innovation value. Larger, more profitable firms producing high-value innovations tend to occupy more central positions in the innovation network.

By contrast, changes in innovation centrality (1- and 2-year growth) are only significantly associated with firm-level innovation value. This finding is consistent with expectations: firms generating high-value innovations in the current year are more likely to experience growth in innovation centrality relative to prior years. Importantly, this also highlights the value of focusing on *growth* in innovation centrality in our econometric analyses—its variation is much less likely to be mechanically confounded by firm size or other static firm characteristics.

Finally, as we show in Tables 3 and A1, growth in innovation centrality predicts medium- to long-run profit growth even after controlling for the focal firm’s innovation value. This indicates that while centrality and innovation value are significantly correlated, our centrality measure captures additional information about a firm’s profit growth potential that is not subsumed by innovation value alone.

### 4.3.3 Mechanism

Firms whose innovation centrality grows rapidly experience faster profitability growth because increases in centrality reflect a shift in the *structural relevance* of their technologies, not merely the standalone value of their current inventions. When a firm’s patents become more central in the technology network, they are more likely to serve as reference points, complements, or standards for other firms’ innovations. This position generates diffusion leverage, expands complementarities across products and markets, and strengthens bargaining power in alliances and supply chains. Importantly, these effects boost profits without requiring a proportional increase in physical assets. As a result, profits rise faster relative to total assets, producing sustained increases in profitability ratios.

To test this mechanism, we estimate regressions of profitability growth, defined as  $\frac{\text{sale}-\text{cogs}}{\text{at}}$ , on innovation centrality growth using a modified version of equation 2, where the left-hand side is profitability growth rather than profit growth. The key regressor is the change in the focal firm’s innovation centrality, and we control for the contemporaneous innovation value of the firm’s innovations.

First, we find that the focal firm’s current innovation value is significantly positively associated with contemporaneous profitability. In addition, the results in Table 5 show innovation values are negatively associated with subsequent profitability growth, reflecting that highly innovative firms already earning high margins tend to grow more slowly in profitability. By contrast, increases in innovation centrality are significantly positively associated with profitability growth, and the association unfolds gradually over the medium to long run: centrality growth does not coincide with sharp concurrent jumps in profitability, but instead predicts persistent gains in revenues and margins over the following years. Thus, innovation centrality captures the embedded capacity of a firm’s technologies to shape and benefit from the broader innovation ecosystem, making it a forward-looking predictor of profit growth that is distinct from, and complementary to, the contemporaneous value of patents.

Table 5: The association between innovation centrality growth and profit margin growth.

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>				
	$\Delta M_{i,t+1}$ (1)	$\Delta M_{i,t+2}$ (2)	$\Delta M_{i,t+3}$ (3)	$\Delta M_{i,t+4}$ (4)	$\Delta M_{i,t+5}$ (5)
Centrality $_{f,t}^{PR}$ (1-year)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000** (0.000)	0.002** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)
Firm-level innovation value	-0.000 (0.001)	-0.002** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.002)	-0.005*** (0.002)
Centrality $_{f,t}^{PR}$ (2-year)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.002)	0.003** (0.001)
Firm-level innovation value	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.002)	-0.006*** (0.002)
Observations PR 1y	21,761	20,872	17,146	15,559	14,157
R <sup>2</sup> : PR 1y	0.003	0.007	0.034	0.036	0.038
Observations PR 2y	20,988	20,312	16,600	15,102	13,732
R <sup>2</sup> : PR 2y	0.006	0.006	0.038	0.039	0.041

Note:

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

## References

- Dogu Araci. Finbert: Financial sentiment analysis with pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10063*, 2019.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654*, 2020.
- Ali Kakhbod, Leonid Kogan, Peiyao Li, and Dimitris Papanikolaou. Measuring creative destruction. *MIT Sloan Working Paper*, 2024.
- Leonid Kogan, Dimitris Papanikolaou, Amit Seru, and Noah Stoffman. Technological innovation, resource allocation, and growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(2): 665–712, 2017.
- Suproteem K Sarkar. Economic representations, 2025.

## A Appendix / supplemental material

We provide additional details and background information related to our paper. First, in Appendix A.1, we show results of some robustness analyses verifying the significantly positive association between the growth in innovation centrality and profit. In Appendix A.2, we show more details about our data processing steps and summary statistics. In Appendix A.3, we show summary statistics of our pre-training data and innovation centrality. Lastly, in Appendix A.4, we show more direct examples to show that NoLBERT is free from lookahead and lookback biases.

