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Abstract

With the explosive growth of livestream broadcasting, there is an urgent need for new summarization technology that enables us to create a preview of streamed content and tap into this wealth of knowledge. However, the problem is nontrivial due to the informal nature of spoken language. Further, there has been a shortage of annotated datasets that are necessary for transcript summarization. In this paper, we present StreamHover, a framework for annotating and summarizing livestream transcripts. With a total of over 500 hours of videos annotated with both extractive and abstractive summaries, our benchmark dataset is significantly larger than currently existing annotated corpora. We explore a neural extractive summarization model that leverages vector-quantized variational autoencoder to learn latent vector representations of spoken utterances and identify salient utterances from the transcripts to form summaries. We show that our model generalizes better and improves performance over strong baselines. The results of this study provide an avenue for future research to improve summarization solutions for efficient browsing of livestreams.

1 Introduction

One of the most powerful communication mediums is livestreaming. New platforms such as YouTube Live, Twitch, Instagram Live and TikTok encompass a variety of topics, ranging from video games to social media to professional sports. We are particularly interested in livestreams that are distinguished by three characteristics: Excessive length, the recordings could last from several minutes to several hours; Verbal communication, the use of natural language is the primary means of communication, in contrast to gestures or facial expressions; Informal nature, the streamers’ language is mostly informal and unplanned, unlike news broadcasts. Without an effective mechanism to summarize such streamed content, livestreaming platforms may not fully meet the needs of their customers.

Figure 1: An example of streamed content on Behance, a streaming platform for artists and designers to showcase creative work related to Adobe Photoshop, Illustrator, Fresco, UI/UX, photography and more. Top: The videos are each 27 minutes long. Bottom: One video is being broadcast live, the other is >2 hours long.

Our goal in this work is to create a text preview of the streamed content. When a user hovers over the thumbnail or scrolls past a video, they are shown a preview of the content. We present a dataset of over 500 hours of video footage, which were streamed live on a social media platform (behance.net) created to showcase and discover creative work. Figure 1 shows an example of the streams, where the artists showcase the use of Adobe Photoshop and Illustrator in designing holiday cards and posters. It is necessary to point out that video analysis is not suitable here, as the video only mirrors the artists’ screen content. As a first step towards automatic creation of a text preview, we focus on identifying salient utterances to produce an extract from the livestream transcript.

We make use of vector-quantized variational autoencoders (VQ-VAE; van den Oord et al., 2017) to identify salient utterances. The model has been applied successfully to opinion summarization that learns in-domain sentence representations (Angelidis et al., 2021), which is essential for adaptation of general-domain models. We refrain from using sequential methods for utterance selection. First,
it is difficult to scale up sequential prediction to process transcripts that exceed the maximum allowed length, even with models that handle long text (Beltagy et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020). Second, sequential methods (Narayan et al., 2018b; Xiao and Carenini, 2019) may not give enough flexibility to select salient utterances on-the-fly when content is being streamed live, thus they are unsuitable for our case.

There has been a shortage of annotated datasets that are necessary for livestream transcript summarization. We build a browser-based user interface for summary annotation that provides to the annotators a clip of the livestream recording alongside a synchronized display of the transcript. The interface allows annotators to conveniently label summary utterances and write an abstractive summary using their own words (Figure 3). With a total of 500 hours of annotated video footage, our dataset is notably larger than existing annotated corpora for transcript summarization (Janin et al., 2003; Carletta et al., 2006). We compare our summarization approach with strong baselines on the dataset and shed light on the task of livestream transcript summarization. Our contributions are as follows.

- We create a detailed annotation interface and new benchmark dataset for automatic summarization of livestream transcripts. An informative preview of streamed content is of crucial importance to users when considering whether to hit play.
- We present StreamHover, a unsupervised model based on VQ-VAE to identify salient utterances from livestream transcripts to form preview summaries. We evaluate the method across multiple dimensions and discuss its strengths and weaknesses. Empirical results show that our method outperforms strong summarization baselines.1

2 Related Work

Closed captions are often provided onscreen, turning streaming videos into text on an unprecedented scale (Besik, 2020). However, there are very few summarization studies that attempt to generate text previews of streaming videos to help users browse or reﬁnd information that has been watched before. Neural text summarizers have focused primarily on written text, including news articles, reviews, scientiﬁc papers and book chapters (See et al., 2017; Tan et al., 2017; Chen and Bansal, 2018; Narayan et al., 2018a; Gehrmann et al., 2018; Cohan et al., 2018; Liu and Lapata, 2019; Fabbri et al., 2019; Bražiškas et al., 2020; Ladhak et al., 2020; Song et al., 2021). Despite their success, it remains unclear as to if and how the summarizers can be extended to spoken text, whose utterances may have very low information density.

