

key challenge for these black-box methods is handling high-dimensional search spaces. This typically restricts their use to training networks that are small compared to those used in neural sequence modeling (Mania, Guy, and Recht 2018; Ha and Schmidhuber 2018), or requires massive parallelization (Salimans et al. 2017), and their use with large-scale natural language processing models has been under-explored.

In this paper, we leverage the fact that in many sequence modeling tasks encountered in natural language processing, a surrogate update direction is available in the form of the maximum likelihood gradient. We hypothesize that incorporating this surrogate information into a random-search method can substantially alleviate issues stemming from the large search space. We frame learning as sampling from a distribution over parameter update directions that is proportional to the improvement in task loss. Since this distribution is only accessible for evaluation up to a normalizing constant, we propose to use self-normalized importance sampling for obtaining update directions.

The key idea behind our method is to form a proposal distribution that is a mixture of random search around the current parameters and around the maximum-likelihood update direction. Our experiments show that the resulting procedure, called *maximum-likelihood guided parameter search* (MGS), is effective for minimizing sequence-level losses in natural language generation and machine translation, offering an alternative to policy gradient and minimum risk methods.

2 Maximum-Likelihood Guided Parameter Search

Sequence generation. Sequence generation is the problem of mapping an input X to an output $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_{|Y|})$. In our setting of neural sequence generation, this mapping is a deterministic decoding algorithm $\mathcal{F}(\theta, X)$, which uses an autoregressive model $p_\theta(Y|X) = \prod_{t=1}^{|Y|} p_\theta(y_t|y_{<t}, X)$ to produce an output \hat{Y} given an input X . This includes greedy and beam search decoding, and stochastic decoding algorithms with a noise input, $\mathcal{F}(\theta, X, \epsilon)$. The goal of sequence generation is to find a model whose generations have minimal task loss on a set $\mathcal{D} = \{(X, Y)\}$ of input-output pairs,

$$C(\theta, \mathcal{D}) = \sum_{X, Y \in \mathcal{D}} c(\mathcal{F}(\theta, X), Y), \quad (1)$$

where we assume $c(\hat{Y}, Y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary sequence-level loss (e.g. sentence-BLEU). The most widely used approach to training such a model is minimizing the negative log-likelihood given a training set, which ignores the task loss: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\sum_{X, Y \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^{|Y|} \log p_\theta(y_t|y_{<t}, X)$.

Method. To directly optimize (1), we iteratively update the parameters θ in the direction of maximal improvement in the task loss. Each update corresponds to the expected update under a distribution that weights each direction according to its improvement,

$$\Delta_* = \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \sim p_*(\Delta|\theta; \alpha)} [\Delta], \quad (2)$$

where,

$$p_*(\Delta|\theta; \alpha) \propto \tilde{p}_*(\Delta|\theta; \alpha) = \exp(\alpha(C(\theta) - C(\theta + \Delta))),$$

and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a temperature parameter. When $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, the distribution becomes uniform, and when $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ it concentrates on the direction(s) of maximal task loss improvement. Since p_* is only known up to a normalizing constant and is defined over a high-dimensional parameter space, it is impractical to approximate the update direction Δ_* with samples from p_* . Instead, we use self-normalized importance sampling with a proposal distribution $q(\Delta|\theta)$:

$$\Delta_* = \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \sim q(\Delta|\theta)} \left[\frac{p_*(\Delta|\theta; \alpha)}{q(\Delta|\theta)} \Delta \right] \quad (3)$$

$$\approx \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{w(\Delta_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^K w(\Delta_k)} \Delta_k = \Delta_{\text{MGS}}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$w(\Delta_k) = \frac{\exp(\alpha(C(\theta) - C(\theta + \Delta_k)))}{\tilde{q}(\Delta_k|\theta)}, \quad (5)$$

$\Delta_k \sim q(\Delta|\theta)$, and $q \propto \tilde{q}$. This update direction equals Δ_* in the limit: $\mathbb{P}(\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{\text{MGS}} = \Delta_*) = 1$ (Owen 2013).¹

The sample complexity of such a random-search method is known to depend on the dimensionality of the sample space (Vemula, Sun, and Bagnell 2019), thus it is crucial to choose a good proposal distribution. Our contribution is a proposal distribution for use in sequence generation, where we have access to the maximum likelihood gradient $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}$. Specifically, we propose a mixture of two Gaussians, whose components are centered at the origin and at the maximum-likelihood gradient, respectively:

$$q_{\text{MGS}}(\Delta|\theta) = \mathcal{N}(\Delta|0, I\sigma^2) \cdot \pi + \mathcal{N}(\Delta|\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}, I\sigma^2) \cdot (1 - \pi), \quad (6)$$

where $\pi \in [0, 1]$ is a mixture parameter that we set to 0.5 in practice. Given a batch of examples, we compute the gradient of the maximum likelihood loss, sample candidate directions from the proposal distribution (6), then evaluate the task loss of each candidate and form the update direction (3). Algorithm 1 summarizes the procedure, called **maximum-likelihood guided parameter search** (MGS).

3 Other Task Loss Minimization Methods

Comparison with policy gradient. Policy gradient (PG) methods such as REINFORCE (Williams 1992) consist of the objective and gradient estimator:

$$C_{\text{PG}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{Y} \sim p_\theta(\cdot|X)} [c(\hat{Y}, Y)], \quad (7)$$

$$\nabla_\theta^{\text{PG}} = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{Y} \sim p_\theta(\cdot|X)} [c(\hat{Y}, Y) \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}|X)]. \quad (8)$$

The policy gradient objective contains an expectation over the output distribution $p_\theta(\cdot|X)$, unlike the objective optimized by

¹See Appendix A.1 for a review of self-normalized importance sampling.

Algorithm 1: MLE-guided parameter search (MGS).

Given: Batch $\{X_i, Y_i\}_{i=1}^B$, model p_θ , decoding algorithm \mathcal{F} , task-loss $c(\hat{Y}, Y)$.

Hyperparams: Number of candidates K , temperature α , noise level σ^2 .

Output: Update direction Δ_{MGS} .

$\{\hat{Y}_i\} = \mathcal{F}(\theta, \{X_i\})$ // decode

$C(\theta) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B c(\hat{Y}_i, Y_i)$ // eqn. 1

$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}} = \text{backprop}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}(\theta; \{X_i, Y_i\}))$

for $k \in 1, \dots, K$ **do**

$\Delta_k \sim q_{\text{MGS}}(\cdot | \theta, \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}, \sigma^2)$ // eqn. 6

$\{\hat{Y}_i\} = \mathcal{F}(\theta + \Delta_k, \{X_i\})$ // decode

$C(\theta + \Delta_k) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B c(\hat{Y}_i, Y_i)$ // eqn. 1

$w(\Delta_k) = \frac{\exp(\alpha(C(\theta) - C(\theta + \Delta_k)))}{q_{\text{MGS}}(\Delta_k | \theta)}$ // eqn. 5

$\Delta_{\text{MGS}} = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{w(\Delta_i)}{\sum_{k'} w(\Delta_{k'})} \Delta_k$ // eqn. 3

MGS (Equation 1). In particular, computing the PG objective involves decoding with ancestral sampling, while the objective (1) uses an arbitrary decoding algorithm. Naturally, approximating the policy gradient also uses ancestral sampling instead of the algorithm used at inference time (e.g. greedy or beam search). To contrast this with maximum-likelihood guided parameter search, we formalize the sampling and examine the per-sequence gradient.

