Robust Reading Comprehension with Linguistic Constraints via Posterior Regularization

Mantong Zhou,Minlie Huang,Xiaoyan Zhu

arXiv:1911.06948v1 [cs.CL] 16 Nov 2019

***Abstract*—In spite of great advancements of machine reading comprehension (RC), existing RC models are still vulnerable and not robust to different types of adversarial examples. Neural models over-confidently predict wrong answers to semantic different adversarial examples, while over-sensitively predict wrong answers to semantic equivalent adversarial examples. Existing methods which improve the robustness of such neural models merely mitigate one of the two issues but ignore the other. In this paper, we address the *over-confidence* issue and the *over-sensitivity* issue existing in current RC models simultaneously with the help of external linguistic knowledge. We first incorporate external knowledge to impose different linguistic constraints (entity constraint, lexical constraint, and predicate constraint), and then regularize RC models through posterior regularization. Linguistic constraints induce more reasonable predictions for both semantic different and semantic equivalent adversarial examples, and posterior regularization provides an effective mechanism to incorporate these constraints. Our method can be applied to any existing neural RC models including state-of-the-art BERT models. Extensive experiments show that our method remarkably improves the robustness of base RC models, and is better to cope with these two issues simultaneously.**

***Index Terms*—Machine Reading Comprehension, Robust, Adversarial Examples, Linguistic constraints, Posterior Regularization**

I. Introduction

READING Comprehension (RC) has been much advanced by recently proposed datasets [9], [19], [26] and models [10], [29]. However, RC models are still vulnerable and faced with two typical issues. One is **the over-confidence issue**: *when a model is fed with **S**emantic **D**ifferent **A**dversarial (**SDA**) examples* [15], *the model wrongly predicts the same answer*. If small perturbations are applied to the question/passage, for instance replacing "America" with "Canada" in the example of Fig. 1, the model still predicts the same answer even though the question is unanswerable. The other is **the over-sensitivity issue**: *a model is not robust when fed with **S**emantic **E**quivalent **A**dversarial (**SEA**) examples* [28]. If we make perturbations yet keep the semantics unchanged, for instance replacing "1790s" with "nineties of the 18th century", the model may be distracted and possibly predict wrong answers.

The over-confidence issue can be attributed to overfitting [3], [8]: the model, for instance, may use a trick to output low-entropy distributions over classes to minimize negative log-likelihood loss. The over-sensitivity issue can be attributed to non-local generalization of neural networks caused by massive nonlinear operations [31] or high-dimensional linear operations [7]. As for RC, the representation dilemma additionally leads to the over-confidence and over-sensitivity issues: if words are replaced with analogous but semantic-different counterparts ("America" $\rightarrow$ "Canada", where the entities have very similar embeddings), the representation of the sentence may change slightly, so it is not surprising that a RC model outputs the same answer. Conversely, if words are replaced with synonymous phrases ("1790s" $\rightarrow$ "nineties of the 18th century"), it is hard for the model to regard them as equivalent through much different representations. Recent solutions, such as entropy regularization [25] and adversarial training [7], merely mitigate one issue but ignore the other. However, a robust RC model should be able to cope with both SDA and SEA examples simultaneously.

In this work, we aim to improve the robustness of RC models with linguistic constraints via posterior regularization (PR, [5]). Specifically, once we obtain predictions from a base RC model, we can extract linguistic feature pairs (synonyms, antonyms, entity pairs, etc.) with external knowledge resources, and derive linguistic constraints with the extracted features. Then, we adjust the output distribution according to these linguistic constraints. The training objective is reformulated as a constrained optimization problem in the posterior regularization framework, which can be solved by an expectation maximization (EM) algorithm.

The aforementioned issues are addressed as follows: **First**, posterior regularization alleviates overfitting by restricting the parameter space. Regularization term functions as penalty for vanilla negative log-likelihood loss. **Second**, applying constraints to the output distribution is more straightforward than to the input or intermediate layers, which makes predictions less affected by massive non-linear operations. **Third**, the constraints to regularize RC models are designed with paired linguistic knowledge (synonyms, antonyms, entity pairs, etc.), which has two benefits. On one hand, linguistic constraints are designed to capture two types of adversarial examples simultaneously. On the other hand, instead of operating in the embedding space, symbolic changes in entity or lexicon can be more easily and explicitly captured by the constraints, and thus address the representation dilemma.

Our main contribution is to improve the robustness of reading comprehension models by **considering the over-confidence issue and the over-sensitivity issue simultaneously**. We incorporate external linguistic knowledge to impose

Mantong Zhou, Minlie Huang and Xiaoyan Zhu are with the Institute for Artificial Intelligence, State Key Lab of Intelligent Technology and Systems, Beijing National Research Center for Information Science and Technology, Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China, e-mail: (zmt.keke@gmail.com, aihuang@tsinghua.edu.cn, zxy-dcs@tsinghua.edu.cn).

Corresponding author: Minlie Huang.

Document	*sentence-1*: New York is the **largest** city in **America** since **1790s.** *sentence-2*: While in **1780**s, Philadelphia had the **most** population in **U.S.**					
Original Question Original Answer	Which city in America is the largest in 1790s? New York					
Adversarial Question	Which city in Canada is the largest in 1790s?		Which is the largest city in America in 1780s?		Which city in the U.S. is the largest in the nineties of the 18th century?	
Evidence	w/o knowledge	with knowledge	w/o knowledge	with knowledge	w/o knowledge	with knowledge
	Canada = America	**Canada ≠ America**	**1780s = 1790s**	**1780s ≠ 1790s America = U.S.**	**nineties ≠ 1790s**	**nineties = 1790s U.S. = America**
Predicted Answer	New York	(unanswerable)	New York	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	New York
Type	semantic different (SDA)		semantic different (SDA)		semantic equivalent (SEA)	
Issue	over-confidence		over-confidence		over-sensitivity	

Fig. 1: Different types of adversarial examples in reading comprehension.

different constraints on the models via posterior regularization. Using this method, semantic different and semantic equivalent adversarial examples can be handled effectively. Moreover, our method can be applied to many RC models, and depends less on the quality of adversarial examples compared with adversarial training.