It is crucial to identify salient content from transcripts where a substantial number of utterances are devoted to informal chit-chats in an attempt to connect with the audience (Figure 2). We investigate extractive rather than abstractive approaches as the latter are prone to generate hallucinated content that does not exist in the source text (Cao et al., 2017; Kryscinski et al., 2019; Lebanoff et al., 2019; Maynez et al., 2020). The problem could be exacerbated by ungrammatical spoken utterances and transcription errors. Instead, we consider VQ-VAE, an unsupervised representation learning technique (van den Oord et al., 2017; Jin et al., 2020; Angelidis et al., 2021) for content extraction. Unsupervised training of the VQ-VAE model and its inference could potentially be performed at the same time, allowing important utterances to be extracted from a transcript segment on-the-fly during streaming, without interrupting the learning process. It is also easier to tailor the model to specific domains compared to contemporary extractive methods (Yasnaga et al., 2017; Dong et al., 2018; Xu and Durrett, 2019; Wang et al., 2020).

1Our annotations and source code are available at https://github.com/ucfnlp/streamhover
Our work contributes to a refined understanding of transcript summarization, which is understudied relative to its importance and potential. The transcripts may be obtained from channels such as movies and TV’s (Papalampidi et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021), interviews (Zhu et al., 2021), multi-party meetings (Murray and Carenini, 2008; Wang and Cardie, 2013; Li et al., 2019b; Koay et al., 2020, 2021; Zhong et al., 2021), telephone speech (Kafle and Huenerfauth, 2018) and more. The main thrust distinguishing our work with others is the combination of a benchmark summarization dataset, novel summarization methods and a challenging new domain where salient content is scattered throughout the transcript and mixed with substantial chit-chats. We do not make use of video event detection or multi-modal fusion (Zhu et al., 2018; Palaskar et al., 2019; Li et al., 2020) as little information could be gleaned from videos that mirror the artists’ desktop. Instead, we focus on generating short descriptions from transcripts and leave for future work cross-modality research. We describe our data annotation process in the following section.

3 Our Dataset

We aim to create a large and representative corpus containing transcripts and summaries of streamed videos. We explore a leading social media platform (Behance.net) supported by Adobe Creative Cloud that features livestreams of creative work by artists and designers. The website boasts over 10 million users, who watch artists and designers livestream when they create. Our data are extracted from this website, containing a large quantity of streamed videos (>5,000), the length of which ranges from minutes to several hours. The streamers’ language is unplanned, instead of rehearsed as that of TED talks (Hernandez et al., 2018).

We obtain a total of 5,398 streamed videos. The metadata of a video includes its ID, duration, title, a short description and the transcript. Automatic transcription was provided by Microsoft Automatic Speech Recognition which helps make videos accessible to a wide audience. Each transcript contains a set of segments, each corresponds to about 30 seconds of audio. Each segment contains a set of utterances. Figure 2 shows an example of the segments and utterances. The offset of the segment

\[\text{Task A: Select sentences that best summarize a 5 minute transcript.}
\text{Please do NOT select chit-chat or greetings as summary sentences.}\]

\[\text{A little too many. But okay if they are good sentences.}\]

\[\text{Task B: Write a summary based on the selected sentences.}
\text{A minimum length of 100 characters is required. Characters written: 163}\]

\[\text{Selected Sentences}\]

\[\text{"We’re going to do a digital painting photo study, but we have a}
\text{little bit of a theme today which I hope you’re going to like,” “I was}
\text{looking for something for us to do a photo study of, and I found a}
\text{couple that have a nice cohesive theme,” “So the first one is this one}
\text{right here, which I’ve had for a while and wanted to paint,” “And the}
\text{other one is this woman sitting in a field holding a branch, and this}
\text{one is really pretty too.”}\]

\[\text{Selected Sentence Numbers}\]

\[\{7, 8, 11, 12\}\]

indicates the number of minutes since the beginning of the recording.

When a user hovers over the thumbnail or scrolls past a video, we expect a textual summary to give a glimpse of the verbal content. This view of summarization leads us to annotate salient content across the video in an equally detailed manner. It naturally avoids lead bias that is ubiquitous in news (Grenander et al., 2019). We segment a video into 5-minute clips and annotate each clip for summary-worthy content. A clip contains an average of 51 utterances and 460 words. Due to time and budget constraints, we select 370 streamed video for summary annotation.\(^3\) Table 1 provides a detailed comparison of our annotated corpus with previous datasets, including Switchboard (Godfrey et al., 1992), ICSI (Janin et al., 2003) and AMI (Carletta et al., 2006) that contain both transcripts and human-annotated ex-

\(^3\)Details of video selection are provided in Supplementary.
Table 1: A comparison of the transcript summarization
datasets with manually annotated extractive/abstractive summaries. “Yes/No” indicate a summary type is available or not. † suggests only small pilot summary annotations are available for the Switchboard dataset (Penn and Zhu, 2008). With a total duration of over 500 hours, our dataset is notably larger than similar datasets.

