

# Abstractive Meeting Summarization: A Survey

Virgile Rennard<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Guokan Shang<sup>1\*</sup>, Julie Hunter<sup>1</sup>, Michalis Vazirgiannis<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Linagora, <sup>2</sup>École Polytechnique

## Abstract

Recent advances in deep learning, and especially the invention of encoder-decoder architectures, has significantly improved the performance of abstractive summarization systems. While the majority of research has focused on written documents, we have observed an increasing interest in the summarization of dialogues and multi-party conversation over the past few years. A system that could reliably transform the audio or transcript of a human conversation into an abridged version that homes in on the most important points of the discussion would be valuable in a wide variety of real-world contexts, from business meetings to medical consultations to customer service calls. This paper focuses on abstractive summarization for multi-party meetings, providing a survey of the challenges, datasets and systems relevant to this task and a discussion of promising directions for future study.

## 1 Introduction

Being a primary and inevitable means of information exchange at the workplace, a vast amount of time and organizational resources are allocated to meetings (Mroz et al., 2018). Rogelberg et al. (2007) reported that on average, American employees and managers put 6 and 23 hours per week, respectively, into meetings. The rise in videoconferencing linked to the COVID-19 pandemic has only made the situation more severe (Kost, 2020): people are having longer and more frequent meetings, which leads to increased fatigue and less time to digest the information exchanged (Fauville et al., 2021).

In this context, developing a system that could reliably identify key information from a meeting or meeting transcript and use it to produce




Figure 1: Number of papers on dialogue and meeting summarization in ACL Anthology over the years.

a significantly condensed and easily digestible summary—as well as, perhaps, a set of meeting minutes that details decisions and action items—is becoming more of a priority than ever before (Edmunds and Morris, 2000; Elciyar, 2021). Summaries and minutes would be of great value not only to meeting participants, who could use them to organize their next steps, but also to employees who were unable to attend the meeting. They could be exploited by managers as well to analyze overall meeting expenses, productivity, processes, and outcomes in order to maximize the benefit drawn from meetings relative to their cost (Romano and Nunamaker, 2001).

Research on automatic summarization dates as far back as the 1950s with systems aiming to generate abstracts from scientific literature (Luhn, 1958). Since then, approaches to summarization have developed along two main lines (Gambhir and Gupta, 2017). *Extractive* summarization, in which a system creates a summary by directly lifting important sentences from source documents and concatenating them without any modification to the original sentences, dominated earlier work due to its simplicity. The advent of neural encoder-decoder architectures (Sutskever et al.,

\* These authors equally contributed to this work.

2014; Vaswani et al., 2017), however, has opened the door to *abstractive* summarization (See et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2020), which draws upon deep representations of word or sentence meaning to generate well-written, novel sentences that more succinctly sum up information that might be distributed among numerous clauses or sentences in the original text or transcript.

While the majority of research on summarization has been conducted on formal written documents (e.g., news, scientific articles, etc.), we have observed an increasing interest in its application to dialogues and multi-party meetings in the ACL Anthology publications over the past few years (see Figure 1). For work on the summarization of various types of conversation, including medical consultations (Krishna et al., 2021) and customer service calls (Liu et al., 2019a), we refer to previous survey articles (Murray, 2008; Carenini et al., 2011; Feng et al., 2021a; Reza-zadegan et al., 2022). In this paper, we restrict our attention to multi-party meetings and provide a general and comprehensive introduction to the challenges posed by *abstractive meeting summarization* and the datasets and systems that have been developed to meet these challenges (Shang, 2021). Indeed, we suspect that the biggest hurdles to advances in automatic meeting summarization come not from a lack of interest or recognition of a need for meeting summarization, but from particular features of meeting-style conversation that make studying it a daunting task. We conclude on a positive note, laying out some promising directions for future research that we think will ultimately lead to resolving the task.

## 2 Challenges

Meeting summarization poses challenges not encountered by traditional text summarization (Kryscinski et al., 2019). Some are related to data scarcity or model limitations, while others stem from the very nature of the linguistic interactions involved in meetings or multi-party conversation more generally. These challenges suggest that producing commercial-level, automatic tools for abstractive meeting summarization cannot be perfectly accomplished by generalizing or fine-tuning models trained on text or even many forms of dialogue, but will require developing radically new approaches, tailored to the particular needs of the meeting domain (Zechner, 2002).

**The idiosyncratic nature of meeting-style speech.** When we participate in meetings, we are rarely concerned with producing a transcript of the discussion that would read like a clear and coherent story for some third-party audience as an author of a newspaper article might be. Our utterances are spontaneous in that we do not prepare them down to the word and do not edit them prior to transcription, we might reformulate our thoughts multiple times in a single turn in an effort to improve clarity, and we often ramble on or veer offtrack. These features of spontaneous conversation manifest themselves in long transcripts with low-information density and a lot of “noise”, including fragmentary or ungrammatical utterances, self-corrections (“The corner uh side of the box”), repetitions (“the box the the box to your left”), filled pauses (“um”) and other disfluencies, as well as overlapping speech (when two or more people speak at the same time). Adding to this noise is a potentially high number of transcription errors introduced by automatic speech recognition systems used in a variety of real-world contexts in which manual transcription is not a viable option.

Moreover, in contrast to other types of conversation, such as customer service calls and medical appointments, meetings can be much more open ended in form and content and they often involve multiple speakers. This not only opens the door to a variety of speech styles and more instances of overlapping speech, but also complicates the task of speaker and addressee identification and thus, the conversion of first and second person pronouns into third person identifiers, as is needed for summarization.

**Scarce data.** While vast progress in automatic speech recognition is making high quality speech transcripts increasingly available, the significant cost and effort required for producing summaries and minutes, as well as concerns about the privacy of meeting content, mean that there are very few datasets of meeting summaries or minutes paired with their corresponding transcripts. We know of only three available meeting datasets for English — AMI (McCowan et al., 2005), ICSI (Janin et al., 2003) and ELITR (Nedoluzhko et al., 2022)—which together offer around 280 hours of meetings. And only ELITR, which contains roughly 50 hours of meetings in Czech, contains data for a language other than English. This lack of data, combined with the difficulty of producing

new datasets, is highly problematic for supervised learning approaches, which often require large amounts of training data and generally yield language and domain-dependent models. The need to develop less-data hungry or even entirely unsupervised summarization techniques, such as abstractive meaning representation (Dohare et al., 2018) and autoencoder (Schumann, 2018) based approaches, is thus arguably inevitable.

#### **The preference for abstractive summarization.**

Early contributions on meeting summarization focused on extractive methods (Tur et al., 2008, 2010; Riedhammer et al., 2008; Garg et al., 2009; Tixier et al., 2017). However, while such approaches might be acceptable for traditional documents — the LEAD-3 baseline, which takes the first three sentences of a document as its summary, is a good indicator of basic performance, for example — it is arguably inappropriate for meeting summarization. Cutting and pasting fragments of conversations, in which language might be highly disfluent and information spread across multiple turns, and taking them out of their original contexts, renders extractive summaries of spoken conversation largely unintelligible. Humans thus tend to prefer abstractive summarization for conversation (Murray et al., 2010), which is inherently more difficult than extractive summarization as it involves content synthesis and language generation in addition to the selection of important material.

**Heterogeneous meeting formats.** Because there are many different types of meetings carried out for different purposes (Nedoluzhko and Bojar, 2019), there is arguably no one-size-fits all approach to summarization. Focused summaries (Fernández et al., 2008; Bui et al., 2009; Wang and Cardie, 2011, 2012, 2013) that provide an outline of proposed ideas, supporting arguments, and decisions might be more appropriate for decision-making meetings, for example, while general topic summaries might be better suited for information-sharing meetings, and template-based summaries (Oya et al., 2014), for well-framed meetings with clear agendas. Given that summaries may vary with respect to their format, style, and content, approaches to automating production will arguably need to be conducted with a variety of methods to allow a system to produce a summary type tailored to a particular meeting format.