II. Related Works

Adversarial Reading Comprehension Tasks

Many studies [17], [23] start to retrospect the benchmark datasets and tasks of reading comprehension (RC) critically. Existing RC models which perform well on SQuAD1.1 [26] are not robust to adversarial sentences. For instance, adversarial examples in SQuAD-ADDSENT [15], collected with semantic-altering noise using AddSent algorithm, fooled most of the successful models trained on SQuAD1.1. AddSent-Diverse [35] modified AddSent by generating more diverse adversarial examples to prevent RC models from learning superficial clues. Gao et al. [6] generated longer and semantic-richer distractors which are closer to those in real RC examinations. Rajpurkar et al. [16] developed SQuAD2.0 that combines SQuAD1.1 with new unanswerable questions, to test the ability of distinguishing unanswerable questions in RC. SQuAD-ADDSENT and SQuAD2.0 examined the overconfidence issue of RC models using adversarial examples which differ in semantics.

Ribeiro et al. [28] designed adversarial examples and rules, which can preserve original semantics but cause models to make wrong predictions. Iyyer et al. [14] proposed syntactically controlled paraphrase networks to generate semantic equivalent adversarial examples.

However, to our best knowledge, there exists no dataset which combines both SDA and SEA examples.

Robust Reading Comprehension Models

Current RC models are vulnerable since remarkable performance drops can be observed on adversarial examples compared to that on original examples. Entropy regularization [3] is proposed to alleviate overfitting by maximizing the entropy of prediction distributions of similar inputs. Label smoothing [30] is equivalent to adding the KL divergence between the uniform distribution and the predicted answer distribution thus alleviates overfitting [25]. But these methods only target at making models more sensitive to input permutations, yet ignoring the semantic-equivalent adversarial examples.

The standard method to defend against adversarial attacks is adversarial training [7], [32]. Szegedy et al. [32] discovered that several machine learning models are vulnerable to adversarial examples and found that by training on a mixture of adversarial and clean examples, a neural network can be regularized to some degree. Goodfellow et al. [7] introduced a family of fast methods for generating adversarial examples and demonstrated that adversarial training can result in regularization in theory. Wang et al. [35] introduced adversarial training to RC models and improved robustness using more diverse adversarial examples. A3Net [33] blended adversarial training into each layer of the network by adding numerical perturbations to original variables. However, adversarial training relies on high-quality training adversarial examples [35]. Such models cannot recognize unseen adversarial patterns without sufficient training data. In comparison, our model effectively identifies adversarial patterns with the help of external knowledge.

Min et al. [22] proposed a selector to pick out oracle sentences from adversarial ones, but cannot deal with unanswerable questions. No-answer scoring [1], [20] and answer verification modules [11], [29] were used in some models to determine whether a question is unanswerable. However, these modules depend on the specific "no-answer-classification" setting of SQuAD2.0. By contrast, our framework is more general.

Posterior Regularization

Posterior Regularization (PR) [5] is a structured learning framework which enables flexible injection of various constraints with structured knowledge, and already applied to many NLP tasks such as Machine Translation [4], [27], [38] and Sentiment Classification [37], [39]. Hu et al. [12] developed a knowledge distillation framework to incorpo-




Fig. 2: Posterior regularization framework for robust reading comprehension. Base RC model obtains the preliminary answer distribution $p(y|x;\theta)$, and the values of constraint functions $f^l(x,y)$ are computed via linguistic knowledge for each candidate answer. A larger $h(x,y)$ is derived for candidates which satisfy the constraints but a smaller $h(x,y)$ for those which violate the constraints. $h(x,y)$ is then used to regularize $p(y|x;\theta)$ to obtain the final answer distribution $q^*(y|x)$.

rate PR into neural networks. A student neural network is trained to imitate a teacher network which is constructed by imposing posterior constraints. However, these models have limited generalization since constraints are fixed and manually designed. Mei et al. [21] attempted to learn the constraint weights with additional supervisions in a Bayesian model with posterior regularization. Hu et al. [13] proposed mutual distillation to further enable the former distillation framework to learn constraints by parameterizing constraints. These works inspired us to incorporate linguistic constraints to improve the robustness of RC models.

III. Methodology

A. Reading Comprehension with Posterior Regularization

The RC problem can be formulated as follows: given a set of triples (Q,P,A), where $Q=(q_1,q_2,...,q_m)$ is the question with m words, $P=(p_1,...,p_n)$ is the passage with n words, and $A=(p_s,...,p_e)$ is the answer span extracted from the passage where s/e indicates the start/end word position. The task is to build a model with parameters θ to estimate the conditional probability $p(A|Q,P;\theta)=p(s|Q,P;\theta)p(e|s,Q,P;\theta)$.