Table 2: Statistics of our dataset.

4 We use 10-second intervals rather than utterances as measuring units as the duration of utterances vary. If annotators all selected some content, or no content at all, from a 10-second interval, they are in agreement.

5 A show may have more than one host, their utterances are treated indistinguishably due to speaker diarization that identifies different speakers in the audio is not provided.
We define a codebook $E$ we seek to reconstruct the input utterance, which involves the input decoder ($\phi$) application domain. Our model parameters include the semantic space into clusters relevant to the application domain. The model is trained using a dictionary learning algorithm for code embeddings ($E$) and backpropagation with a straight-through estimator for model parameters $\theta$, $\varphi$ and $\phi$.

We employ an embedding function $\text{Embed}()$ to map an input utterance $x$ into a semantically meaningful space. The space is subsequently discretized according to a codebook. To achieve this, we prefix $x$ with a [CLS] token and append a [SEP] token, pass it into a BERT model, then obtain the vector corresponding to [CLS] as a pooled representation of the utterance, denoted by $h \in \mathbb{R}^H$ (Eq. (1)). We use a $\text{ConvEncoder}_\varphi(\cdot)$ with a set of $D$ filters to convolve the input $h$. The output is a sequence of feature vectors $\{q_1, \cdots, q_H\}$ where $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$ (Eq. (2)). We define a codebook $E = \{e_1, \cdots, e_K\}$, where $K$ is the number of latent codes and $e_k \in \mathbb{R}^D$ is the $k$-th code embedding. The $i$-th feature $q_i$ is assigned to the latent code $z_i$ whose embedding $e_{z_i}$ has the minimum Euclidean distance with it (Eq. (3)).

$$h = \text{Embed}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^H$$

(1)

$$\{q_1, \cdots, q_H\} = \text{ConvEncoder}_\varphi(h), q_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$$

(2)

$$z_i = \arg \max_k -\|q_i - e_k\|_2, \quad i \in [H]$$

(3)

With the latent code embeddings $\{e_1, \cdots, e_K\}$, we seek to reconstruct the input utterance, which is achieved by generating a dense vector $\hat{h}$ using a $\text{ConvDecoder}_\phi(\cdot)$ (Eq. (4)). $\hat{h}$ is then fed to a Transformer decoder to reconstruct the original utterance $\hat{x}$ (Eq. (5)). In this process, the code embeddings serve as “topic vectors” that group dimensions of the semantic space into clusters relevant to the application domain. Our model parameters include those used by the BERT encoder and Transformer decoder ($\theta$ and $\phi$), the convolutional encoder and decoder that use tied parameters ($\varphi$), and embeddings of the codebook $E$.

$$\tilde{h} = \text{ConvDecoder}_\phi([e_{z_1}, \cdots, e_{z_H}]) \in \mathbb{R}^H$$

(4)

$$\tilde{x} = \text{Generate}_\phi(\tilde{h})$$

(5)

We next describe the loss function used to learn these parameters. The loss function of our model comprises of three parts, including a cross-entropy term between the original and reconstructed utterance $X\text{Ent}(x, \tilde{x})$ that optimizes the BERT embedder $\theta$, Transformer generator $\phi$, and convolutional encoder and decoder $\varphi$, as shown in Figure 4. The gradients will, however, bypass the latent code embeddings due to the straight-through estimator (Bengio et al., 2013). To learn code embeddings in an end-to-end manner, we use a dictionary learning algorithm (van den Oord et al., 2017) that moves code embeddings $e_{z_i}$ towards feature vectors $q_i$ by minimizing the $l_2$-distance between the two vectors $\|e_{z_i} - \text{sg}(q_i)\|_2^2$, where $\text{sg}(\cdot)$ is a stop-gradient operator that constrains its operand to be a non-updated constant during backpropagation, i.e., it stops $q_i$ from being updated. As illustrated in Eq. (6), we additionally apply a commitment loss to encourage the feature vector $q_i$ to commit to a code embedding $e_{z_i}$. This loss term is associated with a coefficient $\beta \in [0, 1]$.