Ancestral sampling decodes a sequence by sampling autoregressively from the model’s per-step categorical distributions. Given noise $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$, ancestral sampling, which consists of repeated categorical sampling $\hat{y}_t \sim p_\theta(\cdot | \hat{y}_{<t}, X)$, can be written as a deterministic function $\hat{Y} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{anc}}(\theta, X, \epsilon)$. The policy gradient estimator is an expectation over the noise used to produce the categorical samples,

$$\nabla_\theta^{\text{PG}} = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon [c(\mathcal{F}_{\text{anc}}(\theta, X, \epsilon), Y) \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\mathcal{F}_{\text{anc}}(\theta, X, \epsilon))].$$

Maximum-likelihood guided parameter search uses any arbitrary decoding algorithm, e.g. $\hat{Y} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{greedy}}(\theta, X)$, which can be chosen to be the same algorithm used at evaluation time. The MGS estimator is an expectation over noise in the *parameter space*, $\nabla_\theta^{\text{MGS}} =$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim q} [\hat{w}(\epsilon) \exp(\alpha(c(\mathcal{F}(\theta, X), Y) - c(\mathcal{F}(\theta + \epsilon, X), Y))) \epsilon],$$

where we consider a single example and rewrite the MGS update (3) in order to illustrate how the use of noise and the decoding algorithm differ from policy gradient. See the Appendix for the derivation. In short, policy gradient uses each parameter θ to sample multiple sequences for each input, while MGS samples multiple parameters, and uses each to decode a single sequence per input.

Comparison with minimum risk training. Minimum risk training (MRT) (Shen et al. 2016) approximates the

policy gradient objective (7) as,

$$C_{\text{MRT}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{Y} \sim q_\theta(\cdot | X, S)} [c(\hat{Y}, Y)], \quad (9)$$

$$q_\theta(Y | X, S) = \begin{cases} \frac{p_\theta(Y | X)^\alpha}{Z_\theta(X, S)}, & \text{if } Y \in S, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $S = \{\hat{Y}_1, \dots, \hat{Y}_k\}$ is a set of candidate output sequences, and $Z_\theta(X, S) = \sum_{Y \in S} p_\theta(Y | X)^\alpha$. There are no importance weights, and q_θ is not a valid proposal, unlike q_{MGS} . The gradient is,²

$$\nabla_\theta C_{\text{MRT}} = \alpha \left[\mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} \left[c(\hat{Y}, Y) \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\hat{Y} | X) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} \left[c(\hat{Y}, Y) \right] \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} \left[\nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\hat{Y} | X) \right] \right], \quad (11)$$

where \mathbb{E}_{q_θ} denotes $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{Y} \sim q_\theta(\cdot | X, S)}$. The MRT gradient consists of the policy gradient, minus a term that includes the score function and the expected loss. Minimum risk training can incorporate the maximum likelihood gradient by including the ground truth sequence Y^* as a candidate,

$$\nabla_\theta C_{\text{MRT}} = \alpha [(w(Y^*) - \bar{w}(Y^*)) \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(Y^* | X) + \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S \setminus Y^*} (w(\hat{Y}) - \bar{w}(\hat{Y})) \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\hat{Y} | X)]$$

where $w(Y') = c(Y', Y) q_\theta(Y' | X, S)$, and $\bar{w}(Y') = \mathbb{E}_{Y'' \sim q_\theta} [c(Y'', Y)] q_\theta(Y' | X, S)$. Unlike MGS, the other candidate directions in MRT are not related to the maximum-likelihood gradient. Instead, the candidates are determined by action-space sampling, similar to policy gradient.

Pooled task losses. PG and MRT both sample in the action space (i.e. vocabulary), while the proposed MGS samples in the parameter space. This difference affects the *amount of supervision* that is used to weight each candidate update direction. To see this, consider a minibatch $\{X_n, Y_n\}_{n=1}^N$. The policy gradient estimator with K samples per batch element is,

$$\nabla_\theta^{\text{PG}} = \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{n, k} c(\hat{Y}_n^{(k)}, Y_n) \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}_n^{(k)} | X_n), \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{Y}_n^{(k)}$ is a sampled sequence. Policy gradient uses a *single* sequence loss to weight each candidate update direction. A similar inspection reveals that MRT shares this property. On the other hand, MLE-guided parameter search,

$$\nabla_\theta^{\text{MGS}} = \sum_k [\hat{w}(\Delta_k) \exp(\alpha(C(\theta) - C(\theta + \Delta_k))) \Delta_k],$$

weights each candidate direction using a loss $C(\cdot)$ computed over the entire minibatch (see Equation 1). This has the effect of ‘densifying’ the sparse loss by pooling the losses from multiple examples.

²See Appendix A.2 for the derivation.

	LM ↓	Edit ↓	Nonterm ↓	Repetition ↓	Avg. len.	Perplexity ↓
MLE	157.6 (13.5)	.945 (.008)	.344 (.063)	.530 (.062)	228.1 (33.3)	21.3 (0.2)
MGS-LM	64.9 (2.09)	.937 (.002)	.012 (.003)	.046 (.009)	22.8 (2.2)	22.0 (0.1)
MRT-LM (+MLE 0.1)	57.4 (.967)	.948 (.002)	.013 (.004)	.023 (.005)	16.9 (2.3)	25.8 (1.7)
PG-LM (+MLE 0.1)	48.4 (.523)	.967 (.004)	.000 (.000)	.002 (.002)	3.8 (1.0)	30.7 (7.3)
MGS-edit	78.2 (1.38)	.925 (.003)	.037 (.008)	.098 (.007)	44.0 (2.2)	21.6 (0.1)
MRT-edit (+MLE 0.3)	138.7 (11.1)	.929 (.011)	.227 (.094)	.472 (.066)	178.4 (43.1)	23.2 (1.0)
PG-edit (+MLE 0.1)	103.0 (4.05)	.904 (.001)	.051 (.016)	.246 (.027)	68.5 (8.2)	24.5 (0.8)
Human	–	–	.000	.011	107.9	–

Table 1: Text completion results (GPT-2, Wikitext-103 test set), reported as mean (stdev) using 5 random seeds. Policy gradient (PG) and minimum risk training (MRT) are stochastically mixed with MLE and reported as (+MLE α), with the α values selected based on the task loss. Results here are with greedy decoding; see Table 7 in the Appendix for ancestral sampling.

4 Related Work

Sequence-level training for NLP. Sequence-level training methods based on policy gradient have been applied to several NLP tasks (Liu et al. 2017; Paulus, Xiong, and Socher 2018; Ziegler et al. 2019). Related methods use policy gradient with generative adversarial networks (GAN) (Yu et al. 2017; de Masson d’Autume et al. 2019). Policy gradient methods often face training instability and sensitivity to hyper-parameters (Henderson et al. 2018), and GAN methods under-perform maximum likelihood (Caccia et al. 2020).

Reward augmented maximum-likelihood (RAML) (Norouzi et al. 2016) maximizes the likelihood of sequences that are sampled proportional to their rewards, which in practice relies on a sampling method designed for a specific task loss. Our method weights parameter, rather than sequence, samples proportional to their rewards. Minimum risk training originated in statistical machine translation (Och 2003; Smith and Eisner 2006) and was applied to end-to-end neural machine translation (Shen et al. 2016; Edunov et al. 2018). Other approaches train a greedy decoder given a learned model (Gu, Cho, and Li 2017; Chen et al. 2018), which is a different setting than ours.

A separate family of methods, including globally normalized models, (Andor et al. 2016; Sountsov and Sarawagi 2016), energy-based models (LeCun et al. 2006; Wang and Ou 2018; Deng et al. 2020), unlikelihood training (Welleck et al. 2020b; Li et al. 2020), and beam search optimization (Daumé and Marcu 2005; Wiseman and Rush 2016), incorporate sequence-level scores without reference to an external reward function.

Drawbacks of MLE in NLP. Several studies investigate drawbacks of maximum likelihood training, including label bias (Lafferty, McCallum, and Pereira 2001; Andor et al. 2016), exposure bias (Daumé, Langford, and Marcu 2009; Ross, Gordon, and Bagnell 2011; Bengio et al. 2015), and loss mismatch (Lee et al. 2020). Neural machine translation models trained with maximum likelihood have been shown to exhibit decreased performance with increased beam size (Koehn and Knowles 2017; Ott et al. 2018) and a bias towards short sequences (Sountsov and Sarawagi 2016; Stahlberg and Byrne 2019), which have been attributed to label bias due to local normalization (Murray and Chiang 2018).

In open-ended text generation, MLE-trained models have been observed to produce non-terminating sequences (Welleck et al. 2020a), degenerate repetition (Holtzman et al. 2019; Welleck et al. 2020b), and a mismatched unigram distribution (Li et al. 2020). These motivate our investigation of an alternative training procedure.

