arXiv:1912.05957v4 [cs.CL] 23 Oct 2023

Highlights

Text as Environment: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Text Readability Assessment Model

Hamid Mohammadi, Seyed Hossein Khasteh, Tahereh Firoozi, Taha Samavati

- Self-attention's computational load grows quadratically with input size
- Transformers can be mathematically modeled as dynamic integral transforms
- Domain decomposition method can reduce transformer's computational complexity
- Reinforcement learning can be used for domain decomposition for transformers

Text as Environment: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Text Readability Assessment Model

Hamid Mohammadi[a], Seyed Hossein Khasteh[b], Tahereh Firoozi[c], Taha Samavati[d]

[a]*Computer Engineering Department, Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Tehran, Iran*
[b]*Computer Engineering Department, K.N. Toosi University of Technology, Tehran, Tehran, Iran*
[c]*Measurement, Evaluation, and Data Science (MEDS), University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada*
[d]*School of Computer Engineering, University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Tehran, Iran*

Abstract

Evaluating the readability of a text can significantly facilitate the precise expression of information in written form. The formulation of text readability assessment involves the identification of meaningful properties of the text regardless of its length. Sophisticated features and models are used to evaluate the comprehensibility of texts accurately. Despite this, the problem of assessing texts' readability efficiently remains relatively untouched. The efficiency of state-of-the-art text readability assessment models can be further improved using deep reinforcement learning models. Using a hard attention-based ***active inference*** technique, the proposed approach makes efficient use of input text and computational resources. Through the use of semi-supervised signals, the reinforcement learning model uses the minimum amount of text in order to determine text's readability. A comparison of the model on Weebit and Cambridge Exams with state-of-the-art models, such as the BERT text readability model, shows that it is capable of achieving state-of-the-art accuracy with a significantly smaller amount of input text than other models.

Keywords: Text Readability, Deep Reinforcement Learning, Transformer, Active Inference

1. Introduction

Text, as a prevalent form of communication, has a fundamental role in conveying knowledge and information between humans. Nevertheless, not all texts are equally intelligible and understandable for all people. It is, therefore, vital to measure the readability of written information in order to ensure its clarity and understandability. The significance of this measurement is apparent from its applications in different fields such as education [1, 2], medical instructions [3, 4, 5, 6, 7], social media communications [8, 9, 10], marketing and advertising [11, 12], and in some related fields of research like text simplification [13, 14, 15, 7].

As early as the 1940s, attempts were made to quantify the readability of text manually by reading experts. In order for such an evaluation to be standardized or globally accurate, researchers like Flesch [16] have developed formulas for measuring the readability of texts. The readability formulas use simple and manually calculable properties of the text, such as the number of syllables, words, or sentences in the text, to assess its readability. Even today, these formulas have remained very popular and are still used by many people around the world.

Using heuristics and hand-made mathematical relations, the readability formulas are designed to assess the level of readability of texts in a particular language. As a result, they are usually low in accuracy and language-dependent. To compensate for the deficiencies of readability formulas, advanced and accurate readability assessment methods use machine learning techniques. Due to their use of NLP features and machine intelligence, these models can identify a proper level of readability based on extracted features. As such, these models represent a significant improvement over traditional readability formulas, providing much more accurate assessments of text complexity. Models proposed by Vajjala and Meurers [17], Xia et al. [18], and Mohammadi and Khasteh [19] are examples of state-of-the-art models for their target languages and target audience. In these models, Support Vector Machines (SVM) are trained on complex and extensive feature sets extracted from related datasets. However, due to language-specific NLP features, these models can be challenging to implement and are highly language-dependent. As a result, these models require significant pre-processing and language-specific NLP feature engineering to ensure accurate and successful implementation. This has led to the use of transformers Vaswani et al. [20] for natural language understanding and, therefore, text readability assessment.

BERT is one of the most commonly used transformers in NLP applications, enabling state-of-the-art accuracy with minimal training data. Automating feature extraction with transformers has facilitated SOTA accuracy in various NLP applications and enabled multilingual models to be built efficiently.

It is not necessary to consider the entire length of the text when assessing its readability. For example, reading a fraction of a text can provide a general view of the text's readability for human assessors. It is surprising that previous approaches have not utilized this possibility to reduce computation load by efficiently processing the smallest amount of input. An improved variant of the BERT model is presented here that is based on reinforcement learning. This model can predict the readability of text using less than half the text's length. A reinforcement learning model is combined with a pretrained BERT in this model to form ***active inference***. Input text can be perceived within a window of several adjacent words by the model. To view further parts of the text, the model's actions could move the hard attention window. As a result of the model's ability to intelligently choose which portion of the text is to be perceived, it is possible to determine the minimal amount of content to be read to determine the readability of the text.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 discusses the previous attempts to automate the readability assessment task in detail. Section 3 presents the proposed model and describes its architecture. Later, section 4 reviews the experiment results, and section 5 explains the advantages and disadvantages of the presented model. The last section states the main contributions of this study and potential future works.