In general, we can optimize θ by maximizing the log-likelihood of the ground truth answer as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\max \mathcal{L}(\theta) &= \sum_i \log p(A_i|Q_i,P_i;\theta) \\ &= \sum_i \log p(s_i|Q_i,P_i;\theta) + \log p(e_i|s_i,Q_i,P_i;\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Our central idea is to build a robust model with linguistic constraints. Following the posterior regularization (PR) framework, we apply a set of constraints to the posterior distribution over the answers. We can define the constraints in the form of $E_q[\phi(x,y)] \le b$ where x and y are an input question[1] and the answer respectively. $\phi(x,y)$ is a constraint function whose value is expected to be less than b according to some particular linguistic rules, and q is any distribution satisfying the constraints. The PR objective with slack penalty variables is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\max \mathcal{J}(\theta,q) = \mathcal{L}(\theta) - \min_q \{ & KL(q(y|x)||p(y|x;\theta)) \\ & + C\sum \xi\} \\ s.t. \quad & \lambda^l E_q[\phi^l(x,y)] - b^l \le \xi \quad l=1,...,L \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Let $f^l(x,y) = b^l - \phi^l(x,y)$ denotes constraint functions whose values are expected to be larger than $-\xi$, i.e. $f^l(x,y) > 0$, when (x,y) satisfies the constraints. The solution to the second term of $\mathcal{J}(\theta,q)$ is given by:

$$q^*(y|x) = \frac{p(y|x;\theta)\exp\{C\sum_l \lambda^l f^l(x,y)\}}{Z} \quad (3)$$

where Z is the normalization factor. $q^*(y|x)$ is the desired distribution which is close to the distribution learned from data $p(y|x;\theta)$ and meanwhile is regularized by constraints.

In theory, this PR framework can be applied to any probabilistic model $p(y|x;\theta)$ which is called the base model hereafter.

[1]We input a question-passage pair as x to the RC model $p(y|x;\theta)$, but merely use the question in constraints $\phi(x,y)$.




Fig. 3: The work flow of entity constraint. The entity pairs are extracted from x and s_y, and are weighted by the attention network Att_ω. The constraint function $f^1(x, y)$ is then evaluated and used to regularize $q(y|x)$.

B. Linguistic Constraints

We design three constraints in this section. **All constraints are designed to account for two types (semantic-different and semantic-equivalent) of adversarial examples in this framework**. Since it is inadequate to pre-define all adversarial situations by deterministic functions, **we introduce learnable parameters ω to parameterize the constraint functions as** $f^l(x, y; \omega_l)$.

Entity Constraint: The answer should be extracted from a sentence that has the same entities (person, location, time, event, etc) with the question, and on the contrary, the answer should not be extracted from a sentence that has different entities. For example, the model should not extract *"New York"* from sentence *"New York is the largest city in America since 1790s"* as the answer to the question *"Which is the largest city in America in 1780s"*.

As shown in Fig. 3, we first extract entity pairs[2] $\{(e_x, e_y)|e_x \in x, e_y \in s_y\}$ between the question sentence x and the sentence s_y where answer y is located. In this example, we have pairs $\{(America, America), (1780s, 1790s)\}$. The entity constraint is formulated as:

$$f^1(x, y; \omega_1) = \sum_k \alpha_{\omega_1}^k \mu(e_x^k, e_y^k)$$

where $\mu(e_x^k, e_y^k) = 1$ if the k^{th} entity pair is semantic equivalent or $\mu(e_x^k, e_y^k) = -1$ if semantic different, according to external linguistic knowledge. $\alpha_{\omega_1} = Att(x, s_y; \omega_1)$ is the weight of each entity pair, obtained from an attention network parameterized by ω_1.

Intuitively, $f^1(x, y; \omega_1)$ is positive when y is the ground truth, whereas negative when y locates in a semantic different sentence. Consequently, according to Eq. 3, positive $f^1(x, y; \omega_1)$ makes the regularized probability $q(y|x)$ larger than $p(y|x)$. Conversely, if $f^1(x, y; \omega_1)$ is negative, $q(y|x)$ becomes smaller.

Lexical Constraint: The answer should be extracted from a sentence that has the synonyms (same adjectives/adverbs, full name noun vs. abbreviation, etc.) with the question, or on the contrary, the answer should not be extracted from where antonyms exist. For example, *"New York is the largest city in America."* v.s. *"Which is the smallest city in America?"*.

[2]See section 4.1 *Data Preparation*.

Similarly, we extract synonym and antonym pairs $\{(w_x, w_y)|w_x \in x, w_y \in s_y\}$ and define the lexical constraint as:

$$f^2(x, y; \omega_2) = \sum_k \alpha_{\omega_2}^k \mu(w_x^k, w_y^k)$$

which regularizes the probability of answer y in the same way as $f^1(x, y; \omega_1)$. α_{ω_2} is obtained similar to α_{ω_1}.

Predicate Constraint: Verbs (predicates) sometimes provide crucial semantic information. For example, in the *other neutral case* [16] irrelevant verbs may act as indicators of irrelevant events. (e.g. *"Who discovered Y. pestis?* vs. *"The Black Death was caused by a variant of Y. pestis.*).

Since it is difficult to explicitly define whether two verb sequences are semantic equivalent or different, we model the predicate constraint by a neural network as:

$$f^3(x, y; \omega_3) = F(v_x, v_y; \omega_3)$$

where v_x is the verb sequence in the input question x and v_y is the verb sequence in the answer sentence s_y ($y \in s_y$)[3].

The network F is expected to output a positive value for a semantic equivalent pair but a negative value for a semantic different pair. Consequently, $f^3(x, y; \omega_3)$ regularizes the answer distribution by decreasing the probability of extracting answers from irrelevant sentences.