$$L(\theta) = X\text{Ent}(x, \tilde{x}) + \sum_i \|e_{z_i} - \text{sg}(q_i)\|_2^2 + \beta \sum_i \|\text{sg}(e_{z_i}) - q_i\|_2^2$$

(6)

At test time, we define summary utterances as those associated with prominent latent codes/topics. Given a set of $N$ utterances, we obtain latent codes from the $n$-th utterance using Eq. (3), denoted by $\{z_i^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^H$. This gives a total of $N \times H$ codes from which we find prominent ones. They are denoted by
which contains a set of most frequently occurring codes. A score \( S(x_n) \) is assigned to utterance \( x_n \) that computes how often it is associated with those prominent codes \( \mathcal{P} \). In Eq. (7), \( \sum_{i=1}^{H} 1[z_i^{(n)} = k] \) indicates the number of times the \( n \)-th utterance is assigned to code \( k \), where \( k \) belongs to \( \mathcal{P} \). Finally, we extract \( K \) highest-scoring utterances to form an extractive summary of the input.

\[
S(x_n) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{i=1}^{H} 1[z_i^{(n)} = k] \tag{7}
\]

Our method draws on the convolutional encoder and decoder to transform BERT’s semantic space to map each dimension to a latent code. The summary selection process is deterministic and our encoder takes full advantage of a large, pre-trained model to produce initial utterance representations. This design sets our method apart from that of Angelidis et al. (2021). Moreover, the method has the potential for modelling topic transitions between utterances to improve summarization of livestreams, which we leave for future work.

5 Experiments

Dataset. Finding salient content from livestream transcripts is a “needle-in-the-haystack” problem. Our summarization dataset contains a total of 370 videos split into short clips of 5 minutes each. The annotators manually annotated 5,421 clips (\( \sim 451 \) hours) with extractive and abstractive summaries. 582 clips (\( \sim 49 \) hours) are removed because they are identified to contain only chit-chats. The dataset is divided into training, validation and test splits:

- 3,884 clips (320 videos / 323 hours) in training,
- 728 clips (25 videos / 61 hours) in validation,
- 3,884 clips (320 videos / 323 hours) in test split.

We call our summarizer “StreamHover.” When a user hovers their mouse over a video’s timeline, a summary preview is shown and keeps updating. As a first attempt, StreamHover focuses on extracting salient utterances from individual clips instead of whole streams to encourage selected utterances to be mostly evenly distributed across the stream. When the content is provided live, the stream can be divided into short clips and our algorithm consumes one clip at a time to produce summaries on-the-fly. It is important to note that extracting summary utterances remains challenging even for modern neural summarizers. E.g., Kedzie et al. (2018) reveal that summarizers may not effectively identify summary content without a dependency on intentional lead bias in news writing. Our setting is challenging as not only are there few utterances deemed to be summary-worthy but such utterances can occur anywhere in a video clip.

Baselines. We compare StreamHover with state-of-the-art extractive and abstractive summarizers. The abstractive summarizers generate an abstract from the transcript of a clip without tuning.\(^6\) These include BART-large, BART-large-cnn (Lewis et al., 2020) and T5 (Raffel et al., 2020), which are some of the strongest performing neural abstractive summarizers that are pre-trained on language modeling and summarization tasks.

The unsupervised extractive summarizers extract salient utterances from a clip. LexRank (Erkan and Radev, 2004) and TextRank (Mihalcea and Tarau, 2004) are graph-based models that extract relevant sentences based on eigenvector centrality. SumBasic (Vanderwende et al., 2007) assigns higher scores to sentences containing frequently occurring content words. We further compare to a novel unsupervised graph-based summarization method for speech transcripts: FluCovRank (Shang et al., 2018) groups utterances into clusters, generates an abstractive sentence from each cluster, then selects the best elements from abstractive sentences under a budget constraint. Finally, we compare our approach with the Quantized Transformer (Angelidis et al., 2021), which uses a clustering interpretation of the quantized space and two-step sampling algorithm to extract summary sentences from reviews.

Settings. We use pretrained BERT-BASE as our embedder Embed\(_\theta(\cdot)\). The model has 12 layers, 12 heads per layer and a hidden size \( H \) of 768. A 6-layer Transformer decoder is used as the generator \( \text{Gen}_{\phi, \varphi} \) to reconstruct the original utterance. The model has 8 heads per layer, a hidden size of 768, and randomly initialized parameters. The convolutional encoder and decoder use a kernel size of 3. Because our embedder is pretrained and the remaining parameters are not, we divide them into two groups \( \mathcal{E} = \{ \theta \} \) and \( \mathcal{R} = \{ \phi, \varphi \} \), then apply separate training schedules. Following Liu and Lapata (2019) we use two Adam optimizers:

\[
lr_\mathcal{E} = \tilde{lr}_\mathcal{E} \cdot \min(\text{step}^{-0.5}, \text{step} \cdot \text{warmup}_\mathcal{E}^{-1.5}), \tag{5}\n\]

\[
lr_\mathcal{R} = \tilde{lr}_\mathcal{R} \cdot \min(\text{step}^{-0.5}, \text{step} \cdot \text{warmup}_\mathcal{R}^{-1.5}) \tag{6}\n\]

where the learning rate for the embedder \( \tilde{lr}_\mathcal{E} = 7e^{-4} \)