2. Related Works

The text readability literature can be divided into four main categories: traditional formulas, machine learning models with hand-crafted features, deep learning models, and transformer models. The increasing complexity of models in each category improved the text readability models' accuracy, data efficiency, feature richness, and multi-lingual capabilities.

Flesch-Kincaid grade level [16] can be named as one of the English language's earliest and most utilized readability formulas. The Flesch-Kincaid readability formula uses only the average number of words per sentence and the average number of syllables per word to evaluate text readability. The Flesch-Kincaid formula can be seen in Equation 1.

$$Flesch\text{-}Kincaid\ GradeLevel = 0.39 \cdot \frac{|words|}{|sentences|} + 11.8 \cdot \frac{|syllables|}{|words|} - 15.59 \quad (1)$$

With advances in automated computations, readability assessment applications utilize extracted and computer-calculated features. Lexile [21] and the work of Collins-Thompson and Callan [22] used word-frequency and language models, respectively. It has been found that statistical models can be utilized to improve the accuracy of text readability assessment models. Formulas using traditional methods are simple to implement and require limited computational resources. In spite of these advantages, these methods are low in accuracy and have a significant difference between the results and human judgments [23, 24, 25, 26]. Due to the fact that these formulas are specially designed for a particular language, they cannot be applied to assess the readability of texts in other languages. Short text applications are also incompatible with these formulas, which are prevalent on social media and the web these days [27].

Using machine learning models, researchers have created a more accurate and comprehensive system for assessing text readability that overcomes the shortcomings of traditional formulas. Assessment of text readability can be viewed either as a regression problem or as a classification problem. However, studies have shown increased accuracy and applicability of text readability assessment as a classification task [28]. Among the primary advantages of machine learning models are their use of many features (naive or sophisticated) and their automated ability to learn how the features interact with readability levels, which makes them more popular than traditional formulas [29]. Models are only as good as the features they include, which makes choosing features crucial. Simple features, such as the average number of characters or syllables in words, the average number of words in sentences, the number of sentences in a text, and simple statistical language models were features used in early machine learning models for text readability assessment like works presented in [25, 30]. The use of syntactical features [31], and cohesive features [32] also supported the realization of models with higher accuracy. However, by restricting machine learning models to predefined features, it is impossible to extract and use subtle features that were not designed by NLP experts. To address this limitation, recent works have

proposed techniques for automatically extracting features from unstructured texts, enabling more accurate models and providing a more efficient way to extract knowledge from text.

"Attention is all you need" is the slogan of the next generation of natural language understanding models [20]. The BERT model, a prominent model within the transformer family, incorporates self-attention and unsupervised transfer learning to improve many NLP tasks [33]. Transformer models are able to understand long-term temporal dependencies by using soft attention as encoder layers. In addition, the use of arbitrary tasks to pre-train transformers increases their zero-shot and few-shot learning abilities [33]. As compared to previous approaches to text analysis, transformers offer an unattainable advantage over previous approaches as transformers could benefit from large corpora of unlabeled text for pre-training. Based on the results of this paper, pre-trained BERTs can be fine-tuned and adapted to text readability problems. Transformers, however, have a limited input size as one of their constraints. By utilizing truncation, pre-trained transformers are applied to texts of different sizes. In addition, truncating a long text to fit the transformer's input size limits the perceived information since part of the text must be removed. Furthermore, in practical GPU implementations of transformers, applying a model to texts of uneven size wastes computational resources since excess parameters still need to be stored for efficient computation. Zero-padding and feature concatenation are naive approaches to adding flexible input sizes to transformers. Further, it is difficult to determine how much of the text needs to be processed to extract relevant and sufficient data. This paper proposes a method of optimally processing the minimum length of text to capture the necessary information required for text readability assessment.

Reinforcement learning can be considered a semi-supervised approach to machine learning. The ability to learn from partially labeled data makes reinforcement learning particularly useful for NLP. Hence, there is a trend in using reinforcement learning models in NLP tasks such as machine translation [34, 35, 36, 37], sentence simplification [38], text summarization [39, 40, 41], dialogue generation [42, 43], question answering [44, 45, 46], and text generation [47, 48]. Moreover, deep reinforcement learning models can help to fuse the advantages of reinforcement learning and deep learning so as to produce more accurate and efficient models for NLP tasks. Specifically, deep reinforcement learning could be used to develop hard-attention abilities. By incorporating hard-attention abilities, deep reinforcement learning models

would be able to effectively identify and exploit the most relevant information from a given dataset, resulting in improved performance on NLP tasks. The main drawback of soft attention is the fast-growing computational load that makes them inefficient when processing large sequences of text. In contrast, hard-attention models reduce the size and computations of their models by decreasing the amount of information they process during each step [49]. Through ***active inference***, these models are able to intelligently focus on specific parts of a text that carry more valuable information for their tasks. Despite some drawbacks of deep reinforcement learning models, such as training instability, these models can achieve higher efficiency in NLP tasks in comparison to soft-attention deep learning models.

We utilize reinforcement learning to optimize transformer-based text processing for texts of varying lengths. This approach combines the power of transformers, BERT in particular, with the ***active inference*** ability of reinforcement learning models. The following sections discuss the proposed model in detail and compare it with standard approaches using technical evaluations of the readability datasets.