C. Training Algorithm

Ganchev et al. [5] presented a min-max algorithm to optimize $\mathcal{J}(\theta, q)$ as follows:

$$E: \quad q^{t+1} = \arg\min_q KL(q(y)||p(y|x; \theta^t)) \tag{4}$$

$$M: \quad \theta^{t+1} = \arg\max_\theta E_{q^{t+1}}[\log p(y|x; \theta)] \tag{5}$$

Hu et al. [13] proposed a mutual distillation algorithm that transfers PR into optimization of neural networks. Following the mutual distillation algorithm, we can design the training objectives to update the RC model's parameters θ and the constraint functions' parameters $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$.

The RC model $p(y|x; \theta)$ at iteration t is updated with a distillation objective that balances fitting ground truth distribution g (one-hot) and imitating soft predictions of desired regularized distribution q^t with distillation parameter β:

$$\theta^{t+1} = \arg\max_\theta \frac{1}{N} \sum_i E_g[\log p(y|x_i; \theta)] + \beta * E_{q^t}[\log p(y|x_i; \theta)] \tag{6}$$

Inspecting the posterior regularization objective, $h(x, y; \omega) = \exp\{C \sum_l \lambda^l f^l(x, y; \omega_l)\}$ should be larger when y is ground truth. In previous work [13], it was considered as a "likelihood" metric w.r.t the observations and was optimized the same way as $p(*; \theta)$. In this work, we considered it as a "score" indicating whether the answer is reasonable or not. We labelled positive examples as $\log h^*(x, y) = 1$ and negative examples as $\log h^*(x, y) = -1$. Ground truths or semantic equivalent adversarial sentences

[3]A verb sequence is all the verbs in their original order in the sentence.

are regarded as positive examples, but irrelevant or semantic different adversarial sentences are marked as negative examples. The parameters of the constraint functions ω can be optimized using mean-square-error loss (MSE loss):

$$\omega^{t+1} = \arg\min_{\omega} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} (\log h(x_i, y_i; \omega) - \log h^*(x_i, y_i))^2 \tag{7}$$

As λ serves to balance different constraints, it is adjusted as follows:

$$\lambda^{t+1} = \arg\max_{\lambda} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} E_g[q(y|x_i; \lambda)] \tag{8}$$

Algorithm: Mutual Distillation

Input: data $\{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{N}$ and hyper-parameters C,β
1: Pretrain RC model $p(y|x;\theta)$
2: Initialize constraint functions $f(x, y; \omega)$ and weights λ
3: While not converged do:
4: Sample a minibatch (X,Y)
5: (E) Build the desired distribution:
$q^{t+1} = p^t \exp\{C \sum \lambda^t f(x, y; \omega^t)\}$
5: (M) Update θ with distillation objective Eq. 6
6: (M) Update ω with objective Eq. 7
and update λ with objective Eq. 8
8: End while
Output: Regularized model $q = p \exp\{C \sum \lambda f\}$

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Data Preparation

We prepared the SQuAD-Adv dataset which consists of original examples, semantic different adversarial (SDA) examples and semantic equivalent adversarial (SEA) examples. The original examples are randomly sampled from SQuAD1.1 to keep the size balanced with that of adversarial examples. SDA examples are randomly sampled from SQuAD-ADDSENT [15] and unanswerable questions in SQuAD2.0 [16]. We simply generated SEA examples by replacing the adjectives, adverbs, and noun phrases in questions or oracle sentences with their synonyms. The statistics of SQuAD-Adv are listed in Table I.

TABLE I: Statistics of SQuAD-Adv which consists of original, SDA, and SEA examples.

	#(Q,P,A) triples	#Original	#SDA	#SEA
Train	120,280	45,005	51,696	23,579
Test	23,603	9,981	8,032	5,590

We used NLTK[4] and spaCy[5] toolkits to extract entities, verbs, noun phrases, etc. The words/entities from a question and those from a sentence are paired. We then filtered irrelevant pairs in which two words/entities do not share similar types or contexts. We obtained the semantic relationship of each pair, such as *"1790s /r/IsA/ nineties"* and *"America /r/Synonym/ U.S."* using WordNet[6] and ConceptNet[7]. More details are presented in *Supplementary Material*.

B. Experiment Settings

We adopted open-source reproduction[8] of R-Net [34], Mnemonic Reader (MemReader) [10] and BERT [2] as the base models. The former two models are top performing models on SQuAD except those based on BERT. BERT introduced a large and empirically powerful language model pre-trained with massive data. It can be fine-tuned to create state-of-the-art models for various tasks including reading comprehension.

The weight networks $Att(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{s_y}; \omega)$ are used to decide the weights of entity/word pairs in constraint f^1 and f^2. They first apply bi-linear attention to input embeddings of sequence $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, ...x_m)$ and $\boldsymbol{s_y} = (y_1, .., y_n)$ and then obtain the weight of an entity/word pair by summing the attention scores of some tokens that are included in the pair. Concretely, if the two entities of one entity pair $(\boldsymbol{e_x^k}, \boldsymbol{e_y^k})$ are represented as $(\boldsymbol{e_x^k} = (x_{s_1}, .., x_{e_1}), \boldsymbol{e_y^k} = (y_{s_2}, .., y_{e_2}))$ respectively, the weights of the entity pair α^k can be calculated as follows:

$$o_i^x = Softmax(\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_j^T W_1 x_i)$$
$$o_i^y = Softmax(\sum_{j=1}^{m} x_j^T W_1 y_i)$$
$$\alpha^k = \sum_{i=s_1}^{e_1} o_i^x + \sum_{j=s_2}^{e_2} o_j^y$$

