

Inflected Forms Are Redundant in Question Generation Models

Xingwu Sun
University of Macau
sunxingwu01@gmail.com

Hongyin Tang
Meituan Inc.
tanghongyin@meituan.com

Chengzhong Xu
University of Macau
czxu@um.edu.mo

Abstract

Neural models with an encoder-decoder framework provide a feasible solution to Question Generation (QG). However, after analyzing the model vocabulary we find that current models (both RNN-based and pre-training based) have more than 23% inflected forms. As a result, the encoder will generate separate embeddings for the inflected forms, leading to a waste of training data and parameters. Even worse, in decoding these models are vulnerable to irrelevant noise and they suffer from high computational costs. In this paper, we propose an approach to enhance the performance of QG by fusing word transformation. Firstly, we identify the inflected forms of words from the input of encoder, and replace them with the root words, letting the encoder pay more attention to the repetitive root words. Secondly, we propose to adapt QG as a combination of the following actions in the encode-decoder framework: generating a question word, copying a word from the source sequence or generating a word transformation type. Such extension can greatly decrease the size of predicted words in the decoder as well as noise. We apply our approach to a typical RNN-based model and UNILM to get the improved versions. We conduct extensive experiments on SQuAD and MS MARCO datasets. The experimental results show that the improved versions can significantly outperform the corresponding baselines in terms of BLEU, ROUGE-L and METEOR as well as time cost.

1 Introduction

Question Generation (QG) aims to generate natural language questions from given text. It can aid several applications: (1) QG can help create educational materials by generating questions for reading comprehension materials (Heilman and Smith, 2010; Du et al., 2017). (2) It can be used to automatically curate question answering datasets (Duan

Root Word	Inflected Forms		
commit	commits	committed	committing
big	bigger	biggest	-

Figure 1: Two root words and their corresponding inflected forms in the vocabulary of QG models.

et al., 2017). (3) It can also aid dialogue systems by actively asking meaningful questions. Typically, QG includes two sub-tasks: (1) determine the targets that should be asked (e.g., sentences, phrases or words), and (2) produce the surface-form of the question. In this work, we focus on the sub-task of surface-form generation of questions by assuming that the targets are given.

Recent neural QG models, e.g., RNN-based sequence-to-sequence models and pre-training based models, have made great progress in generating proper questions. In particular, UNILM (Dong et al., 2019), which applies a pre-training model for QG, is the state-of-the-art model with the best performance. However, those models all suffer high computational costs in decoding. We carefully examine existing neural QG models which have an encoder-decoder architecture in general and find that existing models remain two issues. Firstly, in the encoder, the root word and its inflected forms, e.g., “commit” and its inflected forms “committed” and “committing” as shown in Figure 1, might all occur in the vocabulary of the encoder. According to our statistics, in the widely used QG dataset SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), the top-10000 frequent words contain 3718 inflected forms. Moreover, even though UNILM applies the WordPiece segmentation to reduce the vocabulary size, its vocabulary still contains about 23.18% (6722/28996) inflected forms. As a result, the encoder will generate individual embeddings for these words, which

seems a little redundant for QG. Even worse, they occupy the space in the vocabulary of encoder. As a result, the encoder will generate separate embeddings for the inflected words, leading to a waste of training data and parameters. Secondly, in the decoder, the same large set of words are employed to generate a question regardless of the input. Therefore, these models are vulnerable to irrelevant noise. Besides, while decoding each word of a question, probability distribution of words in the entire static and fairly large vocabulary have to be calculated, which slows the decoding process down.

To decrease the computational cost and improve the performance of QG, we propose an approach named as word transformation approach. The approach is inspired by the feature of the inflected language and our daily reading experience. The former refers to the fact that words with different inflected forms may divert the focus to QG. The latter refers to our observations that most words in the generated question can be copied or simply transformed from the words in the original source sequence, except for the question word. Therefore, in our approach, we treat QG as a combination of word transformation, word copying and question word generation. In detail, in the question word generation, a question word is generated from a limited question word vocabulary. In the transformation type generation, an inflected form type is generated from a small word transformation type vocabulary. For example, type “##ed” may be generated and will be used for transforming a verb to its past tense in the final step. In the word copying, words are copied from the source sequence. Besides, we identify the inflected forms of words from the input of encoder, and replace them with their root forms, letting the encoder pay more attention to the repetitive root words and take in more different words for training. We have applied our approach to a typical RNN-based model and a pre-trained transformer-based model UNILM and get the corresponding improved versions.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows.

- We find that inflected words take up unnecessary spaces in vocabulary and define a series of word transformation types to facilitate transforming a word into its inflected forms.
- We only keep the root words in vocabulary of the encoder to make the best of the training data and the limited vocabulary space, which

is also applicable in many other NLP models.

- We propose to simplify the decoding process of QG by question word generation, transformation type generation and word copying, to avoid generating each word from a large vocabulary and enhance the performance.
- For evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of our proposed approach, we conduct extensive experiments on two large scale datasets, i.e., SQuAD and MS MARCO datasets and compare the baselines with the corresponding improved versions. The experimental results show that the improved versions can significantly outperform the baselines.