### A.1 Robustness analysis of the association between innovation centrality and profit growth

We conduct robustness checks of our finding that growth in the focal firm’s innovation centrality is significantly positively associated with its profit growth. In particular, we do two types of robustness checks. First, we extend subsection 4.2 by examining the association between the 2-year (instead of 1-year) growth of centrality and profit growth. Secondly, we use weighted-degree as an alternative definition of centrality and show that growth in innovation centrality is significantly positively associated with profit growth in the medium to long run. Let  $F_t$  be all of the firms with at least 1 granted patent in year  $t$ , and take any focal firm  $f$ , the weighted-degree centrality of  $f$  in year  $t$  is

$$\text{centrality}_{f,t}^{wd} = \frac{\sum_{s \in F_t \setminus f} \text{sim}(f, s, t)}{\max_{f \in F_t} \sum_{s \in F_t \setminus f} \text{sim}(f, s, t)}.$$

We are following the specification of equation 2 where the growth in centrality is either 1 or 2 years, and the centrality is computed by either the page rank or weighted-degree definition. Note that page rank and weighted-degree centralities are highly correlated with a Pearson correlation of 0.81.

As shown in Table A1, across all definitions of growth in innovation centrality (page rank, weighted-degree, 1-year growth, and 2-year growth), the growth in the focal firm’s innovation centrality is significantly positively associated with its profit growth. This shows the robustness of our finding in subsection 4.2.

### A.2 Data processing details and summary statistics

#### A.2.1 Data processing for pre-training

We highlight the detailed procedure that we use to process a few key datasets that are included in our pre-training data.

**Processing FOMC minutes** For each meeting record, we extracted the date and the full text of the minutes, excluded rows with missing or empty text, and split the remaining text

Table A1: Association between changes in innovation centrality and profit growth (different definitions of innovation centrality).

	<i>Dependent variable: <math>\Pi_{t+k} - \Pi_t</math></i>				
	<i>k</i> = 1	<i>k</i> = 2	<i>k</i> = 3	<i>k</i> = 4	<i>k</i> = 5
$\Delta$ Centrality <sup>PR</sup> <sub><i>f,t</i></sub> (1-year)	0.001 (0.004)	0.005* (0.003)	0.007** (0.003)	0.007* (0.004)	0.003** (0.001)
$\Delta$ Centrality <sup>PR</sup> <sub><i>f,t</i></sub> (2-year)	0.002 (0.002)	0.004 (0.003)	0.008** (0.003)	0.010*** (0.002)	0.008*** (0.002)
$\Delta$ Centrality <sup>wd</sup> <sub><i>f,t</i></sub> (1-year)	0.001 (0.004)	0.005* (0.003)	0.007** (0.003)	0.007* (0.004)	0.003** (0.001)
$\Delta$ Centrality <sup>wd</sup> <sub><i>f,t</i></sub> (2-year)	0.002 (0.002)	0.004 (0.003)	0.008** (0.003)	0.010*** (0.002)	0.008*** (0.002)
Observations 1y	20,976	18,987	17,204	15,615	14,199
Observations 2y	20,272	18,354	16,646	15,148	13,753
R <sup>2</sup> : PR 1y	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.032	0.035
R <sup>2</sup> : PR 2y	0.023	0.029	0.032	0.033	0.036
R <sup>2</sup> : WD 1y	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.032	0.035
R <sup>2</sup> : WD 2y	0.023	0.029	0.032	0.033	0.036

*Note:*

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01.

into individual sentences. Documents containing fewer than ten sentences were retained in their entirety, while longer documents were partitioned into consecutive chunks of three to seven sentences (the number of sentences is randomized), ensuring variability in chunk size but preserving sentence order. Any residual sentences at the end of a document were grouped together as a final chunk.

**Processing patent texts** We include the abstracts of all utility patents in the USPTO in each year. The only filter we apply is removing any abstract longer than 300 words, which eliminates 0.4% of patents.

Other sources of long documents are processed with a similar procedure.

### A.2.2 Data processing for fine-tuning

To prepare patent abstracts for a similarity-based fine-tuning task, we first filtered the dataset to retain only those entries with more than two sentences. For each abstract, we randomly selected a *breaking point* between the first and the penultimate sentence, and split the abstract into two parts: chunk A (the leading segment up to the breaking point) and chunk B (the trailing segment thereafter). This procedure ensured that each abstract was decomposed into a coherent pair of textual fragments.