3. Proposed Approach

The self-attention mechanism computations grow exponentially with increasing input size [50]. To show the relationship between input size and computational load, transformers can be mathematically modeled as dynamic integral transforms [50]. Equation 2 shows the formulation of the self-attention coefficient.

$$A_{i\cdot} = \frac{e^{(QK^\intercal/\sqrt{d})_{i\cdot}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{p} e^{(QK^\intercal/\sqrt{d})_{ij}}} := Softmax(q_i K^\intercal/\sqrt{d}) \tag{2}$$

Where $A_{i\cdot}$ is the attention coefficient computed for the token at the ith position considering a total of p tokens, the Q and K are query and key values, and the q_i is the query computed for the jth token. Finally, d is the embedding dimensions. The time complexity of Equation 2 is $O(n^4)$ [50]. The growth rate of the self-attention mechanism makes it costly to apply to lengthy sequences. An empirical evaluation of the growth of the BERT model's latency relative to the input sequence length is presented in Table 1.

The Domain Decomposition Method (DDM) is a method for simplifying and solving integral equations. Essentially, DDM is a method for dividing

Table 1: BERT model latency with different input sequence lengths and batch sizes on an Intel Xeon Platinum 8275 CPU (48 cores/96 threads) and using Tensorflow framework [51].

Batch size	Seq. Length (token)	Latency (ms)
16	512	5,747
	256	1,663
	128	701
	64	473
32	512	11,800
	256	3,765
	128	1,518
	64	747
128	512	41,311
	256	13,562
	128	6,513
	64	3,065

a vector space into sub-spaces so that solvers can calculate the solution to each sub-problem more quickly. DDM is similar to the divide and conquer concept in computational algorithms. To reduce the computational requirement for accurate text classification, this study applies a DDM-like solution of dividing the problem domain into manageable sub-problems. According to [50], the self-attention layer can be roughly described using an integral transform formulation. The integral transform form for a self-attention layer in Equation 3 produces a Fredholm-like formulation for self-attention based on a kernel approximation.

$$z(x) \approx \frac{1}{\sum_{l=1}^{d}(e^{q_i K^{\intercal}/\sqrt{d}})_l} \int_{\omega} \tilde{\kappa}(x, x^{'}) v(x^{'}) d\mu(x^{'}) \tag{3}$$

Where $\tilde{\kappa}(x, x^{'})$ is the kernel approximation of the self-attention coefficient computed for two input tokens, $v(x^{'})$ is the linear projection of the token, and $\mu(x^{'})$ is the Borel function which is required for the conversion of the self-attention formulation into a continuous space. In this study, a **R**einforcement learning-based **A**ctive **I**nference **T**ransformer (**RAIT**) model

is proposed that uses DDM to reduce the computational cost of text classification using transformers. RAIT differs from the standard DDM method in two main ways. Firstly, in DDM, all sub-problems are solved and utilized in forming the global solution. However, this study uses machine learning optimization to avoid the computation of all sub-problems by selecting the minimal set of sub-domains required to solve the global problem. Secondly, in a standard DDM, the global solution is computed by combining the sub-domain solutions via an auxiliary coarse problem. Yet, in this study, the global combination of sub-solutions is achieved using a learned policy in RL agent training. By converting a problem into an expected reward formulation, a problem can be framed as a reinforcement learning problem. Equation 4 illustrates the general framework for expected rewards.

$$G_t = R_{t+1} + \gamma R_{t+2} + \gamma^2 R_{t+3} + \cdots = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1} \tag{4}$$

In Equation 4, G_t is the cumulative discounted reward, R_t is the reward observed at time-step t, and γ is the discount value. You can assign rewards for changing your attention window and selecting a class. Using G_t general modeling of the desired task output (here: maximum accuracy with minimal computation), the Bellman equation can present an abstract global aggregation function for the custom DDM. The modified DDM is formulated as a state-value estimation problem in Equation 5 and state-action value estimation problems in Equation 6.

$$\upsilon_\pi(s) = E_\pi \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1} | S_t = z(x_{t+k+1}) \right] \tag{5}$$

$$q_\pi(s, a) = E_\pi \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1} | S_t = z(x_{t+k+1}), A_t = a) \right] \tag{6}$$

The $z(x)$ function replaces the S_t, which is the state representation at the time-step t. In other words, to reduce the problem's computational complexity, it is converted into a partially observable environment using reinforcement learning-based hard attention. Thus, the global solution is computed by solving only a small number of sub-domain problems. Evaluations presented in this paper demonstrate that this method reduces computational complexity without affecting the model's end-to-end accuracy.

3.1. Active Inference

Text is observed by the RAIT model using a text crop function. Crop function coordinates are derived from their internal state. As a first step, the internal state is initialized by focusing on the beginning of the text. The crop function's coordinates are updated in the next steps according to the RL agent's actions. The crop function's length (number of words to keep) could also be modified to adjust the trade-off between computational cost and accuracy. The evaluations in section 4 show the relationship between crop size and the model's accuracy.