**Limits of pretrained language models.** Meet-

ing transcripts are in general significantly longer than documents used in text summarization, and the same goes for their summaries. On average, the transcript for a meeting from the AMI corpus has 4,757 tokens and its summary has 322. By contrast, an article from the CNN/DailyMail dataset (Hermann et al., 2015) has an average of 781 tokens while its summary has only 56. Extra length poses a problem for abstractive meeting summarization because transformer models, on which most state-of-the-art systems for natural language generation are based, have a quadratic cost with respect to the length of the input document (Vaswani et al., 2017). They also tend to limit the accepted input length of documents, forcing often arbitrary cuts in longer documents.

Issues of document length aside, pretrained models have limited effectiveness for abstractive meeting summarization due to the other challenges described above. In particular, the idiosyncratic nature of the type of language encountered in spontaneous, multiparty conversation, the scarcity of training data for meeting summarization, and the heterogeneous formats that meetings (and summaries) can take mean that meeting summarization cannot be seen as a generalization of other common summarization methods. This makes it difficult to transfer models trained on other kinds of documents to this domain.

**Overly strict evaluation methods.** Evaluation is itself a challenging task, as there is normally no single best summary for a given input. Different human annotators can create dissimilar but equally valid summaries of the same document or meeting, and even one and the same annotator can produce different results when asked to summarize the same document on two separate occasions (Rath et al., 1961). The ROUGE metric (Lin, 2004), however, which remains the standard for summary evaluation, scores system-produced summaries based purely on surface lexicographic matches with a gold standard summary. And even more recent metrics, including BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2019), MoverScore (Zhao et al., 2019a), and FrugalScore (Kamal Eddine et al., 2022), which leverage pretrained language models to address certain shortcomings of ROUGE (Sai et al., 2022), fail to handle the subjectivity of meeting summarization content.

It is worth mentioning that another line of research attempts to evaluate factual consistency be-




Figure 2: Example (Shang et al., 2020a) of ground truth human annotations from the ES2011c AMI meeting. Successive grey nodes on the left denote utterances recorded in the transcript, the black nodes correspond to a subset of utterances that annotators judged important (summary-worthy). A single sentence from each section of the abstractive summary is shown on the right. The colored arcs link a sentence from the abstract summary to a single abstractive community; that is, the set of clauses from the extractive summary that is summarized by the sentence from the abstractive summary.

tween a summary and its source (Huang et al., 2021). It is reported that nearly 30% of summaries generated by neural seq2seq models suffer from fact fabrication (Cao et al., 2018), and for the dialogue domain, most of the factual errors are related to dialogue flow modeling, informal interactions between speakers, and complex coreference resolution (Tang et al., 2022). Given the special characteristics of dialogues, more studies will be needed to develop more appropriate metrics for dialogue summarization (Zechner and Waibel, 2000).

### 3 Datasets and annotations

In the area of meeting summarization, the AMI and ICSI corpora are both widely-used and were until very recently the only-available English meeting corpora. Not only do they contain summaries for each meeting, but they also provide the audio and video recordings of each meeting, annotated with multiple layers of information, to support the work of diverse research communities.

**The AMI corpus (McCowan et al., 2005):** contains 137 scenario-driven meetings (~65 hours) recorded for the Augmented Multi-party Interaction project. In each meeting ranging from 15 to 45 minutes, four participants play the roles of a project manager (PM), a marketing expert (ME),

a user interface designer (UI), and an industrial designer (ID) within a fictive electronics company. The meetings are centered around a design team whose task is to develop a new television remote control from inception to market, through individual work and a series of group meetings. Note that even though the scenario is artificial, how the participants decide to carry it out is not scripted and so the resulting interactions are fully spontaneous. **The ICSI corpus (Janin et al., 2003):** consists of 75 naturally-occurring meetings (~72 hours) recorded at the International Computer Science Institute. In each (weekly) meeting of around one hour, members from research groups (including undergraduate and graduate students and professors) discuss specialized and technical topics such as natural language processing, neural theories of language, and ICSI corpus related issues. There are six participants on average per meeting.

Summaries for both the AMI and ICSI corpora were produced based on meeting transcripts, where a transcript is a written record of every word uttered by a speaker in the order in which the words were uttered. For transcripts of conversations, contiguous sequences of words uttered by a single speaker are grouped together and labeled with an identifier for that speaker, as shown on the left in Figure 2. Transcripts often come with extra information as well, including the start/end time

stamps for each word and even labels for dialogue acts or addressees.

For each meeting in these two corpora, annotators were instructed to create abstractive summaries that consisted of (up to) four parts:

*abstract*: a coherent paragraph to summarize the meeting as a whole so that the content can be understood by those not present for the meeting.

*decisions*: a description of all task-oriented decisions that were made during the meeting.

*problems*: a list of problems or difficulties encountered during the meeting, which came to the surface and either remained open or were solved, but only with a significant amount of effort.

*actions*: a record of the next steps that the group should take before the next meeting.

In addition to abstractive summaries, the AMI and ICSI corpora both contain extractive summaries for each meeting as well as a mapping from each sentence in the abstractive summary to a set of sentences in the extractive summary that support it. We visually illustrate the relationship between abstractive and extractive summaries in Figure 2 with an excerpt from an AMI transcript.

In Figure 2, successive utterances of the speech transcript are represented as the grey nodes on the left. The thicker, black nodes represent utterances recorded in the extractive summary; that is, utterances from the meeting that a human judge found summary-worthy. On the right of the figure, we see one example sentence from each of the four summary sections. The colored arcs link a sentence from the abstractive summary with a set of utterances selected for the extractive summary according to whether the former can be jointly summarized by the latter. A single utterance can be linked with one or more abstractive sentences, and vice versa (many-to-many mapping). All utterances linked to the same abstractive sentence form a single *abstractive community* (Murray et al., 2012; Shang et al., 2020a).

We publicly release a preprocessed version of the AMI and ICSI corpora including the aforementioned annotations<sup>1</sup> to foster research on this topic.

In the end, we note that the recently released ELITR corpus (Nedoluzhko et al., 2022) contains transcripts for 113 technical project meetings in English and 53 in Czech, yielding over 160 hours of meeting content. Each meeting comes with at least one, and sometimes multiple, versions of

meeting minutes. Annotators for the ELITR corpus were not given strict instructions on how to produce minutes, and as a result, minutes can vary widely from one annotator to the next, making the corpus a potentially valuable resource for studying subjectivity in minute and summary creation.

## 4 Taxonomy

Jones (1999) describes a general summarization pipeline consisting of three stages:

(I) Interpretation: mapping the input text to a *source representation* containing additional information useful for interpreting the text.

(T) Transformation: transforming the source representation to a *summary representation* based on which the final summary will be produced.

(G) Generation: generating a summary text from the summary representation.

In the course of our literature review, we noted that when extant work on meeting summarization attempts to address one of the challenges described in Section 2, it can be seen as focusing on one of the stages of Jones’ pipeline. We therefore adopt this three-stage schema as the backbone for our taxonomy. We report the system performance either gathered from the original paper or from other benchmarks (Feng et al., 2021a) in Table 1.

Although all systems implicitly follow the complete I-T-G pipeline, their principal contributions usually focus on a single stage. Some approaches focus on *interpretation* by adding extra information to a transcript, such as discourse structure labels and visual cues, that is considered crucial for proper interpretation of its content. Other systems concentrate on how best to *transform* the original input text into an intermediate representation, such as topic or query-related segments, to be subsequently summarized by a downstream generation module. A third class of approaches, driven by the conviction that transformers are powerful enough to handle the I and T stages, focuses attention on *generation* and specifically, on how to eliminate the limits of pretrained language models described in Section 2.

