

A Survey of Pretrained Language Models Based Text Generation

JUNYI LI*, Renmin University of China, China and Université de Montréal, Canada

TIANYI TANG*, Renmin University of China, China

WAYNE XIN ZHAO†, Renmin University of China, China

JIAN-YUN NIE, Université de Montréal, Canada

JI-RONG WEN, Renmin University of China, China

Text Generation aims to produce plausible and readable text in human language from input data. The resurgence of deep learning has greatly advanced this field by neural generation models, especially the paradigm of pretrained language models (PLMs). Text generation based on PLMs is viewed as a promising area in both academics and industry. In this survey, we begin with introducing three key aspects of applying PLMs to text generation: 1) how to encode the input as representations preserving input semantics which can be fused into PLMs; 2) how to design an effective and performant PLM served as the generation model; and 3) how to effectively optimize PLMs given the reference text and ensure the generated text satisfying special text properties. Then, we figure out some major challenges and solutions corresponding to the three key views. Next, we present a summary of various useful resources and typical text generation applications to work with PLMs. Finally, we highlight some of the future research directions which will further improve these PLMs for text generation. We strongly believe that this comprehensive survey paper will serve as a valuable resource to learn the core concepts as well as stay up to date on the latest developments in PLMs.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Natural language generation**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: text generation, pretrained language models, natural language processing

ACM Reference Format:

Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. A Survey of Pretrained Language Models Based Text Generation. 1, 1 (March 2022), 37 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Text generation, also known as *natural language generation*, has been one of the most important sub-fields in natural language processing (NLP). It aims at producing plausible and readable text in human language, from the input data in a variety of forms including text, image, tabular and knowledge base. In recent decades, text generation techniques have been extensively applied to a wide range of applications [102]. For example, dialog system generates responses to user utterances

*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding author

Authors' addresses: Junyi Li, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China and Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada, lijunyi@ruc.edu.cn; Tianyi Tang, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China, steventianytang@outlook.com; Wayne Xin Zhao, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China, batmanfly@gmail.com; Jian-Yun Nie, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada; Ji-Rong Wen, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2022/3-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>




Fig. 1. An illustrative process of applying PLMs to text generation. We divide the process into three main steps: input representation learning, model architecture design and selection, model parameters optimization.

in a conversation [232]; machine translation translates a text from one language into another [30]; text summarization generates an abridged summary of the source text [39].

The essential goal of text generation is to learn a mapping function from input data to output text. Early approaches usually adopt statistical language models for modeling the condition probabilities of words given the n -gram context [11, 13]. Such a statistical approach is likely to suffer from the data sparsity issue, and a number of smoothing methods have been developed in order to better estimate unobserved term occurrences [181, 217]. With the emergence and development of deep learning techniques [95], neural network models have dominated the mainstream techniques in text generation and achieved tremendous improvements in generating natural language text. Deep neural generation models usually adopt the sequence-to-sequence framework [178] based on the encoder-decoder scheme: the encoder first maps the input sequence into fix-sized low-dimensional vectors (called *input embeddings*), and then the decoder generates the target text conditioned on the input embeddings. Various neural models have been proposed with different designs for the encoder-decoder architecture, such as graph neural networks (GNN) for encoding graph input [100] and recurrent neural networks (RNN) for decoding text [105]. Besides, the attention mechanism [2] and copy mechanism [166] are widely used to improve the performance of text generation models. An important merit of deep neural networks for text generation is that they enable end-to-end learning of semantic mappings from the input data to output text without labor-intensive feature engineering. Moreover, deep neural models employ low-dimensional semantic representations [80] to capture linguistic features of language, which is useful to alleviate data sparsity.

Despite the success of deep neural models for text generation, a major performance bottleneck lies in the availability of large-scale labelled datasets. Most of text generation methods require substantial amounts of manually labelled parallel data, which restricts their applicability in many domains that suffer from a dearth of annotated examples. To date, most of existing labelled datasets for text generation tasks are usually small. In such cases, deep neural networks are likely to overfit on these small datasets and do not generalize well in practice. Moreover, the early neural models for text generation tasks were still relatively shallow. Therefore, these models have difficulties in modeling the relationship between the context and word meanings and deriving contextual word representations for better generation [151].

In recent years, the paradigm of pretrained language models (PLMs) is thriving in NLP [151]. The basic idea is to first pretrain the models on large-scale unsupervised corpus and then fine-tune these models in downstream supervised tasks to achieve state-of-the-art results. With the emergence of Transformer [182] and the development of computational power, the architecture of PLMs has advanced from shallow to deep, such as BERT [34] and OpenAI GPT [153]. Substantial works have shown that PLMs can encode massive amounts of linguistic knowledge from corpus into their large-scale parameters and learn universal and contextual representations of language with specially designed objectives such as language modeling during pretraining. Therefore, PLMs are generally beneficial for downstream tasks and can avoid training a new model from scratch.

Following the success of PLMs in other NLP tasks, researchers have proposed to solve the text generation tasks based on PLMs [14, 98, 154]. Pretrained on large-scale corpus, PLMs are able to understand natural language accurately and further express in human language fluently, both of which are critical abilities to fulfill text generation tasks. Grounding text generation on PLMs is seen as a promising direction in both academia and industry. Thus, in this survey, we focus on text generation as this field has been totally transformed by these powerful PLMs.

Existing surveys in this area only partially reviewed some related topics. For example, Qiu *et al.* [151] summarized two generations of PLMs for the whole NLP domain and introduced various extensions and adaption approaches of PLMs. Kalyan *et al.* [86] gave a brief overview of the advances of self-supervised learning in Transformer-based PLMs. Han *et al.* [68] took a deep look into the history of pretraining, especially its special relation with transfer learning and self-supervised learning. Besides, El-Kassas *et al.* [39] mainly paid attention to the current application of PLMs to the field of automatic text summarization. Zaib *et al.* [213] discussed the implementation of PLMs in dialog systems with a special emphasis on question answering systems. These researches focused on specific applications, *e.g.*, summarization and dialogue systems, while did not go deeper to the core technique, *i.e.*, text generation. To the best of our knowledge, our survey is the first work that presents a comprehensive review of PLMs-based text generation. It aims to provide text generation researchers a synthesis and pointer to related researches.

To start with, we present a general task definition of text generation and an overview of PLMs in Section 2. Given the encoded input data, the goal of text generation is to optimize the generation function (*i.e.*, PLMs) for generating satisfactory output text. Thus, there are three key points of applying PLMs to text generation: 1) how to encode the input data as representations preserving input semantics which can be fused into PLMs (Section 3); 2) how to design an effective and performant architecture of PLMs served to be the generation function (Section 4); 3) how to effectively optimize the generation function (*i.e.*, PLMs) given the reference text and ensure the generated text satisfying special text properties such as fluency and naturalness (Section 5). Then, we figure out several typical non-trivial challenges and solutions within each key point in Section 6. We also present a summary of various useful resources to work with PLMs in Section 7 and review PLMs for a variety of text generation applications in Section 8. Finally, we conclude and summarize the contribution of this survey and future directions in Section 9.

2 PRELIMINARY

In this section, we first present a general task formulation of text generation, then describe the background of PLMs, and finally introduce three key aspects of applying PLMs to text generation.

2.1 Text Generation

Generally, a text can be denoted as a sequence of tokens $y = \langle y_1, \dots, y_j, \dots, y_n \rangle$, where each token y_j is drawn from a word vocabulary \mathcal{V} . The task of text generation aims to generate plausible and readable text in human language. In most cases, text generation is conditioned on the input data, such as text, image, tabular, and knowledge base, which can be denoted as x . In particular, the generated text is desired to satisfy some special language properties such as fluency, naturalness, and coherence. We define the desired properties for output text as a property set \mathbb{P} . Thus, the task of text generation can be formally described as:

$$y = f_{\mathcal{M}}(x, \mathbb{P}), \quad (1)$$

where the generation function $f_{\mathcal{M}}$ is fed with the input data x and the property set \mathbb{P} to produce the output text y . In this paper, the generation function is specially crafted based on a PLM \mathcal{M} .

Specifically, according to the type of the input data x and the property set \mathbb{P} , text generation can be categorized into different kinds of applications:

- When the input data x is **not provided** or a **random noise vector** z , text generation will degenerate into language modeling or unconditional text generation [152, 153]. In this case, the output text is required to satisfy some common language properties, such as fluency and naturalness.
- When the input data x is a set of **discrete attributes** (e.g., topic words, sentiment labels), text generation becomes topic-to-text generation [32] or attribute-based generation [89]. The input data x plays the role of controlling the meaning of the generated text. In such situation, the output text should be relevant to the input topics or attributes.
- When the input data x is **structured data** like knowledge base or table, text generation will be considered as data-to-text generation [58, 103]. This task aims to generate descriptive text about the structured data. Therefore, the output text must be objective and accurate.
- When the input data x is **multimedia input** such as image and speech, text generation becomes image captioning [195] or speech recognition [44]. In image captioning, we might expect the generated caption text to be vivid for attracting children, while in speech recognition, the transformed text must be faithful to the original speech.
- The most common form of input data x is a **text sequence**, spanning a number of applications such as machine translation [30], text summarization [162] and dialog system [222]. While, for each kind of task, the output text would be expected to satisfy some specific properties. For example, in dialog system, the generated response should be relevant to the input dialog history and context.

2.2 Pretrained Language Models

Pretrained language models (PLMs) are pretrained on large-scale unlabelled corpus and can be fine-tuned on downstream tasks. Pretrained on text data, PLMs are able to encode massive linguistic knowledge into their vast amounts of parameters, which can enhance the understanding of language and improve the generation quality.

Owing to the great achievements that Transformer [182] has made, almost all PLMs employ the backbone of Transformer. GPT [152] and BERT [34] are firstly developed based on Transformer decoder and encoder respectively. Following GPT and BERT, PLMs such as XLNet [205], RoBERTa [121], ERNIE [224], T5 [154] and BART [98] are introduced. Among them, XLNet, RoBERTa and ERNIE are improved over BERT model, while T5 and BART are encoder-decoder based PLMs. Recent studies showed that the performance of PLMs can be boosted just by increasing the scale of the model parameters [87], which triggered the development of large-scale PLMs like GPT-3 (175B) [14], PANGU (200B) [214], GShard (600B) [97] and Switch-Transformers (1.6T) [45] which contains billions of or trillions of parameters. In addition to language understanding and generation, PLMs are also designed for other tasks like named entity recognition [147], programming [48], and networking [124].

According to the pretraining objectives, the PLMs for text generation can be categorized as masked language models, causal language models, prefix language models, and encoder-decoder language models. The details of each category are discussed in Section 4.

2.3 Applying PLMs to Text Generation

To leverage PLMs for downstream text generation tasks, we need to consider three key aspects from the perspectives of data, model, and optimization, respectively:

- **Input Data:** *How to effectively encode the input x as representations preserving input semantics that can be fused into the PLM \mathcal{M} ?* For text generation, the input data, containing critical semantic information for the target output, is often not present in a suitable form for PLMs, and the data forms

are also varied for different tasks. Therefore, it needs to develop effective, flexible representation learning approaches for capturing semantic evidence from the input in different data forms.

- **Model Architecture:** *How to design an effective and performant PLM \mathcal{M} served as the generation function $f_{\mathcal{M}}$?* In the literature, a number of PLMs have been developed, with different architectures (e.g., denoised autoencoder [98] and autoregressive decoder [153]). When adapting PLMs to text generation tasks, we need to make specific designs on the underlying PLMs in order to achieve good task performance.

- **Optimization Algorithm:** *How to effectively optimize the generation function (i.e., PLMs) $f_{\mathcal{M}}$ given the reference text y and ensure the generated text satisfying special text properties \mathbb{P} ?* After encoding the inputs and designing appropriate PLMs, it is important to develop effective optimization algorithms for producing the satisfactory text. A major challenge lies in that some desired properties for output text are difficult to be formulated or optimized.

In the following sections, we mainly present recent research works on PLM-based text generation, focusing on the above three aspects.

3 ENCODING INPUT REPRESENTATIONS

As discussed in Section 2, the first aspect is how to encode the input data x as representations preserving input semantics for PLMs. In this section, we will introduce three main types of input data for text generation, *i.e.*, unstructured input, structured input, and multimedia input.

3.1 Unstructured Input

In text generation, most of studies are focused on modeling unstructured text input (e.g., sentence, paragraph, and document), which requires accurately understanding the input information and deriving meaningful semantic text representations. The aim of text representation learning is to condense the input text into low-dimensional vectors while preserving its core semantic meanings. In what follows, we discuss how to derive effective semantic representations for three kinds of unstructured text data, namely paragraph, document and multi-lingual input text.

3.1.1 Paragraph Representation Learning. A paragraph usually contains multiple sentences, and several sentences may discuss a certain topic. To capture the low-level word meanings and high-level topical semantics in a paragraph, many studies proposed hierarchy-based or graph-based methods to learn the paragraph representation.

Hierarchy-based Representation Learning. For a multi-sentence paragraph such as a multi-turn dialogue, most of the previous works generally concatenated sentences as the model input and predict the output text [7, 222]. However, flat concatenation is likely to ignore the semantic dynamics across utterances and the information loss may lead to decoding errors. To fill these gaps, several studies proposed to encode the input paragraphs with a hierarchical architecture [62, 109]. Specifically, Gu *et al.* [62] employed a hierarchical framework, DialogBERT, to represent the dialogue context, which utilizes sentence- and discourse-level Transformer encoders to encode each dialogue utterance and the sequence of utterance vectors, respectively. However, this method lacks the history information when encoding each individual utterance, while the history information is essential for understanding dialogue utterances. Thus, Li *et al.* [109] first employed a Transformer to encode the whole conversation to get the dense context representation, upon which a unidirectional Flow module was designed to capture the utterance-level history context transformation for the next response generation.

Graph-based Representation Learning. In a long paragraph, multiple sentences may contain repeated, redundant or contradictory information. How to exploit the deep semantic structure in the intricate text input is a key to further promote paragraph-based generation performance.




Fig. 2. The main content of our paper.

Compared with sequence, graph can aggregate relevant disjoint context by uniformly representing them as nodes and their relations as edges [138, 194]. As a representative example, Wu *et al.* [194] leveraged a phrase-relation graph to improve long sequence summarization, where nodes are phrases and edges are similarity. This graph is suitable for information aggregation with the help of

coreference resolution that substantially compresses the input. Besides, in conversational machine reading, Ouyang *et al.* [138] formulated the input text as two complementary graphs, *i.e.*, explicit and implicit discourse graphs, to fully capture the discourse relations and latent vector interactions among all the elementary discourse units (EDUs).

3.1.2 Document Representation Learning. In many text generation tasks such as document translation and document summarization, the input text might be a long document consisting of multiple paragraphs. When encoding the documents, it is challenging to encode the cross-sentence semantics and then capture the most critical semantics.

Encoding Inter-Sentential Semantics. Most of PLMs are trained as masked language models, thus they are forced to learn token-level representations instead of sentence-level ones. Although introducing segment embeddings to represent different sentences, it is only applied to sentence-pair inputs. To encode the inter-sentential semantics among input documents for text generation, several studies [120, 221, 229] proposed to learn document representations in a hierarchical way. For example, Liu *et al.* [120] insert the “[CLS]” token at the start of each sentence to collect sentence features in lower layers and then combine them with self-attention in higher layers. Besides, Zhang *et al.* [221] proposed HIBERT for learning the document representations in a hierarchical fashion by using a sentence encoder to transform each sentence into a vector and a document encoder to learn sentence representations given their surrounding sentences as context.

Capturing Critical Semantics. In practice, sentences or paragraphs in long documents would inevitably be complement, overlapping or conflicting to each other. Therefore, it is important to retain the most critical contents of documents and verbalize them in the generated text. To address the issue of key points missing in output text, Nguyen *et al.* [136] introduced a topic model to capture the global semantics of the document and a mechanism to control the amount of global semantics supplied to the text generation module. Similarly, Liu *et al.* [115] also proposed two topic-aware contrastive learning objectives to capture the global topic information of a conversation and outline salient facts. These objectives are able to implicitly model the topic change varying upon conversations, pushing PLMs to focus more on snippets that contain salient information from the same topics when generating output text.