\(^6\)In a similar vein, our summarizer uses the transcripts to learn model parameters. It does not require utterance labels.
Table 3: Classification performance of extractive summarizers on identifying ground-truth summary utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>3-Sentence Output</th>
<th></th>
<th>4-Sentence Output</th>
<th></th>
<th>5-Sentence Output</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (%)</td>
<td>R (%)</td>
<td>F (%)</td>
<td>#Wrds</td>
<td>P (%)</td>
<td>R (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD-N</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SumBasic</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuantizedTran</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>80.09</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexRank</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TextRank</td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>22.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StreamHover</td>
<td>36.18</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>108.04</td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>22.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Results of extractive and abstractive summarizers evaluated by ROUGE. Extractive summarizers generate a 5-utterance summary for each clip. Oracle contains ground-truth summary utterances. StreamHover achieves the highest scores on R-2 and R-L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Extract</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>R-L</td>
<td>#Wrds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>123.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large-cnn</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>43.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-large</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>50.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FluCovRank</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>110.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Results of human evaluation regarding fluency, informativeness and the overall quality of system summaries using Best-Worst Scaling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Informat.</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FluCovRank</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexRank</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Results

In Table 3, we analyze the performance of extractive summarizers on identifying ground-truth summary utterances and report their precision, recall and $F_1$-measure scores. We vary the length of their output to yield {3, 4, 5}-utterance summaries. In comparison, a ground-truth extract contains 5.5 utterances. The Lead-N baseline selects the first N utterances of a clip. It gives low scores because our data do not present a strong lead bias as that of news articles. We find that StreamHover consistently outperforms other summarization systems across all lengths. Its length, when measured by number of words, is comparable to that of LexRank and TextRank. The highest $F_1$-score of 30.47% is achieved when StreamHover generates a 5-utterance summary for each 5-minute clip. This amounts to rendering one utterance per one-minute segment when a user scrolls past the video.

In Table 4, we compare extractive and abstractive summarizers and report ROUGE scores (Lin, 2004) that measure content overlap between system and reference summaries. We use human abstracts as the reference. All extractive summarizers produce 5-utterance summaries and Oracle Extract contains ground-truth utterances. StreamHover generates a 5-utterance summary for each 5-minute clip. This amounts to rendering one utterance per one-minute segment when a user scrolls past the video.

In Table 5, we compare extractive and abstractive summarizers and report ROUGE scores (Lin, 2004) that measure content overlap between system and reference summaries. We use human abstracts as the reference. All extractive summarizers produce 5-utterance summaries and Oracle Extract contains ground-truth utterances. StreamHover generates a 5-utterance summary for each 5-minute clip. This amounts to rendering one utterance per one-minute segment when a user scrolls past the video.

The recent automatic metrics (Zhang et al., 2020; Sellam et al., 2020) have not been tested on speech transcripts. Spoken text contains filled pauses (um, uh, well), disfluencies (go-go-go away), repetitions and verbal interruptions. ROUGE is the only metric that has been validated to attain good correlation with human judgments on transcripts (Liu and Liu, 2008).
When I look at the sheet but I would say top left when I look at the sheet but I would say top left yeah, you can find those yeah well top right also is like very Contra high contrast that tends to like grab my attention when I look at the sheet but I would say top left and bottom right give me the most like happy feels.

So yeah, if you guys want to grab the reference images, you can find them in the stream description below the individual images.

LexRank
- I hope you guys are having a good day so far.
- So I'm going to be painting from these images and these beautiful photos are from various photographers.
- Those yeah well top right also is like very Contra high contrast that tends to like grab my attention when I look at the sheet but I would say top left and bottom right give me the most like happy feels.
- So yeah, if you guys want to grab the reference images, you can find them in the stream description below the individual images.

BART-Large
- Hello good morning everybody welcome to the stream. I hope you guys are having a good day so far. Is there a lot of buffering or are we doing alright? I got a little message that there was some connectivity issue. For a moment there, so I hope I hope it's OK. Yeah, I'll just keep going. So yeah, if you guys want to grab the reference images, you can find them in the stream description below the individual images.