The texts are encoded using a BERT encoder [20], and the produced representations are fed into the RL agent during training. The size of the crop function determines BERT encoder embedding sequence length. As demonstrated by Equation 6, reducing the crop size reduces the computation required by the BERT encoder by reducing the number of words included in the self-attention correlation matrix. The BERT encoder produces a fixed-size vector of 768 dimensions. Therefore, the reinforcement learning agent's network architecture does not depend on crop size.

The reinforcement learning agent learns to predict text's category while observing a minimal set of text-window representations. The deep reinforcement learning agent is trained end-to-end with the BERT encoder using Q learning loss. Consequently, the negative reward for changing the crop function coordinates and the positive reward for correctly predicting the text's category are propagated using the error gradient through the DRL agent and the BERT encoder. Due to the discrete nature of the problem's formulation and the data efficiency of off-policy methods, a DQN is chosen for this study.

The agent's actions can be divided into two categories. During the "see more" action, the crop function coordinates are changed programmatically so that the next text window can be loaded. The next cycle of text encoding and agent decision-making begins with this action. The "select class" action, on the other hand, terminates the classification loop. This action, which consists of multiple output nodes corresponding to the number of possible classes, selects the text's category based on the text windows observed up to this point.

3.2. Model Training

The model is rewarded for its interactions with partially observable textual environments in two ways. Firstly, negative rewards (-0.1) are given for changes in window position to encourage the model to take the smallest

number of steps. Secondly, the model can observe a positive (+1) or negative (-1) reward for choosing a readability level for the intended text by picking one of the readability classes. A visual depiction of model interaction with the textual environment is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The interactions of the RAIT model with the text readability environment. BERT representations of words in the attention window act as the RL agent's observation. The agent decides to continue the observation or select the text's class based on observations and rewards.




Figure 2: The classification process of the RAIT model. The crop text function is initialized to capture the left-most window at first. The RL agent's subsequent actions determine the crop window's future location. The processing loop is terminated when the RL agent selects a class for the input text.

At each training step, the loss of the model is calculated using the Q learning equation (Equations 7 and 8). Since deep reinforcement learning models are prone to divergence, a method called double Q network learning [52] is applied to stabilize the process. For each state-action pair, the target Q value is computed using a frozen instance of the main model to avoid oscillations. As soon as the predefined training steps have been completed, the frozen network, which is called the target network, is replaced by a new copy of the main Q network.

$$Q(z(x_t), a_t) = Q(z(x_t), a_t) + \alpha \left[r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_a Q(z(x_{t+1}), a) - Q(s_t, a_t) \right] \tag{7}$$

$$loss = \left(r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_a Q(z(x_{t+1}), a) - Q(z(x_t), a_t) \right)^2 \tag{8}$$

Deep reinforcement learning models demand numerous interactions with their environment to be sufficiently trained. To overcome this problem and further stabilize the learning process, a technique called experience replay [53] is used in the current study. During its training process, the DRL model is fed multiple times with $(current - state, action, reward, next - state)$ tuples containing its previous interactions with the environment. The reintroduction of previous experiences to the model increases data usage efficiency and prevents the model from forgetting older experiences. Additional hyperparameters are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Hyperparameters of the RAIT model.

Hyperparameter	**Value**
Main network learning rate	2e−5
Number of training episodes	2.5e5
Target network update frequency	5 episodes
Experience buffer size	1000
Q learning discount factor	0.99
Exploration policy	$\epsilon - greedy$
Initial action randomness	100%
Final action randomness	10%

4. Experiments

Using ***active inference***, the proposed method effectively decreases the computational cost of transformer-based text readability assessment models. Mathematically, the suggested method reduces computational costs by utilizing a smaller self-attention perception field than a standard transformer. A comparison of the RAIT model with standard baselines in text readability

assessment is presented in this section to demonstrate that it is effective at reducing the computing requirements of text readability assessment without significantly adversely affecting accuracy at the end-to-end level.

4.1. Datasets

RAIT is evaluated using two text readability datasets. Firstly, the Weebit dataset [17] is used to assess the model's accuracy in deciding the readability of English texts for native readers. Weebit is gathered from articles in the Weekly Reader magazine and BBC-Bitesize, which are targeted at readers of different ages. There are five different readability levels in the Weebit dataset arranged by age (8-9, 9-10, 10-12, 12-14, 14-16). More than ten thousand texts are included in the dataset. In addition to the Weebit dataset, RAIT is applied to the Cambridge Exams dataset [18] in order to assess its English as a second language readability. This dataset's text comes from the Cambridge English Exams reading section, which targets students at five CEFR levels (A2 to C2). In comparison to the Weebit dataset, the Cambridge dataset contains only 331 texts. Details about the datasets can be found on Table 3.

Table 3: Number of texts and length of texts at each readability level before balancing.

Dataset	**Class**	**# texts**	**Avg. # words/text**
Weebit [17]	8-9	629	150
	9-10	789	189
	10-12	807	289
	12-14	646	238
	14-16	7615	347
	total	10486	311
Cambridge [18]	A2	64	139
	B1	60	268
	B2	71	613
	C1	67	768
	C2	69	752
	total	331	519

According to Table 3, the Cambridge dataset is fairly balanced, while the Weebit dataset has extreme imbalance in its fifth class (14-16). A large difference in data point counts between classes can lead to imbalanced learning

problems. Therefore, similarly to Weebit's original paper [17], a total of 3145 texts are used for evaluation purposes.