Representation Learning Efficiency. Efficiency is an important factor to consider for modeling long documents, especially when generating long text. Since the self-attention mechanism grows quadratically with sequence length, many studies aimed to improve the encoding efficiency of self-attention [77, 131]. A representative example is Manakul *et al.* [131] proposed two methods: local self-attention, allowing longer input spans during training; and explicit content selection, reducing memory and compute requirements. Besides, several researchers further adopted divide-and-conquer methods for encoding long documents. For example, Gidiotis *et al.* [54] split a long document and its summary into multiple source-target short sentence pairs, which are used for training PLMs that learn to summarize each part of the document separately. By splitting the long document into short sentences, encoding semantics of documents will become easier, reducing the computational complexity and text noise.

3.1.3 Multi-language Representation Learning. Most of PLMs are pretrained on rich English text while ignore other low-resource languages. This problem makes it difficult to directly apply English PLMs to multilingual text generation tasks such as multilingual machine translation.

Cross-lingual Representations. The idea behind learning cross-lingual representations is to learn a shared embedding space for two languages to improve the model’s ability for cross-lingual translation. A well-known cross-lingual PLM is XLM [30], which proposed unsupervised and supervised objectives by leveraging monolingual and parallel data, respectively, to learn cross-lingual representations. However, these learned representations on shared BPE spaces is implicit

and limited. Therefore, Ren *et al.* [157] calculated cross-lingual n -gram embeddings and inferred an n -gram translation table from them for providing explicit representation learning signals.

Multi-lingual Representations. Given more than two languages, multi-lingual PLMs aim to learn representations for any of the language pairs. Based on the monolingual PLMs, BART and T5, Liu *et al.* [119] and Xue *et al.* [201] proposed mBART and mT5, respectively, which are pretrained once for all languages. Considering the language structure difference between languages, several studies utilized contrastive learning to learn multi-lingual representations [139, 188]. In particular, Wang *et al.* [188] proposed two training objectives: contrastive sentence ranking (CSR) and sentence aligned substitution (SAS). CSR samples sentences from the document and constructs positive and negative pairs based on their saliency. By contrastively learning what is more important, the model is supposed to obtain the ability to distinguish salient information in different languages.

3.2 Structured Input

Structured data (*e.g.*, table, graph, and tree) is also a critical kind of input for text generation in many real-world applications, such as medical report [71] and weather report [55] generation. However, it is non-trivial to model structured input for data-to-text tasks based on PLMs due to three main challenges: (1) there exists a semantic gap between the structured input and natural language input that is used for pretraining PLMs; (2) there is a lack of encoding the input structure which contains the structural information of the input data; (3) it requires to maintain text fidelity to the input information when generating text.

3.2.1 Bridging the Semantic Gap. In general, PLMs are pretrained on unstructured text, which is different from the structured data in semantic form. In order to better leverage structured data, we need to bridge the semantic gap between the structured input and natural language input that is used for pretraining PLMs.

Structured Data Linearization. To adapt to the sequential nature of PLMs, a simple approach is to linearize the input data into sequence [42, 128, 158]. Specifically, Ribeiro *et al.* [158] linearized knowledge graph (KG) into a sequence of triples by concatenating relational triples. Besides, some people adopted template-based heuristic methods to serialize the input data [58]. For example, the attribute-value pair “*name: jack reynolds*” will be serialized as a sentence “*name is jack reynolds*”.

Representation Alignment. In addition to directly feeding structured input into PLMs, some people struggled to firstly transform the structured data into embeddings, which can be taken as input of PLMs. For example, Li *et al.* [103] utilized graph neural networks (GNN) to project KG entities into embeddings, and then proposed a representation alignment method to align the entity representations (encoded by GNN) and PLM-based entity embeddings in semantic spaces.

3.2.2 Capturing the Structural Information. Unlike the unstructured text, the structured data contains structural information, such as the $\langle \text{attribute}, \text{value} \rangle$ pair in table or the $\langle \text{entity}, \text{relation}, \text{entity} \rangle$ triple in KG. The structural information can help models understand the input information correctly for generating more faithful text.

Incorporating Additional Training Objectives. In order to enhance the preservation of structural information when encoding the structured data, a number of studies introduced auxiliary training objectives related to the structural information in addition to the primary generation objective [58, 103, 128]. One kind is to reconstruct the semantic structure of the input data. For example, Gong *et al.* [58] utilized the input table attribute names as the labels to reconstruct table structure from PLMs’ learned value representations, which can force PLMs to embed table structure into its representation. Another kind is to adjust the output text based on the structural information. Mager *et al.* [128] proposed cycle-consistency based losses to assess the quality of output text based on how well it can reconstruct the input.

Adding Structural Information as Input. Unlike previous works that implicitly capture structural information with training losses, several studies proposed to explicitly take structural information as input [42, 158]. Ribeiro *et al.* [158] directly prepended “⟨H⟩”, “⟨R⟩”, and “⟨T⟩” tokens before the head entity, relation and tail entity of a KG triple to reveal the relations between entities. Besides, Fan *et al.* [42] first encoded the AMR graph into graph embedding, which can then be taken as input. The graph embedding provides additional information to the encoder by encoding the depth of each node in the rooted graph and the subgraph each node belongs to.

Employing Structural Encoding Module. Since PLMs are originally designed for sequential input, a natural method is to use additional modules to encode the structured input. A representative example is StructAdapt [159], which adds layer-wise graph convolution modules in order to learn representations built upon the graph connectivity over the PLM encoder. Similarly, Li *et al.* [103] employ GNN to explicitly encode entity relations in KG. The entity embeddings from GNN are regarded as input word embeddings of PLM for generating text.

3.2.3 Maintaining Text Fidelity. In literature of linguistics, fidelity means the generated text adheres to the content in the structured data. Generating high fidelity text that correctly describes information in the structured input is the core of data-to-text generation.

Incorporating Additional Training Objectives. To generate high-fidelity text adhering to input, Gong *et al.* [58] introduced an Optimal-Transport based content matching loss that helps model correctly describe important information from table, which measures the distance between the input information and the output text. While, Harkous *et al.* [70] employed a semantic fidelity classification loss to detect and avoid generation errors (such as hallucination and omission).

Utilizing Copy Mechanism. The pointer-generator [166] is a critical technology to ensure the faithfulness of generated text about input data by copying important words from input into output. Li *et al.* [103] adopted pointer-generator to copy entities from input knowledge data. While, Suadaa *et al.* [173] incorporated the copy mechanism by using general placeholders to avoid producing hallucinated phrases that are not supported by a table.

Adding Target Information as Input. To combat with the low fidelity problem, Chen *et al.* [27] argued that it is necessary to leverage intermediate meaning representations to achieve faithful generation. Therefore, the authors provided the generation module with a logical form representing the semantics of the target text.

3.3 Multimedia Input

In addition to the above textual data, several attempts have been made to take the multimedia data as input (*e.g.*, image, video, and speech) such as image captioning and speech recognition.

3.3.1 Image Captioning. Image captioning, which aims to generate a textual description of an image, has been extensively studied in computer vision research. With the advent of PLMs, researchers have proposed to utilize the remarkable ability of PLMs. A well-known pretrained model is XGPT [195]. Inspired by GPT in textual modal, XGPT takes images as inputs and uses the image captioning task as the basic generative task in the pretraining stage. Chen *et al.* [20] also proposed an image captioning pretrained model, called VisualGPT. They designed a self-resurrecting attention mechanism to learn how to encode the visual information and adapt it to PLMs decoder. However, traditional vision-language pretraining fails to capture the relationship between the visual and text modalities. Yang *et al.* [207] proposed three pretraining tasks to effectively help the model learn a better aligned representation among the three modalities: text word, visual object, and scene text.

3.3.2 Video Captioning. Video captioning focuses on generating natural language text describing the video content. VideoBERT [175] and CBT [174] are the first pioneers to investigate video-language pretraining with regard to the video captioning task. Since they trained a separate video-to-text decoder, it tends to cause a *pretrain-finetune discrepancy*. Therefore, Unified VLP [233] and UniVL [126] proposed unified video and language pretraining model. Unified VLP uses a shared multi-layer Transformer network for both encoding and decoding. While, UniVL encodes the text and video separately by two single-modal encoders, and generates text with a decoder.

3.3.3 Speech Recognition. In practice, speech recognition is hungry for human-transcribed supervised data. So a number of unsupervised and semi-supervised methods are developed to integrate PLMs for weakly-supervised learning. For example, Fan *et al.* [44] proposed an unsupervised approach to pretraining encoder-decoder model with unpaired speech and transcripts. Liao *et al.* [111] proposed a speech recognition post-processing model that aims to transform the incorrect and noisy recognition output into a readable text for humans and downstream tasks by leveraging the Metadata Extraction (MDE) corpus to construct a small task-specific dataset.

4 DESIGNING PLMS FOR TEXT GENERATION

Following the encoding of the input data into low-dimensional representations, the next step is to develop an effective and suitable PLM \mathcal{M} as the text generation function f . Based on such an architecture of PLM, the text generation objective can be modeled as the conditional probability of the output text y given the input data x , which can be formally factorized by tokens:

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{M}}(y|x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\mathcal{M}}(y_i|y_{<i}, x), \quad (2)$$

where y_i denotes the i -th output token, and $y_{<i}$ denotes the previous tokens y_1, \dots, y_{i-1} .

To model the conditional probability, traditional neural models mainly adopt the RNN architecture [178], with a number of improvement variants [166]. In recent years, solely based on attention mechanisms, Transformer [182] can better capture long-range dependency in texts, which is beneficial for modeling and generating texts. With the excellent parallelization capacities, Transformer has been the backbone for developing extremely large PLMs. When trained on large-scale unlabeled corpus [121], PLMs based on the Transformer architecture can encode rich semantic or linguistic knowledge. Furthermore, it has shown that PLMs can be effectively fine-tuned to different text generation tasks [98, 170], which becomes the first choice of the text generation function \mathcal{M} .

4.1 Standard Architecture

Existing PLMs for text generation utilize either single or double stacks of Transformer as backbone. PLMs, such as GPT-3 [14] and UniLM [35], use a single Transformer to implement the process of input encoding and output decoding simultaneously. They yield three variants: masked language models, causal language models and prefix language models, according to different self-attention mask strategies. In contrast, PLMs with double stacks follow the whole Transformer architecture with cross-attention between the encoder and decoder.

4.1.1 Masked Language Models. Masked language models utilize the full attention mask, which is the same as Transformer encoders. Equipped with full attention mask, models are usually pretrained with masked language modeling (MLM) tasks, *i.e.*, predicting the masked tokens using the contextualized information. The most representative model is BERT [34], which is used extensively in natural language understanding (NLU).

However, due to the discrepancy between the pretraining task of masked LMs and the downstream generation function, masked LMs are rarely utilized for text generation tasks [205]. It is more

common to use BERT as an encoder part for text generation, leveraging its excellent bidirectional encoding capacities. For example, Rothe *et al.* [162] proposed to initialize both the encoder and decoder of the generation models with BERT [34], of which the result is comparable with other PLMs specially designed for text generation.

4.1.2 Causal Language Models. Similar to Transformer decoder, causal language models adopt the diagonal mask matrix. Causal LMs are designed for language modeling, which usually refers to computing the probability of occurrence of a number of words. Causal LMs are straightforward for text generation, predicting the next word conditioned on all the previous words.

GPT [152] was the first causal LM which can be applied to the text generation task. GPT-2 [153] explored the transfer capacity of language models for zero-shot generation task, highlighting the significance of sufficient data. GPT-3 [14] shown that massive model parameters can significantly improve the downstream generation tasks, by showing it just a few examples or prompts. CTRL [89] is trained as a conditional language model to generate text conditioned on control codes that govern style, content, and task-specific behavior. CPM [225] and PanGu- α [214] practiced on training large-scale auto-regressive Chinese language models.

Although causal LMs are simple and straightforward for text generation, they have several structural and algorithmic limitations. Causal LMs encode the tokens just from left to right, as a result, they neglect the bidirectional information in the input side. Moreover, causal LMs are not specially designed to solve Seq2Seq tasks, therefore they do not achieve satisfying results in tasks such as summarization and translation.

4.1.3 Prefix Language Models. In order to overcome the disadvantages of the bidirectional masked LMs and the unidirectional causal LMs in text generation, Prefix LMs are proposed to combine the advantages of both. By utilizing the mixture attention masks, the tokens in the input text x can attend to each other, while the tokens in the target text y can only attend to all input tokens and previous generated ones.

UniLM [35] was the first prefix language model. Compared to causal LMs, UniLM utilized prefix attention mask to solve conditional generation tasks, which is similar to the encoder-decoder architecture. UniLMv2 [5] and GLM [38] improved vanilla prefix masking strategy by introducing permuted language modeling in XLNet [205]. Although prefix LMs have several advantages, Raffel *et al.* [154] compared single-stack prefix LMs to double-stack encoder-decoder LMs and concluded that the addition of an explicit encoder-decoder attention is more beneficial.

4.1.4 Encoder-Decoder Language Models. Most of PLMs follow the standard Transformer architecture for text generation, consisting of stacks of both encoder and decoder layers. MASS [170] and ProphetNet [150] took the sequence with one masked fragment as the input of encoder and then the decoder generates the masked tokens in an auto-regressive way. T5 [154] randomly replaced several spans in the source text with different special tokens, and then asked the decoder to predict the replaced spans in turn. BART [98] was pretrained with denoising autoencoder (DAE), *i.e.*, the model learns to recover the original text from corrupted text, which is corrupted with different noising methods, such as sentence permutation, token deletion, and document rotation.

4.2 Architecture Extensions

Based on vanilla Transformer architecture, several advanced PLMs proposed improved modules to adapt to different input formats in text generation tasks. In this part, we will introduce extended embeddings and improved attention modules of Transformers. Embeddings are shallow but apparent information added to each token, whereas extended attentions are usually designed for better processing input information.

4.2.1 Auxiliary Embeddings. Besides the (sub-) word embeddings, almost all PLMs utilize position embeddings to indicate the index of words. Compared to CNN and RNN, the self-attention operation is order-independent. Hence, it is essential to provide explicit position information to make use of the sequential nature of text. Original Transformer [182] utilizes the predetermined absolute position embeddings with sinusoidal functions, while most PLMs, such as BERT and GPT, adopt learned absolute position embeddings. Instead of absolute ones, relative position embeddings produce learned embeddings according to the offset between two tokens. T5 [154], UniLMv2 [5] and ProphetNet [150] employ an improved bucket relative positional method. In addition, hierarchical position embeddings are utilized to indicate inter- and intra- sentence position information, which is often used in some fixed-format text such as poem [106] and lyric [202].

Moreover, it is necessary to leverage auxiliary embeddings to enrich the input information [86]. Similar to segment embeddings used in BERT, dialog state embeddings are employed to assign each utterance [6, 193], and user embeddings are utilized to differentiate the characters and background knowledge involved in the conversation [6, 67]. In the multilingual scenario, language embedding is commonly introduced to inform the model about the language of each sentence [29, 170]. In addition, rhyme embeddings [106] and vowel embeddings [202] are proposed to indicate acoustics information in poem and lyric.

4.2.2 Improved Attention Modules. Though there exist various module variants of layer normalization and position-wise FFN in Transformer [86], they are rarely used in PLMs for text generation. Hence, we mainly present the variants of self- and cross- attention modules. In order to adapt to long-form text and alleviate quadratic complexity of full-attention operation, sparse attention is proposed to replace the original self-attention for long-form input. Rather than attending to all other tokens, every token only attends to specific tokens with strategies such as window attention [131, 143, 212], global attention [143, 212], random attention [212] and Sinkhorn attention [230].