Quantized Transformer
- Good to see you were going to be doing cloud studies today.
- The stream in the description.
- One of them is from Morguefile, One is from Unsplash, well, two are from Unsplash and one is from pixels there a little bit from all over the place, but you can find the photographers below if you'd like.
- Let's see top left, bottom right.

StreamHover (Ours)
- So if anybody is interested in joining in, if you want to work on some skies for your landscapes for future landscapes, this is what we're going to be doing.
- One of them is from Morguefile. One is from Unsplash, well, two are from Unsplash and one is from pixels there a little bit from all over the place, but you can find the photographers below if you'd like.
- Hey Jennifer, saw the images.
- Let's see top left. bottom right.
- Those yeah well top right also is like very Contra high contrast that tends to like grab my attention when I look at the sheet but I would say top left and bottom right give me the most like happy feels.

We show example system summaries in Table 6. The BART summary is fluent but its content lacks specificity, as is the case for LexRank. The summary segments selected by FluCovRank are ungrammatical. StreamHover identifies on-topic and informative utterances related to digital painting. Their relevant spans of text are manually underlined for readability.

We show example system summaries in Table 6. The abstractive summaries generated by BART-Large are fluent but their content lacks specificity, so are the summaries produced by LexRank and Quantized Transformer. Particularly, QT does not seem to perform well on this task despite that the model has been retrained on livestream transcripts. We believe this is partly because words and phrases tend to repeat themselves in review documents, and while spoken utterances are verbose, there is little repetition found in the transcripts. We observe that summary segments selected by FluCovRank are on-topic but they are ungrammatical and difficult to interpret without context. In contrast, StreamHover can identify on-topic and informative utterances related to digital painting. We provide more examples in the supplemental materials.

In Table 7, we study the most prominent latent codes and their representative utterances (‘X’). Human annotated summary utterances are colored gray and ultra-short utterances are crossed out.

Table 6: Example system summaries for Digital Painting Studies with Maddy Bellwoar—Clouds. The BART summary is fluent but its content lacks specificity, as is the case for LexRank. The summary segments selected by FluCovRank are ungrammatical. StreamHover identifies on-topic and informative utterances related to digital painting. Their relevant spans of text are manually underlined for readability.

Table 7: A snippet from Digital Painting Studies with Maddy Bellwoar—Clouds. We show the most prominent latent codes and their representative utterances (‘X’). Human annotated summary utterances are colored gray and ultra-short utterances are crossed out.

For increased training stability of variational autoencoder (VAE) models, we refer the reader to (Li et al., 2019a).
bias. The evaluator is asked to select the best and worst of the summaries according to each of these criteria: Fluency/Coherence: is the the summary well-presented, grammatically correct and easy to read? Informativeness: does the summary provide useful information about the video clip? Overall Quality: is the summary of good quality considering both content and linguistic aspects?

We randomly sample 100 clips from the test set. Each clip and its summaries are judged by five evaluators that we recruit from Amazon mechanical turk. Table 5 shows the performance of all systems measured by Best-Worst Scaling (Kiritchenko and Mohammad, 2016), where the score of a system is computed as the percentage of times it was selected as the best minus the worst. The range of scores is [-1,1]. Figure 5 shows how frequently a system is chosen to produce the “best summary.” We observe that StreamHover achieves an overall score of 0.52 and it is selected as the best summary in over half of the times.

6 Conclusion

We present StreamHover, a new framework for annotating and summarizing livestream transcripts. Our dataset contains over 500 hours of videos annotated with extractive and abstractive summaries. We explored an extractive method leveraging VQ-VAE to identify salient summary utterances and obtained strong results. Future work includes boosting summarization solutions to provide users a concentrated overview of streamed content.
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A Behance Dataset

We collect a total of 5,398 streamed videos from Behance.net. Some streamers opt-out of the transcription service provided by Microsoft Automatic Speech Recognition, so transcripts are not available for these videos. We create a list of domain keywords by finding 50 most frequently appearing words from video titles (stopwords are excluded). Examples include ‘fresco’, ‘adobe’, ‘photoshop’, ‘illustration’, ‘art’, ‘painting’, ‘drawing’, ‘illustrator’, ‘character’, ‘design.’ The keywords are used to select videos for human annotation. 2,360 videos have transcripts available and contain at least one of our domain keywords in their titles. These videos are split into clips of 5-minute each. Some clips contain little or no verbal content. We thus remove clips that contain very few words (≤333 words) or utterances (≤38 utterances). These thresholds are determined using the average values of all clips. Videos with less than 5 valid clips are also removed from consideration. This preprocessing step gives 6,003 clips from 381 videos. During annotation, our annotators find 582 clips to contain only chit-chats, suggesting that these clips are uninformative. 11 videos contain only chit-chat clips, they are subsequently removed from the dataset, yielding a total of 5,421 clips from 370 videos that are split into train, validation and test sets.