4.2. Baselines

Common baselines and state-of-the-art models are implemented to evaluate the presented model comprehensively. Transformers, led by the BERT model, have dominated natural language processing. A comparison between RAIT and the BERT model evaluates the accuracy of the method when compared to the current state-of-the-art in-text readability models. Moreover, Word2Vec-based ConvLSTM models act as their low-computation, low-accuracy counterparts to demonstrate the superior accuracy of the proposed method at a low computation cost.

4.2.1. Convolutional-LSTM

The Word2Vec ConvLSTM [54] is a sequence classification model. The vector space representation of words in the input text window is combined to form a 2-dimensional view of the input text (1-dimensional Word2Vec $\times$ 1-dimensional text). In the ConvLSTM model, convolutional layers act as feature extraction modules, encoding information as a window embedding from the input. In order to create a text embedding, the window embeddings are aggregated using LSTM layers. Therefore, ConvLSTM operates as a Text2Vec model. A supervised cross-entropy loss feeds the convolutional backbone and LSTM layers with their learning signals. The architecture of the ConvLSTM-based text readability assessment model can be found in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The architecture of the ConvLSTM model. The Word2Vec representation sequence is fed to the convolutional backbone for feature extraction. With the help of an LSTM layer, the extracted features for each word are aggregated into a text-level feature. Finally, an MLP classifies the aggregated features according to their readability.

4.2.2. BERT

Considering the BERT model's unprecedented and excellent results in several NLP tasks, it is exciting to see BERT's accuracy on the text readability assessment task. The BERT model was trained on a large-scale corpus,

and its deep learning architecture allows it to capture the subtle nuances of language. Thus, it is expected to provide highly accurate readability assessments, as it can detect and model the complexities of a text. The implemented BERT-based text readability assessment model works by classifying the text representations generated by a fine-tuned BERT model from the texts in each dataset [33]. Similarly, RAIT also relies on the BERT model as a backbone, but the fine-tuning process is done by the RL loss and through the agent's interaction with the textual environment. In this study, the BERT base model is used, which has approximately 110 million parameters [33].

4.3. Results

Datasets are divided into two parts, 80 percent as the training dataset and 20 percent as the testing dataset. The datasets are bootstrapped to ensure their validity and stability. Comparative analyses are conducted with different window sizes applied to the models in order to demonstrate the model's ability to accurately and efficiently predict text readability. Benchmark models also use limited window sizes of 256, 128, and 64 words in addition to the full text as input. Each model's perception is therefore limited to the first N words in a text. The defined window sizes are used in training and evaluating all three models. We train models with different hyperparameters, and we report the results that are obtained with the best hyperparameters. Table 4 compares some of the recently published models for English text readability on the Weebit [17] and Cambridge [18] readability datasets with BERT.

Table 4: Model accuracy comparison on the Weebit [17] and Cambridge [18] readability datasets.

Model	**Weebit [17]**	**Cambridge [18]**	**Design**
Vajjala and Meurers [17]	93.3%	-	SML (SVM) + hand-crafted features
ConvLSTM [54]	74.4%	76.3%	Convolutional NN + LSTM
Xia et al. [18]	-	**80.3%**	SML (SVM) + hand-crafted features
Fujinuma and Hagiwara [55]	-	79.6%	Graph Convolutional Network
Qiu et al. [56]	87.3%	78.5%	Graph NN + Transformer
Li et al. [57]	92.7%	-	Transformer + hand-crafter features
Jian et al. [58]	89.1%	-	Convolutional NN + Pooling
BERT [33]	**94.3%**	76.1%	Transformer

Table 4 demonstrates BERT's superior accuracy (94.3%) on the Weebit dataset. The second-best accuracy on this dataset is achieved by the SVM

model proposed by Vajjala and Meurers [17] which uses hand-crafted features. Additionally, the original model proposed by Xia et al. [18] achived state-of-the-art accuracy (80.3%) on the Cambridge dataset. However, SVM-based models require the design and implementation of hand-crafted features which is costly, and limits the generalizability of the model across languages and tasks. As a result, despite the speed and accuracy of traditional models, deep learning- and transformer-based models are more widely used because of their feature extraction automation. Automated feature extraction reduces task- and language-specific biases in the model which in turn increases the need for more data. The data requirement especially affects deep models' performance on datasets of smaller sizes (i.e., Cambridge). Use of small and biased models, more training data, and transfer learning is preferred in these scenarios.

The RAIT model increases the computational efficiency of the BERT model by reducing self-attention computations inside the transformer backbone. The comparison between the proposed model results and the other state-of-the-art models is shown in Table 5. According to the reported accuracy and latency, a reduction in the input length of the BERT model reduces its latency while negatively affecting its accuracy. On the other hand, the RAIT model can avoid drastic accuracy loss by actively adjusting the length of text required for accurate classification. As a result, the RAIT model can achieve close to state-of-the-art accuracy with less than half of the original BERT's latency. For example, the RAIT models with a window size of 64 achieve an accuracy of 93.8% on the Weebit dataset with a latency of 2.1 ms. In other works, the 83% reduction in computational cost with only 0.5% loss in accuracy.