Black-box optimization. Our approach is motivated by black-box optimization methods, specifically those based on random search (Matyas 1965; Rechenberg 1978; Bäck and Schwefel 1993). Several methods augment random search with auxiliary information (Hansen 2011; Lehman et al. 2018; Pourchot and Sigaud 2019). Related to our method are learned manifold random search (Sener and Koltun 2020) which requires an inner optimization to learn parameters of a search manifold, and guided evolutionary strategies (Maheswaranathan et al. 2019) which uses surrogate directions to modify the search distribution’s covariance; their method requires QR decomposition and was evaluated on synthetic and unrolled optimization tasks with smaller networks than those we consider.

5 Experiments

5.1 Text Completion with GPT-2

First, we evaluate MGS on a text completion task, which has previously been used to evaluate the effectiveness of sequence models (e.g. Sutskever, Martens, and Hinton (2011); Graves (2013); Radford et al. (2018); Holtzman et al. (2019); Welleck et al. (2020b)). The task consists of decoding a continuation $\hat{Y} = \mathcal{F}(\theta, X)$ given a prefix $X = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$.

In this task, neural language models such as GPT-2 (Radford et al. 2018) exhibit degenerate repetition (Holtzman et al. 2019) and non-termination with greedy decoding; (Welleck et al. 2020a) conjectured that the lack of a decoding algorithm in maximum-likelihood training is the cause of the latter. We evaluate whether MGS, which uses a decoding algorithm during training, can alleviate these issues.

Experimental setup. We use the Wikitext-103 dataset (Merity et al. 2016), a large-scale collection of Wikipedia articles containing over 100 million words that has been used for language modeling (Baeviski and Auli 2019) and

Prefix	<i>The British organized an expedition in early 1776 for</i>
MLE	the defense of the French colonies in the Caribbean. The expedition was led by Captain William Henry St. Clair, who had been appointed to command the expedition. The expedition was led by Captain William Henry St. Clair, who had been appointed to command the expedition in 1776. The expedition $\rightarrow \infty$
PG-LM	the Continental Army. $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
PG-edit	the defence of the French colony of New France. The expedition was to be led by Captain Samuel Frederick Gray, who was to become the first commander of the expedition. $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
MGS-LM	the defense of the Ohio River. The expedition was led by Colonel John C. St. Clair, who had been appointed to command the expedition. $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
MGS-edit	the defense of the French colonies. The expedition was led by Lieutenant Colonel John Henry, who was promoted to lieutenant colonel in 1776. $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
Prefix	<i>On The Joshua Tree Tour, "Where the Streets</i>
MLE	Have No Name" was performed by the band in a medley with "The Way You Make Me Feel", "The Way You Make Me Feel", "The Way You Make Me Feel", and "The Way You Make Me Feel". The medley was included on the DVD release of the tour. $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
PG-LM	Have No Name" $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
PG-edit	Have No Name" was performed by the band. The performance was recorded in the studio in Los Angeles, California, and was recorded in the same room as the band's previous two singles, "The Way" and "The Way". $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
MGS-LM	Have No Name" was performed by the band. $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$
MGS-edit	Have No Name" was performed by the band in a medley with "The Day the World Gets 'Round". $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$

Table 2: Example greedy continuations (GPT-2, Wikitext-103 validation set).

text completion (Welleck et al. 2020b). We model individual sequences by splitting the corpus according to its newline boundaries, then splitting each sequence into a context X and continuation Y , resulting in a dataset of (X, Y) pairs. Each continuation ends in a special $\langle \text{eos} \rangle$ token. We use a context size of $k = 10$ tokens, discarding sequences that are length k or shorter. The resulting dataset consists of 874,556 training, 1,896 validation, and 2,162 test pairs.

We use GPT-2 117M (Radford et al. 2018), a transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) language model with a byte-level BPE vocabulary of 50k tokens, pre-trained with maximum likelihood on WebText, a dataset of scraped web pages (see Radford et al. (2018) for details). We fine-tune the pretrained GPT-2 model using MLE and select the model state with the lowest validation perplexity. We then continue with MGS beginning at the selected model state. We use 4 candidates, and compute training task loss with a max decoding length of 1.3 times the ground-truth length. Models are evaluated with a max decoding length of 500 tokens. See Appendix A.4 for more details.

For the MRT and PG baselines we finetune using 4 samples. For policy gradient we used an exponential moving average baseline. Each method is stochastically mixed with MLE according to a hyper-parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$: given a training batch, we draw $z \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\alpha)$ and use MLE when z is zero. We performed a grid search using $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$, selecting α based on the validation task loss that the model is optimizing. In Appendix A.5 we also report results for MRT and PG without stochastically mixing MLE and an ablation of the choice of MRT candidates.

Our main results are reported with greedy decoding; refer to Table 7 in the Appendix for results with ancestral sampling.

Task losses. We experiment with two sequence-level task losses. We define a language modeling (LM) loss which scores each sequence with a fixed language model:

$$c_{\text{LM}}(\hat{Y}) = -\log p_{\text{score}}(\hat{Y}). \quad (13)$$

Intuitively, minimizing this loss adjusts the MLE model to work well with greedy decoding. We use the fine-tuned GPT-2 model as p_{score} , which is the starting point of MGS training. As a task loss that incorporates the ground-truth sequence, we use **edit** distance $c_{\text{edit}}(\hat{Y}, Y)$, normalized by $|Y|$.

Metrics. Motivated by prior work which showed that MLE-trained LMs produce repetitive, non-terminating text with greedy decoding, we measure the portion of duplicate n-grams (we use $n = 4$) (Welleck et al. 2020b) and the proportion of non-terminating continuations (Welleck et al. 2020a):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{repetition}(\hat{Y}) &= 1 - |\text{unique n-grams}| / |\text{n-grams}|, \\ \text{nonterm}(\hat{Y}) &= \mathbb{I}[\langle \text{eos} \rangle \notin \hat{Y}]. \end{aligned}$$

We also report the task loss, average length of the generated continuations, and the perplexity.

Effect on sequence-level task loss. Table 1 shows the task losses and metrics for the baseline fine-tuned model (MLE) and each model trained with MGS to optimize the indicated task loss (MGS-loss). The baseline has the highest task losses, and a high degree of non-termination (.387) and repetition (.538). MGS-LM substantially reduces the LM task loss (59.1), along with non-termination (.012) and repetition (.035).

Figure 2 (q_{MGS}) illustrates how optimization progresses, with a monotonic decrease in training loss over time. MGS-edit achieves the lowest edit distance (.928), while also substantially reducing LM task loss, non-termination, and repetition. Both MGS variants result in short sequences, especially MGS-LM, which is expected due to the bias towards short sequences in MLE-trained LMs (Stahlberg and Byrne 2019).

Table 2 shows representative continuations (see the Appendix for more). The first example shows how MGS can fix non-termination, and the second shows how MGS reduces repetition in a terminating sequence.

Prefix	<i>The manga was licensed for English language release by Del</i>	Pooled Task-Loss
\mathcal{N}_{MLE}	Rey in the United States, and was released in the United Kingdom in the United States in the first volume of the series, and in the United States in the second, and third, volumes of the series, in the United States in the first and second volumes of the first and second volumes of the second and third volumes ...	137.8
\mathcal{N}_0	Rey Manga in the United States. (eos)	51.2
Source	<i>bei den budgets der bundesstaaten geht es um sehr , sehr viel geld – ich werde ihnen die zahlen zeigen – und man kümmert sich sehr wenig um sie .</i>	Pooled Task-Loss
\mathcal{N}_{MLE}	state budgets are very , very high money – i’ll show them numbers – and they take care of them very little .	.6767
\mathcal{N}_0	the state budgets are about a lot , a lot of money – i’m going to show you the numbers – and you’re very little concerned about them .	.5972

Table 3: Example sequences decoded from sampled candidates, showing the component that the candidate was sampled from, and the pooled cost. Top: text completion. Bottom: machine translation.




Figure 1: Task loss (solid) and perplexity (dashed) as α varies.