B Baseline Summarizers

Our neural abstractive baselines include pre-trained BART-large (Lewis et al., 2020), BART-large-cnn, and T5-large (Raffel et al., 2020). We follow the HuggingFace implementation (Wolf et al., 2020). Utterances that are longer than 5 words are concatenated into a flat sequence, which is used as the input to each summarizer. The model parameters include: the maximum and minimum summary lengths are 150 and 15 tokens, respectively. We use a beam size of 5 with early stopping. The length penalty is 1.0. “no_repeat_ngram_size” is set to 3, such that a trigram cannot occur more than once in the summary.

Our extractive baselines include LexRank (Erkan and Radev, 2004), TextRank (Mihalcea and Tarau, 2004), and SumBasic (Vanderwende et al., 2007). They are implemented using the Sumy library where we adopt the default text parser and stemmer. Our unsupervised summarizer for speech transcript summarization (Shang et al., 2018) uses the following settings: we report the FluCovRank scores. The number of components used in LSA is 25. The number of utterance communities is 35. The number of clusters is 6, with a scaling factor of 1.3 and lambda of 0.4. The size of the summary is set to 50 words.

C Example Summaries

We show example summaries generated by different summarizers: FluConvRank (Shang et al., 2018), LexRank (Erkan and Radev, 2004), BART-large (Lewis et al., 2020) and StreamHover. We also show the top-3 most prominent latent codes and their associated utterances. We choose 5 representative utterances for each code that are most frequently assigned to this code. We observe that C1 utterances are frequently seen in the data (chit-chats) and not representative of the input. C2 is associated with lengthy but not necessarily summary-worthy utterances. C3 utterances are both comprehensive and contain diverse information. In our experiments, we exclude C1/C2 before performing grid search on all codes to find the set of prominent codes. It allows us to effectively identify summary utterances without biasing towards the lengthy ones.
Hi

I really like the pattern of light on the building over here, and the just overall feeling the different colors.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far.

I hope you’ve all been well.

If I haven’t seen you since last week, I hope you had a good weekend.

We’re going to be doing some digital painting today.

As usual, I’m going to be working from this photo as a reference.

I think it’s really beautiful.

It’s like a little cafe table in Spain, with some dappled lighting coming through these trees.

I really like the pattern of light on the building over here, and the just overall feeling the different colors.

The Blues and pinks and yellows on the wall here.

It’s really, really cheerful scene.

Hi Mohammed, how are you?

I hope you’re all doing well.

If you guys are interested in painting along with me or doing a little sketch or whatever, you have time for your always welcome to my reference.

I might have planned to work on this if I’m feeling good, we might go on a painting.

It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

You can find a link to the original post from the photographer below.

The stream.

I’m doing pretty good to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so

I’m doing pretty good to be honest. I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so today’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter or otherwise just sit back and relax and enjoy the painting.

I really like the reference so.

I think it’s really beautiful.

I hope you’re all doing well.

If you guys are interested in painting along with me or doing a little sketch or whatever, you have time for your always welcome to my reference.

It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.

I hope you’ve had a good day so far. I’m doing pretty good pro to be honest.

I have a little bit of a sore throat, so
day’s stream might be a tiny bit shorter than some of the others. It’s still going to be around 3 hours minimum.
So I'm going to start to work on the foreground now and this is going to be tricky, so this is one of the things that made me choose to paint this reference.

The rushing water in the foreground kind of coming towards us and the ripples that it creates are the little bubbles and all that kind of stuff.

Sometimes the image stitching just has some weird stuff that happens, Oh team.

Oh, if you want to share a link for map crunch.

Alright that should work this time.

Trying to figure out those relationships near the end or like when you're trying to like if you're going to try to get the one or like if the one is like if I'm working on the one I'm going to do it's like if it's not working. I'm ready for some dog like with half his body has been overlapped by a boat. Yeah, it's always really satisfying the color combination in these kind of desert scenes, the nice blue Sky and like the Warm Reds and oranges. It's like you get the extra bonus of like some purple thrown in there and that's just perfect. You know, I've seen people like riding camels and stuff, he's taking pictures.

Trying to figure out how to paint this kind of situation.

The rushing water in the foreground kind of coming towards us and the ripples that it creates are the little bubbles and all that kind of stuff.