5. Discussion

Based on evaluation results, RAIT maintains state-of-the-art accuracy while significantly reducing model size and computation load. Similar to its original BERT counterpart, the full window-size model behaves like a standard transformer. The "see more" action is virtually eliminated when the window size is at its maximum. As a result, the proposed model differs only in its reinforcement learning loss instead of its multiclass cross-entropy loss from the BERT model in this scenario. However, the presented method is more accurate when the window size is limited to a value less than the maximum possible size. Based on the proposed method results, the 256, 128,

Table 5: Comparison between the proposed model and the state-of-the-art models on different datasets. The execution times were measured using the Huggingface [51] Pytorch [59] implementation of BERT [33] on an A100 GPU with a batch size of 1.

Model (window-size)	**Weebit [17]**	**Cambridge [18]**	**Latency (ms)**
BERT (full)	**0.943**	0.761	12.6
BERT (256)	0.916	0.734	3.8
BERT (128)	0.911	0.729	1.6
BERT (64)	0.887	0.712	1.0
RAIT (full)	**0.943**	0.762	12.8
RAIT (256)	**0.942**	**0.76**	4.6
RAIT (128)	**0.939**	**0.758**	2.7
RAIT (64)	**0.938**	**0.755**	2.1

and 64-word window sizes achieve state-of-the-art accuracy while observing 1.2, 1.7, and 2.1 windows of words, respectively. Conversely, models such as BERT and ConvLSTM show reduced accuracy when limited to smaller observation windows.

Active inference allows the proposed method to accurately and efficiently classify partially observed input data based on the model's representation. In other words, a dynamic selection of observed windows is used to maximize the accuracy of each input text and minimize the model's load. It is reasonable to use dynamic observation lengths due to the fact that different texts' representations have varying marginal errors within their class cluster. Text representations closer to class cluster boundaries must be more accurate to avoid misclassification. RAIT can also adjust the global solution aggregation strategy to maintain accuracy close to the state-of-the-art. When the window size is smaller, the self-attention function is further limited to generating contextually relevant text representations. However, as presented in Table 5, the proposed method adapts to the smaller window size by increasing the number of observed windows. The limited self-attention perception range negatively impacts the quality of learned representations, but the reinforcement learning-based global solution aggregation described in Equations 5 and 6 minimizes the negative impact when compared to state-of-the-art models.

6. Conclusion and future work

The readability of a text can be determined precisely by analyzing a small section of it. This study introduces a reinforcement learning-based hard attention method based on transformers in order to realize this point. This hard attention method allows for precise readability assessment by focusing on the most informative parts of the text. RAIT uses the Domain Decomposition Method (DDM) to divide the computationally expensive attention mechanism across smaller and more manageable portions of the text. DDM further reduces computation complexity by calculating the global solution from a minimal set of sub-problem solutions using reinforcement learning. As evidenced by the comparison between the newly developed method and standard baselines, computational cost reduction has minimal effect on model accuracy.

The next step in this research is to test the RAIT model on additional NLP tasks, including automated essay scoring, sentiment analysis, and text classification in general. This will assess the generality of this paper's assumptions. Combining this method with other deep computation reduction methods like distillation can further optimize transformer-based text processing methods. Currently, the proposed method does not interact with the input text beyond simple actions by the reinforcement learning agent. There is no possibility for the agent to change the observation window size dynamically or jump to different text sections randomly. The global solution aggregation strategy can be further optimized with these actions.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Ekaterina Kochmar[1], Dr. Baosong Yang[2], and Dr. Yang Gao[3] for their valuable review and suggestions on this manuscript. We are also grateful to HuggingFace [51] and StableBaselines3 [60] for providing us with state-of-the-art tools and frameworks for natural language processing and reinforcement learning. Their open-source contributions have greatly facilitated our research and experiments.

[1]Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge
[2]Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Macau
[3]Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway, University of London

References

[1] R. M. Rawian, Text readability: A snapshot, 2019.

[2] B. T. Cheng, A. B. Kim, A. P. Tanna, Readability of online patient education materials for glaucoma, Journal of Glaucoma 31 (2022) 438–442.

[3] A. Devaraj, B. C. Wallace, I. J. Marshall, J. J. Li, Paragraph-level simplification of medical texts, in: Proceedings of the conference. Association for Computational Linguistics. North American Chapter. Meeting, volume 2021, NIH Public Access, 2021, p. 4972.

[4] O. Mac, J. Ayre, K. Bell, K. McCaffery, D. M. Muscat, Comparison of readability scores for written health information across formulas using automated vs manual measures, JAMA Network Open 5 (2022) e2246051–e2246051.

[5] Y. Guo, W. Qiu, Y. Wang, T. Cohen, Automated lay language summarization of biomedical scientific reviews, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 35, 2021, pp. 160–168.