Figure 2: Training task-loss (C_{LM}) with varied proposals. Figure 3: Standard dev. of candidate weights (MGS-LM).

PG & MRT comparison. The MRT-LM and PG-LM methods result in a lower LM loss than MLE and MGS-LM. However, the perplexity is higher than that of MGS-LM (25.8 and 30.7 vs. 22.0), with a larger standard deviation (1.7 and 7.3 vs. 0.1). Policy gradient finds a solution with very short sequences (average length 3.8). For edit distance, MRT-edit underperforms MGS-edit on average (.929 vs. .925), with higher nontermination, repetition, and perplexity. PG-edit achieves the best edit distance, though with higher repetition (.246 vs. .098) and perplexity (24.5 vs. 21.6) than MGS.

We also report results with ancestral sampling in Appendix Table 7. We observe similar trends - MGS performs comparably to MRT but with better perplexity, and PG finds a degenerate short-sequence solution under the LM loss.

In summary, all three methods improve the task loss, and MGS does so while having a favorable balance across the other metrics (e.g. perplexity, repetition). We find that α trades perplexity for task loss minimization in PG and MRT, while MGS finds solutions that are much more stable in terms of perplexity, as shown in Figure 1. Our conclusion is that MGS is an attractive alternative to mixing minimum risk training and policy gradient with maximum likelihood training for the problem of text generation.




Figure 4: Total weight of candidates from the MLE component.




Figure 5: Validation sequence loss as α varies (MGS-LM).

MGS candidate analysis. First, we perform an ablation of the proposal distribution q_{MGS} , which is a mixture of two components. We compare against only using the zero-mean (q_{zero}) or MLE-mean (q_{MLE}) components as proposals. Figure 2 shows the training loss using each proposal, indicating that both components in the q_{MGS} mixture are necessary. The task loss on the validation set (see Appendix Table 6) is analogous.

Next, we inspect how the pooled task loss varies between the sampled candidates. Figure 3 shows the standard deviation in candidate weights $w(\Delta_k)$ during training. They fall within 0.35-0.45, implying that each proposal samples candidates with varied task losses. As a qualitative example, we sample two candidates from q_{MGS} at the end of training, decode a batch of sequences with each candidate, and in Table 3 show an example sequence and the pooled loss. The MLE candidate’s sequence is non-terminating, while the zero candidate decodes a shorter sequence and has a lower pooled loss.

We investigate which candidates contribute to the update direction over the course of training by showing the total weight of MLE-component candidates in Figure 4 ($\alpha = 1.0$). The MLE candidates are highly weighted at the beginning of training, only contributing occasionally thereafter. Finally, we analyze the effect of the α hyper-parameter, which controls the entropy of the candidate weights. As α decreases, the candidate weights are smoothed towards uniform, which allocates more weight to the MLE candidates, as seen in Figure 4. Performance decreases when the weights are either too uniform or too peaked, as seen in Figure 5.

5.2 Machine Translation

Experimental setup. We experiment on the IWSLT ‘14 German to English task (Cettolo et al. 2014) using a standard experimental setup from the fairseq (Ott et al. 2019a)

	Valid				Test			
	BLEU \uparrow	SBLEU \uparrow	MET. \uparrow	EDIT \downarrow	BLEU \uparrow	SBLEU \uparrow	MET. \uparrow	EDIT \downarrow
MLE	36.00	36.22	63.82	47.88	34.71	35.67	62.19	50.74
MGS-SBLEU	36.22	36.58	64.08	47.25	35.03	35.89	62.2	50.23
MGS-METEOR	36.26	36.51	64.13	47.35	34.98	35.97	62.49	50.29
MGS-EDIT	35.73	36.42	63.73	46.83	34.73	35.95	62.04	49.45
MGS-SBLEU (train)	36.19	36.13	63.65	48.40	34.80	35.32	61.95	51.38

Table 4: Machine translation results (IWSLT ‘14 De \rightarrow En). BLEU is computed with beam search (width 5). SBLEU, METEOR, and EDIT are computed with greedy decoding to match the training conditions.

	Valid	Test
W & S (2020) (MLE)	-	34.70
W & S (2020) (MRT)	-	35.20
Ed. (2018) (MLE)	33.11	32.21
Ed. (2018) (MRT)	33.55	32.45

Table 5: IWSLT ‘14 De \rightarrow En with minimum risk (BLEU).

repository which we detail in Appendix A.4. We train the MLE baseline and a MGS models with the same hyper-parameters. We use 4 candidates and a grid search over noise ($\{0.01, 0.1, 1.0\}$) and α ($\{1.0, 10.0, 100.0\}$). The noise is scaled by $\frac{1}{|\theta|} \|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{MLE}\|_1$.

For fine-tuning, we use a batch size of 16k tokens, and accumulate gradients for 4 iterations. We select $\alpha = 100.0$ and noise 1.0 for all MGS fine-tuning based on a grid search with MGS-SBLEU. For training from scratch, we select $\alpha 1.0$ and noise 1.0. All models are selected by validation BLEU using beam search with width 5.

Results. Results for the baseline, MGS fine-tuned models, and models trained from scratch with MGS are in Table 4, along with prior work that fine-tuned with minimum risk training in Table 5.

The fine-tuned MGS-SBLEU model improves BLEU over the baseline MLE model (+0.32 test) at a comparable level to the improvement from fine-tuning with MRT (+0.24 and +0.50 test), with MGS-METEOR showing a similar gain. All of the fine-tuned MGS models improve the sequence-level task losses that are computed with greedy decoding (SBLEU, METEOR, EDIT), with each model achieving the best score on its associated task loss. MGS-EDIT shows the largest difference, underperforming on BLEU yet outperforming the baseline by a full point on EDIT.

The MGS model trained from scratch outperforms the baseline MLE model on BLEU, though by a smaller margin than the fine-tuned models. Figure 6 shows the validation BLEU over time for MGS and the baseline, indicating that they arrive at their performance levels via different paths. Figure 7 shows the proportion of MLE candidates that had the highest weight out of the four candidates sampled from the mixture (q_{MGS}), and Table 3 shows an example sequence decoded from a candidate sampled from each component.

Candidates sampled from the zero-component tend to locally improve the task loss more than those from the MLE




Figure 6: Validation BLEU.




Figure 7: Proportion of highest-weight MLE candidates.

component. However, we find that at the end of training, roughly 46% of the weight comes from the MLE candidates. We attribute this to the variations in weight between the candidates, which are smaller than those in the text completion task, with a standard deviation ranging from .005 to .025 over the course of training.

The task losses used in MT are highly concentrated on matching a reference translation and are similar to the 0-1 loss to which the log loss (MLE) is a proxy. We suspect that it is more difficult to find candidates that improve substantially over MLE, resulting in smaller improvements than in text completion.

6 Conclusion

We propose maximum-likelihood guided parameter search (MGS), a training method for optimizing an arbitrary sequence-level task loss. MGS samples update directions and weights them according to their improvement in task loss. Key to our method is a proposal distribution which either performs random search around the current parameter or around the maximum-likelihood gradient.

MGS substantially reduced non-termination and repetition in a text completion task, and outperformed maximum likelihood on machine translation, with fine-tuning and when trained from scratch. MGS incorporates the maximum-likelihood gradient into its objective, which led to solutions that were more stable with respect to perplexity than those found by policy and minimum risk training, which required MLE as an auxiliary loss in practice. The results suggest that MGS is a promising alternative to minimum risk and policy gradient, and improving upon its simple, yet effective, form of exploration is a fruitful direction for future research.

Broader Impact

Our method deals with improving neural sequence generation models for natural language processing applications, and thus inherits the potential impact and concerns that these applications bring (see Brown et al. (2020) for a review). Generation tasks such as translation, summarization, and machine-aided writing hold the promise of improved communication, easier information access, and increased creative output, and can potentially benefit from directly optimizing task-specific objectives. On the other hand, generation models carry a risk of producing biased or offensive content, and can be used for nefarious applications such as fake news generation (Zellers et al. 2019), which could be enhanced by task loss minimization. Alternatively, using a task loss to specify and correct for biases in conventionally-trained models may be part of a solution that mitigates these issues, but more work is needed to determine whether this is a viable path.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ilia Kulikov for valuable discussions. We thank NVIDIA and eBay for their support. This work was supported by NSF Award 1922658 NRT-HDR: FUTURE Foundations, Translation, and Responsibility for Data Science; Samsung Advanced Institute of Technology (Next Generation Deep Learning: from pattern recognition to AI); and Samsung Research (Improving Deep Learning using Latent Structure).