Next, we constructed training data by year of grant between 1997 and 2021. Within each year, abstracts were randomly shuffled, and two versions of chunk B were generated: the original trailing segment and a shifted version, where chunk B was rotated across the set of abstracts. For each abstract, we randomly chose with probability 0.5 whether to keep

the true chunk B (positive pair) or replace it with the shifted chunk B (negative pair). A binary indicator variable (`sim`) was created to mark whether the final pair represented a true continuation of the abstract or an artificially mismatched fragment.

Then, we fine-tune a NoLBERT-based text-pair classifier on the processed patent data in a year-by-year fashion. For each grant year  $y \in \{1997, \dots, 2021\}$ , we create stratified splits (70% train, 30% test). Then, we use the custom NoLBERT tokenizer to process the pairs, padding/truncating each to 512 tokens.

The classifier instantiates the NoLBERT encoder and extracts the [CLS] embeddings for chunk A and chunk B. We compose a richer pair representation by concatenating four components: (i) direct concatenation  $[h_A; h_B]$ , (ii) element-wise product  $h_A \odot h_B$ , and (iii) absolute difference  $|h_A - h_B|$ , yielding a  $4d$ -dimensional vector for hidden size  $d$ . A MLP head (two ReLU layers with dropout) maps this feature to logits over two classes. We optimize with AdamW (learning rate  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ , weight decay 0.01), a linear warmup/decay schedule (10% warmup), and cross-entropy loss, applying gradient clipping ( $\|g\|_2 \leq 1$ ) for stability. Training proceeds for one epoch per year, with scheduler steps taken each batch.

### A.2.3 Creating firm dataset

In our econometric analyses of innovation centrality versus profit growth, we use five firm characteristics from COMPUSTAT: “Property, Plant, and Equipment – Total” (`ppeg`), “Assets - Total” (`at`), “Sales” (`sale`), “Cost of Goods Sold” (`cogs`), “Employment” (`emp`). In particular, a firm’s capital stock is computed as `ppeg` divided by the equipment deflator for each year. Profit is computed as `sale-cogs` divided by the consumer price index of each year.

In addition, we use year and PERMNO to merge the COMPUSTAT data with the innovation value dataset from Kogan et al. [2017]. A firm’s innovation value is computed as the sum of patent values granted in each year divided by its total assets. The value of a patent is estimated as the real stock market reaction to the application and granting of the patent. The industry-level innovation value that each firm is exposed to is the aggregated firm-level innovation value in the focal 3-digit SIC industry, other than the focal firm.

### A.3 Summary statistics

#### A.3.1 Number of samples from each data source


Table A2: Summary statistics of text sources.

Source	Count
Paper	2,815,934
COCA	1,566,883
Patent	1,102,398
Song	284,506
Book	140,810
Parliament	76,470
Hong Kong News	32,914
Reuters News	24,067
Music	1,149
FOMC	678
Political Campaign	615
Friends (TV Show)	198

#### A.3.2 Summary statistics of innovation centrality

S

Figure A1: Summary statistics of page rank and weighted-degree centrality.



### A.4 Demonstration of NoLBERT against lookback and lookahead biases

We demonstrate the knowledge limitations of the NoLBERT model by asking it to fill in the job title of United States presidents from 1969 to 2008. The prompt is

XXX is a United States <mask>.

The results shown in Table A3, other than George W. Bush, the probabilities of all presidents outside of our training interval (1976-1995) are strictly lower than any president in our time interval. In addition, all of these presidents within our time frame are correctly identified as a president within the top 2 most likely words. Presidents who took office outside of the time range are not identified within the top 2, other than George W. Bush. In the case of George W. Bush, we find that the last name Bush implies presidency in the knowledge base

of NoLBERT (because it has seen George H.W. Bush as a president in the training data). Indeed, when we only mention “Bush” and “George Bush”, NoLBERT also predicts this person as the United States president. Overall, this provides more examples to demonstrate that NoLBERT knowledge is restricted within the time frame from 1976 to 1995.

Table A3: Examples demonstrating no lookahead and lookback biases.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Within Top 2 Choices</b>	<b>Probability</b>
Richard Nixon	No	0.05
Gerald Ford	No	0.03
1977		
Jimmy Carter	Yes	0.14
Ronald Reagan	Yes	0.58
George H.W. Bush	Yes	0.51
Bill Clinton	Yes	0.54
2001		
George W. Bush	Yes	0.45
Barack Obama	No	0.08