### 4.1 Interpretation

What counts as important in a conversation certainly depends on the content of the utterances recorded in a speech transcript; certain facts or problems will be more summary-worthy than others, for example. But there are arguably other fea-

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/guokan-shang/ami-and-icsi-corpora>

|   |   | AMI   |       |        | ICSI  |       |        |
|---|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
|   |   | R-1   | R-2   | R-L    | R-1   | R-2   | R-L    |
| I   | Sentence-Gated (Goo and Chen, 2018)           | 49.29 | 19.31 | 24.82  | 39.37 | 9.57  | 17.17  |
|   | DDAMS + DDADA (Feng et al., 2020)             | 53.15 | 22.32 | 25.67  | 40.41 | 11.02 | 19.18  |
|   | BART + Discourse (Ganesh and Dingliwal, 2019) | 35.41 | 7.24  | -      | 31.84 | 6.19  | -      |
|   | TopicSeg + VFOA (Li et al., 2019)             | 53.29 | 13.51 | 26.90  | -     | -     | -      |
| T   | Topic + ILP (Banerjee et al., 2015)           | -     | 4.80  | -      | -     | -     | -      |
|   | Community + MSCG (Mehdad et al., 2013)        | 32.30 | 4.80  | -      | -     | -     | -      |
|   | UNS (Shang et al., 2018)                      | 37.86 | 7.84  | 13.72  | 31.73 | 5.14  | 14.50  |
|   | PreSeg + POV (Park and Lee, 2022)             | 33.66 | 6.85  | 14.17  | 27.80 | 4.56  | 11.77  |
|   | Template-Based (Oya et al., 2014)             | 31.50 | 6.70  | -      | -     | -     | -      |
| SOAP-Cluster2Sent T5 + HLSTM (Krishna et al., 2021) |   | 50.52 | 17.56 | 24.89  | -     | -     | -      |
| G   | SUMM <sup>N</sup> (Zhang et al., 2021)        | 53.44 | 20.30 | 51.39* | 45.57 | 11.49 | 43.32* |
|   | Longformer-BART-arg (Fabbri et al., 2021)     | 55.27 | 20.89 | 24.94  | 44.51 | 11.80 | 19.19  |
|   | HMNet (Zhu et al., 2020)                      | 53.02 | 18.57 | 24.00  | 46.28 | 10.60 | 18.54  |
|   | HAT-CNNNDM (Rohde et al., 2021)               | 52.27 | 20.15 | 50.57* | 43.98 | 10.83 | 41.36* |
|   | HAS-RL (Zhao et al., 2019b)                   | 48.64 | 17.45 | -      | -     | -     | -      |
|   | DialogLM (Zhong et al., 2022)                 | 54.49 | 20.03 | 51.92* | 49.25 | 12.31 | 46.80* |

Table 1: Abstractive meeting summarization benchmarks on the AMI and ICSI corpora (some results are gathered from (Feng et al., 2021a)). The \* indicates *summary-level* (with sentence split) ROUGE-L score (Lin, 2004).

tures of both the discourse and the audio-visual context that are important for interpreting the content of a conversation and for judging the significance of various bits of information conveyed through it. To give a simple example, it can be helpful to know not only what is said, but who said it and to whom. This information can help to improve the coherence of a transcript and also to convert (frequent) occurrences of first and second person pronouns into third person pronouns, as is necessary for summarization (Luo et al., 2009). Speaker information is thus commonly used in abstractive summarization systems such as HMNet (Zhu et al., 2020) and DDAMS (Feng et al., 2020).

In this section, we take a look at more theoretically complex kinds of information that state of the art models have used to enrich textual documents, including speech transcripts, in order to improve interpretation of their content.

#### 4.1.1 Discursive information

When a speaker makes an utterance, it generally serves not only to communicate the semantic content of the sentence uttered, but also to perform some higher level function in the conversation. It might, for example, be used to regulate conversation flow, as when a participant asks another not to interrupt. Or it might serve to ask a question, prompting the addressee to perform an action or provide an informative response, rather than asserting information on its own. In this way, dif-

ferent utterances can be seen as different types of acts in a dialogue, and understanding what type of *dialogue act* is at issue is crucial for understanding, and thus properly summarizing, the interaction. Sometimes, utterances are best construed as *relational*: understanding that a speaker is using one dialogue act to provide an explanation of another when they say “We won’t be able to buy new computers this year. We’ve had to drastically cut our budget.”, for example, can be important.

Information about dialogue acts and discourse relations is frequently left implicit by speakers and thus not reflected in speech transcripts. Its importance, however, has led numerous researchers to enrich transcripts, and written documents more generally, with this information. Of course, this decision comes at a cost: most annotations are performed manually and require linguistic expertise to do well, and annotations done automatically, as in (Shi and Huang, 2019) or (Shang et al., 2020b), can add uncertainties to the data. Still, discourse information can help to separate “noisy” areas of a transcript from more informative sections; using richer source representations can arguably make a single transcript more valuable for training, partially offsetting the problem of scarce data; and graphs that result from complex representations of discourse structure can provide input to graph-based networks, helping to overcome the lengthy input problem for pretrained language models described in Section 2.

**Dialogue acts.** Individual dialogue acts are classified using a combination of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic criteria (Stolcke et al., 2000). Some acts serve to organize the flow of conversation (“Let’s hear from Vanessa now”), while others serve to convey information, ask questions, make requests or suggestions, provide feedback (“hmm hmm”) and so on. Exactly what labels a dialogue act can have must be defined in an annotation scheme, such as DAMSL (Allen and Core, 1997; Core and Allen, 1997) or DiAML (Bunt et al., 2010, 2012).

Dialogue acts provide a shallow notion of discourse structure (Jurafsky et al., 1997) in the sense that dialogue act labels need not entail a full tree or graph structure over the set of dialogue acts in a conversation; an act might simply be labeled as information-conveying, for instance, without being related to any other act in the conversation. Dialogue act labels have nonetheless proven useful for summarization. Goo and Chen (2018) uses a sentence-gated mechanism to jointly model explicit relationships between dialogue acts and topic summaries to improve abstractive meeting summarization. Using LSTM, their model consists of three components enhanced with various attention mechanisms: an utterance encoder, a dialogue act labeler, and a summary decoder.

Dialogue acts have also been used to good effect for summarizing decisions. Fernández et al. (2008) and Bui et al. (2009) first identify relevant areas of decision-related discussion in meetings and classify them as decision-related dialogue acts including the *issue* under discussion, its *resolution*, or *agreement* with the proposed resolution. Then, key fragments of the decision related utterances are retained to form an extractive decision summary. Similar ideas can also be found in the literature on detecting and summarizing action-item-specific dialogue acts in meetings (Purver et al., 2006, 2007).

**Rhetorical relations and discourse structure.** Whereas dialogue act labels frequently reflect non-relational properties of a single utterance (that it serves to ask a question or to make a suggestion, for example), theories of discourse structure, such as Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST; Mann and Thompson, 1987) and Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT; Asher, 1993; Lascarides and Asher, 2008), focus on identifying semantic relations that link the content of one ut-




Figure 3: Discourse graph for Example (1). The dashed edge represents the long distance link. CQ and QAP stand for ‘Clarification Question’ and ‘Question/Answer Pair’.

terance to that of another. These accounts argue that in a coherent conversation, each elementary discourse unit—roughly, the content expressed by an individual clause<sup>2</sup>—should be semantically related to some other part of the conversation via a *discourse relation* such as Elaboration, Explanation, Contrast, and Question-answer pair, etc. Identifying these relations, which need not be signaled by explicit discourse markers (e.g., *because*), allows for a deeper and more complete interpretation of the discourse.

If we consider all instances of discourse relations inferred for a particular discourse or dialogue, in general, they will entail a multi-level, weakly-connected tree or graph structure rather than a linear sequence determined by utterance time or order. Consider the simple toy example, (1), and its corresponding graph in Figure 3:

- (1) a. Alex: What is Mary’s last name?
- b. Bill: The Mary from our reading group?
- c. Alex: Yes.
- d. Bill: It’s Johnson.