2 Related Work

The existing QG approaches can be broadly classified into two kinds: rule-based and neural network-based. The rule-based approaches rely on hand-crafted rules, while the neural network-based approaches are data-driven and trainable in an end-to-end fashion.

Early QG approaches are mostly rule-based ones (Heilman and Smith, 2009, 2010; Chali and Hasan, 2015), which leverage rules or templates to generate questions. The rule-based approaches employ manually crafted rules for declarative-to-interrogative sentence transformation, typically based on syntactic (Mitkov and Ha, 2003; Ali et al., 2010; Heilman, 2011) or semantic information (Chen, 2009), while the template-based approaches generate questions using manually created templates which are predefined with placeholders to be filled with words from the source word sequence (Cai et al., 2006; Lindberg et al., 2013; Song and Zhao, 2016). The major limitations of these rule-based approaches include: (1) they rely heavily on rules and templates, which are created manually and therefore expensive, (2) these rules or templates lack diversity, (3) the targets they can deal with are limited.

To tackle the limitations of rule-based approaches, the neural network-based approaches with an encoder-decoder framework are applied to the task of QG. These approaches do not rely on hand-crafted rules, and they are instead data driven and trainable in an end-to-end fashion. The release of large-scale machine reading comprehension datasets, e.g. SQuAD, MS MARCO (Nguyen et al., 2016), Hotpot QA (Yang et al., 2018) and DROP (Dua et al., 2019), further drives the devel-

Part-of-speech	Transformation Types	Transformation Type Description
verb	##ing	converting the verb to its present participle
	##vs	converting the verb to its singular present
	##ed	converting the verb to its past tense
	##edp	converting the verb to its past participle
noun	##ns	converting the noun to its plural word
adjective	##jer	converting the adjective to its comparative form
	##jest	converting the adjective to its superlative form
adverb	##ver	converting the adverb to its comparative form
	##vest	converting the adverb to its superlative form

Table 1: Word transformation types and the corresponding descriptions.

opment of neural QG models. In general, these datasets contain large-scale manually annotated triples, i.e., question, answer and the context, and they can be used as training data of QG models.

As for the RNN-based models, both Du et al. (2017) and Yuan et al. (2017) apply a sequence-to-sequence model with an attention mechanism to generate questions for the text in SQuAD dataset. Zhou et al. (2017) enrich the RNN-based model with rich features (i.e., answer position and lexical features) to generate answer focused questions, and incorporate a copy mechanism that allows the model to copy words from the context. Duan et al. (2017) propose to combine templates and the sequence-to-sequence model, in which they mine question patterns from a question answering community and employ a sequence-to-sequence model to generate question patterns for a given text. Tang et al. (2017) model question answering and question generation as dual tasks, which helps generate better questions and get better question answering models at the same time.

Further, based on pointer generator network (See et al., 2017), Sun et al. (2018) propose an answer focused and position-aware model to effectively leverage answer encoding and position features. Zhao et al. (2018) mainly focus on incorporating paragraph level context by using gated self-attention and maxout pointer networks. Nema et al. (2019) give a refine network to mimic human process of generating questions. Besides, there has also been some work on generating questions from knowledge bases (Serban et al., 2016; Indurthi et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2019).

More recently, pre-training models are applied to QG. For example, Dong et al. (2019) propose UNILM which makes a great progress in QG. Currently, UNILM is the QG model with the best performance.

Differing from the previous work, our approach does not provide a QG model, and instead provides two extensions to the encoder-decoder framework for performance improvement. Our approach can be applied to most existing models, including RNN-based sequence-to-sequence models plus UNILM.

3 Our Approach

To begin with, we formally give the QG task definition as follows. Given the text $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{T_x})$ of length T_x as well as lexical features, i.e., named entity (NE) and part-of-speech (POS). The answer positions in this text range from l to r . The goal is to generate a question, which is required to be as close as the reference question $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{T_y})$.

In the following subsections, we describe the details of the proposed approach to deal with the issues discussed in the previous sections. Firstly, we define a series of word transformation types, which is the basis of our approach. Secondly, we choose the pointer generator network and UNILM as baselines, and describe how to apply our approach by elaborating the working process of the encoder-decoder in the improved versions, respectively.

3.1 Word Transformation Types

As the basis of our approach, we define the transformation types in terms of the part-of-speech of the word, as listed in Table 1. As for a verb, we define four types of transformation, i.e., “##ing”, “##vs”, “##ed” and “##edp”. As for a noun, we define one transformation type “##ns”, which means converting the noun to its plural word. For an adjective or an adverb, we define the transformation to their comparative form as “##jer” and “##ver”, respectively. Similarly, we define their transformation to the superlative form as “##jest” and “##vest”. Note

that we use the Pattern module¹ in Python to conduct these transformations. As for irregular words, we manually collect a lookup table, for instance, “went” can be converted into go and “##ed”.

Recall the two issues mentioned in Section 1. As for the first issue in the encoder, by a series of transformation types, we only keep the root words and the transformation types in the encoder vocabulary. As a result, it can substantially save space for other words and make the best of training data. As for the second issue, we directly copy or transform the word in the source sequence to generate questions except for the question word. A transformation type vocabulary is introduced as a necessity in the transformation type generation, which will be elaborated in the next subsections.