While the predicate constraint network $f^3 = F(\boldsymbol{v}_x, \boldsymbol{v}_y; \omega_3)$ adopts one LSTM layer and one feed-forward layer. Concretely, F receives two verb sequences and outputs a score as:

$$o^x = LSTM(\boldsymbol{v}_x; \omega_3)$$
$$o^y = LSTM(\boldsymbol{v}_y; \omega_3)$$
$$F(\boldsymbol{v_x}, \boldsymbol{v_y}; \omega_3) = tanh(W_3[o^x; o^y; o^x - o^y; o^x * o^y] + b_3)$$

If the base RC model is BERT, the base model adopts WordPiece embeddings [36] and constraint networks share randomly initialized word vectors. Otherwise, both base RC models and constraint networks use 300-dimension GloVe word embeddings [24] and we kept the pre-trained embeddings fixed during training. The dimension of hidden states of $LSTM(\omega_3)$ is set to 100. The dimensions of other parameters are $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{300\times300}$, $W_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times400}$ and $b_3 \in \mathbb{R}^1$. $f^l(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}; \omega)$ outputs a scalar for each input. We used Adam [18] optimizer.Regularization parameter is set as $C = 1$ and distillation parameter is set as $\beta = 0.005$.

We compared the following settings and methods to verify the effectiveness of our PR method:

Ori-Training: base RC models are trained with only original examples without any adversarial examples.

[4]http://www.nltk.org
[5]https://spacy.io
[6]NLTK WordNet interface: http://www.nltk.org/howto/wordnet.html
[7]http://conceptnet.io
[8]The open-source codes are available at: https://github.com/HKUST-KnowComp/MnemonicReader and https://github.com/huggingface/pytorch-pretrained-BERT

TABLE II: Performance comparison with different settings and on different test subsets. *Overall* means the original, SDA and SEA test examples are evaluated together.

Base Model	Train set	Method	Test set						Overall	
			Original		SDA		SEA			
			EM	F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM	F1
R-Net	Original	Ori-Training	**65.3**	**74.9**	30.9	37.9	54.4	65.1	51.0	60.0
	SQuAD-Adv	Adv-Training	59.2	68.3	57.3	65.6	52.8	63.0	57.1	66.1
		Feature-Input	60.1	69.7	57.5	63.3	53.9	64.4	57.7	66.3
		PR (ours)	61.4	69.8	**59.4**	**70.8**	**59.1**	**69.8**	**60.2**	**70.1**
MemReader	Original	Ori-Training	**66.8**	**76.5**	35.5	41.9	56.2	67.0	53.7	62.5
	SQuAD-Adv	Adv-Training	59.6	69.3	58.5	69.0	53.2	63.6	57.7	67.8
		Feature-Input	61.9	71.8	56.5	65.6	55.2	65.6	58.5	68.2
		PR (ours)	62.0	72.8	**66.7**	**72.4**	**58.7**	**69.7**	**62.8**	**71.9**
BERT-base	Original	Ori-Training	**73.2**	**82.7**	41.3	48.8	62.2	73.1	59.7	68.9
	SQuAD-Adv	Adv-Training	71.7	79.0	76.8	84.1	68.2	76.5	72.6	80.1
		Feature-Input	Not Applicable							
		PR (ours)	**73.1**	**82.8**	**77.4**	**85.7**	**71.2**	**80.8**	**74.1**	**83.3**

Adv-Training: base RC models are trained on SQuAD-Adv where both SDA and SEA examples are used in training.
Feature-Input: base RC models' inputs are concatenations of word vectors and feature vectors. For each word, its linguistic features such as entity type ("type=DATE") and POS-tag ("pos=NN") are extracted by the toolkit. The feature vector of one word will be formulated as $f(w) \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}$ where $|F|$ is the amount of features[9]. Each position $f_i(w)$ use $1/0$ to indicate a property feature like entity type or use a scalar to record a numerical feature like tf-idf. This is a practical method to utilize linguistic knowledge in RC models [10]. Feature-Input models are trained on SQuAD-Adv. Due to BERT specifies its input layers, Feature-Input method is only applied to R-Net and MemReader in the following experiments.
PR: our method regularizes base RC models with linguistic constraints via PR. PR models are also trained on SQuAD-Adv. Different from *Feature-Input*, *PR* utilizes linguistic knowledge in the output stage by adjusting the prediction distributions.

To predict unanswerable[10] questions, we padded the original document with an extra position (equal to index the answers' positions as -1 in BERT) to indicate "unanswerable". We adopted EM (Exact Match) and F1 score as evaluation metrics.

C. Main Results

For brevity, we presented the following comparisons with respect to the F1 metric of MemReader, but our statements also hold for the EM metric and other two base models.

First, we investigated whether linguistic constraints can benefit RC models.
(a-1) As shown in Table II, *Ori-Training* achieves good results on the original test examples[11], but its performance drops remarkably on both SDA (76.5→41.9) and SEA (76.5→67.0). These drops indicate that base RC models cannot handle the over-confidence issue (for SDA examples) or over-sensitivity issue (for SEA examples).
(a-2) Compared to other settings, *Ori-Training* performs best on the original test examples but has the worst overall performance because it overfits the original data and lacks of robustness to the adversarial data.
(b-1) *Adv-Training* obtains better overall performances compared to *Ori-Training* (62.5→67.8), showing that the model becomes more robust when trained with adversarial examples.
(b-2) Compared to *Ori-Training* , *Adv-Training* improves the performance on SDA examples (41.9→69.0) but degrades that on SEA examples (67.0→63.6). The inconsistency indicates *Adv-Training* cannot balance the over-confidence and over-sensitivity issues simultaneously.
(c) Compared to *Ori-/Adv-Training*, our *PR* method achieves the best overall performance (62.5/67.8 vs. 71.9), verifying the effectiveness of linguistic constraint regularization. Our method can improve the performance on SDA and SEA examples simultaneously, as the constraints account for two types of adversarial examples at the same time.
(d) Our *PR* method improves the robustness of both lightweight models (R-Net and MemReader) and the BERT model, manifesting the linguistic constraint regularization is a versatile method and has a positive effect for all the tested models.