References

- Andor, D.; Alberti, C.; Weiss, D.; Severyn, A.; Presta, A.; Ganchev, K.; Petrov, S.; and Collins, M. 2016. Globally normalized transition-based neural networks. In *54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016 - Long Papers*. ISBN 9781510827585. doi:10.18653/v1/p16-1231.
- Bäck, T.; and Schwefel, H.-P. 1993. An Overview of Evolutionary Algorithms for Parameter Optimization. *Evolutionary Computation* ISSN 1063-6560. doi:10.1162/evco.1993.1.1.1.
- Baevski, A.; and Auli, M. 2019. Adaptive Input Representations for Neural Language Modeling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ByxZX20qFQ>.
- Bahdanau, D.; Brakel, P.; Xu, K.; Goyal, A.; Lowe, R.; Pineau, J.; Courville, A.; and Bengio, Y. 2016. An Actor-Critic Algorithm for Sequence Prediction.
- Bahdanau, D.; Cho, K.; and Bengio, Y. 2015. Neural Machine Translation by Jointly Learning to Align and Translate. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0473>.
- Banerjee, S.; and Lavie, A. 2005. METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*.
- Bengio, S.; Vinyals, O.; Jaitly, N.; and Shazeer, N. 2015. Scheduled sampling for sequence prediction with recurrent neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. ISSN 10495258.
- Brown, T. B.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Agarwal, S.; Herbert-Voss, A.; Krueger, G.; Henighan, T.; Child, R.; Ramesh, A.; Ziegler, D. M.; Wu, J.; Winter, C.; Hesse, C.; Chen, M.; Sigler, E.; Litwin, M.; Gray, S.; Chess, B.; Clark, J.; Berner, C.; McCandlish, S.; Radford, A.; Sutskever, I.; and Amodei, D. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners .
- Caccia, M.; Caccia, L.; Fedus, W.; Larochelle Google Brain, H.; Mila, M.; Research, F. A.; and Canada CIFAR Chair, M. A. 2020. Language GANs Falling Short. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Cettolo, M.; Niehues, J.; Stüker, S.; Bentivogli, L.; and Federico, M. 2014. Report on the 11th IWSLT evaluation campaign, IWSLT 2014. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation*.
- Chen, Y.; Li, V. O.; Cho, K.; and Bowman, S. R. 2018. A stable and effective learning strategy for trainable greedy decoding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2018*. ISBN 9781948087841. doi:10.18653/v1/d18-1035.
- Choshen, L.; Fox, L.; Aizenbud, Z.; and Abend, O. 2020. On the Weaknesses of Reinforcement Learning for Neural Machine Translation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Daumé, H.; Langford, J.; and Marcu, D. 2009. Search-based structured prediction. *Machine Learning* ISSN 08856125. doi:10.1007/s10994-009-5106-x.
- Daumé, H.; and Marcu, D. 2005. Learning as Search Optimization: Approximate Large Margin Methods for Structured Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '05*, 169–176. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 1595931805. doi:10.1145/1102351.1102373. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1102351.1102373>.
- De Boer, P. T.; Kroese, D. P.; Mannor, S.; and Rubinstein, R. Y. 2005. A tutorial on the cross-entropy method. *Annals of Operations Research* ISSN 02545330. doi:10.1007/s10479-005-5724-z.
- de Masson d’Autume, C.; Mohamed, S.; Rosca, M.; and Rae, J. 2019. Training Language GANs from Scratch. In Wallach, H.; Larochelle, H.; Beygelzimer, A.; d’Alché Buc, F.; Fox, E.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, 4300–4311. Curran Associates, Inc. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/8682-training-language-gans-from-scratch.pdf>.
- Deng, Y.; Bakhtin, A.; Ott, M.; Szlam, A.; and Ranzato, M. 2020. Residual Energy-Based Models for Text Generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B114SgHKDH>.

- Edunov, S.; Ott, M.; Auli, M.; Grangier, D.; and Ranzato, M. 2018. Classical Structured Prediction Losses for Sequence to Sequence Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, 355–364. New Orleans, Louisiana: Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/N18-1033. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N18-1033>.
- Graves, A. 2013. Generating Sequences With Recurrent Neural Networks URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1308.0850>.
- Gu, J.; Cho, K.; and Li, V. O. 2017. Trainable greedy decoding for neural machine translation. In *EMNLP 2017 - Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings*. ISBN 9781945626838. doi:10.18653/v1/d17-1210.
- Ha, D.; and Schmidhuber, J. 2018. Recurrent world models facilitate policy evolution. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. ISSN 10495258.
- Hansen, N. 2011. Injecting External Solutions Into CMA-ES URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.4181>.
- Hansen, N.; and Ostermeier, A. 2001. Completely de-randomized self-adaptation in evolution strategies. doi:10.1162/106365601750190398.
- Henderson, P.; Islam, R.; Bachman, P.; Pineau, J.; Precup, D.; and Meger, D. 2018. Deep reinforcement learning that matters. In *32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2018*. ISBN 9781577358008.
- Holtzman, A.; Buys, J.; Forbes, M.; and Choi, Y. 2019. The curious case of neural text degeneration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09751*.
- Koehn, P.; and Knowles, R. 2017. Six Challenges for Neural Machine Translation. doi:10.18653/v1/w17-3204.
- Lafferty, J.; McCallum, A.; and Pereira, F. C. N. 2001. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. *ICML '01 Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning* ISSN 1750-2799. doi:10.1038/nprot.2006.61.
- LeCun, Y.; Chopra, S.; Hadsell, R.; Ranzato, M.; and Huang, F. 2006. A tutorial on energy-based learning. *Predicting structured data* 1(0).
- Lee, J.; Tran, D.; Firat, O.; and Cho, K. 2020. On the Discrepancy between Density Estimation and Sequence Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07233*.
- Lehman, J.; Chen, J.; Clune, J.; and Stanley, K. O. 2018. Safe Mutations for Deep and Recurrent Neural Networks through Output Gradients. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO '18*, 117–124. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450356183. doi:10.1145/3205455.3205473. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3205455.3205473>.
- Li, M.; Roller, S.; Kulikov, I.; Welleck, S.; Boureau, Y.-L.; Cho, K.; and Weston, J. 2020. Don't Say That! Making Inconsistent Dialogue Unlikely with Unlikelihood Training.
- Liu, S.; Zhu, Z.; Ye, N.; Guadarrama, S.; and Murphy, K. 2017. Improved Image Captioning via Policy Gradient optimization of SPIDeR. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. ISBN 9781538610329. ISSN 15505499. doi:10.1109/ICCV.2017.100.
- Maheswaranathan, N.; Metz, L.; Tucker, G.; Choi, D.; and Sohl-Dickstein, J. 2019. Guided evolutionary strategies: augmenting random search with surrogate gradients. In Chaudhuri, K.; and Salakhutdinov, R., eds., *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 4264–4273. Long Beach, California, USA: PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/maheswaranathan19a.html>.
- Mania, H.; Guy, A.; and Recht, B. 2018. Simple random search provides a competitive approach to reinforcement learning. Technical report. URL <https://github.com/modestyachts/ARS>.
- Matyas, J. 1965. Random Optimization. *Automat. i Telemekh*.
- Merity, S.; Xiong, C.; Bradbury, J.; and Socher, R. 2016. Pointer Sentinel Mixture Models. *ArXiv* abs/1609.07843.
- Murray, K.; and Chiang, D. 2018. Correcting Length Bias in Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, 212–223. Brussels, Belgium: Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/W18-6322. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W18-6322>.
- Norouzi, M.; Bengio, S.; Chen, Z.; Jaitly, N.; Schuster, M.; Wu, Y.; and Schuurmans, D. 2016. Reward augmented maximum likelihood for neural structured prediction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. ISSN 10495258.
- Och, F. J. 2003. Minimum error rate training in statistical machine translation. doi:10.3115/1075096.1075117.
- Ott, M.; Auli, M.; Grangier, D.; and Ranzato, M. 2018. Analyzing uncertainty in neural machine translation. In *35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018*. ISBN 9781510867963.
- Ott, M.; Edunov, S.; Baevski, A.; Fan, A.; Gross, S.; Ng, N.; Grangier, D.; and Auli, M. 2019a. fairseq: A Fast, Extensible Toolkit for Sequence Modeling. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019: Demonstrations*.
- Ott, M.; Edunov, S.; Grangier, D.; and Auli, M. 2019b. Scaling Neural Machine Translation. doi:10.18653/v1/w18-6301.
- Owen, A. B. 2013. *Monte Carlo theory, methods and examples*.
- Papineni, K.; Roukos, S.; Ward, T.; and Zhu, W.-j. 2002. BLEU : a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. *Computational Linguistics*.
- Paulus, R.; Xiong, C.; and Socher, R. 2018. A deep reinforced model for abstractive summarization. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018 - Conference Track Proceedings*.