[6] Y. Zheng, Y. Tang, H.-C. Tseng, T.-H. Chang, L. Li, P. Chen, Y. Tang, X.-b. Lin, X. Chen, K.-J. Tang, Evaluation of quality and readability of over-the-counter medication package inserts, Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy 18 (2022) 3560–3567.

[7] B. Ondov, K. Attal, D. Demner-Fushman, A survey of automated methods for biomedical text simplification, Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association 29 (2022) 1976–1988.

[8] E. Pancer, V. Chandler, M. Poole, T. J. Noseworthy, How readability shapes social media engagement, Journal of Consumer Psychology 29 (2019) 262–270.

[9] S. Sazzed, Influence of language proficiency on the readability of review text and transformer-based models for determining language proficiency, in: Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2022, 2022, pp. 881–886.

[10] D. C. Gkikas, K. Tzafilkou, P. K. Theodoridis, A. Garmpis, M. C. Gkikas, How do text characteristics impact user engagement in social media posts: Modeling content readability, length, and hashtags number in facebook, International Journal of Information Management Data Insights 2 (2022) 100067.

[11] A. Curiel, C. Gutiérrez-Soto, J.-R. Rojano-Cáceres, An online multi-source summarization algorithm for text readability in topic-based search, Computer Speech & Language 66 (2021) 101143.

[12] R. Korniichuk, M. Boryczka, Conversion rate prediction based on text readability analysis of landing pages, Entropy 23 (2021) 1388.

[13] D. Murphy Odo, The effect of automatic text simplification on l2 readers' text comprehension, Applied Linguistics (2022).

[14] J. Monteiro, M. Aguiar, S. Araújo, Using a pre-trained simplet5 model for text simplification in a limited corpus, Proceedings of the Working Notes of CLEF (2022).

[15] L. Cripwell, J. Legrand, C. Gardent, Document-level planning for text simplification, in: Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023, pp. 993–1006.

[16] R. Flesch, Marks of readable style; a study in adult education., Teachers College Contributions to Education (1943).

[17] S. Vajjala, D. Meurers, On improving the accuracy of readability classification using insights from second language acquisition, in: Proceedings of the seventh workshop on building educational applications using NLP, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2012, pp. 163–173.

[18] M. Xia, E. Kochmar, T. Briscoe, Text readability assessment for second language learners, in: Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications, Association for Computational Linguistics, San Diego, CA, 2016, pp. 12–22. URL: https://aclanthology.org/W16-0502. doi:10.18653/v1/W16-0502.

[19] H. Mohammadi, S. H. Khasteh, A machine learning approach to persian text readability assessment using a crowdsourced dataset, in: 2020 28th

Iranian Conference on Electrical Engineering (ICEE), IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–7.

[20] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin, Attention is all you need, Advances in neural information processing systems 30 (2017).

[21] A. J. Stenner, Measuring reading comprehension with the lexile framework. (1996).

[22] K. Collins-Thompson, J. Callan, Predicting reading difficulty with statistical language models, Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology 56 (2005) 1448–1462.

[23] R. G. Benjamin, Reconstructing readability: Recent developments and recommendations in the analysis of text difficulty, Educational Psychology Review 24 (2012) 63–88.

[24] J. Hartley, Is time up for the flesch measure of reading ease?, Scientometrics 107 (2016) 1523–1526.

[25] S. E. Petersen, M. Ostendorf, A machine learning approach to reading level assessment, Computer speech & language 23 (2009) 89–106.

[26] S. A. Crossley, D. B. Allen, D. S. McNamara, Text readability and intuitive simplification: A comparison of readability formulas., Reading in a foreign language 23 (2011) 84–101.

[27] I. Pilán, E. Volodina, R. Johansson, Rule-based and machine learning approaches for second language sentence-level readability, in: Proceedings of the ninth workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications, 2014, pp. 174–184.

[28] L. Feng, M. Jansche, M. Huenerfauth, N. Elhadad, A comparison of features for automatic readability assessment, in: Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on computational linguistics: Posters, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010, pp. 276–284.

[29] T. François, E. Miltsakaki, Do nlp and machine learning improve traditional readability formulas?, in: Proceedings of the First Workshop on Predicting and Improving Text Readability for target reader populations, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2012, pp. 49–57.

[30] S. E. Schwarm, M. Ostendorf, Reading level assessment using support vector machines and statistical language models, in: Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2005, pp. 523–530.

[31] R. J. Kate, X. Luo, S. Patwardhan, M. Franz, R. Florian, R. J. Mooney, S. Roukos, C. Welty, Learning to predict readability using diverse linguistic features, in: Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on computational linguistics, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010, pp. 546–554.

[32] Y.-T. Sung, J.-L. Chen, J.-H. Cha, H.-C. Tseng, T.-H. Chang, K.-E. Chang, Constructing and validating readability models: the method of integrating multilevel linguistic features with machine learning, Behavior research methods 47 (2015) 340–354.

[33] J. D. M.-W. C. Kenton, L. K. Toutanova, Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, in: Proceedings of NAACL-HLT, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.

[34] X. Ke, English synchronous real-time translation method based on reinforcement learning, Wireless Networks (2022) 1–13.