Second, we compared the effect of different ways to incorporate linguistic knowledge. As shown in Table II, *PR* works more effectively than *Feature-Input* when faced with adversarial examples (SDA:65.6→72.4; SEA:65.6→69.7). **For one reason**, regularization on the output distribution is more straightforward than feeding traditional feature vectors into the input layer since the symbolic features may vanish after

[9]In our baselines, $|F| = 74$

[10]We found that most models learned the strategy to select the "unanswerable" positions. So we only evaluated with answerable SDA examples in our experiments.

[11]The scores differ from the original papers since we only sampled half of SQuAD1.1 examples for training and the test set is also different, but the codes we used can produce the results reported in the original papers on their own datasets.

TABLE III: Performance of Adv-Training (Adv-T) and PR models that were trained with only **SDA** examples.

Base Model	Method	Test			
		SDA		SEA	
		EM	F1	EM	F1
R-Net	Adv-T	54.7	65.1	41.1	51.7
	PR	65.4	71.8	**57.2**	**67.5**
MemReader	Adv-T	58.4	69.9	41.2	52.0
	PR	65.4	74.5	**57.8**	**68.4**
BERT-base	Adv-T	70.1	77.8	23.8	26.4
	PR	77.2	86.1	**53.6**	**66.1**

TABLE IV: Performance of Adv-Training (Adv-T) and PR models that were trained with only **SEA** examples.

Base Model	Method	Test			
		SDA		SEA	
		EM	F1	EM	F1
R-Net	Adv-T	26.7	33.4	57.9	67.9
	PR	**41.3**	**49.5**	58.2	69.1
MemReader	Adv-T	28.8	35.5	58.1	69.1
	PR	**49.0**	**55.9**	60.2	69.9
BERT-base	Adv-T	42.2	48.8	70.2	79.9
	PR	**69.8**	**77.2**	74.3	85.9

massive nonlinear operations in neural networks. **For another reason**, *PR* applies paired features, which are more informative than features assigned to individual words. For example, feature "1790s≠1780s" is more useful than features {"1790s /r/IsA/ DATE", "1780s /r/IsA/ DATE"}.

D. Cross Evaluation

As discussed above, *Adv-Training* models trained with both types of adversarial examples cannot cope with these two types at the same time. We further conducted experiments to verify whether a model trained with only one type of adversarial (e.g. SDA) examples is robust to the other type of adversarial (e.g. SEA) examples.

As shown in Table III, if trained with only SDA examples, the performance of *Adv-Training* drops remarkably from SDA test examples to SEA test examples (69.9→52.0). Moreover, *Adv-Training* performs even worse than *Ori-Training* on SEA examples (52.0 v.s. 67.0). Similarly, as shown in Table IV, if trained with only SEA examples, the performance of *Adv-Training* degrades substantially from SEA test examples to SDA test examples (69.1→35.5), and *Adv-Training* is even worse than *Ori-Training* when faced with unseen SDA examples (35.5 v.s. 41.9). The gap is even enlarged when it is applied to the BERT model. By contrast, *PR* performs much better than *Adv-Training* on those unseen cases with higher EM/F1 scores and smaller performance gaps between seen and unseen cases. Particularly for the BERT model trained on SDA examples where the powerful model may overfit the training data easily, *PR* can positively modulate the base RC model substantially (26.4→66.1).

These results reveal that *Adv-Training* mitigates one robustness issue however deteriorates the other issue. Though *Adv-Training* improves the robustness of a model, the effect of such a method relies heavily on the training data. Considering the larger gaps of BERT's results, where the BERT model leverages very large-scale data with pretraining, it is still insufficient to defend against different adversarial types. As SDA examples requires a model to be sensitive enough, while SEA examples requires a model to be confident, it is hard for data-driven models to handle the two cases simultaneously. By contrast, our *PR* method can handle unseen adversarial types with the help of external linguistic knowledge. The linguistic constraints are applicable to different types of adversarial examples, which consider more symbolic semantics instead of operate in embedding spaces.

E. Ablation Test

TABLE V: Ablation test to investigate the effect of different constraints.


	SDA		SEA	
	EM	F1	EM	F1
Adv-Training	58.5	69.0	53.2	63.6
(Full)PR	66.7	72.4	58.7	69.7
−Entity	62.3	71.0	57.1	67.4
−Lexical	62.5	71.6	56.2	66.5
−Predicate	65.4	71.8	58.3	69.2
Only Entity	61.9	70.5	56.0	66.3
Only Lexical	61.2	70.2	56.9	66.8
Only Predicate	58.8	66.3	52.9	63.3

We conducted ablation test to investigate the effect of each constraint. MemReader was chosen as the base model and it was evaluated on adversarial examples to discriminate between different constraints. Results in Table V show that:
First, the entity constraint and lexical constraint play more important roles in robustness than the predicate constraint. On one hand, adversarial examples violating the former two constraints are observed more frequently than those violating the predicate constraint in our data. On the other hand, determining SEA and SDA examples via entity/lexical constraints is more straightforward and precise than predicate constraint. **Second**, models with more constraints perform better than those with less constraints: three constraints (Full) $>$ two constraints ($-*$) $>$ single constraint (Only *) $>$ no constraint (Adv-Training). When more constraints are adopted, the performance is better since more adversarial phenomena [16] are captured.