Besides the sparse attention, several methods are employed to process input from multiple sources. It is common practise to leverage one or more encoders to encode multiple inputs, and then utilize different strategies to aggregate them in the cross-attention module. Golovanov *et al.* [56] conducted mean pooling for dialog history, current state and persona information. Chen *et al.* [21] and Liu *et al.* [117] further utilized attention to process embeddings from multiple views or knowledge. In addition, VECO [125] unified the encoder and decoder module via a plug-and-play cross-attention module. BASS [194] and Ribeiro *et al.* [159] substituted the self-attention module with graph network to better extract structural information. Zeng *et al.* [216] appended the gating mechanism after self-attention to inject condition-aware information.

5 OPTIMIZING PLMS FOR TEXT GENERATION

As discussed in Section 3, after the input data is encoded and the generation model (*i.e.*, PLMs) is designed, the next key step is to optimize PLM \mathcal{M} for the text generation task. We mainly consider three optimization ways, namely a) fine-tuning b) prompt-tuning and c) property-tuning. Next, we will describe each optimization way in detail.

5.1 Fine-Tuning for Text Generation

During pretraining, PLMs can encode general linguistic knowledge from large-scale corpus. While, it requires task-specific knowledge to perform downstream text generation tasks. For this purpose, fine-tuning is a commonly adopted way to incorporate task-specific information into PLMs by adapting their weights with text generation losses such as the sequence cross-entropy loss [153].

According to how the parameters of PLMs are updated, exiting fine-tuning methods for text generation can be categorized as: 1) vanilla fine-tuning 2) intermediate fine-tuning 3) parameter-efficient fine-tuning and 4) multi-task fine-tuning. Compared with vanilla fine-tuning, intermediate and multi-task fine-tuning are able to alleviate the overfitting issue on small datasets. As the vanilla fine-tuning requires adjusting the entire model, parameter-efficient methods such as adapters [75] can fine-tune PLMs in a lightweight way.

5.1.1 Vanilla Fine-Tuning. In vanilla fine-tuning, PLMs are adapted to downstream text generation tasks based on task-specific losses such as the cross-entropy loss [153]. Zhang *et al.* [222] trained DialoGPT model on the basis of the GPT-2 architecture by modeling a multi-turn dialogue session as a long text and optimize the generation model with language modeling objective. Ribeiro *et al.* [158] investigated two recent PLMs, BART and T5, for graph-to-text generation and fine-tuned them by conventional auto-regressive cross-entropy loss. A major issue of vanilla fine-tuning is that it is often not sufficiently optimized on small datasets, which is prone to overfitting.

5.1.2 Intermediate Fine-Tuning. The basic idea of intermediate fine-tuning is to incorporate an intermediate dataset consisting of sufficient labelled instances. The intermediate dataset can be the same target text generation task but from different domains or a related NLP task from the same target domain. It is helpful to infuse domain- or task-specific knowledge from the intermediate dataset for alleviating the overfitting issue and enhancing the performance on small target text generation datasets [146]. According to the relatedness between the intermediate dataset and target dataset, intermediate fine-tuning can be divided into two categories, *i.e.*, domain adaptive intermediate fine-tuning (DAIFT) and task adaptive intermediate fine-tuning (TAIFT).

Domain Adaptive Intermediate Fine-Tuning. According to Kalyan *et al.* [86], DAIFT utilizes an intermediate dataset, which focuses on a related NLP task (not text generation tasks) from the same target domain, consisting of sufficient labelled instances. By leveraging such an intermediate dataset, PLMs can be enriched with domain-specific knowledge, which is helpful to improve the performance of the target text generation task within the same domain. DAIFT is usually adopted in machine translation to eliminate the issue of unseen languages in translation pairs. For example, to improve the translation quality of the low-resource target language (*e.g.*, Kazakh), Liu *et al.* [123] constructed a large-scale intermediate monolingual corpus of the target language and fine-tuned mBART by reconstructing the corrupted target language text. The intermediate dataset comes from the same language domain with the target dataset (*e.g.*, Kazakh), which can impart language-related linguistic knowledge to PLMs for better translation.

Task Adaptive Intermediate Fine-tuning. In contrast with DAIFT, TAIFT incorporates an intermediate dataset focused on the same target text generation task but from different domains. It aims to infuse task-specific knowledge from the massive intermediate labelled dataset for improving the same target text generation task. Many works have shown that performing the same target text generation task on intermediate generic text corpus (*e.g.*, Wikipedia, WebText) can improve the performance of the target text generation task on a specific domain (*e.g.*, Movie) [41, 132]. For example, Fabbri *et al.* [41] performed summarization on intermediate pseudo-summaries created from Wikipedia to improve the zero-shot and few-shot performance of abstractive summarization, and Mao *et al.* [132] conducted generation on intermediate BookCorpus from WebText to improve commonsense story generation on the target WritingPrompts dataset.

5.1.3 Multi-Task Fine-Tuning. By incorporating auxiliary tasks, multi-task fine-tuning can utilize the cross-task knowledge to improve the primary text generation task. Furthermore, by injecting knowledge from related NLP tasks, multi-task fine-tuning can enhance the robustness of PLMs and reduce the need of large amounts of labelled instances in the text generation task. According to the

relatedness between the primary text generation task and auxiliary tasks, multi-task fine-tuning (MTFT) can be divided into two categories, *i.e.*, pure MTFT and hybrid MTFT.

Pure Multi-Task Fine-Tuning. Pure MTFT refers that the auxiliary tasks are the same with the primary text generation task but from different domains. Previous studies mainly utilized additional datasets to eliminate the data scarcity issue of the primary text generation task [3, 59]. Specifically, Goodwin *et al.* [59] performed MTFT on twenty-one datasets on summarization and question answering to enable zero-shot summarization and question answering on previously unseen datasets. Besides, Bai *et al.* [3] incorporated an auxiliary monolingual summarization task to improve the primary cross-lingual summarization task in low-resource setting.

Hybrid Multi-Task Fine-Tuning. Hybrid MTFT means the auxiliary tasks are different (not text generation tasks) from the primary text generation task. These diverse auxiliary tasks can help enhance some specific aspects of the primary generation task. For example, Liu *et al.* [115] and Jin *et al.* [85] fine-tuned PLMs with auxiliary tasks (*e.g.*, coherence detection, style-carrying text reconstruction) to control the content of the generated text such as the topic change and text style (humor, romance, and clickbait). Besides, to improve the faithfulness of the generated text, Li *et al.* [103] and Gong *et al.* [58] introduced auxiliary input reconstruction tasks to reconstruct KG triples and table values for aligning the input information and the generated content.

5.1.4 Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning. As fine-tuning requires updating all the model parameters, it is time-consuming to perform the entire fine-tuning in resource-limited scenarios. There are a number of studies that develop parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods for text generation task.

Adapter-based Fine-Tuning. Adapter is a special neural layer proposed by Houslyby *et al.* [75] to fine-tune PLMs in a parameter-efficient way. The adapter module projects the input vector into a small vector and then projects back into the original dimension using two feed-forward layers and a non-linear layer. Specifically, the adapters first project the original d -dimensional features into a smaller dimension, m , apply a non-linearity, then project back to d dimensions. The total number of parameters added per layer, including biases, is $2md + d + m$. By setting $m \ll d$, we can limit the number of additionally added parameters per task. Thus, it is highly efficient to fix the parameters of original PLMs but only fine-tune the adapters [26, 171]. To address the inefficiency and overfitting issues in low-resource abstractive summarization, Chen *et al.* [26] inserted the adapters into both encoder and decoder of PLMs by restricting the number of trainable parameters and layers. Besides, many studies have shown that adapters can be used to help PLMs efficiently capture some input characteristics for generating more accurate output text with a low extra cost in terms of parameters [94, 159]. For example, Ribeiro *et al.* [159] utilized the adapters to effectively model the input graph structure when fine-tuning PLMs, which are usually pretrained using natural language and not structured data.

Freezing-based Fine-Tuning. This approach refers to freeze most parameters of PLMs and only update a small proportion of model parameters. Recent studies have shown that not all parameters of PLMs are necessary to be fine-tuned for text generation tasks and some of them can be fixed during fine-tuning without much impact on the model performance. Several studies have revealed that cross-attention (or encoder-decoder attention) layers are more important than self-attention layers when fine-tuning PLMs for machine translation [53, 210]. Therefore, Gheini *et al.* [53] only fine-tuned the cross-attention parameters while kept the encoder and decoder fixed, which achieved close translation performance to fine-tuning all parameters.

Distillation-based Fine-Tuning. It involves distilling large teacher PLMs into small student models for efficient fine-tuning. By distilling the knowledge in PLMs for text generation into small generative model (*e.g.*, sequence-to-sequence), the student models can be efficiently fine-tuned for achieving better generation performance [25, 169]. A representative example is Chen *et al.* [25]

leveraged BERT as the teacher model that generates sequences of word probability logits, and treat Seq2Seq model as the student network, which can effectively learn from the teacher’s outputs.

5.2 Prompt-Tuning for Text Generation

Most of generative PLMs are pretrained using language modeling objectives and then fine-tuned on text generation tasks with task-specific objectives. The discrepancy between pretraining and fine-tuning impacts the performance of PLMs on text generation tasks. In prompt-tuning, downstream text generation tasks are reformulated to the language modeling task during pretraining.

5.2.1 Background. According to Liu *et al.* [116], a prompting function $f_{prompt}(\cdot)$ is applied to convert the input text x into a prompt $x' = f_{prompt}(x)$ through a two-step process:

1. Apply a textual *template* containing two slots: an input slot $[X]$ for input x and an answer slot $[Z]$ for an intermediate generated answer text z that will later be mapped into y .
2. Fill the input slot $[X]$ with the input text x .

Here the prompt can be close or prefix style. The close-style prompt is usually adopted in language understanding tasks, where the empty slot $[Z]$ is either in the middle of the prompt or at the end. For example, in sentiment analysis where $x =$ “I love this movie.”, the template may take a close form such as “[X] It was a really [Z] movie.” to predict the answer in $[Z]$. While, in the prefix-style prompt, the input text comes entirely before the empty slot $[Z]$ such as “English: [X] German: [Z]” in machine translation. Therefore, prefix prompts are widely used in text generation, as they mesh well with the left-to-right nature of language modeling. In the above prompt examples, the template is composed of *discrete* natural language tokens. While, they could be virtual words (*e.g.*, represented by numeric ids) which would be mapped into *continuous* embeddings later.

5.2.2 Discrete Prompts. Most of studies create prompts by manually designing templates based on human introspection. As pioneers, GPT-2 [153] performed text generation tasks using various manually-created prompts. For example, the prompt “translate to french, [*input*], [*output*]” is used in machine translation. The prompt defines the semantic mapping from input data to output text in a specific text generation task. By utilizing diverse prompts, a single PLM is able to implement many different text generation tasks. Previous studies heavily relied on manual efforts to create prompts, however, PLMs are highly sensitive to prompts: improperly-constructed prompts cause low performance [82]. To overcome the need to manually specify prompts, Shin *et al.* [168] proposed AutoPrompt to automatically search for template tokens. Besides, several methods have been proposed to discovery discrete prompts automatically such as paraphrasing existing prompts [82], generating prompts using PLMs [50], and mining prompts from a corpus [82].

5.2.3 Continuous Prompts. In addition to discrete prompts, a lot of studies explored continuous prompts (*a.k.a.*, soft prompts) in the embedding space. Continuous prompts have two advantages: 1) relax the constraint that the prompt template should be natural language words; 2) remove the restriction that the template is parameterized by PLMs’ parameters. Instead, prompt templates have their own parameters that can be tuned based on the training data of the text generation tasks.

The most well-known continuous prompting method for text generation is prefix-tuning [107], which keeps generative PLMs (*e.g.*, GPT-2, BART) frozen and instead optimizes a sequence of task-specific continuous vectors. In contrast to fine-tuning, which updates all PLMs parameters and thus requires storing a tuned copy of the model for each text generation task, prefix-tuning only optimizes the prefix for each text generation task. Based on prefix-tuning, several works struggled to solve other text generation tasks such as dialog generation [63].

5.3 Property-Tuning for Text Generation

For various generation tasks, we expect to optimize PLMs specially for different language properties, so that the generated text can satisfy the corresponding needs of the generation tasks. Next, we discuss three major properties that are enhanced via fine-tuning PLMs.

5.3.1 Relevance. According to linguistic literature [104], in text generation, *relevance* refers that the topical semantics conveyed in output text are highly related to the input text. As a representative example, in dialog systems, the generated responses should be relevant to the historical utterance and other conditions, such as speaker persona and discourse topic.

Compared with traditional neural generative models, PLMs utilize the powerful multi-layer cross-attention mechanism to connect the input side and output side. Therefore, applying PLMs to the dialog generation task would improve the relevance of generated text to the input data [193, 222]. A good example is DialoGPT [222], which is formulated as an auto-regressive language model and uses GPT-2 as model architecture. Specially, DialoGPT is first trained on large-scale dialog pairs/sessions, which could enable DialoGPT to capture the joint distribution of $\Pr(\text{history}, \text{response})$ in conversational flow for generating relevant responses to the history utterance. Furthermore, to consider various types of condition information when generating dialog, Zeng *et al.* [215] utilized the masked language modeling objective to train the conditioned dialog generation task. Specifically, they proposed TF-IDF based masking which selects more condition-related tokens to mask, so that PLMs can generate condition-related expressions rather than the general language patterns. Besides, they used a non-parametric attention-based gating mechanism to choose between generating a general word or a condition-related word at each position.

5.3.2 Faithfulness. *Faithfulness* is also an important language property to consider for text generation, which means the generated content should adhere to the information in input text. For example, text summarization aims to generate faithful text representing the salient information of the input text. Sometimes, it is generalized to refer that the generated text is in accord with the world facts.

To be faithful with input text, an desired capacity is the underlying text generation can accurately understand the core semantics of input or acquire sufficient world knowledge. Pretrained on large collections of text with special training objectives, PLMs show excellent natural language understanding capacities in capturing core semantics from plain text [34]. Furthermore, it has been found that PLMs indeed encode a large amount of knowledge facts [82], which is potentially beneficial to generate faithful summary by injecting background knowledge into text. For example, Kryscinski *et al.* [92] utilized a contextual network in PLM decoder to retrieve the most salient parts from the source document for improving the level of faithfulness of generated summaries. Besides, several studies proposed to generate faithful text by introducing additional losses besides the text generation loss [162, 209]. Specifically, Yang *et al.* [209] fine-tuned PLMs through a theme modeling loss and a denoising autoencoder. The role of the theme modeling loss is to optimize PLMs for generating faithful summaries by making the generated text semantically close to the original article through a semantic classifier. The denoising autoencoder can help PLMs extract salient information from corrupted text to further enhance the faithfulness of generated summaries.

5.3.3 Order-Preservation. In the NLP field, *order-preservation* is a special property that refers that the order of semantic units (*e.g.*, word, phrase, etc.) in both input and output text is consistent. Such a property is key to several important text generation tasks, such as text paraphrase and machine translation. In machine translation, when translating from source language to target language, it often requires preserving the order of phrases in the source and target text for ensuring the accuracy of the translation results.

Table 1. Summary of the existing studies on PLMs with respect to key modules and solutions according to different challenges.

View	Challenge	Solution
Data View	Lacking Enough Training Data	prior knowledge transfer [117, 144, 236], data augmentation [22, 129, 142, 200], multi-task learning [3, 59]
	Domain Transfer	Continuously pretrained on specific out-domain data [26, 236], or on auxiliary intermediate tasks [133].
	Pretraining Corpus Bias	Mitigate the gender bias in word embeddings [8], identify and mask bias-sensitive tokens [33].
Model View	Model Compression	Quantization by truncating PLMs weights [172, 211], pruning less critical weights [43, 60, 66, 74], knowledge distillation [25, 84, 101].
	Model Extension	Large-scale PLMs [14, 45, 97, 214], knowledge-enriched PLMs [69, 108, 145, 224], efficient PLMs [72, 83].
	Model Robustness	Utilize character embeddings rather than sub-word embeddings [10, 127], adversarial data augmentation [81, 191, 196, 231].
Optim. View	Satisfying Text Properties	Enhance coherence [104, 174], preserve factuality [28, 36, 103, 134], improve controllable [32, 90, 141].
	Mitigating Tuning Instabilities	Intermediate fine-tuning [123, 146], mixout strategy [96], supervised contrastive learning [65].