Utterances (1-b) and (1-c) serve to clarify which Mary is under discussion in (1-a). Once Alex and Bill settle this intervening discussion, Bill finally answers Alex’s original question. Intuitively, (1-d) should not be attached to the immediately preceding discourse unit, (1-c), but directly to (1-a) (cf. Ginzburg, 2012). The resulting link between (1-a) and (1-d) is long distance because it ignores the two dialogue acts that were performed immediately after the utterance of (1-a).

Discourse structure has been exploited in natural language processing for tasks such as language generation (Hovy, 1993) and machine reading comprehension (Li et al., 2021), among others (Joty et al., 2019). The idea that it could be

<sup>2</sup>The notion of a discourse unit yields a conception of utterance content that is independent of what kind of act that content is used to perform in a particular context. For our purposes, however, we can simply think of an elementary discourse unit as a generalization of the notion of dialogue act content in the sense that it applies to monologue as well.

useful for text summarization goes back to at least [Marcu \(1997\)](#) and has been developed in the work of [Gerani et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Louis et al. \(2010\)](#).

While most work on abstractive meeting summarization tends to assume that conversation is merely a linear sequence of utterances without semantic relations between them, allowing a system to leverage the rich information entailed in discourse graphs could arguably result in a more thorough understanding of the meeting and, consequently, a better meeting summary, containing details such as the arguments made for or against a claim and who made them, or to know the order in which it was decided that certain actions would be performed and who is meant to perform them.

To the best of our knowledge, [Feng et al. \(2020\)](#) is the first work to exploit discourse graphs to generate abstractive meeting summaries. Their approach employs a sequential discourse parser ([Shi and Huang, 2019](#)) trained on the STAC corpus of multi-party chats ([Asher et al., 2016](#)) to automatically obtain discourse graphs for the AMI and ICSI meeting corpora. Levi graph transformation ([Gross and Yellen, 2003](#)) is then performed on the graphs, which turns graph edges labeled with discourse relation types into vertices. Their graph-to-sequence model consists of a graph convolutional network encoder ([Schlichtkrull et al., 2018](#)) that takes a meeting discourse graph as input and a PGN decoder ([See et al., 2017](#)) to generate the final summary. A dialogue-aware data augmentation strategy for constructing pseudo-summaries is introduced to pretrain the model.

[Ganesh and Dingliwal \(2019\)](#) proposes a two-step, unsupervised pipeline for abstractive meeting summarization that first exploits discourse relations to restructure AMI and ICSI meetings into document-like texts and then generates a summary using a classical pretrained document summarization model (e.g., BART, [Lewis et al., 2020](#)). And while their work focuses on dialogue more generally, we note that [Chen and Yang \(2021\)](#) uses discourse graphs to generate short dialogue summaries for the SAMSum corpus ([Gliwa et al., 2019](#)). Discourse graphs are paired with action graphs, which reflect *who-doing-what* (subject-predicate-object) triplets extracted from utterances ([Gee, 2004](#)). Both discourse and action graphs are then encoded by graph attention networks ([Velickovic et al., 2017](#)), which are connected with a BART transformer decoder.

### 4.1.2 Multimodality

Meetings tend to take place in shared visual contexts, allowing important information to be conveyed through gestures, facial expressions, head poses, eye gaze, and so on. It is thus reasonable to hypothesize that harnessing this information could lead to improved performance over a summarization system that draws on speech transcripts alone; more visual attention directed towards a speaker during certain parts of a meeting, for example, might indicate that these parts are more summary-worthy. Indeed, [Li et al. \(2019\)](#) has shown that the Visual Focus Of Attention (VFOA), which is estimated based on each participant’s head orientation and eye gaze, can assist a multi-modal summarization system in determining salient utterances, consequently improving the quality of abstractive meeting summaries. In this work, VFOA is integrated with attention mechanisms in a PGN text decoder and topic segmenter trained in a multi-task learning setting.

In the context of extractive meeting summarization, ([Erol et al., 2003](#)) exploits multimodality to select segments of meeting video recordings in order to facilitate browsing of the videos for interesting and important information. Along with TF-IDF text analysis of the speech transcript, their system attends to certain visual motion activities (e.g., someone entering the meeting room or standing up to make a presentation) as well as acoustic features (e.g., a high degree of interaction and the presence of loud speech.) to enhance the detection of summary-worthy events. The similar idea can also be found in other studies ([Xie and Liu, 2010](#); [Nihei et al., 2016, 2018](#); [Nihei and Nakano, 2019](#)).

Like discourse structure, enriching speech transcripts with audiovisual information can be extremely costly in terms of effort. However, given that meeting summarization comes at the end of a long pipeline that can introduce ASR and other forms of errors into transcripts that are inherently noisy due to the nature of meeting-style speech, relying on speech transcripts alone as input to summarization systems seems risky. Arguably, we need help from as many sources as we can get.

## 4.2 Transformation

Similar in spirit to many standard multi-step, text summarization techniques ([Salton et al., 1997](#)) that begin by grouping sentences according to se-

semantic similarity, this category of work focuses on transforming meeting transcripts into intermediate representations and leveraging these representations to improve summarization. Utterances are first grouped according to a variety of criteria, such as whether they share a topic, can be jointly summarized (i.e. form an abstractive community), contribute to the same field in a template, or respond to the same query. An extractive summarization component is often applied beforehand or afterwards to filter out non summary-worthy utterances. The motivating idea is that first segmenting a transcript into chunks will help to streamline summary generation, as each chunk will be focused on a different aspect of the meeting.

#### 4.2.1 Topic segments

Topic segmentation involves dividing text into topically coherent segments of sentences. With the help of a topic segmenter, such as LCSEg (Galley et al., 2003), the work of Banerjee et al. (2015) first separates the meeting transcription into several topic segments. Then, the important utterances in each segment are combined together to generate a single summary sentence. The combination is performed by finding the most informative and well-formed sub-graph (i.e., a sentence) in the global dependency graph, obtained by merging the dependency parse trees of topic utterances. Outside the meeting domain, topic segments also serve as useful information in summarizing nurse-to-patient dialogues (Liu et al., 2019b) and unstructured daily chats (Chen and Yang, 2020).

#### 4.2.2 Abstractive communities

Introduced in (Murray et al., 2012), *abstractive community detection* is a sub-task of abstractive meeting summarization, in which utterances are grouped according to whether they can be jointly summarized by a common abstractive sentence (see Figure 2; note that a given community may be nested in or overlapping with another). A few works focus on finding such structures, Murray et al. (2012) train a logistic regression classifier with handcrafted features to predict if two utterances belong to the same community, then build an utterance graph whose edges represent the binary predictions of the classifier, and finally apply an overlapping community detection algorithm to the graph. Shang et al. (2020a) approach this task by applying Fuzzy c-Means algorithm (Bezdek et al., 1984) on the utterance embeddings learned with a

siamese or triplet networks (Chopra et al., 2005; Hoffer and Ailon, 2015).

The work of Mehdad et al. (2013) is the first to propose an abstractive meeting summarization system built on communities. They first extend the method of Murray et al. (2012) by using entailment relations to eliminate less informative utterances from each detected community. Then, the utterances of the same community are represented by a multi-sentence compression graph (MSCG, Filippova, 2010), which is an unsupervised NLG component to compress a cluster of related, overlapping sentences. The best compression path is extracted as the abstractive summary sentence of the given utterance community. Shang et al. (2018) and Park and Lee (2022) follow the work of Mehdad et al. (2013), introducing various novel components to improve the original summarization process. Abstractive communities of specific types (e.g., decisions) have also proven useful in summarizing decisions (Wang and Cardie, 2011, 2012).