F. Case Study and Error Analysis

We demonstrated here how the constraint weight works in our model via case studies. We also conducted error analysis on failure cases to give insights on the method's behavior.

For the SDA example in Fig. 4, our model correctly identifies the most important entity pair ("Prussia≠Warsaw")



(a) SDA



(b) SEA

Fig. 4: Entity/Word pairs and corresponding weights in SDA and SEA examples. Adversarial pairs (in bold text) were successfully identified by external knowledge and derived expected constraint values f^l. Note that λ^l is only specific to the constraint type thus identical across different question-sentence pairs.

and obtains a negative f^1 value which suppresses the probability of wrong answer *"1313"*. As for the SEA example, our model successfully identifies the adversarial substitution ("television=TV" and "prizes=awards"). The model then derives a positive f^2 value to increase the probability of the correct answer.

In spite of successfully answering these adversarial examples, data processing is still insufficient in our model. As shown in Fig. 4, pairs like "history vs. historical" are excluded because we merely compared words with the same POS tags. Verb phrase "dates back to" and the key entity "Doctor Who" are not identified by the data processing toolkit either.

To analyze how the quality of data processing affects the performance, we sampled 100 error cases for manual annotation. The reasons why our model failed to answer these adversarial examples broadly fall into the following categories:

(a) For 28% examples, the model failed to extract basic verbs, adjectives, etc, and thus had no constraint features. For examples, passive voice "be colonized" cannot be tagged as a verb. Improving these examples needs more precise tools.

(b) For 31% examples, the model failed to group words as an entity like "15 June 1520", and thus had wrong pairs. Improving these examples needs more rules or better tools in data processing.

(c) For 12% examples, the model failed to find the correct relationship of a pair, and thus obtained wrong f values. Improving these examples needs larger knowledge bases.

(d) For 29% examples, wrong predictions were just due to the deficiency of models. Better base models and more constraints may benefit these examples.

V. Conclusion

This paper studies two robustness issues existing in current machine reading comprehension models: over-confidence and over-sensitivity. To address these two issues simultaneously, we leverage external linguistic knowledge to impose three linguistic constraints (entity constraint, lexical constraint, and predicate constraint) on the answer distribution via posterior regularization. Experiments demonstrate that our method improves the robustness of reading comprehension models, and it is better to cope with these two types of adversarial examples simultaneously.

Appendix A
Data Processing

We present the details of data processing in this section. To obtain the linguistic constraints, we have two steps: the first step is to obtain the entity set (entities), the word set (adjectives, adverbs, noun phrases) and the verb sequence (verbs in original order) for each sentence. The second step is to obtain paired entities and words from the entity or word sets of the two sentences.

The first step has the following procedure: **Firstly**, We use NLTK and spaCy toolkits to tokenize a sentence, and then obtain the POS tag and entity type of each word in the sentence. **Secondly**, the following rules are applied to decide which set (the entity set, word set, or verb sequence) a word belongs to:

- Discard a word if its POS tag is in set {'PDT', 'POS', 'PRP', 'PRP$', 'RP', 'CD', 'EX'}.
- Add a word to the entity set if it has an entity type given by spaCy.
- Add a word to the verb sequence if its POS tag is VB*.
- Add a word to the word set if its POS tag is JJ* or RB*.
- If a word's POS tag is NN*, we first obtain a noun phrases (e.g., 'train station') by merging the word with its adjacent words which have the same POS tag, and then add the phrase to the word set.

The second step is to obtain entity or word pairs from the entity and word sets for the input question x and sentence s_y. This process is mainly based on the semantic relationship between two words or two entities. The procedure is as follows: **Firstly**, each item (a word or a phrase) in the word

set of the question x is paired with each in that of the sentence s_y. The same process is applied to the entity sets of x and s_y. **Secondly**, for each entity or word pair, we decide its semantic relationship sequentially as follows:

- If the two items in this pair have different POS tags or entity types, such as ("hot","city") and ("1949","America"), the pair is treated as irrelevant and discarded.
- For each item in the pair, We extract a contextual word set from a sentence with a 10-word window. If the number of overlapping words in the two contextual word sets is less than 3, the pair is treated as irrelevant and discarded.
- If the two items in this pair are exactly the same, or are defined as synonyms in WordNet, or have relationships like /r/IsA/ and /r/RelatedTo/ according to ConceptNet, the pair is judged as semantic equivalent.
- For an entity pair, we additionally obtain abbreviations by concatenating initials with "." like "United State→U.S.". If one entity's abbreviation is the same as the other entity, the pair is judged as semantic equivalent.
- If the two items differ in negative prefix such as "(unbalanced, balanced), (possible, impossible)", the pair is judged as semantic different.
- If the two items are defined as antonyms in WordNet, or have /r/Not* relationship according to ConceptNet, the pair is judged as semantic different.
- For an entity pair, if the two items are different and this pair is not judged as semantic equivalent before, we judge it as semantic different.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2018YFC0830200), and partly by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No.61876096/61332007). The authors would like to thank all the workers who help us to annotate sampled data. Mantong Zhou would like to acknowledge Dr.Yao Xiao and Yijie Zhang for fruitful discussions and data preparation.

REFERENCES

[1] Christopher Clark and Matt Gardner. Simple and effective multi-paragraph reading comprehension. *meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, 1:845–855, 2018.

[2] Jacob Devlin, Mingwei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. 2018.

[3] Shi Feng, Eric Wallace, Alvin Grissom II, Mohit Iyyer, Pedro Rodriguez, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Pathologies of neural models make interpretations difficult. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3719–3728, 2018.