In machine translation, one line of research to improve the order-preservation property is to perform word alignment. A representative study is Code-Switching Pre-training (CSP) [206]. CSP first extracted the word-pair alignment information from the source and target monolingual corpus automatically. Then, to enhance the order-preservation property during translation, CSP continuously pretrained PLMs by predicting the sentence fragment on the source side given the aligned fragment in the target language. Moreover, to loose the restriction of discrete word alignment, another line of research aims to conduct continuous representation alignment for improving the order-preservation property. Wada *et al.* [184] focused on aligning word representations of each language by mapping word embeddings of each language into a common latent space, making it possible to preserve the word order consistent. Although recent studies have achieved some progress on English language, it is more challenging to enhance order-preservation across multiple languages. Thus, Lin *et al.* [113] proposed mRASP, which enforces words and phrases with similar meanings across multiple languages to be aligned in the representation space.

6 CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

The above three sections describe three key aspects with basic methods in designing text generation models. In this section, we further summarize the major challenges and existing solutions in three different views. A summary of these challenges and solutions is presented in Table 1.

6.1 Data View

We first discuss the challenges and solutions related to the data.

6.1.1 Lacking Sufficient Training Data. In many text generation tasks, it is difficult to obtain sufficient annotated data. Transfer learning provides an effective solution by transferring the knowledge of data-rich source tasks into data-scarce target text generation tasks. Besides, data augmentation and multi-task learning can also be used to address this problem.

Transfer Learning. To deal with the challenge of lacking enough annotated data in text generation tasks, several studies considered first fine-tuning PLMs on large amounts of external corpus and

then transferring into target text generation tasks [117, 144, 236]. In particular, Peng *et al.* [144] and Zou *et al.* [236] first fine-tuned PLMs on large amounts of external labelled dialog/summary data and then fine-tuned for the target dialog/summarization task in a new domain with limited labelled data. Besides, Liu *et al.* [117] first trained on large-scale ungrounded dialogues and unstructured knowledge base separately to improve the low-resource knowledge-grounded dialog task.

Data Augmentation. In recent literature, data augmentation has become an important approach to constructing weak-supervised data for improving the model performance in data-scarce text generation tasks. One line of research is to use retrieval models to return simulated data [142, 200]. For the query-focus summarization task, Pasunuru *et al.* [142] used search engine, *i.e.*, Bing, to retrieve the answer passage as the simulated summary based on the ground-truth query. Another line is to use perturbation-based methods to corrupt the original text [22, 129]. For example, Chen *et al.* [22] presented a set of data augmentation methods for conversation summarization, such as random swapping/deletion to randomly swap or delete utterances in conversations.

Multi-Task Learning. Another strategy to overcome the data scarcity issue is to explore multi-task learning by leveraging other data-rich tasks and datasets. Most of studies usually incorporated similar auxiliary generation tasks for enhancing the primary text generation task such as machine translation [3] and summarization [59]. However, these methods usually adopt independent decoders without sharing parameters, breaking the connections between high-resource and low-resource generation tasks. To bridge these connections, Bai *et al.* [3] employed a unified decoder which learns the alignments and patterns across multiple languages in machine translation.

6.1.2 Transferring from In Domain to Out Domain. For text generation, PLMs are typically pre-trained on hundreds of thousands of data points, which is an infeasible requirement when applying PLMs to new domains, especially with large distribution discrepancy from pretraining. Therefore, pretraining on intermediate data or tasks before applying PLMs to text generation tasks in new domains may be an effective solution.

Pretraining on Intermediate data. As discussed in Section 5.1.2, the intermediate and target data are of the same domain but can be different tasks. Pretraining on the intermediate data can help PLMs gain more domain-specific knowledge which enhances the performance of the target text generation tasks on the same domain. For example, to improve the translation quality of the low-resource target language (*e.g.*, Kazakh), Liu *et al.* [123] constructed a large-scale intermediate monolingual corpus of the target language and fine-tuned mBART by reconstructing the corrupted monolingual text.

Pretraining on Intermediate Task. The intermediate task focuses on the same target text generation task but from different domains, which can impart task-specific knowledge to PLMs. For example, Fabbri *et al.* [41] performed summarization on intermediate pseudo-summaries created from Wikipedia to improve the zero-shot and few-shot performance of abstractive summarization.

6.1.3 Data Bias from Pretraining Corpus. Since the pretraining corpus of PLMs are collected from the Web, it may contain datasets from various domains such as biomedical and legal corpus. However, these domain-specific data are likely to contain biased information, and PLMs are prone to learning and amplifying the data bias of the pretraining corpus.

It has been found that the the generated text from these PLMs are likely to be biased towards some attributes [14], *i.e.*, may favor a particular race, gender or aged people, which is not desired for the target generation tasks. These undesirable biases are unexpectedly contained in model components such as word embeddings [9] and attention heads [183]. A simple approach to mitigating the gender bias in word embeddings is to “swap” gendered terms in training data when generating word embeddings [228]. Furthermore, simply masking names and pronouns may also reduce biases and improve the performance of certain language tasks [33]. However, to date, there is still no a

general, unified approach to reducing the data bias from PLMs for text generation. Some of these techniques for bias detection and mitigation have been critiqued as merely capturing over-simplified dimensions of bias with proper debiasing requiring more holistic evaluation [57].

6.2 Model View

In this section, we present the challenges from the PLM architecture and discuss corresponding solutions for text generation.

6.2.1 Model Compression. Although PLMs have achieved great success on text generation tasks, the backbone Transformers are bulky and resource-hungry, resulting in high memory consumption, computational overhead, and energy cost. To address these issues, one way is through compressing parameters of PLMs. According to Ganesh *et al.* [49], there are three kinds of methods including quantization, pruning, and knowledge distillation to compress PLMs for text generation.

Quantization. Quantization means reducing the number of unique values used to represent PLMs weights, which in turn allows to represent them using fewer bits [49]. As most of PLMs are based on Transformer, quantization can be generally applied to those PLMs weights residing in fully-connected layers (*i.e.*, the embedding layers, the linear layers, and the feed-forward network layers). To alleviate the issue of generating unsatisfactory text when truncating PLMs weights, a helpful solution is to first identify important weights and then not truncate them during the quantization step [211].

Pruning. Pruning refers to identifying and removing redundant and/or less important weights [49]. Pruning methods for text generation largely fall into two categories. The first type of unstructured pruning prunes individual weights by locating the set of least important weights in PLMs. The importance of weights can be measured by specific metrics such as absolute values [60] and gradients [66]. The second type of structured pruning prunes structured blocks of weights or even complete components in PLMs by reducing and simplifying certain modules such as attention heads [74] and Transformer layers [43].

Knowledge Distillation. Knowledge distillation refers to training a smaller model (called the *student*) using the output of PLMs (called the *teacher*). First, the student model can directly learn from the output word distribution of the final softmax layer in PLMs, which allows the student to mimic the generated text of the teacher model by replicating the word distribution across the whole vocabulary [25]. Second, the student can also learn from the output tensors of PLMs encoders [101]. Intuitively, the representations of PLMs encoder may contain meaningful semantics and contextual relationships between input tokens, which is helpful for generating accurate text. Third, by replicating attention distributions between input data and output text, a student can also learn the contextual dependency between input and output [84].

6.2.2 Model Extension. Recently, there has been a surge of interest in the research community to improve the underlying design of PLMs to increase the text generation performance.

Large-scale PLMs. Kaplan *et al.* [87] have shown that the performance of PLMs is considerably related to the scale of PLMs parameters. This observation sparked the development of large-scale PLMs in text generation [14, 214]. The most representative PLMs for text generation is GPT-3 [14], which adopts 175 billion parameters, 10x more than any previous non-sparse PLMs. With large-scale parameters, GPT-3 can achieve strong performance in various text generation tasks without any gradient updates or fine-tuning.

Knowledge-Enriched PLMs. Recent research has found that integrating knowledge from external knowledge sources can help PLMs enhance their text generation performance even more [176, 234]. Specifically, ERNIE 3.0 [176] was pretrained on a 4TB corpus consisting of plain texts and a large-scale knowledge graph for both language understanding and generation tasks.

Without incorporating explicit knowledge, CALM [234] can pack commonsense knowledge into the parameters by teaching PLMs to write and reason with common concepts through pre-training strategies, yielding better performance on text generation tasks.

Efficient PLMs. Pretraining PLMs on large-scale text data is prohibitively expensive. Recently, it has been demonstrated that by meticulously structuring the model architecture, it is possible to obtain equivalent or higher text generation performance with less pretraining data [234] or lower pretraining costs [83]. CALM [234], for example, achieved comparable results to other larger PLMs such as T5 on text generation tasks while only being progressively pretrained on a relatively small corpus for a few steps.

6.2.3 Model Robustness. Transformer-based PLMs are susceptible to both adversarial and natural noise, which may have a significant impact on the text generation performance of PLMs.

Character Embedding. One reason behind model brittleness is the use of sub-word embeddings during generation. In the case of sub-word embeddings, generating an incorrect sub-word will influence the meaning and representation of the final word, affecting the final generation qualities [127]. To improve the robustness of PLMs in text generation, several research have advocated using character-level embeddings [10, 197]. In particular, Xie *et al.* [197] combined word and character level embeddings for poetry generation and shown that language models that fuse word- and character-level embeddings significantly outperform models that employ only word- or character-level embeddings.

Data Augmentation. Another reason for the vulnerability of PLMs is that these PLMs do not generalize well on semantic neighborhood in the representation space around each generation instance [164]. To solve this issue, data augmentation [81] have been proposed by revising original generation data to augment attack-related data. With the development of text generation techniques, back translation [196] and variant auto-encoder [187] are used to augment new data. Despite their effectiveness, these methods have lost the generality. Zhou *et al.* [231] utilized a masked language model with Gaussian noise to augment virtual examples for improving the PLM robustness.

6.3 Optimization View

In this part, we discuss the challenges and solutions about how to optimize PLMs for text generation.

6.3.1 Satisfying Special Text Properties. In Section 5.3, we introduced three basic text properties. While, in this section, we will present three more difficult text properties for text generation tasks, *i.e.*, coherence, factuality, and controllability.

Enhancing the Coherence. In linguistics, language coherence is what makes a text semantically meaningful. An essential technique to improving coherence is to meticulously plan the generated content, which is known as text planning [76, 104]. For example, Li *et al.* [104] designed a two-level text plan: (1) the document plan is modeled as a sequence of sentence plans in order, and (2) the sentence plan is modeled as an entity-based subgraph from KG. The local coherence is naturally enforced by KG subgraphs, and the global coherence can be improved by generating a coherent sequence of subgraphs. During the generation process, decoding strategies such as top-*k* sampling usually produce improper tokens especially at the boundary of sentences, reducing the discourse coherence. Wang *et al.* [189] designed an auxiliary task of discourse relation modeling to enhance the discourse coherence of the generated text by classifying adjacent sentences.

Preserving the Factuality. The input data for various text generation tasks, such as table-to-text generation, usually contains some factual information. In such cases, the generated content should adhere to the original input fact. However, the universal structure of PLMs is unable to retain the text factuality in specific tasks. For data-to-text generation, the pointer generator [166] is usually adopted to copy the input facts into output for preserving factuality [28, 103]. Furthermore,

the input text of text summarization sometimes alludes to news including world facts. To make summarization models produce more factual summaries, some works proposed some evaluation metrics or correction methods to measure and revise the generated text for preserving factuality [36, 134].

Improving the Controllability. Controlling the attributes of generated text becomes difficult until the model architecture of large-scale PLMs is modified to allow for extra input attributes. The Plug and Play Language Model, commonly known as PPLM [32], is an example of a controllable PLM that combines a PLM with one or more simple attribute classifiers that direct text generation without further PLM training. Several studies achieved controllability from a distributional view [90, 141]. For example, Pascual *et al.* [141] described a plug-and-play decoding approach in a single sentence: given a topic or keyword, the model adds a shift to the probability distribution over the vocabulary towards semantically similar words.

6.3.2 Mitigating Tuning Instabilities. Due to the issues of catastrophic forgetting and small size of text generation datasets, tuning PLMs for text generation is usually unstable *i.e.*, fine-tuning the model with different random seeds results in a wide variance of performance. The possible solutions include a) intermediate fine-tuning b) mix-out and c) use of supervised contrastive loss.

Intermediate Fine-Tuning. Recent studies have shown that continuously pretraining PLMs on unsupervised tasks like language modeling, and then fine-tuning them on the target generation tasks can achieve significantly better target performance than using the target generation training data alone [123, 146]. For example, Liu *et al.* [123] constructed an intermediate monolingual corpus of the target language (*e.g.*, Kazakh) and fine-tuned mBART to reconstruct the corrupted monolingual text for improving the translation quality of the low-resource target language.

Mixout Strategy. When just a few number of training instances are available, fine-tuning a large PLM on a text generation task is prone to degenerate performance. Lee *et al.* [96] introduced a regularization technique, mixout, which stochastically mixes the parameters of two PLMs. They shown that the mixout strategy regularizes learning to minimize the deviation from one of the two models and the strength of regularization adapts along the optimization trajectory.

Contrastive Learning. The most used cross-entropy loss in text generation, *i.e.*, the KL-divergence between one-hot vectors of labels and the distribution of model's outputs, lacks robustness to noise labels [226] or adversarial examples [40]. Therefore, fine-tuning PLMs with cross-entropy loss tends to be unstable across different runs, especially when supervised data is limited. To tackle this issue, Gunel *et al.* [65] proposed an objective that includes a supervised contrastive learning term that pushes the words from the same class close and the words from different classes further apart.

7 EVALUATION AND RESOURCES

In this part, we will discuss several commonly used evaluation metrics and resources with respect to PLMs for text generation.

7.1 Evaluation

With the growing variety of text generation applications and datasets, evaluating text generated results by humans is becoming more expensive and time-consuming to design and run, and more importantly, the results are not always repeatable [18]. As a result, we will concentrate on automatic evaluation metrics for text generation in this part. According to Celikyilmaz *et al.* [18], we present four categories of metrics, *i.e.*, n -gram overlap metrics, diversity metrics, semantic similarity metrics, and logit-based metrics. We list the metrics used in each generation tasks in Table 2.

7.1.1 N -Gram Overlap Metrics. These metrics measure the degree of “matching” between machine-generated and ground-truth texts.

BLEU. The Bilingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) [140] is one of the first metrics used to measure the similarity between two sentences. This metric was originally proposed for machine translation by comparing a candidate translation of text to one or more reference translations and now employed in various generation tasks. BLEU- n measures the precision of the co-occurrences of n -grams between the generated and real text and conducts length penalty on shorter generated text. Specially, SacreBLEU [149] is recommended for use in machine translation to avoid inconsistency issue. And several smoothing methods [19] are proposed to evaluate short sentences.

ROUGE. Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE) [112] is a set of metrics for evaluating automatic summarization of long texts consisting of multiple sentences or paragraphs. ROUGE- n counts the F1 score of the overlapping n -grams between generated and real text.

METEOR. The Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit ORDERing (METEOR) [4] is designed to address some of the issues found in BLEU. Compared to BLEU, METEOR is computed based on the harmonic mean of the unigram precision and recall, and measures word-to-word matches between generated and real text based on WordNet.

ChrF++. Character n -gram F-score (ChrF++) [148] is an automatic evaluation for machine translation. Different from the word level co-occurrence of BLEU, ChrF++ is mainly focused on the character-level to consider the morpheme overlapping.

7.1.2 Diversity Metrics. Lexical diversity is desirable in many text generation tasks, such as dialog systems and story generation.

Distinct. Distinct- n measures the degree of diversity by calculating the number of distinct n -grams in generated text [99]. This value is scaled by total number of generated tokens to avoid favoring long sentences.