- Plappert, M.; Houthoofd, R.; Dhariwal, P.; Sidor, S.; Chen, R. Y.; Chen, X.; Asfour, T.; Abbeel, P.; and Andrychowicz, M. 2018. Parameter space noise for exploration. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018 - Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Pourchot, and Sigaud. 2019. CEM-RL: Combining evolutionary and gradient-based methods for policy search. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BkeU5j0ctQ>.
- Radford, A.; Wu, J.; Child, R.; Luan, D.; Amodei, D.; and Sutskever, I. 2018. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners .
- Raffel, C.; Shazeer, N.; Roberts, A.; Lee, K.; Narang, S.; Matena, M.; Zhou, Y.; Li, W.; and Liu, P. J. 2019. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10683>.
- Ranzato, M.; Chopra, S.; Auli, M.; and Zaremba, W. 2016. Sequence level training with recurrent neural networks. In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2016 - Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Rechenberg, I. 1978. Evolutionsstrategien. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-81283-5_8.
- Ross, S.; Gordon, G. J.; and Bagnell, J. A. 2011. A reduction of imitation learning and structured prediction to no-regret online learning. In *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. ISSN 15324435.
- Rubinstein, R. 1999. The Cross-Entropy Method for Combinatorial and Continuous Optimization. *Methodology And Computing In Applied Probability* ISSN 1387-5841. doi:10.1023/A:1010091220143.
- Rückstieß, T.; Sehnke, F.; Schaul, T.; Wierstra, D.; Sun, Y.; and Schmidhuber, J. 2010. Exploring Parameter Space in Reinforcement Learning. *Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics* ISSN 2081-4836. doi:10.2478/s13230-010-0002-4.
- Rush, A. M.; Chopra, S.; and Weston, J. 2015. A neural attention model for sentence summarization. In *Conference Proceedings - EMNLP 2015: Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. ISBN 9781941643327.
- Salimans, T.; Ho, J.; Chen, X.; Sidor, S.; and Sutskever, I. 2017. Evolution Strategies as a Scalable Alternative to Reinforcement Learning.
- Sener, O.; and Koltun, V. 2020. Learning to Guide Random Search. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BlgHokBKwS>.
- Shen, S.; Cheng, Y.; He, Z.; He, W.; Wu, H.; Sun, M.; and Liu, Y. 2016. Minimum risk training for neural machine translation. In *54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016 - Long Papers*. ISBN 9781510827585. doi:10.18653/v1/p16-1159.
- Smith, D. A.; and Eisner, J. 2006. Minimum risk annealing for training log-linear models. doi:10.3115/1273073.1273174.
- Soutsov, P.; and Sarawagi, S. 2016. Length bias in encoder decoder models and a case for global conditioning. In *EMNLP 2016 - Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings*. ISBN 9781945626258. doi:10.18653/v1/d16-1158.
- Stahlberg, F.; and Byrne, B. 2019. On NMT Search Errors and Model Errors: Cat Got Your Tongue? In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, 3354–3360. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/D19-1331. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D19-1331>.
- Sutskever, I.; Martens, J.; and Hinton, G. 2011. Generating text with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2011*. ISBN 9781450306195.
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. ISSN 10495258.
- Vemula, A.; Sun, W.; and Bagnell, J. 2019. Contrasting Exploration in Parameter and Action Space: A Zeroth-Order Optimization Perspective. In Chaudhuri, K.; and Sugiyama, M., eds., *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2926–2935. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/vemula19a.html>.
- Vinyals, O.; Quoc, G.; and Le, V. 2015. A Neural Conversational Model. In *ICML Deep Learning Workshop*.
- Wang, B.; and Ou, Z. 2018. Learning Neural Trans-Dimensional Random Field Language Models with Noise-Contrastive Estimation. In *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*. ISBN 9781538646588. ISSN 15206149. doi:10.1109/ICASSP.2018.8461813.
- Wang, C.; and Sennrich, R. 2020. On Exposure Bias, Hallucination and Domain Shift in Neural Machine Translation URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.03642>.
- Welleck, S.; Kulikov, I.; Kim, J.; Pang, R. Y.; and Cho, K. 2020a. Consistency of a Recurrent Language Model With Respect to Incomplete Decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02492* .
- Welleck, S.; Kulikov, I.; Roller, S.; Dinan, E.; Cho, K.; and Weston, J. 2020b. Neural Text Generation With Unlikelihood Training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SJeYe0NtvH>.
- Wierstra, D.; Schaul, T.; Glasmachers, T.; Sun, Y.; Peters, J.; and Schmidhuber, J. 2014. Natural evolution strategies. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* ISSN 15337928.
- Williams, R. J. 1992. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning* ISSN 0885-6125. doi:10.1007/bf00992696.
- Wiseman, S.; and Rush, A. M. 2016. Sequence-to-sequence learning as beam-search optimization. In *EMNLP 2016 - Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language*

Processing, Proceedings. ISBN 9781945626258. doi: 10.18653/v1/d16-1137.

Wolf, T.; Debut, L.; Sanh, V.; Chaumond, J.; Delangue, C.; Moi, A.; Cistac, P.; Rault, T.; Louf, R.; Funtowicz, M.; and Brew, J. 2019. HuggingFace's Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. *ArXiv* abs/1910.03771.

Yu, L.; Zhang, W.; Wang, J.; and Yu, Y. 2017. SeqGAN: Sequence generative adversarial nets with policy gradient. In *31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2017*.

Zellers, R.; Holtzman, A.; Rashkin, H.; Bisk, Y.; Farhadi, A.; Roesner, F.; and Choi, Y. 2019. Defending Against Neural Fake News. In Wallach, H.; Larochelle, H.; Beygelzimer, A.; d'Alché Buc, F.; Fox, E.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, 9054–9065. Curran Associates, Inc. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/9106-defending-against-neural-fake-news.pdf>.

Ziegler, D. M.; Stiennon, N.; Wu, J.; Brown, T. B.; Radford, A.; Amodei, D.; Christiano, P.; and Irving, G. 2019. Fine-Tuning Language Models from Human Preferences URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08593>.

A Appendix

A.1 Self-normalized Importance Sampling

For completeness, we review self-normalized importance sampling (see (Owen 2013) for a further review), and show the explicit derivation of the MGS update. Importance sampling estimates the expected value of a function $f(x)$ under $p(x)$ using a proposal distribution $q(x)$. Self-normalized importance sampling assumes $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are only known up to multiplicative constants, $\tilde{p}(x) = ap(x)$, $\tilde{q}(x) = bq(x)$. The expected value is estimated with weights $w(x) = \frac{\tilde{p}(x)}{\tilde{q}(x)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}_{f,p} &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K f(x_k)w(x_k)}{\sum_{k'=1}^K w(x_{k'})} \\ &= \frac{\frac{a}{b} \sum_{k=1}^K f(x_k) \frac{p(x_k)}{q(x_k)}}{\frac{a}{b} \sum_{k'=1}^K \frac{p(x_{k'})}{q(x_{k'})}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K f(x_k) \frac{p(x_k)}{q(x_k)}}{\sum_{k'=1}^K \frac{p(x_{k'})}{q(x_{k'})}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last line shows that self-normalized importance sampling is equivalent to using standard importance sampling weights $\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$ that are normalized.