#### 4.2.3 Template-related clusters

In some cases, a meeting summary or the sentences therein are expected to follow a specific template. Oya et al. (2014) introduces the first template-based abstractive meeting summarization system. Using a clustering algorithm and the MSCG, it creates a set of sentence templates generalized from human-authored abstractive sentences, e.g., “[speaker] discussed [act] and [content]”. For a given meeting to be summarized, the system first segments the transcription based on topics, then finds the best sentence templates for each segment, and fills the templates to create summaries. The work of Krishna et al. (2021) leverages template structure at the summary-level, i.e., 4 sections in AMI summaries (see Figure 2). Using a multi-label classifier, the system first extracts noteworthy utterances, while also predicting the section(s) for which they are relevant, i.e., clustering utterances with respect to the in-template sections. Finally, it generates the final summary in a section-by-section way, using only each section’s predicted noteworthy utterances. This approach is also tested on clinical summary generation of doctor-patient conversations.

#### 4.2.4 Query-related clusters

To deal with the problem of heterogeneous meeting formats as well as the subjectivity inherent in

summary-production, [Mehdad et al. \(2014\)](#) proposed a query-based meeting summarization system that allows for the creation of different summaries for different user interests expressed via queries. Given a phrasal query, the system first extracts the utterances that are most relevant to the keywords of the query and of the main meeting content. Then, these utterances are compressed into summary sentences with an MSCG. Since there were no human-written query-based summaries for AMI at the time, this system was evaluated manually. The QMSum dataset ([Zhong et al., 2021](#)) provides multiple query-summary pairs for each meeting in the AMI and ICSI corpora, covering both general and specific points people might be interested in. They also propose a system with two distinct modules: a locator based on pointer network ([Vinyals et al., 2015](#)) and a neural seq2seq summarizer. The former is used to locate the query-related utterances in the meeting transcripts, and the latter is meant to summarize selected utterances into summaries.

### 4.3 Generation

While Interpretation concerns the enhancement of transcripts to improve meaning extraction and Transformation segments long transcripts into more manageable chunks, the Generation part of the pipeline focuses on developing core language generation components. Recently, massive pre-trained language models based on transformer architecture ([Vaswani et al., 2017](#)), such as BART ([Lewis et al., 2020](#)) and T5 ([Raffel et al., 2020](#)), and many others ([Keskar et al., 2019](#); [Brown et al., 2020](#); [Kamal Eddine et al., 2021](#)), have brought significant improvement to nearly all NLG tasks. Despite the success in dealing with documents, these models are inadequate for meeting summarization, if applied off-the-shelf. As explained in Section 2, meeting-style speech has an idiosyncratic nature unlike that of the text data on which pre-trained language models are trained. In addition, meeting transcripts are usually much longer than the hard limit on input tokens employed by pre-trained language models.

#### 4.3.1 Long input processing

A straightforward solution to the length problem would be to segment a long document into smaller segments to be processed. [Koay et al. \(2021\)](#) separate ICSI meetings with a sliding window, and then apply BART on each segment to pro-

duce smaller summaries, which are concatenated into an overall extractive summary. [Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#) propose SUMM<sup>N</sup>, a multi-stage split-then-summarize framework. Within each stage, it first splits the source input into segments, so that the size of each does not exceed the length limit. A coarse summary is then generated for each segment, which are then concatenated as the input to the next stage. This process is conducted repetitively until a final, fine-grained abstractive meeting summary is produced. While such segmenting approaches may address the length problem, they can potentially result in loss of important cross-partition information ([Beltagy et al., 2020](#)).

**Long-sequence transformers.** Multiple variants of adapting transformer-based approaches to address the lengthy input problem exist in the literature ([Dai et al., 2019](#); [Beltagy et al., 2020](#); [Martins et al., 2022](#)). Longformer ([Beltagy et al., 2020](#)), for example, introduces a multi-layer self-attention operation that scales linearly with sequence length, enabling it to process long meeting transcripts. Although these models are not initially proposed for abstractive meeting summarization, recent benchmarks show their promise ([Fabbri et al., 2021](#)) in comparison with certain dedicated systems.

**Hierarchical transformers.** Some systems manage to leverage transformers in a hierarchical manner for summarizing long meeting transcripts. Since the single sequence of all meeting tokens is overly long for the transformer, it is intuitive to break it down to multiple relatively shorter sequences of different levels, mirroring the underlying hierarchical structure of text ([Yang et al., 2016](#)), i.e., words combine into an utterance, and utterances form a transcription.

[Zhu et al. \(2020\)](#) propose the HMNet model following a two-level structure. First, each utterance in the meeting is separately encoded by the same word-level transformer encoder, resulting in a sequence of utterance vectors. That sequence is then processed by the turn-level encoder. The transformer decoder makes use of both levels' representations via cross-attention layers. [Rohde et al. \(2021\)](#) propose Hierarchical Attention Transformer (HAT). Utterance are first prepended with a special BOS token. After obtaining token-level embeddings with a standard transformer encoder, the BOS tokens' embeddings are fed into one extra layer, resulting in sentence-level representations.

Finally, the decoder leverages the outputs at both levels to produce the final summary. Similarly, the hierarchical encoder of (Zhao et al., 2019b) consists of 3 levels, which gets word, utterance and topic segment embeddings encoded sequentially.

### 4.3.2 Domain adaptation

Gururangan et al. (2020) have shown that instead of directly using an off-the-shelf language model pretrained on a massive, heterogeneous, and broad-coverage corpus, it is helpful in performance gains to conduct domain-adaptive and task-adaptive pretraining.

For instance, BART proposes a full-text denoising pre-training objective for seq2seq models, whose cost is prohibitive for long text, and not tailored to dialogues. Zhong et al. (2022) present the DialogLM model, along with a dialogue-dedicated, window-based denoising pretraining approach. Windows of consecutive utterances are first selected from the conversation, which is then disrupted with arbitrary dialogue-related noises, e.g., speaker mask, turn splitting, turn merging, text infilling and turn permutation. In the end, the model is trained with the objective of reconstructing the original window based on the perturbed one and the remaining conversation. This approach allows a model to effectively learn dynamic dialogue structures within and surrounding the window. Zou et al. (2021) propose a multi-source pretraining paradigm for low-resource dialogue summarization. They first pretrain the encoder and the decoder separately on the in-domain data, for respectively modeling the dialogue and summary language, and then pretrain the complete encoder-decoder on the out-of-domain abstractive summarization data using adversarial critics.

## 5 Future directions

In this section, we list some directions that are worth further investigation in future work:

**Multi-task learning.** Considering the needs and beneficial effects of multiple discussed annotations, it is expected to see a one-for-all system involving abstractive meeting summarization, and all together the tasks of dialogue act classification, discourse parsing, abstractive community detection, etc. Studies on multi-task learning have shown that solving different tasks in a simultaneous fashion often improves learning efficiency and performance, compared to models trained separately (Caruana, 1997). Future work could follow

up on previous attempts in this direction (Li et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2021b; Lee et al., 2021).

**Factual consistency.** As mentioned in Section 2, information inconsistency (Kryscinski et al., 2019, 2020) is a common problem of general text summarization systems, especially for the meeting domain (Tang et al., 2022). This suggests future research to focus on dealing with hallucinated content in generated meeting summaries. Moreover, specific attention could be addressed to the development of a factual consistency evaluation metric for the dialogue domain. Although many metrics have been put in place (Huang et al., 2021), they are inadequate for meeting summarization, as they usually work at the sentence level, which is acceptable for shorter documents but hardly for longer meeting transcriptions.

**Weak supervision.** The largest hurdle that meeting summarization faces is a lack of data, as explained in Section 2, due to privacy concerns and the extremely high cost of annotating. The problem is only amplified when considering summarization models for languages other than English, for which there are no data sets suitable for supervised learning. Recent works mainly focus on supervised approaches, which makes trained models inevitably language-dependent, and even corpus-dependent. One way to get around the data scarcity problem might be to move to meeting summarization techniques with weaker supervision, such as in a purely unsupervised fashion (Shang et al., 2018; Park and Lee, 2022), or even in a zero-shot way (Ganesh and Dingliwal, 2019).