7.1.3 Semantic Similarity Metrics. The researchers used neural networks to capture semantic meaning and syntactic structure of sentences by mapping them into vectors, and the results of text generation can be evaluated using sentence embeddings from the generated and reference texts.

BERTScore. Given the excellent performance of BERT across many tasks, BERTScore [220] leverages the pretrained contextual embeddings from BERT and matches words in candidate and reference sentences by cosine similarity. BERTScore has been shown to correlate well with human judgments on sentence-level and system-level evaluations.

7.1.4 Logit-Based Metrics. In text generation, the probability of a generated text $y = \langle y_1, \dots, y_n \rangle$ can be formulated as $\Pr(y) = \prod_{j=1}^n \Pr(y_j | y_{1:j-1}; x)$, where x denotes the input data, and $y_{1:j-1}$ denotes the previous tokens $\langle y_1, \dots, y_{j-1} \rangle$.

PPL. In information theory, perplexity (PPL) is a measurement of how well a probability distribution or probability model predicts a sample compared with the ground-truth [12]. A low perplexity indicates the probability distribution is good at predicting the sample. Therefore, the perplexity of the discrete probability distribution $\Pr(y)$ is defined as:

$$\text{PPL}(\Pr(y)) := e^{\text{H}(\Pr(y))} = e^{-\sum_y \Pr(y) \ln \Pr(y)} = \prod_y \Pr(y)^{-\Pr(y)}, \quad (3)$$

where $\text{H}(\Pr(y))$ is the entropy of the distribution.

7.2 Resources

In this section, we will introduce some available open-source libraries and benchmarks.

7.2.1 Open-Source Libraries. There are numerous popular text generation libraries available to assist scholars in working with PLMs in a more convenient manner. Libraries like Transformers [192] and Fairseq [137] are helpful to model training and evaluation. Some of libraries like TextBox [102]

Table 2. A summary of common datasets and metrics used in each generation task. [†]Smoothing method 7 (with NLTK version 3.4) is usually employed in open-domain dialogue system [6]. [‡]Inform (rate) and Success (rate) are two accuracy metrics specially designed for task-oriented dialogue system [15].

Tasks	Sub-Tasks	Datasets	Metrics
Machine Translation	Unsupervised MT	WMT'14 English-French [30],	SacreBLEU
	Supervised MT	WMT'16 German-English [30]	
Summarization	Vanilla Summarization	CNN/DailyMail [170], XSum [170], GigaWord [170]	ROUGE, BERTScore
	Dialogue Summarization	SAMSum [21]	ROUGE
Dialogue System	Open-Domain Dialogue System	PersonaChat [6], DailyDialog [6], DSTC7-AVSD [6]	Perplexity BLEU [†] , Distinct
	Task-Oriented Dialogue System	MultiWOZ [15]	BLEU, Inform [‡] , Success [‡]
Question Generation		SQuAD [35]	BLEU, ROUGE, METEOR
Story Generation		ROCStories [64], WritingPrompts [155]	Perplexity BLEU, Distinct
Data-to-text Generation		AGENDA [158], LDC2017T10 [128], WikiBio [28], WebNLG [158], E2E [24]	BLEU, ROUGE, METEOR, chrF++

and Trankit [135] which are built on the top of Transformers library make constructing text generation models easier with just a few lines of code. Others like FastSeq [203], DeepSpeed [156], and LightSeq [190] are useful to increase the inference speed of models.

7.2.2 Benchmarks. PLMs have made great progress in a host of Natural Language Understanding (NLU) tasks. Meanwhile, the development of general evaluation benchmarks has also helped drive the progress of these PLMs. In addition to GLUE [186] and SuperGLUE [185] which are general language understanding evaluation benchmarks, an increasing number of general benchmarks targeted for text generation evaluation have recently been proposed. Liu *et al.* [114] introduced the General Language Generation Evaluation (GLGE) benchmark, a new multi-task benchmark for evaluating the generalization capabilities of text generation in English language.

8 APPLICATION

As discussed in Section 2, text generation can be categorized into different kinds of applications according to the input data x . And PLMs have been successfully applied to these text generation applications. The overall taxonomy of these tasks is shown in Table 2, as well as corresponding common datasets and metrics. In what follows, we will highlight some classic applications, such as machine translation, text summarization and dialogue system. Moreover, we will summarize useful methods of how to design a task-specific PLM or how to utilize PLMs for specific tasks.

8.1 Machine Translation

Machine translation (MT) is the process of automatically translating one language into another. With the advent of deep learning, Neural Machine Translation (NMT) has emerged as the dominant method in both academic research and commercial use [31]. Machine translation can be classed into two types: unsupervised machine translation and supervised machine translation, depending on whether parallel corpora are used for fine-tuning PLMs.

8.1.1 Unsupervised Machine Translation. Unsupervised Machine Translation (UMT) refers to the use of solely monolingual corpora without any parallel data for both pretraining and fine-tuning PLMs. UMT enables machine translation to no longer rely on large-scale annotated corpora, and it also brings remarkable advances in low-resource language translation. When using PLMs for UMT, there are often two steps involved [93]: 1) PLMs are pretrained on monolingual corpora in a variety of languages, learning embeddings for each token and modeling probabilities for each sentence in a certain language. 2) Iterative back-translation is then leveraged to combine the source-to-target and target-to-source model with the denoising auto-encoding and back-translation objectives.

Pretraining on Monolingual Corpora. Recent PLM-based research has mainly concentrated on the first step of UMT. Specifically, XLM [30] and mBERT [34] are pretrained on multiple monolingual data using masked language modeling, and then the pretrained model is used to initialize both the encoder and the decoder for machine translation. mBART [119] follows the BART [98] pretraining scheme on multiple languages. However, these PLMs just perform the original pretraining task with mixed monolingual corpora, without considering the relationship between languages. CMLM [157] proposes cross-lingual MLM to randomly mask tokens in monolingual sentences and predict corresponding translation candidates. Therefore, CMLM is beneficial to align the embedding of different languages. CSP [206] shares the similar idea, replacing some words in the source sentences with their translation words and then predicting the replaced words.

Leveraging Iterative Back-translation. In the back-translation stage, Garcia *et al.* [52] proposed using multi-task learning. They investigated *multilingual UMNT*, which involves the use of a third language when translating from one language to another. The extra language can provide auxiliary monolingual data or parallel data containing only one language in the source or target language. They aggregated back-translation loss and introduced a cross-translation term to incorporate the auxiliary corpus. Li *et al.* [110] also applied the cross-translation term and additionally included a knowledge distillation objective for the third language.

8.1.2 Supervised Machine Translation. Supervised machine translation refers to fine-tuning PLMs on the basis of parallel corpora. Next, we will discuss how to utilize existing self-supervised PLMs and how to design PLMs for parallel corpora.

Directly Fine-tuning Unsupervised PLMs. Almost all PLMs mentioned above using unsupervised (self-supervised) pretraining, such as XLM [30] and mBART [119], can be directly fine-tuned with bilingual pairs. Moreover, considering the excellent encoding capability of BERT, BERT-fused model [235] leverages BERT to extract contextual embedding for the source sentence, and fuses the representations with each layer of the encoder and decoder. CTNMT [204] leverages asymptotic distillation and dynamic switching gate to integrate the BERT embedding. Graformer [177] grafted mBERT as the encoder and mGPT as the decoder, and then trained a cross-attention module to combine them. Tang *et al.* [180] proposed to fine-tune mBART on multiple language pairs, which is called multilingual fine-tuning.

Designing PLMs for Parallel Corpora. Most of PLMs are pretrained on monolingual corpora using self-supervised pretraining tasks such as MLM and DAE. Nevertheless, these pretraining objectives are different from the down-stream translation task. Hence, mRASP [113] pretrains the model on bilingual pairs with supervised Seq2Seq loss by randomly substituting the words in the source sentence with the words which have the same meaning in other languages. As a result, words with similar meaning across different languages are encouraged to share similar representation. mRASP2 [139] applies contrastive learning to minimize the representation gap of similar sentences and maximize that of irrelevant sentences. Despite significant success, pretraining on parallel data necessitates vast labour and financial resources to obtain hundreds of millions of bilingual pairs.

8.2 Text Summarization

Text summarization is the process of condensing texts into a brief summary that retains key information from the source texts [39]. The mainstream approaches to solve summarization based on PLMs are extractive and abstractive. Extractive summarization aims to choose a subset of sentences and concatenates them to form the summary [120, 221]. In contrast, abstractive summarization generates the summary automatically from the abstract representation of input texts [166, 218]. Therefore, we only discuss the abstractive summarization in this section.

8.2.1 Document Summarization. Documents are the most common literary form in the world, such as news, opinions, reviews, and scientific papers. PLMs with prefix LM or encoder-decoder architecture can be directly fine-tuned for document summarization, such as UniLM [5, 35], MASS [170], T5 [154], BART [98] and PEGASUS [218]. During pretraining, PLMs learn to predict the masked important sentences in the input document based on the remaining ones, which shares the similar idea of summarization.

Without directly generating summaries, several works first extracted keywords, key sentences or relations as guidance and then coupled these with PLMs for generation. CIT [163] employed RoBERTa [121] as an extractor to extract the important words and sentences from the input document. In addition, topic models are used to capture the global semantics of the document, which can be integrated into the summarization model [136]. GSum [37] proposed a general framework taking different kinds of guidance into the generation model, including keywords, triples, highlighted sentences and retrieved summaries. Apart from external guidance, several tricks can be applied to document summarization. Cao *et al.* [16] improved the attention mechanism to emphasize salient content in the document. Refactor [118] first generated multiple summaries under different setups and then scored them and selected an optimal candidate summary.

8.2.2 Dialogue Summarization. In contrast to plain text, dialogue, such as meeting, chat and medical conversation, consists of multi-turn utterances by two or more individuals. Hence, it is critical to capture the semi-structured chat content and users' interactions in dialogue summarization [46]. The method used in document summarization can be directly transferred into dialogue summarization. Zhang *et al.* [219] first truncated the dialog into several chunks, then summarized each chunk into partial summaries, and finally rewrote these partial summaries into a complete summary.

In the meanwhile, others also explored to conduct dialogue summarization considering the characteristics of dialogue. Chen *et al.* [21] first extracted different topic views from conversations, and then utilized a multi-view decoder to combine these views for generating summaries. Furthermore, Chen *et al.* [23] constructed discourse relation graphs and action graphs of conversations, in order to concentrate on the most salient utterances and understand concrete details of users' action. Considering the low information density, topic drifts and frequent coreferences of dialog [46], some researchers conduct auxiliary tasks to extract intrinsic information of dialog. Feng *et al.* [47] utilized DialoGPT [222], a PLM specially designed for dialogue, to automatically extract the keywords, detect redundant utterances and divide a dialogue into topically coherent segments. Similarly, ConDigSum [115] detects the dialogue topic transfer and generates summaries for each topic using contrastive learning.

8.3 Dialogue System

Dialogue system (*a.k.a.*, conversational agent) aims to let machines to communicate with human fluently. Technically, machines are required to generate a response conditioned on history contexts. According to down-stream applications, dialogue system is commonly categorized into open-domain dialogue and task-oriented dialogue. The former intends to converse with humans engaged

on open topics such as daily life, sports and entertainment [78]. Yet the latter is focused on assisting users to complete specific tasks, such as hotel reservation and product purchase [227].

8.3.1 Open-domain Dialogue System. Open-domain dialogue system is also known as chat-bots focused on daily chat. For example, Microsoft Xiaolce is a famous open-domain dialogue system to satisfy human need for communication, affection, and social belonging [232].

Continuous Pretraining with Dialogue Corpora. PLMs, such as GPT-2, are pretrained on general text corpora, thus various works extended typical PLMs to dialog system by continuously pretraining them in dialogue corpora. Due to the difficulty to obtain large-scale standard dialog corpora, it is usual to continuously pretrain PLMs on forum posts and comments, such as Reddit, Twitter and Weibo. DialoGPT [222] and Meena [1] utilize casual language models like GPT-2 to pretrain on English or Chinese dialogue corpora. Blender [160] and PLATO [6] utilize the Seq2Seq loss to generate the next utterance based on previous utterances. Moreover, PLATO [6] applies the next utterance classification (NUC) loss, just like the next sentence prediction task in BERT, to judge whether the response is relevant to history dialogues to enhance the coherence of utterances. In order to penalize bland responses and decrease repetitions, DialoGPT [222] employs mutual information maximization function to predict the input given generated response and Blender [160] adopts unlikelihood training objective to penalize n -grams appearing too many times.

Directly Fine-tuning Existing PLMs. Aside from pretraining on dialogue corpora, there also exist various methods to directly fine-tune existing PLMs on dialog tasks. TransferTransfo [193] transfers GPT into dialogue system through multi-task learning. Based on TransferTransfo, Golovanov *et al.* [56] modified the architecture to better model multiple inputs including dialog history, persona information, and current state. In addition, researchers explored methods to capture the hierarchical structure of dialog. DialogBERT [62] employs a hierarchical Transformer architecture and additional training objectives to capture the discourse-level coherence of dialog. DialoFlow [109] proposes a dynamic flow mechanism to model the dialogue history by addressing the semantic influence of each utterance. Furthermore, various works focused on the controllable dialogue system. Zeng *et al.* [216] utilized condition-aware Transformer block to steer the response in a specific topic label. StyleDGPT [208] attempts to control the generated response in the target style with KL loss in both word-level and sentence-level.

8.3.2 Task-Oriented Dialogue System. Task-oriented (*a.k.a.*, goal-oriented) dialogue system is a traditional dialog task, which has many real-life applications. Prior to the advent of PLMs, task-oriented dialogue was often divided into several modules, including natural language understanding, dialog state tracking, dialogue policy learning and natural language generation [227]. Though the main goal of task-oriented dialogue is to track user's intent and state to fulfill slot-value pairs, we mainly focus on the generation part that generates response based on given intent and slot pairs.

Considering the open-ended nature of dialogue, researchers usually adopt the auto-regressive GPT as backbone. SC-GPT [144] serializes the system action as the input and generates corresponding response. Moreover, researchers also attempted to build an end-to-end system for task-oriented dialogue. Budzianowski *et al.* [15] proposed to generate responses conditioned on the user input, system action and database state. SimpleTOD [73] and Ham *et al.* [67] generated the dialog state, system action and response successively, based on the user input and previous generated tokens. In addition, Shalymov *et al.* [167] proposed to generate and retrieve candidate response respectively and utilize the NUC task to select the best one. PRAL [61] utilizes two GPTs to model user and system respectively, and also involves a third GPT to perform knowledge distillation.

8.4 Others

In this part, we will introduce other text generation tasks, including question generation, story generation and data-to-text generation.

8.4.1 Question Generation. Question generation (QG) can be seen as a dual problem of question answering (QA), *i.e.*, generate coherent question based on given passage and answer. Existing PLMs, such as UniLM [5, 35] and ProphetNet [150], can be directly employed by concatenating the passage and answer as input. Moreover, researchers explored this task in different QA settings. For example, Huang *et al.* [79] proposed a two-phase model to solve multi-hop question generation, and Cao *et al.* [17] attempted to generate open-ended questions which are answered by multiple sentences. Moreover, Majumder *et al.* [130] proposed a clarification question generation task to ask question about the missing information in the passage in order to reduce ambiguity.

8.4.2 Story Generation. Story (or narrative, news) generation requires to generate a long-form open-ended text leveraging on the given title or premise. It is challenging to produce a coherent and informative text based on limited input [51]. To enrich the content of generated text, some works introduced knowledge graph or commonsense into PLMs. Guan *et al.* [64] and Mao *et al.* [132] utilized commonsense knowledge base to intermediately fine-tune PLMs to generate reasonable stories. Besides, to generate coherent long-form text, content planning is a widely-used method to organize the output structure. PlotMachines *et al.* [155] extracted keywords from input as outline. Megatron-Cntrl [199] further extends keywords to relevant sentences using knowledge base retrieval. ProGen [179] iteratively refined the generated texts to enhance the quality. Moreover, Guan *et al.* [64] leveraged the contrastive learning loss, similar to NSP loss, to judge whether two sentences are successive in corpus.