[4] Kuzman Ganchev and Dipanjan Das. Cross-lingual discriminative learning of sequence models with posterior regularization. *EMNLP*, pages 1996–2006, 2013.

[5] Kuzman Ganchev, Jennifer Gillenwater, Ben Taskar, et al. Posterior regularization for structured latent variable models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Jul):2001–2049, 2010.

[6] Yifan Gao, Lidong Bing, Piji Li, Irwin King, and Michael R Lyu. Generating distractors for reading comprehension questions from real examinations. *AAAI*, 2019.

[7] Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *international conference on learning representations*, 2015.

[8] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. *ICML*, 2017.

[9] Felix Hill, Antoine Bordes, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. The goldilocks principle: Reading children's books with explicit memory representations. *ICLR*, 2016.

[10] Minghao Hu, Yuxing Peng, Zhen Huang, Xipeng Qiu, Furu Wei, and Ming Zhou. Reinforced mnemonic reader for machine reading comprehension. *international joint conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 4099–4106, 2018.

[11] Minghao Hu, Furu Wei, Yuxing Peng, Zhen Huang, Nan Yang, and Dongsheng Li. Read + verify: Machine reading comprehension with unanswerable questions. *national conference on artificial intelligence*, 2019.

[12] Zhiting Hu, Xuezhe Ma, Zhengzhong Liu, Eduard H Hovy, and Eric P Xing. Harnessing deep neural networks with logic rules. *meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, 1:2410–2420, 2016.

[13] Zhiting Hu, Zichao Yang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Eric Xing. Deep neural networks with massive learned knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1670–1679, 2016.

[14] Mohit Iyyer, John Wieting, Kevin Gimpel, and Luke S Zettlemoyer. Adversarial example generation with syntactically controlled paraphrase networks. *north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics*, 1:1875–1885, 2018.

[15] Robin Jia and Percy Liang. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2021–2031. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017.

[16] Robin Jia, Pranav Rajpurkar, and Percy Liang. Know what you dont know: Unanswerable questions for squad. *meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, 2:784–789, 2018.

[17] Divyansh Kaushik and Zachary C. Lipton. How much reading does reading comprehension require? a critical investigation of popular benchmarks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5010–5015. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018.

[18] Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *ICLR*, 2015.

[19] Tomas Kocisky, Jonathan Schwarz, Phil Blunsom, Chris Dyer, Karl Moritz Hermann, Gabor Melis, and Edward Grefenstette. The narrativeqa reading comprehension challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:317–328, 2018.

[20] Omer Levy, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Luke S Zettlemoyer. Zero-shot relation extraction via reading comprehension. *conference on computational natural language learning*, pages 333–342, 2017.

[21] Shike Mei, Jun Zhu, and Jerry Zhu. Robust regbayes: Selectively incorporating first-order logic domain knowledge into bayesian models. In Eric P. Xing and Tony Jebara, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 32 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 253–261, Bejing, China, 22–24 Jun 2014. PMLR.

[22] Sewon Min, Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Efficient and robust question answering from minimal context over documents. *meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, 1:1725–1735, 2018.

[23] Pramod Kaushik Mudrakarta, Ankur Taly, Mukund Sundararajan, and Kedar Dhamdhere. Did the model understand the question. *meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, 1:1896–1906, 2018.

[24] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *EMNLP*, pages 1532–1543, 2014.

[25] Gabriel Pereyra, George Tucker, Jan Chorowski, Lukasz Kaiser, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Regularizing neural networks by penalizing confident output distributions. *ICLR*, 2017.

[26] Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *EMNLP*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas, November 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[27] Shuo Ren, Zhirui Zhang, Shujie Liu, Ming Zhou, and Shuai Ma. Unsupervised neural machine translation with smt as posterior regularization. *national conference on artificial intelligence*, 2019.

[28] Marco Tulio De Freitas Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. Semantically equivalent adversarial rules for debugging nlp models. *ACL*, 1:856–865, 2018.

[29] Fu Sun, Linyang Li, Xipeng Qiu, and Yang Liu. U-net: Machine reading comprehension with unanswerable questions. 2018.

[30] Christian Szegedy, Vincent Vanhoucke, Sergey Ioffe, Jonathon Shlens, and Zbigniew Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer

vision. *computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2818–2826, 2016.

[31] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian J Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *international conference on learning representations*, 2014.

[32] Zaremba Wojciech Sutskever Ilya Bruna Joan Erhan Dumitru Goodfellow Ian J. Szegedy, Christian and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *ICLR*, 2014.

[33] Jiuniu Wang, Xingyu Fu, Guangluan Xu, Yirong Wu, Ziyan Chen, Yang Wei, and Li Jin. A3net:adversarial-and-attention network for machine reading comprehension. *international conference natural language processing*, pages 64–75, 2018.

[34] Wenhui Wang, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, Baobao Chang, and Ming Zhou. Gated self-matching networks for reading comprehension and question answering. 1:189–198, 2017.

[35] Yicheng Wang and Mohit Bansal. Robust machine comprehension models via adversarial training. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 575–581. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018.

[36] Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. Googles neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. sep 2016.

[37] Bishan Yang and Claire Cardie. Context-aware learning for sentence-level sentiment analysis with posterior regularization. In *Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2014.

[38] Jiacheng Zhang, Yang Liu, Huanbo Luan, Jingfang Xu, and Maosong Sun. Prior knowledge integration for neural machine translation using posterior regularization. 2018.

[39] Li Zhao, Minlie Huang, Ziyu Yao, Rongwei Su, Yingying Jiang, and Xiaoyan Zhu. Semi-supervised multinomial naive bayes for text classification by leveraging word-level statistical constraint. In *AAAI*, pages 2877–2884, 2016.