Swimming, the nice blue Sky and like the Warm Reds and oranges. Sometimes the image stitching just has some weird stuff that happens, Oh team.

The rushing water in the foreground kind of coming towards us and the ripples that it creates are the little bubbles and all that kind of stuff.

Yeah, it's always really satisfying the color combination in these kind of desert scenes, the nice blue Sky and like the Warm Reds and oranges. I'm working on the one I'm going to do it's like if it's not working. I'm ready for some dog like with half his body has been overlapped by a boat. Yeah, it's always really satisfying the color combination in these kind of desert scenes, the nice blue Sky and like the Warm Reds and oranges. It's like you get the extra bonus of like some purple thrown in there and that's just perfect. You know, I've seen people like riding camels and stuff, he's taking pictures.

Table 10: Example system summaries from Virtual Plein Air Landscape Painting. The BART summary is fluent but its content lacks specificity, as is the case for LexRank. The summary segments selected by FluCoRank are ungrammatical. StreamHover identifies on-topic and informative summary utterances.

Table 11: A snippet from Virtual Plein Air Landscape Painting. We show the most prominent latent codes and their representative utterances (‘X’). Human annotated summary utterances are colored gray and ultra-short utterances are crossed out.
Table 12: Example system summaries from *Creating ABC Childrens Book Art on Adobe Fresco and Adobe Illustrator Part 18*. BART summary is fluent but its content lacks specificity, as is the case for LexRank. Summary segments selected by FluCovRank are ungrammatical. StreamHover identifies on-topic and informative summary utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Thank you for sticking around wanna show you some real cool stuff, not right there.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 It’s gotta stay and the same letter so they was the letter C and I’m just using my hands my fingers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I do have my Surface Pen somewhere it’s up there.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I’m on the Surface Pro.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I just came out early in October 20th 19th.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 That’s the latest song version of the surface.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I know that in a few days were gonna be in 2020, which is why I want to have.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 This file ready an complete I’m just listening.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 So I’m doing this little dots and what happens is we are on with Adobe fresco is there.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 But I thought we fresco does not have good, um Palm rejection and so when you using the</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 And so as I was drawing diesel letters.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 If this doesn’t have a pain.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Just did good thing is I have extra pants, not only do I have all here’s one, not only do I have extra pants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 OK, here, we go ever it is yeah, some of these.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Now I am going to use my pen there.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 And so as I was drawing diesel letters.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 If this doesn’t have a pain.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I’m on the Surface Pro.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 And then there’s some of these letters that don’t have detail like this one.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 So I got to the point where.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 We go come on here pin so I got a Surface Pen here.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 I need to do some of these lines here is geared is closeout all.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 But I thought we fresco does not have good, um Palm rejection and so when you using the</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Just did good thing is I have extra pants, not only do I have all here’s one, not only do I have extra pants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 OK, here, we go ever it is yeah, some of these.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 But I thought we fresco does not have good, um Palm rejection and so when you using the</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 So I got to the point where.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 I got to the point where.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 So I got to the point where.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 And so as I was drawing diesel letters.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 I need to do some of these lines here is geared is closeout all.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Just did good thing is I have extra pants, not only do I have all here’s one, not only do I have extra pants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 And so as I was drawing diesel letters.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 I need to do some of these lines here is geared is closeout all.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 But I thought we fresco does not have good, um Palm rejection and so when you using the</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bump on Phone so yeah, that’s the wrong letter, but let’s go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 I’m not sure I already have a loud voice.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: A transcript snippet from *Creating ABC Childrens Book Art on Adobe Fresco and Adobe Illustrator Part 18*. We show the most prominent latent codes and their representative utterances (‘X’). Human annotated summary utterances are colored gray and ultra-short utterances are crossed out.
Table 14: Example system summaries from Call me Derek: Value Study. The BART summary is fluent but its content lacks specificity, as is the case for LexRank. Summary segments selected by FluCovRank are ungrammatical. StreamHover identifies on-topic and informative summary utterances.

Table 15: A transcript snippet from Call me Derek: Value Study. We show the most prominent latent codes and their representative utterances ('X'). Human annotated summary utterances are colored gray and ultra-short utterances are crossed out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Example system summaries for Digital Painting Studies with Maddy Bellwoar–Clouds. The BART summary is fluent but its content lacks specificity, as is the case for LexRank. The summary segments selected by FluCovRank are ungrammatical. StreamHover identifies on-topic and informative summary utterances.

Table 17: A snippet from Digital Painting Studies with Maddy Bellwoar–Clouds. We show the most prominent latent codes and their representative utterances (‘X’). Human annotated summary utterances are colored gray and ultra-short utterances are crossed out.