8.4.3 Data-to-text Generation. The above-mentioned tasks take unstructured text as input, while the data-to-text generation task generates descriptive text about structured input data, such as table, knowledge graph (KG) and abstract meaning representation (AMR). First, many works directly linearized the structured table [28, 58] and KG [70, 158] into textual form as the input of PLMs. Some researchers also designed special pretraining tasks to pretrain specific PLMs for table-to-text generation [198], KG-to-text generation [24] and AMR-to-text generation [42]. Considering the graph structure of KG and AMR, Li *et al.* [103] and Ribeiro [159] employed GNN to obtain a better representation of each node. And Li *et al.* [103] further aligned the entity embedding of PLM and GNN to bridge the semantic gap. Moreover, introducing auxiliary tasks such as reconstructing the structured table [58] and KG [88, 103] is usually used to capture the semantic correspondence between structured input and output text. Some works borrowed the idea of dual learning to jointly learn the data-to-text generation and text-to-data parsing tasks [88].

8.4.4 Other Generation Tasks. Besides the above-mentioned tasks, there also exist various text generation applications with PLMs. ColdGANs [165] explored the unconditional language generation. KG-BART [122] investigates the commonsense generation, *i.e.*, generating a natural language consisting of provided commonsense concept (word), which can be as the hard-constrained conditional generation [51]. Moreover, text style transfer means to convert a text into another style while preserving the basic semantics of input [51], including sentiment transfer, formality transfer and writing style transfer [91]. In addition, some researchers devoted to literary creation, such as poem [106] and lyric [202].

9 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this survey, we present an overview of current representative research efforts on PLMs for text generation, and expect it can facilitate future research. We began with introducing three key points when applying PLMs for text generation, base on which the main content of our survey is divided into three sections from the view of input representation learning, model architecture design, and parameter optimization. Besides, we discussed several non-trivial challenges with respect to the above three points. Finally, we reviewed a variety of evaluation metrics, open-source libraries, and common applications to help practitioners evaluate, choose and employ PLMs for text generation.

To advance this field, there remains several open problems and future directions.

Controllable Generation. Controllable text generation with PLMs is an interesting direction but still at a very early stage. Controlling some attributes of the generated text has many practical uses, such as generating positive responses to patients suffering from depression in dialogue systems. However, PLMs are usually pretrained in universal corpus, which is difficult to control the multi-grained attributes of the generated text (e.g., sentiment, topic, and coherence). Keskar et al. [89] has explored text generation with control codes that govern style, content and task-specific behavior. While, these control codes are preset and coarse-grained. Future work can explore multi-grained control and develop PLMs that are sufficiently steerable.

Optimization Exploration. Fine-tuning is the predominant optimization way to distill the linguistic knowledge learned in PLMs to downstream generation tasks. At present, prompt-based learning has become a performant and lightweight optimization method [116]. Future work can explore more kinds of optimization approaches that can combine the advantages of current methods.

Language-agnostic PLMs. Nowadays, almost all the PLMs for text generation are mainly based on English. These PLMs will encounter challenges when dealing with non-English generation tasks. Therefore, language-agnostic PLMs are worthy to be investigated, which need to capture universal linguistic and semantic features across different languages. An interesting direction is how to reuse existing English-based PLMs for text generation in non-English languages.

Ethical Concern. Currently, PLMs are pretrained on large-scale corpus crawled from the web without fine-grained filtering, potentially causing ethical issues such as generating private content about users. Therefore, researchers should try their best to prevent misusing PLMs. For this purpose, we can follow the key steps in [161], such as identifying threats and potential impacts and assessing likelihood. Besides, the text generated by PLMs might be prejudiced, which is in line with the bias in training data along the dimensions of gender, race, and religion [14]. As a result, we should intervene PLMs for preventing such biases. The research on the general approach is extensive but still preliminary for PLMs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel Adiwardana, Minh-Thang Luong, David R. So, Jamie Hall, Noah Fiedel, Romal Thoppilan, Zi Yang, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Gaurav Nemade, Yifeng Lu, and Quoc V. Le. 2020. Towards a Human-like Open-Domain Chatbot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09977* (2020).
- [2] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Neural Machine Translation by Jointly Learning to Align and Translate. In *ICLR*.
- [3] Yu Bai, Yang Gao, and Heyan Huang. 2021. Cross-Lingual Abstractive Summarization with Limited Parallel Resources. In *ACL*.
- [4] Satandeep Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In *IEEvaluation@ACL*.
- [5] Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Wenhui Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Songhao Piao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. 2020. UniLMv2: Pseudo-Masked Language Models for Unified Language Model Pre-Training. In *JCML*.
- [6] Siqi Bao, Huang He, Fan Wang, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2020. PLATO: Pre-trained Dialogue Generation Model with Discrete Latent Variable. In *ACL*.

- [7] Siqi Bao, Huang He, Fan Wang, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, Wenquan Wu, Zhen Guo, Zhibin Liu, and Xinchao Xu. 2021. PLATO-2: Towards Building an Open-Domain Chatbot via Curriculum Learning. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [8] Alex Beutel, Jilin Chen, Zhe Zhao, and Ed H. Chi. 2017. Data Decisions and Theoretical Implications when Adversarially Learning Fair Representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.00075* (2017).
- [9] Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y. Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2016. Man is to Computer Programmer as Woman is to Homemaker? Debiasing Word Embeddings. In *NIPS*.
- [10] Hicham El Boukkouri, Olivier Ferret, Thomas Lavergne, Hiroshi Noji, Pierre Zweigenbaum, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2020. CharacterBERT: Reconciling ELMo and BERT for Word-Level Open-Vocabulary Representations From Characters. In *COLING*.
- [11] Peter F. Brown, John Cocke, Stephen Della Pietra, Vincent J. Della Pietra, Frederick Jelinek, John D. Lafferty, Robert L. Mercer, and Paul S. Roossin. 1990. A Statistical Approach to Machine Translation. *Comput. Linguistics* 16, 2 (1990), 79–85.
- [12] Peter F. Brown, Stephen Della Pietra, Vincent J. Della Pietra, Jennifer C. Lai, and Robert L. Mercer. 1992. An Estimate of an Upper Bound for the Entropy of English. *Comput. Linguistics* (1992).
- [13] Ralf Brown and Robert Frederking. 1995. Applying statistical English language modeling to symbolic machine translation. In *TMI*. 221–239.
- [14] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *NeurIPS*.
- [15] Pawel Budzianowski and Ivan Vulic. 2019. Hello, It's GPT-2 - How Can I Help You? Towards the Use of Pretrained Language Models for Task-Oriented Dialogue Systems. In *NGT@EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- [16] Shuyang Cao and Lu Wang. 2021. Attention Head Masking for Inference Time Content Selection in Abstractive Summarization. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [17] Shuyang Cao and Lu Wang. 2021. Controllable Open-ended Question Generation with A New Question Type Ontology. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [18] Asli Celikyilmaz, Elizabeth Clark, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Evaluation of Text Generation: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.14799* (2020).
- [19] Boxing Chen and Colin Cherry. 2014. A Systematic Comparison of Smoothing Techniques for Sentence-Level BLEU. In *WMT@ACL*.
- [20] Jun Chen, Han Guo, Kai Yi, Boyang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2021. VisualGPT: Data-efficient Adaptation of Pretrained Language Models for Image Captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.10407* (2021).
- [21] Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2020. Multi-View Sequence-to-Sequence Models with Conversational Structure for Abstractive Dialogue Summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- [22] Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2021. Simple Conversational Data Augmentation for Semi-supervised Abstractive Dialogue Summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- [23] Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2021. Structure-Aware Abstractive Conversation Summarization via Discourse and Action Graphs. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [24] Wenhui Chen, Yu Su, Xifeng Yan, and William Yang Wang. 2020. KGPT: Knowledge-Grounded Pre-Training for Data-to-Text Generation. In *EMNLP*.
- [25] Yen-Chun Chen, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, Jingzhou Liu, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Distilling Knowledge Learned in BERT for Text Generation. In *ACL*.
- [26] Yi-Syuan Chen and Hong-Han Shuai. 2021. Meta-Transfer Learning for Low-Resource Abstractive Summarization. In *AAAI*.
- [27] Zhiyu Chen, Wenhui Chen, Hanwen Zha, Xiyu Zhou, Yunkai Zhang, Sairam Sundaresan, and William Yang Wang. 2020. Logic2Text: High-Fidelity Natural Language Generation from Logical Forms. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [28] Zhiyu Chen, Harini Eavani, Wenhui Chen, Yinyin Liu, and William Yang Wang. 2020. Few-Shot NLG with Pre-Trained Language Model. In *ACL*.
- [29] Zewen Chi, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Wenhui Wang, Xian-Ling Mao, and Heyan Huang. 2020. Cross-Lingual Natural Language Generation via Pre-Training. In *AAAI*.
- [30] Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. Cross-lingual Language Model Pretraining. In *NeurIPS*.
- [31] Raj Dabre, Chenhui Chu, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2020. A Survey of Multilingual Neural Machine Translation. *CSUR* (2020).
- [32] Sumanth Dathathri, Andrea Madotto, Janice Lan, Jane Hung, Eric Frank, Piero Molino, Jason Yosinski, and Rosanne Liu. 2020. Plug and Play Language Models: A Simple Approach to Controlled Text Generation. In *ICLR*.

- [33] Erenay Dayanik and Sebastian Padó. 2020. Masking Actor Information Leads to Fairer Political Claims Detection. In *ACL*.
- [34] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [35] Li Dong, Nan Yang, Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. 2019. Unified Language Model Pre-training for Natural Language Understanding and Generation. In *NeurIPS*.
- [36] Yue Dong, Shuohang Wang, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, Jackie Chi Kit Cheung, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Multi-Fact Correction in Abstractive Text Summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- [37] Zi-Yi Dou, Pengfei Liu, Hiroaki Hayashi, Zhengbao Jiang, and Graham Neubig. 2021. GSum: A General Framework for Guided Neural Abstractive Summarization. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [38] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2021. All NLP Tasks Are Generation Tasks: A General Pretraining Framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10360* (2021).
- [39] Wafaa S. El-Kassas, Cherif R. Salama, Ahmed A. Rafea, and Hoda K. Mohamed. 2021. Automatic text summarization: A comprehensive survey. *Expert Syst. Appl.* (2021).
- [40] Gamaleldin F. Elsayed, Dilip Krishnan, Hossein Mobahi, Kevin Regan, and Samy Bengio. 2018. Large Margin Deep Networks for Classification. In *NeurIPS*.
- [41] Alexander R. Fabbri, Simeng Han, Haoyuan Li, Haoran Li, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Shafiq R. Joty, Dragomir R. Radev, and Yashar Mehdad. 2021. Improving Zero and Few-Shot Abstractive Summarization with Intermediate Fine-tuning and Data Augmentation. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [42] Angela Fan and Claire Gardent. 2020. Multilingual AMR-to-Text Generation. In *EMNLP*.
- [43] Angela Fan, Edouard Grave, and Armand Joulin. 2020. Reducing Transformer Depth on Demand with Structured Dropout. In *ICLR*.
- [44] Zhiyun Fan, Shiyu Zhou, and Bo Xu. 2019. Unsupervised pre-training for sequence to sequence speech recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12418* (2019).
- [45] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2021. Switch Transformers: Scaling to Trillion Parameter Models with Simple and Efficient Sparsity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03961* (2021).
- [46] Xiaochong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2021. A Survey on Dialogue Summarization: Recent Advances and New Frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03175* (2021).
- [47] Xiaochong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, Libo Qin, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2021. Language Model as an Annotator: Exploring DialoGPT for Dialogue Summarization. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [48] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. CodeBERT: A Pre-Trained Model for Programming and Natural Languages. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [49] Prakhar Ganesh, Yao Chen, Xin Lou, Mohammad Ali Khan, Yin Yang, Deming Chen, Marianne Winslett, Hassan Sajjad, and Preslav Nakov. 2020. Compressing Large-Scale Transformer-Based Models: A Case Study on BERT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11985* (2020).
- [50] Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2021. Making Pre-trained Language Models Better Few-shot Learners. In *ACL*.
- [51] Cristina Garbacea and Qiaozhu Mei. 2020. Neural Language Generation: Formulation, Methods, and Evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.15780* (2020).
- [52] Xavier Garcia, Pierre Foret, Thibault Sellam, and Ankur P. Parikh. 2020. A Multilingual View of Unsupervised Machine Translation. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [53] Mozhdeh Gheini, Xiang Ren, and Jonathan May. 2021. On the Strengths of Cross-Attention in Pretrained Transformers for Machine Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08771* (2021).
- [54] Alexios Gidiotis and Grigorios Tsoumakas. 2020. A Divide-and-Conquer Approach to the Summarization of Long Documents. *TASLP* (2020).
- [55] Eli Goldberg, Norbert Driedger, and Richard I. Kittredge. 1994. Using Natural-Language Processing to Produce Weather Forecasts. *IEEE Expert* (1994).
- [56] Sergey Golovanov, Rauf Kurbanov, Sergey I. Nikolenko, Kyryl Truskovskiy, Alexander Tselousov, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Large-Scale Transfer Learning for Natural Language Generation. In *ACL*.
- [57] Hila Gonen and Yoav Goldberg. 2019. Lipstick on a Pig: Debiasing Methods Cover up Systematic Gender Biases in Word Embeddings But do not Remove Them. In *WNLP@ACL*.
- [58] Heng Gong, Yawei Sun, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, Wei Bi, Xiaojiang Liu, and Ting Liu. 2020. TableGPT: Few-shot Table-to-Text Generation with Table Structure Reconstruction and Content Matching. In *COLING*.
- [59] Travis R. Goodwin, Max E. Savery, and Dina Demner-Fushman. 2020. Towards Zero Shot Conditional Summarization with Adaptive Multi-task Fine-Tuning. In *EMNLP Findings*.