**Spoken language models.** Over the past few years, pretrained language models have evolved from emerging to mainstream NLP technology. As mentioned in Subsection 4.3, pretrained on free-form text makes these models difficult to process specifically structured dialogue transcriptions. Future research could follow the work of, notably DialoGPT (Zhang et al., 2020) and DialogLM (Zhong et al., 2022), to develop better language models dedicated to spoken language, which will potentially offer large gains in task performance of abstractive meeting summarization.

**Commonsense incorporation.** Some facts are naturally considered as commonsense knowledge by human beings, however, not obvious for machines, e.g., "a piano is played by pressing keys". The integration of such *a priori* knowledge, usually represented by graphs, into language mod-

els would improve their interpretation and reasoning potential (Ilievski et al., 2021). Commonsense knowledge has already been applied to general dialogue summarization with success (Zhou et al., 2018; Xiachong et al., 2021). For meetings, we believe that its incorporation, much like explicitly flagging jargon terms (Koay et al., 2020), would provide further information that is likely not included in the context. Indeed, considering that meetings take place in professional environments, some background concepts are taken as understood by the participants, and being able to understand would undoubtedly facilitate dialogue understanding and summary generation.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we presented a comprehensive overview of the state-of-the-art in abstractive meeting summarization. We discussed the different challenges that research has faced, and we proposed a taxonomy that followed the 3-step summarization pipeline: Interpretation-Transformation-Generation, presented by Jones (1999). We further compared the results obtained by the previous works. Finally, we provided new promising directions for future research.

## 7 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the SUMM-RE project (ANR-20-CE23-0017).

## References

- James Allen and Mark Core. 1997. Draft of damsl: Dialog act markup in several layers.
- Nicholas Asher. 1993. Reference to abstract objects in english.
- Nicholas Asher, Julie Hunter, Mathieu Morey, Benamara Farah, and Stergos Afantenos. 2016. [Discourse structure and dialogue acts in multiparty dialogue: the STAC corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'16)*, pages 2721–2727, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Siddhartha Banerjee, Prasenjit Mitra, and Kazunari Sugiyama. 2015. Generating abstractive summaries from meeting transcripts. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Document Engineering*, pages 51–60.
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*.
- James C Bezdek, Robert Ehrlich, and William Full. 1984. Fcm: The fuzzy c-means clustering algorithm. *Computers & geosciences*, 10(2-3):191–203.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Trung Bui, Matthew Frampton, John Dowding, and Stanley Peters. 2009. [Extracting decisions from multi-party dialogue using directed graphical models and semantic similarity](#). In *Proceedings of the SIGDIAL 2009 Conference*, pages 235–243, London, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harry Bunt, Jan Alexandersson, Jean Carletta, Jae-Woong Choe, Alex Chengyu Fang, Koiti Hasida, Kiyong Lee, Volha Petukhova, Andrei Popescu-Belis, Laurent Romary, Claudia Soria, and David Traum. 2010. [Towards an ISO standard for dialogue act annotation](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'10)*, Valletta, Malta. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Harry Bunt, Jan Alexandersson, Jae-Woong Choe, Alex Chengyu Fang, Koiti Hasida, Volha Petukhova, Andrei Popescu-Belis, and David Traum. 2012. [ISO 24617-2: A semantically-based standard for dialogue annotation](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, pages 430–437, Istanbul, Turkey. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Ziqiang Cao, Furu Wei, Wenjie Li, and Sujian Li. 2018. Faithful to the original: Fact aware neural abstractive summarization. In *thirty-second AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*.

- Giuseppe Carenini, Gabriel Murray, and Raymond Ng. 2011. Methods for mining and summarizing text conversations. *Synthesis Lectures on Data Management*, 3(3):1–130.
- Rich Caruana. 1997. Multitask learning. *Machine learning*, 28(1):41–75.
- Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2020. [Multi-view sequence-to-sequence models with conversational structure for abstractive dialogue summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4106–4118, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2021. [Structure-aware abstractive conversation summarization via discourse and action graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1380–1391, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sumit Chopra, Raia Hadsell, and Yann LeCun. 2005. Learning a similarity metric discriminatively, with application to face verification. In *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'05)*, volume 1, pages 539–546. IEEE.
- Mark G Core and James Allen. 1997. Coding dialogs with the damsl annotation scheme. In *AAAI fall symposium on communicative action in humans and machines*, volume 56, pages 28–35. Boston, MA.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. [Transformer-XL: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2978–2988, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shibhansh Dohare, Vivek Gupta, and Harish Karnick. 2018. [Unsupervised semantic abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2018, Student Research Workshop*, pages 74–83, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angela Edmunds and Anne Morris. 2000. The problem of information overload in business organisations: a review of the literature. *International journal of information management*, 20(1):17–28.
- Kemal Elciyar. 2021. Overloading in lockdown: Effects of social, information and communication overloads in covid-19 days. *İnönü Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi (İNİF E-Dergi)*, 6(1):329–342.
- Berna Erol, D-S Lee, and Jonathan Hull. 2003. Multimodal summarization of meeting recordings. In *2003 International Conference on Multimedia and Expo. ICME'03. Proceedings (Cat. No. 03TH8698)*, volume 3, pages III–25. IEEE.
- Alexander Fabbri, Faiaz Rahman, Imad Rizvi, Borui Wang, Haoran Li, Yashar Mehdad, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. [ConvoSumm: Conversation summarization benchmark and improved abstractive summarization with argument mining](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6866–6880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Geraldine Fauville, Mufan Luo, Anna CM Queiroz, Jeremy N Bailenson, and Jeff Hancock. 2021. Zoom exhaustion & fatigue scale. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 4:100119.
- Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2021a. A survey on dialogue summarization: Recent advances and new frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03175*.
- Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Xinwei Geng. 2020. Dialogue discourse-aware graph model and data augmentation for meeting summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.03502*.
- Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, Libo Qin, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2021b. [Language model as an annotator: Exploring DialoGPT for dialogue summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International*

- Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1479–1491, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Raquel Fernández, Matthew Frampton, John Dowding, Anish Adukuzhiyil, Patrick Ehlen, and Stanley Peters. 2008. Identifying relevant phrases to summarize decisions in spoken meetings. In *Ninth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- Katja Filippova. 2010. [Multi-sentence compression: Finding shortest paths in word graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2010)*, pages 322–330, Beijing, China. Coling 2010 Organizing Committee.
- Michel Galley, Kathleen R. McKeown, Eric Fosler-Lussier, and Hongyan Jing. 2003. [Discourse segmentation of multi-party conversation](#). In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 562–569, Sapporo, Japan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mahak Gambhir and Vishal Gupta. 2017. Recent automatic text summarization techniques: a survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 47(1):1–66.
- Prakhar Ganesh and Saket Dingliwal. 2019. Restructuring conversations using discourse relations for zero-shot abstractive dialogue summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01615*.
- Nikhil Garg, Benoit Favre, Korbinian Reidhammer, and Dilek Hakkani Tür. 2009. Clusterrank: a graph based method for meeting summarization. Technical report, Idiap.
- James Paul Gee. 2004. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. routledge.
- Shima Gerani, Yashar Mehdad, Giuseppe Carenini, Raymond T. Ng, and Bitá Nejat. 2014. [Abstractive summarization of product reviews using discourse structure](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1602–1613, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan Ginzburg. 2012. *The interactive stance: Meaning for conversation*. Oxford University Press.
- Bogdan Gliwa, Iwona Mochol, Maciej Biesek, and Aleksander Wawer. 2019. [SAMSum corpus: A human-annotated dialogue dataset for abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 70–79, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chih-Wen Goo and Yun-Nung Chen. 2018. Abstractive dialogue summarization with sentence-gated modeling optimized by dialogue acts. In *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 735–742. IEEE.
- Jonathan L Gross and Jay Yellen. 2003. *Handbook of graph theory*. CRC press.
- Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. [Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8342–8360, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomas Kocisky, Edward Grefenstette, Lasse Espeholt, Will Kay, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. 2015. Teaching machines to read and comprehend. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.
- Elad Hoffer and Nir Ailon. 2015. Deep metric learning using triplet network. In *International workshop on similarity-based pattern recognition*, pages 84–92. Springer.
- Eduard H Hovy. 1993. Automated discourse generation using discourse structure relations. *Artificial intelligence*, 63(1-2):341–385.
- Yichong Huang, Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2021. The factual inconsistency problem in abstractive text summarization: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14839*.
- Filip Ilievski, Pedro Szekely, and Bin Zhang. 2021. Cskg: The commonsense knowledge graph. In *European Semantic Web Conference*, pages 680–696. Springer.