In our case, x_k is a direction Δ_k , f is the identity, and \tilde{p} and \tilde{q} are defined in 2, 6. This gives,

$$w(\Delta_k) = \frac{\exp(\alpha(C(\theta) - C(\theta + \Delta_n)))}{q_{\text{MGS}}(\Delta_n|\theta)},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Delta} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{w(\Delta_k)}{\sum_{k'=1}^K w(\Delta_{k'})} \Delta_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{w}(\Delta_k) \exp(\alpha(C(\theta) - C(\theta + \Delta_k))) \Delta_k,\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

where

$$\hat{w}(\Delta_n) = \frac{q_{\text{MGS}}(\Delta_n|\theta)^{-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^K w(\Delta_k)}.$$

We use the form (14) in Section 3.

MGS inherits properties of self-normalized importance sampling (see (Owen 2013)). The variance can be computed as,

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{\Delta}_{\text{MGS}}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{w}_k (\Delta_k - \tilde{\Delta})^2,\quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{w}_k = w(\Delta_k) / \sum_{k'} w(\Delta_{k'})$.

A.2 Derivations

Minimum risk gradient. Consider the minimum risk training objective (9). Let Z_θ denote $\sum_{Y \in S} p_\theta(Y|X)^\alpha$, p_θ^α denote $p_\theta(Y|X)^\alpha$, q_θ denote the distribution (9), and $c_{\hat{Y}}$ denote $c(\hat{Y}, Y)$. The gradient of the objective is,

$$\nabla_\theta \left[\sum_{\hat{Y} \in S} q_\theta c_{\hat{Y}} \right] = \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S} q_\theta \nabla \log q_\theta c_{\hat{Y}}.\quad (16)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla \log q_\theta &= \nabla \log p_\theta^\alpha - \nabla \log Z_\theta \\ &= \alpha \nabla \log p_\theta - \nabla \log Z_\theta, \\ \nabla \log Z_\theta &= \nabla \log \sum_{Y' \in S} p_\theta^\alpha \\ &= \frac{\sum_{Y' \in S} \nabla p_\theta^\alpha}{\sum_{Y' \in S} p_\theta^\alpha} \\ &= \alpha \sum_{Y' \in S} q_\theta \nabla \log p_\theta.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these expressions into (16) gives $\nabla_\theta C_{\text{MRT}} =$

$$\begin{aligned}&= \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S} q_\theta \left[\alpha \nabla \log p_\theta \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \alpha \sum_{Y' \in S} q_\theta(Y'|X) \nabla \log p_\theta(Y'|X) \right] c_{\hat{Y}} \\ &= \alpha \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S} q_\theta \left[\nabla \log p_\theta - \mathbb{E}_{Y' \sim q_\theta} \nabla \log p_\theta(Y'|X) \right] c_{\hat{Y}} \\ &= \alpha \left[\mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} [c_{\hat{Y}} \nabla \log p_\theta] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} [c_{\hat{Y}}] \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} [\nabla \log p_\theta] \right],\end{aligned}$$

which is equation (11).

When $Y^* \in S$, expanding the preceding expression for $\nabla_\theta C_{\text{MRT}}$ gives (hiding the conditioning terms for brevity),

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\theta C_{\text{MRT}} &= \alpha \left[q_\theta(Y^*) c(Y^*) \nabla \log p_\theta(Y^*) + \right. \\ &\quad \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S \setminus Y^*} q_\theta(\hat{Y}) c(\hat{Y}) \nabla \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}) - \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} [c_{Y^*}] q_\theta(Y^*) \nabla \log p_\theta(Y^*) - \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S \setminus Y^*} \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} [c_{\hat{Y}}] q_\theta(\hat{Y}) \nabla \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}) \right] \\ &= \alpha \left[w(Y^*) \nabla \log p_\theta(Y^*) + \right. \\ &\quad \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S \setminus Y^*} w(\hat{Y}) \nabla \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}) - \\ &\quad \bar{w}(Y^*) \nabla \log p_\theta(Y^*) - \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S \setminus Y^*} \bar{w}(\hat{Y}) \nabla \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}) \right] \\ &= \alpha \left[(w(Y^*) - \bar{w}(Y^*)) \nabla \log p_\theta(Y^*) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{\hat{Y} \in S \setminus Y^*} (w(\hat{Y}) - \bar{w}(\hat{Y})) \nabla \log p_\theta(\hat{Y}) \right]. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

A.3 Limitations

Computation. Maximum-likelihood guided parameter search requires decoding $K + 1$ sequences to compute the sequence costs, as well as a single forward and backward pass

to compute the loss gradient $\nabla\mathcal{L}$. However, the candidates and their corresponding costs can be computed in parallel. To reduce communication cost, each parameter update can be computed by only communicating the scalar sequence costs and the random seed used to generate each perturbation, in a scheme similar to (Salimans et al. 2017). In principle this would allow scaling MGS to a large number of candidate directions, which we save for future work. We demonstrate in the experiments that MGS can also be effective with just four candidate directions computed serially.

A.4 Experimental Setup

Text completion. First, we fine-tune the pretrained GPT-2 model using maximum likelihood for 400k steps, and select the model state with the lowest validation perplexity (evaluated every 5k steps). Each training batch contains a maximum of 1024 total tokens, and we use the default hyper-parameters from the implementation in the `transformers` library (Wolf et al. 2019). We then train with MGS using the same hyper-parameters, beginning at the fine-tuned model state. We use 4 candidates and a mixture parameter $\pi = 0.5$. For computing each candidate’s task loss during training, we use greedy decoding, with a maximum decoding length of 1.3 times the length of the longest target sequence in the batch. The MLE gradient is clipped to have a maximum L_2 norm of 1.0. The noise level σ^2 is set to $\frac{1}{|\theta|} \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}\|_1$, which on average yields candidates with similar L_1 norms to the MLE gradient. We found that scaling the noise for each weight tensor w individually by $\frac{1}{|\theta_w|} \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}\|_1$ resulted in candidates with more diverse decoded sequences, and use this method in the experiments below. The model is evaluated on the validation set every 100 batches, and training ends when the lowest achieved validation distance does not change for 10 consecutive evaluations.

Machine translation. We experiment on the IWSLT ‘14 German to English task (Cettolo et al. 2014) using the experimental setup from the fairseq repository.³ The training data consists of 160K sentence pairs, the validation set consists of 7K sentences randomly sampled and held out from the training data, and the test data is a concatenation of `tst2010`, `tst2011`, `tst2012`, `dev2010`, and `dev2012`.⁴ All data is lowercased and tokenized with a byte-pair encoding (BPE) of 10,000 types. We use the `transformer_iwslt_de_en` model configuration, a six-layer transformer. We train the MLE baseline with the default hyper-parameters, except we use gradient clipping (1.0) and disable patience (-1) which resulted in higher validation BLEU. We train MGS models with the same hyper-parameters, using 4 candidates and a grid search over noise ($\{0.01, 0.1, 1.0\}$) and α ($\{1.0, 10.0, 100.0\}$), selecting α 1.0 and noise 1.0. The noise is scaled by $\frac{1}{|\theta|} \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}_{MLE}\|_1$. For fine-tuning, we use a batch

³<https://github.com/pytorch/fairseq/tree/8e48f45aa469bbff85613520ffc161c0850e4744/examples/translation>.

⁴<https://github.com/pytorch/fairseq/blob/8e48f45aa469bbff85613520ffc161c0850e4744/examples/translation/prepare-iwslt14.sh>

	Task-loss	Nonterm	PPL
q_{MGS}	59.2	.013	22.1
q_{zero}	143.0	.348	20.9
q_{MLE}	141.6	.351	20.9

Table 6: Using the MGS mixture distribution (q_{MGS}) versus using only the zero-mean component (q_{zero}) or the MLE-mean component (q_{MLE}) as the proposal distribution in MGS (C_{LM}).

size of 16k tokens, and accumulate gradients for 4 iterations. We select $\alpha = 100.0$ and noise 1.0 for all MGS fine-tuning based on a grid search with MGS-SBLEU. All models are selected for evaluation based on validation BLEU using beam search with width 5.