- [60] Mitchell A. Gordon, Kevin Duh, and Nicholas Andrews. 2020. Compressing BERT: Studying the Effects of Weight Pruning on Transfer Learning. In *Repl4NLP@ACL*.
- [61] Jing Gu, Qingyang Wu, Chongruo Wu, Weiyan Shi, and Zhou Yu. 2021. PRAL: A Tailored Pre-Training Model for Task-Oriented Dialog Generation. In *ACL/IJCNLP Short*.
- [62] Xiaodong Gu, Kang Min Yoo, and Jung-Woo Ha. 2021. DialogBERT: Discourse-Aware Response Generation via Learning to Recover and Rank Utterances. In *AAAI*.
- [63] Xiaodong Gu, Kang Min Yoo, and Sang-Woo Lee. 2021. Response Generation with Context-Aware Prompt Learning. *CoRR abs/2111.02643* (2021).
- [64] Jian Guan, Fei Huang, Minlie Huang, Zhihao Zhao, and Xiaoyan Zhu. 2020. A Knowledge-Enhanced Pretraining Model for Commonsense Story Generation. *TACL* (2020).
- [65] Beliz Gunel, Jingfei Du, Alexis Conneau, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2021. Supervised Contrastive Learning for Pre-trained Language Model Fine-tuning. In *ICLR*.
- [66] Fu-Ming Guo, Sijia Liu, Finlay S. Mungall, Xue Lin, and Yanzhi Wang. 2019. Reweighted Proximal Pruning for Large-Scale Language Representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12486* (2019).
- [67] DongHoon Ham, Jeong-Gwan Lee, Youngsoo Jang, and Kee-Eung Kim. 2020. End-to-End Neural Pipeline for Goal-Oriented Dialogue Systems using GPT-2. In *ACL*.
- [68] Xu Han, Zhengyan Zhang, Ning Ding, Yuxian Gu, Xiao Liu, Yuqi Huo, Jiezhong Qiu, Liang Zhang, Wentao Han, Minlie Huang, Qin Jin, Yanyan Lan, Yang Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Zhiwu Lu, Xipeng Qiu, Ruihua Song, Jie Tang, Ji-Rong Wen, Jinhui Yuan, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Jun Zhu. 2021. Pre-Trained Models: Past, Present and Future. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07139* (2021).
- [69] Boran Hao, Henghui Zhu, and Ioannis Ch. Paschalidis. 2020. Enhancing Clinical BERT Embedding using a Biomedical Knowledge Base. In *COLING*.
- [70] Hamza Harkous, Isabel Groves, and Amir Saffari. 2020. Have Your Text and Use It Too! End-to-End Neural Data-to-Text Generation with Semantic Fidelity. In *COLING*.
- [71] Sadid A. Hasan and Oladimeji Farri. 2019. Clinical Natural Language Processing with Deep Learning. In *Data Science for Healthcare*.
- [72] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. DeBERTa: decoding-Enhanced Bert with Disentangled Attention. In *ICLR*.
- [73] Ehsan Hosseini-Asl, Bryan McCann, Chien-Sheng Wu, Semih Yavuz, and Richard Socher. 2020. A Simple Language Model for Task-Oriented Dialogue. In *NeurIPS*.
- [74] Lu Hou, Zhiqi Huang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, and Qun Liu. 2020. DynaBERT: Dynamic BERT with Adaptive Width and Depth. In *NeurIPS*.
- [75] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin de Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning for NLP. In *ICML*.
- [76] Xinyu Hua, Ashwin Sreevatsa, and Lu Wang. 2021. DYPLOC: Dynamic Planning of Content Using Mixed Language Models for Text Generation. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [77] Luyang Huang, Shuyang Cao, Nikolaus Nova Parulian, Heng Ji, and Lu Wang. 2021. Efficient Attentions for Long Document Summarization. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [78] Minlie Huang, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Challenges in Building Intelligent Open-domain Dialog Systems. *TOIS* (2020).
- [79] Xinting Huang, Jianzhong Qi, Yu Sun, and Rui Zhang. 2021. Latent Reasoning for Low-Resource Question Generation. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [80] Touseef Iqbal and Shaima Qureshi. 2020. The survey: Text generation models in deep learning. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences* (2020).
- [81] Robin Jia and Percy Liang. 2017. Adversarial Examples for Evaluating Reading Comprehension Systems. In *EMNLP*.
- [82] Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F. Xu, Jun Araki, and Graham Neubig. 2020. How Can We Know What Language Models Know. *TACL* (2020).
- [83] Zihang Jiang, Weihao Yu, Daquan Zhou, Yunpeng Chen, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. 2020. ConvBERT: Improving BERT with Span-based Dynamic Convolution. In *NeurIPS*.
- [84] Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2020. TinyBERT: Distilling BERT for Natural Language Understanding. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [85] Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, Lisa Orri, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Hooks in the Headline: Learning to Generate Headlines with Controlled Styles. In *ACL*.
- [86] Katikapalli Subramanyam Kalyan, Ajit Rajasekharan, and Sivanesan Sangeetha. 2021. AMMUS : A Survey of Transformer-based Pretrained Models in Natural Language Processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.05542* (2021).
- [87] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*

- (2020).
- [88] Pei Ke, Haozhe Ji, Yu Ran, Xin Cui, Liwei Wang, Linfeng Song, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. 2021. JointGT: Graph-Text Joint Representation Learning for Text Generation from Knowledge Graphs. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [89] Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Lav R. Varshney, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. CTRL: A Conditional Transformer Language Model for Controllable Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858* (2019).
- [90] Muhammad Khalifa, Hady Elsahar, and Marc Dymetman. 2021. A Distributional Approach to Controlled Text Generation. In *ICLR*.
- [91] Kalpesh Krishna, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Reformulating Unsupervised Style Transfer as Paraphrase Generation. In *EMNLP*.
- [92] Wojciech Kryscinski, Romain Paulus, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2018. Improving Abstraction in Text Summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- [93] Guillaume Lample, Myle Ott, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc'Aurelio Ranzato. 2018. Phrase-Based & Neural Unsupervised Machine Translation. In *EMNLP*.
- [94] Hang Le, Juan Miguel Pino, Changhan Wang, Jiatao Gu, Didier Schwab, and Laurent Besacier. 2021. Lightweight Adapter Tuning for Multilingual Speech Translation. In *ACL/IJCNLP Short*.
- [95] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *Nat.* (2015).
- [96] Cheolhyoung Lee, Kyunghyun Cho, and Wanmo Kang. 2020. Mixout: Effective Regularization to Finetune Large-scale Pretrained Language Models. In *ICLR*.
- [97] Dmitry Lepikhin, HyoukJoong Lee, Yuanzhong Xu, Dehao Chen, Orhan Firat, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Noam Shazeer, and Zhifeng Chen. 2021. GShard: Scaling Giant Models with Conditional Computation and Automatic Sharding. In *ICLR*.
- [98] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In *ACL*.
- [99] Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. 2016. A Diversity-Promoting Objective Function for Neural Conversation Models. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [100] Junyi Li, Siqing Li, Wayne Xin Zhao, Gaole He, Zhicheng Wei, Nicholas Jing Yuan, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2020. Knowledge-Enhanced Personalized Review Generation with Capsule Graph Neural Network. In *CIKM*.
- [101] Jianquan Li, Xiaokang Liu, Honghong Zhao, Ruifeng Xu, Min Yang, and Yaohong Jin. 2020. BERT-EMD: Many-to-Many Layer Mapping for BERT Compression with Earth Mover's Distance. In *EMNLP*.
- [102] Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Gaole He, Jinhao Jiang, Xiaoxuan Hu, Puzhao Xie, Zhipeng Chen, Zhuohao Yu, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. TextBox: A Unified, Modularized, and Extensible Framework for Text Generation. In *ACL Demonstration*.
- [103] Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Zhicheng Wei, Nicholas Jing Yuan, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. Few-shot Knowledge Graph-to-Text Generation with Pretrained Language Models. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [104] Junyi Li, Wayne Xin Zhao, Zhicheng Wei, Nicholas Jing Yuan, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. Knowledge-based Review Generation by Coherence Enhanced Text Planning. In *SIGIR*.
- [105] Junyi Li, Wayne Xin Zhao, Ji-Rong Wen, and Yang Song. 2019. Generating Long and Informative Reviews with Aspect-Aware Coarse-to-Fine Decoding. In *ACL*.
- [106] Piji Li, Haisong Zhang, Xiaojiang Liu, and Shuming Shi. 2020. Rigid Formats Controlled Text Generation. In *ACL*.
- [107] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-Tuning: Optimizing Continuous Prompts for Generation. In *ACL*.
- [108] Zhongyang Li, Xiao Ding, Kuo Liao, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. 2021. CausalBERT: Injecting Causal Knowledge Into Pre-trained Models with Minimal Supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.09852* (2021).
- [109] Zekang Li, Jinchao Zhang, Zhengcong Fei, Yang Feng, and Jie Zhou. 2021. Conversations Are Not Flat: Modeling the Dynamic Information Flow across Dialogue Utterances. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [110] Zuchao Li, Hai Zhao, Rui Wang, Masao Utiyama, and Eiichiro Sumita. 2020. Reference Language based Unsupervised Neural Machine Translation. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [111] Junwei Liao, Yu Shi, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Sefik Emre Eskimez, Liyang Lu, Hong Qu, and Michael Zeng. 2021. Generating Human Readable Transcript for Automatic Speech Recognition with Pre-Trained Language Model. In *ICASSP*.
- [112] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*.
- [113] Zehui Lin, Xiao Pan, Mingxuan Wang, Xipeng Qiu, Jiangtao Feng, Hao Zhou, and Lei Li. 2020. Pre-training Multilingual Neural Machine Translation by Leveraging Alignment Information. In *EMNLP*.
- [114] Dayiheng Liu, Yu Yan, Yeyun Gong, Weizhen Qi, Hang Zhang, Jian Jiao, Weizhu Chen, Jie Fu, Linjun Shou, Ming Gong, Pengcheng Wang, Jiusheng Chen, Daxin Jiang, Jiancheng Lv, Ruofei Zhang, Winnie Wu, Ming Zhou, and Nan Duan. 2021. GLGE: A New General Language Generation Evaluation Benchmark. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.

- [115] Junpeng Liu, Yanyan Zou, Hainan Zhang, Hongshen Chen, Zhuoye Ding, Caixia Yuan, and Xiaojie Wang. 2021. Topic-Aware Contrastive Learning for Abstractive Dialogue Summarization. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [116] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Pre-train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586* (2021).
- [117] Shilei Liu, Xiaofeng Zhao, Bochao Li, Feiliang Ren, Longhui Zhang, and Shujuan Yin. 2021. A Three-Stage Learning Framework for Low-Resource Knowledge-Grounded Dialogue Generation. In *EMNLP*.
- [118] Yixin Liu, Zi-Yi Dou, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. RefSum: Refactoring Neural Summarization. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [119] Yinhan Liu, Jiatao Gu, Naman Goyal, Xian Li, Sergey Edunov, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Multilingual Denoising Pre-training for Neural Machine Translation. *TACL* (2020).
- [120] Yang Liu and Mirella Lapata. 2019. Text Summarization with Pretrained Encoders. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP*.
- [121] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [122] Ye Liu, Yao Wan, Lifang He, Hao Peng, and Philip S. Yu. 2021. KG-BART: Knowledge Graph-Augmented BART for Generative Commonsense Reasoning. In *AAAI*.
- [123] Zihan Liu, Genta Indra Winata, and Pascale Fung. 2021. Continual Mixed-Language Pre-Training for Extremely Low-Resource Neural Machine Translation. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [124] Antoine Louis. 2020. *NetBERT: A Pre-trained Language Representation Model for Computer Networking*. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- [125] Fuli Luo, Wei Wang, Jiahao Liu, Yijia Liu, Bin Bi, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, and Luo Si. 2021. VECO: Variable and Flexible Cross-lingual Pre-training for Language Understanding and Generation. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [126] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Botian Shi, Haoyang Huang, Nan Duan, Tianrui Li, Jason Li, Taroon Bharti, and Ming Zhou. 2020. Univl: A unified video and language pre-training model for multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06353* (2020).
- [127] Wentao Ma, Yiming Cui, Chenglei Si, Ting Liu, Shijin Wang, and Guoping Hu. 2020. CharBERT: Character-aware Pre-trained Language Model. In *COLING*.
- [128] Manuel Mager, Ramón Fernandez Astudillo, Tahira Naseem, Md. Arafat Sultan, Young-Suk Lee, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2020. GPT-too: A Language-Model-First Approach for AMR-to-Text Generation. In *ACL*.
- [129] Ahmed Magooda and Diane J. Litman. 2021. Mitigating Data Scarceness through Data Synthesis, Augmentation and Curriculum for Abstractive Summarization. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [130] Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Sudha Rao, Michel Galley, and Julian J. McAuley. 2021. Ask what’s missing and what’s useful: Improving Clarification Question Generation using Global Knowledge. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [131] Potsawee Manakul and Mark J. F. Gales. 2021. Long-Span Summarization via Local Attention and Content Selection. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [132] Huanru Henry Mao, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Julian J. McAuley, and Garrison W. Cottrell. 2019. Improving Neural Story Generation by Targeted Common Sense Grounding. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP*.
- [133] Kaushal Kumar Maurya, Maunendra Sankar Desarkar, Yoshinobu Kano, and Kumari Deepshikha. 2021. ZmBART: An Unsupervised Cross-lingual Transfer Framework for Language Generation. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [134] Feng Nan, Cícero Nogueira dos Santos, Henghui Zhu, Patrick Ng, Kathleen R. McKeown, Ramesh Nallapati, Dejiao Zhang, Zhiguo Wang, Andrew O. Arnold, and Bing Xiang. 2021. Improving Factual Consistency of Abstractive Summarization via Question Answering. In *ACL*.
- [135] Minh Van Nguyen, Viet Dac Lai, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2021. Trankit: A Light-Weight Transformer-based Toolkit for Multilingual Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*.
- [136] Thong Nguyen, Anh Tuan Luu, Truc Lu, and Tho Quan. 2021. Enriching and Controlling Global Semantics for Text Summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- [137] Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. fairseq: A Fast, Extensible Toolkit for Sequence Modeling. In *NAACL-HLT Demonstrations*.
- [138] Siru Ouyang, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Hai Zhao. 2021. Dialogue Graph Modeling for Conversational Machine Reading. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [139] Xiao Pan, Mingxuan Wang, Liwei Wu, and Lei Li. 2021. Contrastive Learning for Many-to-many Multilingual Neural Machine Translation. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [140] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In *ACL*.
- [141] Damian Pascual, Beni Egressy, Clara Meister, Ryan Cotterell, and Roger Wattenhofer. 2021. A Plug-and-Play Method for Controlled Text Generation. In *EMNLP Findings*.

- [142] Ramakanth Pasunuru, Asli Celikyilmaz, Michel Galley, Chenyan Xiong, Yizhe Zhang, Mohit Bansal, and Jianfeng Gao. 2021. Data Augmentation for Abstractive Query-Focused Multi-Document Summarization. In *AAAI*.
- [143] Ramakanth Pasunuru, Mengwen Liu, Mohit Bansal, Sujith Ravi, and Markus Dreyer. 2021. Efficiently Summarizing Text and Graph Encodings of Multi-Document Clusters. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [144] Baolin Peng, Chenguang Zhu, Chunyuan Li, Xiujun Li, Jinchao Li, Michael Zeng, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Few-shot Natural Language Generation for Task-Oriented Dialog. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [145] Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Robert L. Logan IV, Roy Schwartz, Vidur Joshi, Sameer Singh, and Noah A. Smith. 2019. Knowledge Enhanced Contextual Word Representations. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP*.
- [146] Jason Phang, Thibault Févry, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. Sentence Encoders on STILTs: Supplementary Training on Intermediate Labeled-data Tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01088* (2018).
- [147] Telmo Pires, Eva Schlinger, and Dan Garrette. 2019. How Multilingual is Multilingual BERT?. In *ACL*.
- [148] Maja Popovic. 2017. chrF++: words helping character n-grams. In *WMT*.
- [149] Matt Post. 2018. A Call for Clarity in Reporting BLEU Scores. In *WMT*.
- [150] Weizhen Qi, Yu Yan, Yeyun Gong, Dayiheng Liu, Nan Duan, Jiusheng Chen, Ruofei Zhang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. ProphetNet: Predicting Future N-gram for Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [151] Xipeng Qiu, Tianxiang Sun, Yige Xu, Yunfan Shao, Ning Dai, and Xuanjing Huang. 2020. Pre-trained Models for Natural Language Processing: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08271* (2020).
- [152] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- [153] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* (2019).
- [154] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *JMLR* (2020).
- [155] Hannah Rashkin, Asli Celikyilmaz, Yejin Choi, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. PlotMachines: Outline-Conditioned Generation with Dynamic Plot State Tracking. In *EMNLP*.
- [156] Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. DeepSpeed: System Optimizations Enable Training Deep Learning Models with Over 100 Billion Parameters. In *SIGKDD*.
- [157] Shuo Ren, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Ming Zhou, and Shuai Ma. 2019. Explicit Cross-lingual Pre-training for Unsupervised Machine Translation. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP*.
- [158] Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Martin Schmitt, Hinrich Schütze, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. Investigating Pretrained Language Models for Graph-to-Text Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08426* (2020).
- [159] Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Yue Zhang, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Structural Adapters in Pretrained Language Models for AMR-to-Text Generation. In *EMNLP*.
- [160] Stephen Roller, Emily Dinan, Naman Goyal, Da Ju, Mary Williamson, Yinhan Liu, Jing Xu, Myle Ott, Eric Michael Smith, Y-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2021. Recipes for Building an Open-Domain Chatbot. In *EACL*.
- [161] R.S. Ross. 2012. Guide for conducting risk assessments. In *NIST Special Publication*.
- [162] Sascha Rothe, Shashi Narayan, and Aliaksei Severyn. 2020. Leveraging Pre-trained Checkpoints for Sequence Generation Tasks. *TACL* (2020).
- [163] Itsumi Saito, Kyosuke Nishida, Kosuke Nishida, and Junji Tomita. 2020. Abstractive Summarization with Combination of Pre-trained Sequence-to-Sequence and Saliency Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13028* (2020).
- [164] Ludwig Schmidt, Shibani Santurkar, Dimitris Tsipras, Kunal Talwar, and Aleksander Madry. 2018. Adversarially Robust Generalization Requires More Data. In *NeurIPS*.
- [165] Thomas Scialom, Paul-Alexis Dray, Sylvain Lamprier, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Jacopo Staiano. 2020. ColdGANs: Taming Language GANs with Cautious Sampling Strategies. In *NeurIPS*.
- [166] Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. Get To The Point: Summarization with Pointer-Generator Networks. In *ACL*.
- [167] Igor Shalyminov, Alessandro Sordani, Adam Atkinson, and Hannes Schulz. 2020. Hybrid Generative-Retrieval Transformers for Dialogue Domain Adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01680* (2020).
- [168] Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L. Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. 2020. AutoPrompt: Eliciting Knowledge from Language Models with Automatically Generated Prompts. In *EMNLP*.
- [169] Sam Shleifer and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. Pre-trained Summarization Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13002* (2020).
- [170] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2019. MASS: Masked Sequence to Sequence Pre-training for Language Generation. In *ICML*.
- [171] Asa Cooper Stickland, Xian Li, and Marjan Ghazvininejad. 2021. Recipes for Adapting Pre-trained Monolingual and Multilingual Models to Machine Translation. In *EACL*.