- Adam Janin, Don Baron, Jane Edwards, Dan Ellis, David Gelbart, Nelson Morgan, Barbara Peskin, Thilo Pfau, Elizabeth Shriberg, Andreas Stolcke, et al. 2003. The icsi meeting corpus. In *2003 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2003. Proceedings.(ICASSP'03).*, volume 1, pages I–I. IEEE.
- Karen Sparck Jones. 1999. Automatic summarizing: factors immarizing: factors and directions. *Advances in automatic text summarization*, page 1.
- Shafiq Joty, Giuseppe Carenini, Raymond Ng, and Gabriel Murray. 2019. [Discourse analysis and its applications](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 12–17, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Jurafsky, Liz Shriberg, and Debra Bisca. 1997. [Switchboard swbd-damsl shallow-discourse-function annotation coders manual](#). *Institute of Cognitive Science Technical Report*.
- Moussa Kamal Eddine, Guokan Shang, Antoine Tixier, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2022. [Fru-galScore: Learning cheaper, lighter and faster evaluation metrics for automatic text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1305–1318, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Moussa Kamal Eddine, Antoine Tixier, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2021. [BARThez: a skilled pretrained French sequence-to-sequence model](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9369–9390, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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*.
- Jia Jin Koay, Alexander Roustai, Xiaojin Dai, Dillon Burns, Alec Kerrigan, and Fei Liu. 2020. [How domain terminology affects meeting summarization performance](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5689–5695, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Jia Jin Koay, Alexander Roustai, Xiaojin Dai, and Fei Liu. 2021. [A sliding-window approach to automatic creation of meeting minutes](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 68–75, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danielle Kost. 2020. You’re right! you are working longer and attending more meetings. *Harvard Business School Working Knowledge*.
- Kundan Krishna, Sopan Khosla, Jeffrey Bigham, and Zachary C. Lipton. 2021. [Generating SOAP notes from doctor-patient conversations using modular summarization techniques](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4958–4972, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. [Neural text summarization: A critical evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 540–551, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. [Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9332–9346, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Lascarides and Nicholas Asher. 2008. Segmented discourse representation theory: Dy-

- namic semantics with discourse structure. In *Computing meaning*, pages 87–124. Springer.
- Seolhwa Lee, Kisu Yang, Chanjun Park, João Sedoc, and Heuseok Lim. 2021. Who speaks like a style of vitamin: Towards syntax-aware dialogue summarization using multi-task learning. *IEEE Access*, 9:168889–168898.
- 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 *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiaqi Li, Ming Liu, Zihao Zheng, Heng Zhang, Bing Qin, Min-Yen Kan, and Ting Liu. 2021. Dadgraph: A discourse-aware dialogue graph neural network for multiparty dialogue machine reading comprehension. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- Manling Li, Lingyu Zhang, Heng Ji, and Richard J. Radke. 2019. [Keep meeting summaries on topic: Abstractive multi-modal meeting summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2190–2196, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chunyi Liu, Peng Wang, Jiang Xu, Zang Li, and Jieping Ye. 2019a. Automatic dialogue summary generation for customer service. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1957–1965.
- Zhengyuan Liu, Angela Ng, Sheldon Lee, Ai Ti Aw, and Nancy F Chen. 2019b. Topic-aware pointer-generator networks for summarizing spoken conversations. In *2019 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 814–821. IEEE.
- Annie Louis, Aravind Joshi, and Ani Nenkova. 2010. [Discourse indicators for content selection in summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the SIGDIAL 2010 Conference*, pages 147–156, Tokyo, Japan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hans Peter Luhn. 1958. The automatic creation of literature abstracts. *IBM Journal of research and development*, 2(2):159–165.
- Xiaoqiang Luo, Radu Florian, and Todd Ward. 2009. [Improving coreference resolution by using conversational metadata](#). In *Proceedings of Human Language Technologies: The 2009 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Companion Volume: Short Papers*, pages 201–204, Boulder, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William C Mann and Sandra A Thompson. 1987. Rhetorical structure theory: A framework for the analysis of texts. Technical report, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MARINA DEL REY INFORMATION SCIENCES INST.
- Daniel Marcu. 1997. From discourse structures to text summaries. In *Intelligent Scalable Text Summarization*.
- Pedro Henrique Martins, Zita Marinho, and Andre Martins. 2022.  [\$\infty\$ -former: Infinite memory transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5468–5485, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Iain McCowan, Jean Carletta, Wessel Kraaij, Simone Ashby, Sebastien Bourban, Mike Flynn, Mael Guillemot, Thomas Hain, Jaroslav Kadlec, Vasilis Karaiskos, et al. 2005. The ami meeting corpus. In *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on methods and techniques in behavioral research*, volume 88, page 100. Citeseer.
- Yashar Mehdad, Giuseppe Carenini, and Raymond T. Ng. 2014. [Abstractive summarization](#)

- of spoken and written conversations based on phrasal queries. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1220–1230, Baltimore, Maryland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yashar Mehdad, Giuseppe Carenini, Frank Tompa, and Raymond T. Ng. 2013. [Abstractive meeting summarization with entailment and fusion](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th European Workshop on Natural Language Generation*, pages 136–146, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joseph E Mroz, Joseph A Allen, Dana C Verhoeven, and Marissa L Shuffler. 2018. Do we really need another meeting? the science of workplace meetings. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(6):484–491.
- Gabriel Murray. 2008. *Using speech-specific characteristics for automatic speech summarization*. Ph.D. thesis, Citeseer.
- Gabriel Murray, Giuseppe Carenini, and Raymond Ng. 2010. [Generating and validating abstracts of meeting conversations: a user study](#). In *Proceedings of the 6th International Natural Language Generation Conference*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gabriel Murray, Giuseppe Carenini, and Raymond Ng. 2012. [Using the omega index for evaluating abstractive community detection](#). In *Proceedings of Workshop on Evaluation Metrics and System Comparison for Automatic Summarization*, pages 10–18, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anna Nedoluzhko and Ondrej Bojar. 2019. Towards automatic minuting of the meetings. In *ITAT*, pages 112–119.
- Anna Nedoluzhko, Muskaan Singh, Marie Hledíková, Tirthankar Ghosal, and Ondřej Bojar. 2022. ELITR Minuting Corpus: A novel dataset for automatic minuting from multi-party meetings in English and Czech. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2022)*, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). In print.
- Fumio Nihei and Yukiko I Nakano. 2019. Exploring methods for predicting important utterances contributing to meeting summarization. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 3(3):50.
- Fumio Nihei, Yukiko I Nakano, and Yutaka Takase. 2016. Meeting extracts for discussion summarization based on multimodal nonverbal information. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, pages 185–192.
- Fumio Nihei, Yukiko I Nakano, and Yutaka Takase. 2018. Fusing verbal and nonverbal information for extractive meeting summarization.
- Tatsuro Oya, Yashar Mehdad, Giuseppe Carenini, and Raymond Ng. 2014. [A template-based abstractive meeting summarization: Leveraging summary and source text relationships](#). In *Proceedings of the 8th International Natural Language Generation Conference (INLG)*, pages 45–53, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seongmin Park and Jihwa Lee. 2022. [Unsupervised abstractive dialogue summarization with word graphs and POV conversion](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Deriving Insights from User-Generated Text*, pages 1–9, (Hybrid) Dublin, Ireland, and Virtual. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew Purver, John Dowding, John Niekrasz, Patrick Ehlen, Sharareh Noorbaloochi, and Stanley Peters. 2007. [Detecting and summarizing action items in multi-party dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 8th SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 18–25, Antwerp, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew Purver, Patrick Ehlen, and John Niekrasz. 2006. Detecting action items in multi-party meetings: Annotation and initial experiments. In *International Workshop on Machine Learning for Multimodal Interaction*, pages 200–211. Springer.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, Peter J Liu, et al. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning

- with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(140):1–67.
- GJ Rath, A Resnick, and TR Savage. 1961. The formation of abstracts by the selection of sentences. part i. sentence selection by men and machines. *American Documentation*, 12(2):139–141.
- Dana Rezazadegan, Shlomo Berkovsky, Juan C Quiroz, A Baki Kocaballi, Ying Wang, Liliana Laranjo, and Enrico Coiera. 2022. Symbolic and statistical learning approaches to speech summarization: A scoping review. *Computer Speech & Language*, 72:101305.
- Korbinian Riedhammer, Dan Gillick, Benoit Favre, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. 2008. Packing the meeting summarization knapsack. In *Ninth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- Steven G Rogelberg, Cliff Scott, and John Kello. 2007. The science and fiction of meetings. *MIT Sloan management review*, 48(2):18–21.
- Tobias Rohde, Xiaoxia Wu, and Yinhan Liu. 2021. Hierarchical learning for generation with long source sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07545*.
- Nicholas C Romano and Jay F Nunamaker. 2001. Meeting analysis: Findings from research and practice. In *Proceedings of the 34th annual Hawaii international conference on system sciences*, pages 13–pp. IEEE.
- Ananya B Sai, Akash Kumar Mohankumar, and Mitesh M Khapra. 2022. A survey of evaluation metrics used for nlg systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 55(2):1–39.
- Gerard Salton, Amit Singhal, Mandar Mitra, and Chris Buckley. 1997. Automatic text structuring and summarization. *Information processing & management*, 33(2):193–207.
- Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne van den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. 2018. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *European semantic web conference*, pages 593–607. Springer.
- Raphael Schumann. 2018. Unsupervised abstractive sentence summarization using length controlled variational autoencoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.05233*.
- Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. **Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1073–1083, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guokan Shang. 2021. *Spoken Language Understanding for Abstractive Meeting Summarization*. Ph.D. thesis, Institut Polytechnique de Paris.
- Guokan Shang, Wensi Ding, Zekun Zhang, Antoine Tixier, Polykarpos Meladianos, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Jean-Pierre Lorré. 2018. **Unsupervised abstractive meeting summarization with multi-sentence compression and budgeted submodular maximization**. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 664–674, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guokan Shang, Antoine Tixier, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Jean-Pierre Lorré. 2020a. **Energy-based self-attentive learning of abstractive communities for spoken language understanding**. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 313–327, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guokan Shang, Antoine Tixier, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Jean-Pierre Lorré. 2020b. **Speaker-change aware CRF for dialogue act classification**. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 450–464, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Zhouxing Shi and Minlie Huang. 2019. A deep sequential model for discourse parsing on multi-party dialogues. In *Proceedings of the*

- AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 33, pages 7007–7014.
- Andreas Stolcke, Klaus Ries, Noah Coccaro, Elizabeth Shriberg, Rebecca Bates, Daniel Jurafsky, Paul Taylor, Rachel Martin, Carol Van Ess-Dykema, and Marie Meteer. 2000. [Dialogue act modeling for automatic tagging and recognition of conversational speech](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 26(3):339–374.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3104–3112.
- Xiangru Tang, Arjun Nair, Borui Wang, Bingyao Wang, Jai Desai, Aaron Wade, Haoran Li, Asli Celikyilmaz, Yashar Mehdad, and Dragomir Radev. 2022. [CONFIT: Toward faithful dialogue summarization with linguistically-informed contrastive fine-tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5657–5668, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Antoine Tixier, Polykarpos Meladianos, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2017. [Combining graph degeneracy and submodularity for unsupervised extractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 48–58, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gokhan Tur, Andreas Stolcke, Lynn Voss, John Dowding, Benoît Favre, Raquel Fernández, Matthew Frampton, Michael Frandsen, Clint Frederickson, Martin Graciarena, et al. 2008. The calo meeting speech recognition and understanding system. In *2008 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop*, pages 69–72. IEEE.
- Gokhan Tur, Andreas Stolcke, Lynn Voss, Stanley Peters, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, John Dowding, Benoît Favre, Raquel Fernández, Matthew Frampton, Mike Frandsen, et al. 2010. The calo meeting assistant system. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 18(6):1601–1611.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *stat*, 1050:20.
- Oriol Vinyals, Meire Fortunato, and Navdeep Jaitly. 2015. Pointer networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.
- Lu Wang and Claire Cardie. 2011. [Summarizing decisions in spoken meetings](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Automatic Summarization for Different Genres, Media, and Languages*, pages 16–24, Portland, Oregon. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lu Wang and Claire Cardie. 2012. [Focused meeting summarization via unsupervised relation extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 304–313, Seoul, South Korea. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lu Wang and Claire Cardie. 2013. [Domain-independent abstract generation for focused meeting summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1395–1405, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Feng Xiachong, Feng Xiaocheng, and Qin Bing. 2021. [Incorporating commonsense knowledge into abstractive dialogue summarization via heterogeneous graph networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 20th Chinese National Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 964–975, Huhhot, China. Chinese Information Processing Society of China.
- Shasha Xie and Yang Liu. 2010. [Using confusion networks for speech summarization](#). In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 46–54, Los Angeles, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Zichao Yang, Diyi Yang, Chris Dyer, Xiaodong He, Alex Smola, and Eduard Hovy. 2016. [Hierarchical attention networks for document classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1480–1489, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Klaus Zechner. 2002. [Automatic summarization of open-domain multiparty dialogues in diverse genres](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 28(4):447–485.
- Klaus Zechner and Alex Waibel. 2000. [Minimizing word error rate in textual summaries of spoken language](#). In *1st Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. BERTScore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*.
- 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 *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 270–278, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yusen Zhang, Ansong Ni, Ziming Mao, Chen Henry Wu, Chenguang Zhu, Budhaditya Deb, Ahmed H Awadallah, Dragomir Radev, and Rui Zhang. 2021. Summ<sup>n</sup>: A multi-stage summarization framework for long input dialogues and documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.10150*.
- Wei Zhao, Maxime Peyrard, Fei Liu, Yang Gao, Christian M. Meyer, and Steffen Eger. 2019a. [MoverScore: Text generation evaluating with contextualized embeddings and earth mover distance](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 563–578, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhou Zhao, Haojie Pan, Changjie Fan, Yan Liu, Linlin Li, Min Yang, and Deng Cai. 2019b. [Abstractive meeting summarization via hierarchical adaptive segmental network learning](#). In *The world wide web conference*, pages 3455–3461.
- Ming Zhong, Yang Liu, Yichong Xu, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2022. Dialoglm: Pre-trained model for long dialogue understanding and summarization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 11765–11773.
- Ming Zhong, Da Yin, Tao Yu, Ahmad Zaidi, Mutethia Mutuma, Rahul Jha, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Asli Celikyilmaz, Yang Liu, Xipeng Qiu, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. [QMSum: A new benchmark for query-based multi-domain meeting summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5905–5921, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hao Zhou, Tom Young, Minlie Huang, Haizhou Zhao, Jingfang Xu, and Xiaoyan Zhu. 2018. [Commonsense knowledge aware conversation generation with graph attention](#). In *IJCAI*, pages 4623–4629.
- Chenguang Zhu, Ruochen Xu, Michael Zeng, and Xuedong Huang. 2020. [A hierarchical network for abstractive meeting summarization with cross-domain pretraining](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 194–203, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yicheng Zou, Bolin Zhu, Xingwu Hu, Tao Gui, and Qi Zhang. 2021. [Low-resource dialogue summarization with domain-agnostic multi-source pretraining](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 80–91, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.