[35] X. Kang, Y. Zhao, J. Zhang, C. Zong, Dynamic context selection for document-level neural machine translation via reinforcement learning, arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04314 (2020).

[36] V. Uc-Cetina, N. Navarro-Guerrero, A. Martin-Gonzalez, C. Weber, S. Wermter, Survey on reinforcement learning for language processing, Artificial Intelligence Review 56 (2023) 1543–1575.

[37] T. K. Lam, J. Kreutzer, S. Riezler, A reinforcement learning approach to interactive-predictive neural machine translation, in: 21st Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation, ????, p. 169.

[38] Y. Zhao, L. Chen, Z. Chen, K. Yu, Semi-supervised text simplification with back-translation and asymmetric denoising autoencoders, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 34, 2020, pp. 9668–9675.

[39] Z. Li, Z. Peng, S. Tang, C. Zhang, H. Ma, Text summarization method based on double attention pointer network, IEEE Access 8 (2020) 11279–11288.

[40] Y. Keneshloo, N. Ramakrishnan, C. K. Reddy, Deep transfer reinforcement learning for text summarization, in: Proceedings of the 2019 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining, SIAM, 2019, pp. 675–683.

[41] Z. Liang, J. Du, C. Li, Abstractive social media text summarization using selective reinforced seq2seq attention model, Neurocomputing 410 (2020) 432–440.

[42] M. Yang, W. Huang, W. Tu, Q. Qu, Y. Shen, K. Lei, Multitask learning and reinforcement learning for personalized dialog generation: An empirical study, IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems 32 (2020) 49–62.

[43] A. Saleh, N. Jaques, A. Ghandeharioun, J. Shen, R. Picard, Hierarchical reinforcement learning for open-domain dialog, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 34, 2020, pp. 8741–8748.

[44] F. Godin, A. Kumar, A. Mittal, Learning when not to answer: a ternary reward structure for reinforcement learning based question answering, in: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Industry Papers), 2019, pp. 122–129.

[45] Y. Qiu, Y. Wang, X. Jin, K. Zhang, Stepwise reasoning for multi-relation question answering over knowledge graph with weak supervision, in: Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining, 2020, pp. 474–482.

[46] R. Nakano, J. Hilton, S. Balaji, J. Wu, L. Ouyang, C. Kim, C. Hesse, S. Jain, V. Kosaraju, W. Saunders, et al., Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback, arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332 (2021).

[47] G. H. de Rosa, J. P. Papa, A survey on text generation using generative adversarial networks, Pattern Recognition 119 (2021) 108098.

[48] T. Iqbal, S. Qureshi, The survey: Text generation models in deep learning, Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences 34 (2022) 2515–2528.

[49] T. Shen, T. Zhou, G. Long, J. Jiang, S. Wang, C. Zhang, Reinforced self-attention network: a hybrid of hard and soft attention for sequence modeling, in: Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2018, pp. 4345–4352.

[50] S. Cao, P. Xu, D. A. Clifton, How to understand masked autoencoders, arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03670 (2022).

[51] T. Wolf, L. Debut, V. Sanh, J. Chaumond, C. Delangue, A. Moi, P. Cistac, T. Rault, R. Louf, M. Funtowicz, J. Davison, S. Shleifer, P. von Platen, C. Ma, Y. Jernite, J. Plu, C. Xu, T. Le Scao, S. Gugger, M. Drame, Q. Lhoest, A. Rush, Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing, in: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2020, pp. 38–45. URL: https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-demos.6. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.6.

[52] H. Van Hasselt, A. Guez, D. Silver, Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning, in: Thirtieth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, 2016.

[53] L.-J. Lin, Reinforcement learning for robots using neural networks, Technical Report, Carnegie-Mellon Univ Pittsburgh PA School of Computer Science, 1993.

[54] A. Hassan, A. Mahmood, Deep learning approach for sentiment analysis of short texts, in: 2017 3rd international conference on control, automation and robotics (ICCAR), IEEE, 2017, pp. 705–710.

[55] Y. Fujinuma, M. Hagiwara, Semi-supervised joint estimation of word and document readability, arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13103 (2021).

[56] X. Qiu, Y. Chen, H. Chen, J.-Y. Nie, Y. Shen, D. Lu, Learning syntactic dense embedding with correlation graph for automatic readability assessment, arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04268 (2021).

[57] W. Li, Z. Wang, Y. Wu, A unified neural network model for readability assessment with feature projection and length-balanced loss, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10305 (2022).

[58] L. Jian, H. Xiang, G. Le, English text readability measurement based on convolutional neural network: a hybrid network model, Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience 2022 (2022).

[59] A. Paszke, S. Gross, S. Chintala, G. Chanan, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, Z. Lin, A. Desmaison, L. Antiga, A. Lerer, Automatic differentiation in pytorch (2017).

[60] A. Raffin, A. Hill, A. Gleave, A. Kanervisto, M. Ernestus, N. Dormann, Stable-baselines3: Reliable reinforcement learning implementations, Journal of Machine Learning Research 22 (2021) 1–8. URL: http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/20-1364.html.