- [172] Pierre Stock, Angela Fan, Benjamin Graham, Edouard Grave, Rémi Gribonval, Hervé Jégou, and Armand Joulin. 2021. Training with Quantization Noise for Extreme Model Compression. In *ICLR*.
- [173] Lya Hulliyayatus Suadaa, Hidetaka Kamigaito, Kotaro Funakoshi, Manabu Okumura, and Hiroya Takamura. 2021. Towards Table-to-Text Generation with Numerical Reasoning. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [174] Chen Sun, Fabien Baradel, Kevin Murphy, and Cordelia Schmid. 2019. Contrastive Bidirectional Transformer for Temporal Representation Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05743* (2019).
- [175] Chen Sun, Austin Myers, Carl Vondrick, Kevin Murphy, and Cordelia Schmid. 2019. VideoBERT: A Joint Model for Video and Language Representation Learning. In *ICCV*.
- [176] Yu Sun, Shuohuan Wang, Shikun Feng, Siyu Ding, Chao Pang, Junyuan Shang, Jiaxiang Liu, Xuyi Chen, Yanbin Zhao, Yuxiang Lu, Weixin Liu, Zhihua Wu, Weibao Gong, Jianzhong Liang, Zhizhou Shang, Peng Sun, Wei Liu, Xuan Ouyang, Dianhai Yu, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. ERNIE 3.0: Large-scale Knowledge Enhanced Pre-training for Language Understanding and Generation. *CoRR abs/2107.02137* (2021).
- [177] Zewei Sun, Mingxuan Wang, and Lei Li. 2021. Multilingual Translation via Grafting Pre-trained Language Models. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [178] Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. 2014. Sequence to Sequence Learning with Neural Networks. In *NIPS*.
- [179] Bowen Tan, Zichao Yang, Maruan Al-Shedivat, Eric P. Xing, and Zhiting Hu. 2021. Progressive Generation of Long Text with Pretrained Language Models. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [180] Yuqing Tang, Chau Tran, Xian Li, Peng-Jen Chen, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Jiatao Gu, and Angela Fan. 2021. Multilingual Translation from Denoising Pre-Training. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [181] Tao Tao, Xuanhui Wang, Qiaozhu Mei, and ChengXiang Zhai. 2006. Language Model Information Retrieval with Document Expansion. In *NAACL*.
- [182] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *NIPS*.
- [183] Jesse Vig, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yonatan Belinkov, Sharon Qian, Daniel Nevo, Yaron Singer, and Stuart M. Shieber. 2020. Investigating Gender Bias in Language Models Using Causal Mediation Analysis. In *NeurIPS*.
- [184] Takashi Wada and Tomoharu Iwata. 2018. Unsupervised Cross-lingual Word Embedding by Multilingual Neural Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02306* (2018).
- [185] Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. SuperGLUE: A Stickier Benchmark for General-Purpose Language Understanding Systems. In *NeurIPS*.
- [186] Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. GLUE: A Multi-Task Benchmark and Analysis Platform for Natural Language Understanding. In *ICLR*.
- [187] Boxin Wang, Hengzhi Pei, Boyuan Pan, Qian Chen, Shuohang Wang, and Bo Li. 2020. T3: Tree-Autoencoder Constrained Adversarial Text Generation for Targeted Attack. In *EMNLP*.
- [188] Danqing Wang, Jiaye Chen, Hao Zhou, Xipeng Qiu, and Lei Li. 2021. Contrastive Aligned Joint Learning for Multilingual Summarization. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.
- [189] Wei Wang, Piji Li, and Hai-Tao Zheng. 2021. Consistency and Coherency Enhanced Story Generation. In *ECIR*.
- [190] Xiaohui Wang, Ying Xiong, Yang Wei, Mingxuan Wang, and Lei Li. 2021. LightSeq: A High Performance Inference Library for Transformers. In *NAACL-HLT Industry*.
- [191] Yicheng Wang and Mohit Bansal. 2018. Robust Machine Comprehension Models via Adversarial Training. In *NAACL-HLT Short*.
- [192] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. In *EMNLP Demonstrations*.
- [193] Thomas Wolf, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, and Clement Delangue. 2019. TransferTransfo: A Transfer Learning Approach for Neural Network Based Conversational Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08149* (2019).
- [194] Wenhao Wu, Wei Li, Xinyan Xiao, Jiachen Liu, Ziqiang Cao, Sujian Li, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. BASS: Boosting Abstractive Summarization with Unified Semantic Graph. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [195] Qiaolin Xia, Haoyang Huang, Nan Duan, Dongdong Zhang, Lei Ji, Zhifang Sui, Edward Cui, Taroon Bharti, and Ming Zhou. 2021. XGPT: Cross-modal Generative Pre-Training for Image Captioning. In *NLPCC*.
- [196] Qizhe Xie, Zihang Dai, Eduard H. Hovy, Thang Luong, and Quoc Le. 2020. Unsupervised Data Augmentation for Consistency Training. In *NeurIPS*.
- [197] Stanley Xie, Ruchir Rastogi, and Max Chang. 2017. Deep poetry: Word-level and character-level language models for shakespearean sonnet generation. In *Natural Lang. Process. Deep Learn.*
- [198] Xinyu Xing and Xiaojun Wan. 2021. Structure-Aware Pre-Training for Table-to-Text Generation. In *ACL/IJCNLP Findings*.

- [199] Peng Xu, Mostofa Patwary, Mohammad Shoeybi, Raul Puri, Pascale Fung, Anima Anandkumar, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2020. MEGATRON-CNTRL: Controllable Story Generation with External Knowledge Using Large-Scale Language Models. In *EMNLP*.
- [200] Xinnuo Xu, Guoyin Wang, Young-Bum Kim, and Sungjin Lee. 2021. AugNLG: Few-shot Natural Language Generation using Self-trained Data Augmentation. In *ACL*.
- [201] Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. mT5: A Massively Multilingual Pre-trained Text-to-Text Transformer. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [202] Lanqing Xue, Kaitao Song, Duocai Wu, Xu Tan, Nevin L. Zhang, Tao Qin, Wei-Qiang Zhang, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2021. DeepRapper: Neural Rap Generation with Rhyme and Rhythm Modeling. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- [203] Yu Yan, Fei Hu, Jiusheng Chen, Nikhil Bhendawade, Ting Ye, Yeyun Gong, Nan Duan, Desheng Cui, Bingyu Chi, and Ruifei Zhang. 2021. FastSeq: Make Sequence Generation Faster. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04718* (2021).
- [204] Jiacheng Yang, Mingxuan Wang, Hao Zhou, Chengqi Zhao, Weinan Zhang, Yong Yu, and Lei Li. 2020. Towards Making the Most of BERT in Neural Machine Translation. In *AAAI*.
- [205] Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. 2019. XLNet: Generalized Autoregressive Pretraining for Language Understanding. In *NeurIPS*.
- [206] Zhen Yang, Bojie Hu, Ambyra Han, Shen Huang, and Qi Ju. 2020. CSP: Code-Switching Pre-training for Neural Machine Translation. In *EMNLP*.
- [207] Zhengyuan Yang, Yijuan Lu, Jianfeng Wang, Xi Yin, Dinei Florêncio, Lijuan Wang, Cha Zhang, Lei Zhang, and Jiebo Luo. 2021. TAP: Text-Aware Pre-Training for Text-VQA and Text-Caption. In *CVPR*.
- [208] Ze Yang, Wei Wu, Can Xu, Xinnian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Liran Wang, Wei Wang, and Zhoujun Li. 2020. StyleDGPT: Stylized Response Generation with Pre-trained Language Models. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [209] Ziyi Yang, Chenguang Zhu, Robert Gmyr, Michael Zeng, Xuedong Huang, and Eric Darve. 2020. TED: A Pretrained Unsupervised Summarization Model with Theme Modeling and Denoising. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [210] Weiqiu You, Simeng Sun, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Hard-Coded Gaussian Attention for Neural Machine Translation. In *ACL*. 7689–7700.
- [211] Ali Hadi Zadeh, Isak Edo, Omar Mohamed Awad, and Andreas Moshovos. 2020. GOBO: Quantizing Attention-Based NLP Models for Low Latency and Energy Efficient Inference. In *MICRO*.
- [212] Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontañón, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, and Amr Ahmed. 2020. Big Bird: Transformers for Longer Sequences. In *NeurIPS*.
- [213] Munazza Zaib, Quan Z. Sheng, and Wei Emma Zhang. 2020. A Short Survey of Pre-trained Language Models for Conversational AI-A New Age in NLP. In *ACSW*.
- [214] Wei Zeng, Xiaozhe Ren, Teng Su, Hui Wang, Yi Liao, Zhiwei Wang, Xin Jiang, ZhenZhang Yang, Kaisheng Wang, Xiaoda Zhang, Chen Li, Ziyang Gong, Yifan Yao, Xinjing Huang, Jun Wang, Jianfeng Yu, Qi Guo, Yue Yu, Yan Zhang, Jin Wang, Hengtao Tao, Dasen Yan, Zexuan Yi, Fang Peng, Fangqing Jiang, Han Zhang, Lingfeng Deng, Yehong Zhang, Zhe Lin, Chao Zhang, Shaojie Zhang, Mingyue Guo, Shanzhi Gu, Gaojun Fan, Yaowei Wang, Xuefeng Jin, Qun Liu, and Yonghong Tian. 2021. PanGu- α : Large-scale Autoregressive Pretrained Chinese Language Models with Auto-parallel Computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12369* (2021).
- [215] Yan Zeng and Jian-Yun Nie. 2020. Generalized Conditioned Dialogue Generation Based on Pre-trained Language Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11140* (2020).
- [216] Yan Zeng and Jian-Yun Nie. 2021. A Simple and Efficient Multi-Task Learning Approach for Conditioned Dialogue Generation. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- [217] ChengXiang Zhai and John D. Lafferty. 2001. Model-based Feedback in the Language Modeling Approach to Information Retrieval. In *CIKM*. 403–410.
- [218] Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. PEGASUS: Pre-training with Extracted Gap-sentences for Abstractive Summarization. In *ICML*.
- [219] Longxiang Zhang, Renato Negrinho, Arindam Ghosh, Vasudevan Jagannathan, Hamid Reza Hassanzadeh, Thomas Schaaf, and Matthew R. Gormley. 2021. Leveraging Pretrained Models for Automatic Summarization of Doctor-Patient Conversations. In *EMNLP Findings*.
- [220] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. In *ICLR*.
- [221] Xingxing Zhang, Furu Wei, and Ming Zhou. 2019. HIBERT: Document Level Pre-training of Hierarchical Bidirectional Transformers for Document Summarization. In *ACL*.
- [222] Yizhe Zhang, Siqi Sun, Michel Galley, Yen-Chun Chen, Chris Brockett, Xiang Gao, Jianfeng Gao, Jingjing Liu, and Bill Dolan. 2020. DIALOGPT : Large-Scale Generative Pre-training for Conversational Response Generation. In *ACL Demonstrations*.

- [223] Zhengyan Zhang, Yuxian Gu, Xu Han, Shengqi Chen, Chaojun Xiao, Zhenbo Sun, Yuan Yao, Fanchao Qi, Jian Guan, Pei Ke, Yanzheng Cai, Guoyang Zeng, Zhixing Tan, Zhiyuan Liu, Minlie Huang, Wentao Han, Yang Liu, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Maosong Sun. 2021. CPM-2: Large-scale Cost-effective Pre-trained Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10715* (2021).
- [224] Zhengyan Zhang, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, Xin Jiang, Maosong Sun, and Qun Liu. 2019. ERNIE: Enhanced Language Representation with Informative Entities. In *ACL*.
- [225] Zhengyan Zhang, Xu Han, Hao Zhou, Pei Ke, Yuxian Gu, Deming Ye, Yujia Qin, YuSheng Su, Haozhe Ji, Jian Guan, Fanchao Qi, Xiaozhi Wang, Yanan Zheng, Guoyang Zeng, Huanqi Cao, Shengqi Chen, Daixuan Li, Zhenbo Sun, Zhiyuan Liu, Minlie Huang, Wentao Han, Jie Tang, Juanzi Li, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Maosong Sun. 2020. CPM: A Large-scale Generative Chinese Pre-trained Language Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00413* (2020).
- [226] Zhilu Zhang and Mert R. Sabuncu. 2018. Generalized Cross Entropy Loss for Training Deep Neural Networks with Noisy Labels. In *NeurIPS*.
- [227] Zheng Zhang, Ryuichi Takanobu, Qi Zhu, Minlie Huang, and Xiaoyan Zhu. 2020. Recent advances and challenges in task-oriented dialog systems. *Sci. China Technol. Sci.* (2020).
- [228] Jieyu Zhao, Yichao Zhou, Zeyu Li, Wei Wang, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. Learning Gender-Neutral Word Embeddings. In *EMNLP*.
- [229] Hao Zheng and Mirella Lapata. 2019. Sentence Centrality Revisited for Unsupervised Summarization. In *ACL*.
- [230] Ming Zhong, Yang Liu, Yichong Xu, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2021. DialogLM: Pre-trained Model for Long Dialogue Understanding and Summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.02492* (2021).
- [231] Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Sirui Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, Wei Wu, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. Virtual Data Augmentation: A Robust and General Framework for Fine-tuning Pre-trained Models. In *EMNLP*.
- [232] Li Zhou, Jianfeng Gao, Di Li, and Heung-Yeung Shum. 2020. The Design and Implementation of XiaoIce, an Empathetic Social Chatbot. *Comput. Linguistics* (2020).
- [233] Luowei Zhou, Hamid Palangi, Lei Zhang, Houdong Hu, Jason J. Corso, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Unified Vision-Language Pre-Training for Image Captioning and VQA. In *AAAI*.
- [234] Wangchunshu Zhou, Dong-Ho Lee, Ravi Kiran Selvam, Seyeon Lee, and Xiang Ren. 2021. Pre-training Text-to-Text Transformers for Concept-centric Common Sense. In *ICLR*.
- [235] Jinhua Zhu, Yingce Xia, Lijun Wu, Di He, Tao Qin, Wengang Zhou, Houqiang Li, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. Incorporating BERT into Neural Machine Translation. In *ICLR*.
- [236] Yicheng Zou, Bolin Zhu, Xingwu Hu, Tao Gui, and Qi Zhang. 2021. Low-Resource Dialogue Summarization with Domain-Agnostic Multi-Source Pretraining. In *EMNLP*.