A.5 Additional Results

Text completion. Table 6 shows validation metrics for the proposal distribution ablation.

Table 7 shows results using ancestral sampling. In this case we train MGS models with ancestral sampling as the training decoder. Evaluation is done by sampling one continuation per prefix in the validation set.

Table 8 shows results for policy gradient (PG) and minimum risk training (MRT) without mixing the MLE objective, results with mixing MLE with various mixture weights α , and MRT with including the greedy-decoded sequence and/or the ground-truth sequence as a candidate.

Table 9 shows additional continuations.

	LM	Edit	Nonterm	Repetition	Avg len	PPL
MLE	336.0 (27.0)	.932 (.003)	.001 (.001)	.018 (.001)	110.5 (10.4)	21.3 (0.2)
MGS-LM	113.2 (9.1)	.934 (.003)	.000 (.000)	.006 (.001)	28.5 (3.6)	22.2 (0.3)
MRT-LM (+MLE 0.1)	117.8 (8.4)	.945 (.006)	.000 (.000)	.005 (.001)	27.9 (3.6)	25.8 (1.7)
PG-LM (+MLE 0.1)	53.2 (1.8)	.972 (.004)	.000 (.000)	.001 (.002)	4.4 (1.0)	30.7 (7.3)
MGS-edit	159.5 (8.3)	.927 (.002)	.000 (.000)	.009 (.001)	46.0 (2.5)	21.8 (0.2)
MRT-edit (+MLE 0.3)	312.8 (30.8)	.930 (.004)	.002 (.004)	.021 (.004)	105.9 (12.6)	23.2 (1.0)
PG-edit (+MLE 0.1)	225.4 (16.3)	.917 (.002)	.000 (.000)	.015 (.003)	69.2 (5.6)	24.5 (0.8)
Human	–	–	.000	.009	107.7	–

Table 7: Text completion results evaluated using **ancestral sampling** (GPT-2, Wikitext-103 test set), reported as mean (stdev) using 5 random seeds. The MGS models are trained with ancestral sampling as the training decoder.

	LM	Edit	Nonterm	Repetition	Avg. len.	Perplexity
MLE	146.4	.938	.379	.545	239.7	20.9
MGS-LM	59.2	.937	.013	.043	20.1	22.1
MGS-edit	74.3	.925	.049	.089	45.6	21.5
MRT-LM	46.8	.968	.000	.000	3.1	61.9
MRT-LM (greedy)	47.1	.968	.001	.005	3.5	403.4
MRT-LM (gold)	46.7	.978	.000	.000	1.5	105719428593.4
MRT-LM (greedy, gold)	47.3	.980	.000	.000	1.1	1214304797770.7
PG-LM	47.1	.965	.000	.000	3.8	45.5
MRT-LM (+MLE 0.1)	55.3	.946	.016	.027	17.9	24.1
MRT-LM (+MLE 0.3)	106.6	.911	.065	.218	78.3	24.0
MRT-LM (+MLE 0.5)	135.5	.924	.236	.444	173.9	22.5
PG-LM (+MLE 0.1)	47.2	.967	.001	.004	4.0	28.6
PG-LM (+MLE 0.3)	48.2	.960	.004	.009	7.3	24.5
PG-LM (+MLE 0.5)	51.4	.955	.008	.016	11.1	24.4
MRT-edit	159.5	.890	.000	.553	43.6	34427069131.9
MRT-edit (greedy)	116.5	.877	.000	.678	47.3	208.5
MRT-edit (gold)	151.1	.925	.138	.367	126.9	52.4
MRT-edit (greedy, gold)	694.7	.959	.419	.443	270.7	60.9
PG-edit	106.5	.895	.016	.196	57.8	25.6
MRT-edit (+MLE 0.1)	151.7	.942	.376	.595	244.6	22.1
MRT-edit (+MLE 0.3)	125.0	.913	.143	.362	131.2	23.2
MRT-edit (+MLE 0.5)	145.5	.931	.297	.458	199.4	22.9
PG-edit (+MLE 0.1)	96.4	.901	.016	.183	47.8	25.4
PG-edit (+MLE 0.3)	101.9	.904	.041	.212	66.5	24.0
PG-edit (+MLE 0.5)	109.7	.904	.076	.303	90.9	24.0
Human	–	–	.000	.009	107.7	–

Table 8: Policy gradient (PG) and minimum risk training (MRT) for text completion (GPT-2, Wikitext-103 validation set, greedy decoding) in various training setups: (1) PG and MRT without stochastic mixing of the MLE objective; (2) MRT with the greedy sequence, gold sequence, or both as candidates; (3) PG and MRT with stochastic mixing at various α values. Due to the large number of combinations, we report metrics for a single random seed. For the LM loss without MLE, MRT and PG learn to produce empty or short sequences with substantially increased perplexity. For edit distance, MRT finds degenerate solutions in terms of either repetition, nontermination, or perplexity, even with MLE mixed in. For MRT, no candidate strategy shows consistent improvement over the others, so for simplicity we use sampling alone in the other experiments. Stochastically mixing in MLE with PG or MRT training controls the tradeoff between task loss and perplexity.

Prefix	<i>Disappointed by her blocked entry into the operatic</i>
MLE	world, the composer turned to the theatre, where he was able to work with the theatre's theatre staff. He was able to write a number of plays, including The Mikado (1894), The Mikado (1894), The Mikado (1894), The Mikado (1894), The Mikado (1894), The Mikado (1894), The Mikado (1894), → ∞
MGS-LM	world , the composer decided to return to the theatre. ⟨eos⟩
MGS-edit	world , the composer was forced to return to the theatre in 1891. ⟨eos⟩
Prefix	<i>As the 29th Brigade advanced toward the Mivo</i>
MLE	River, the 2nd Battalion, 29th Infantry Regiment, was ordered to attack the village of Mivo. The regiment was ordered to attack the village from the north, and the 2nd Battalion, 29th Infantry Regiment, was ordered to attack from the south. The regiment was ordered to attack from the north → ∞
MGS-LM	River, the brigade's commander, Brigadier General Richard H. White, ordered the brigade to move forward. The brigade's advance was halted by the arrival of the 2nd Battalion, 7th Marines. ⟨eos⟩
MGS-edit	River, the brigade's commander, Lieutenant Colonel Robert J. McPherson, was killed in action. ⟨eos⟩
Prefix	<i>In April 1991, Carol Matthews and Richard Kevin Lang</i>
MLE	were hired as the new head coach of the University of Michigan. The team was ranked No. 1 in the AP Poll and No. 1 in the Coaches' Poll. The team was also ranked No. 1 in the Coaches' Poll. The team was also ranked No. 1 in the Coaches' Poll. The team was also ranked No. 1 in the Coaches' Poll. ⟨eos⟩
MGS-LM	were arrested for the murder of a police officer. ⟨eos⟩
MGS-edit	were arrested in the United States for allegedly assaulting a police officer. ⟨eos⟩
Prefix	<i>In 1644, Hu took it upon himself to</i>
MLE	establish a new royal court in the capital, Beijing. He also established a new administrative system, which was based on the principle of the " Five Hundred Years' War ". He also established a new administrative system for the capital, which was based on the principle of the " Five Hundred Years' War ". He also established a new administrative system for the city, which was based on the principle of the " Five Hundred Years' War ". ⟨eos⟩
MGS-LM	establish a new capital. He built a new palace, the Palace of the Holy Apostles, and built a new church. ⟨eos⟩
MGS-edit	take over the administration of the province. He was assisted by the king's brother, the Duke of Wellington, who was appointed to the post of governor. ⟨eos⟩

Table 9: Example greedy continuations (GPT-2, Wikitext-103 validation set). The first two show representative examples of eliminating non-termination. Roughly 38% of the baseline's continuations are non-terminating, with around 1% for MGS-LM and 5% for MGS-edit. The next two show reduction in repetition within a terminating continuation.