Before model encoding, we first get the root form of each word in the original input sequence. For example, in Figure 2, the word “succeeded” is converted into its root form “succeed” and the corresponding transformation type is “##ed”. After transformation, the input sequence is converted into a sequence $(x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{T'_x})$ of length T'_x and the answer positions range from l' to r' . Similarly, The reference question is converted into $(y'_1, y'_2, \dots, y'_{T'_y})$ of length T'_y .

3.2 Reforming Pointer Generator Network

3.2.1 The Encoder

The baseline which is reformed is the attention-based pointer generator network (See et al., 2017) enhanced with various rich features proposed by Zhou et al. (2017). These features include named entity (NE), part-of-speech (POS) and answer position in the embedding layer of the encoder.

As shown in Figure 2, the encoder is a bidirectional GRU, which takes as input the joint embedding of word, answer position and lexical features (NE, POS) in the form of $(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{T'_x})$ with $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_w+d_a+d_n+d_p}$, where T'_x is the input length, w_i is the embedding of x'_i by concatenating all the feature embeddings and d_w, d_a, d_n, d_p are the dimensionalities of word embedding, answer position embedding, NE embedding and POS embedding, respectively. It produces a sequence of d_h -dimensional hidden states $(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{T'_x})$, each of which is the sum of forward

ward and backward GRU representations:

$$\begin{aligned} h_i &= \overleftarrow{h}_i + \overrightarrow{h}_i, \\ \overleftarrow{h}_i &= \text{GRU}(w_i, \overleftarrow{h}_{i+1}), \\ \overrightarrow{h}_i &= \text{GRU}(w_i, \overrightarrow{h}_{i-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\overleftarrow{h}_i, \overrightarrow{h}_i$ are all d_h -dimensional vectors.

3.2.2 The Decoder

The decoder is modified to support three actions: word copying, transformation type generation and question word generation. (1) In the word copying, the decoder generates words from the source sequence. (2) In the transformation type generation, the decoder generates from a limited transformation type vocabulary, which only includes nine types in Table 1. (3) In the question word generation, the decoder generates question words from a restricted question word vocabulary.

Word Copying The decoder is a unidirectional GRU conditionally taking all the encoded hidden states as input. At decoding step t , the decoder reads an input word embedding w_t , previous attentional context vector c_{t-1} and its previous hidden state s_{t-1} to update its current hidden state $s_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$:

$$s_t = \text{GRU}([w_t; c_{t-1}], s_{t-1}) \quad (2)$$

The context vector c_t is generated through an attention mechanism (Bahdanau et al., 2014). At time step t , the context vector c_t is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_t &= \sum_{i=1}^{T'_x} \alpha_{ti} h_i \\ \alpha_{ti} &= \text{Softmax}(e_{ti}) \\ e_{ti} &= v^T \tanh(W_h^T h_i + W_s^T s_t + b) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where α is the attention distribution and W_h, W_s, b and v are all trainable parameters.

The attention distribution can be viewed as a semantic matching between hidden states of the encoder and the hidden state of the decoder. It indicates how the decoder cares about different hidden states of the encoder during decoding. Therefore, the attention distribution can be regarded as the probability distribution of the word copying.

¹<https://github.com/clips/pattern>

$$P_{\text{copy}} = \alpha_t \quad (4)$$




Figure 2: The improved version based on pointer generator network. “C” represents the context vector.

Transformation Type Generation Before encoding, we have already converted each word to its root form, i.e., the root word. In the decoding, besides coping words, we should endow the model the ability to transform some words to their proper forms, e.g., the “do” in Figure 2 is generated from question word vocabulary and we need to transform it to “did”. To carry out this transformation, we introduce the transformation type generation and generate the transformation type for the root word, e.g., “##ed” is generated to transform “do” to “did”.

We get the transformation type distribution by the following function.

$$P_{trans} = \text{Softmax}(g_1(s_t, c_t)) \quad (5)$$

where $g_1(\cdot)$ is a two-layer feedforward neural network with a maxout internal activation. $P_{trans} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V_{trans}|}$ denotes the probability distribution of transformation types.

Question Word Generation We find that the generation of question words is mainly determined by the answer and its surrounding words. For example, in Figure 2, the answer and its context “in 1970” already involve the essential information to generate the question word “when”, which suggests that the answer and its surrounding words can benefit the question word generation. We also find that the total number of question words is limited. Therefore, we introduce a specific vocabulary of question words to directly and explicitly model the question words generation. Note that the question word vocabulary contains top-1000 frequent words in reference questions of the training set, which means that it also contains other question-related words.

As depicted in Figure 2, in the question word generation, the model generates question words based on a restricted vocabulary of question words. This action produces a question word distribution

based on an answer embedding v_{answer} , the decoder state s_t and the context vector c_t :

$$P_{quest} = \text{Softmax}(g_2(v_{answer}, s_t, c_t)) \quad (6)$$

where $g_2(\cdot)$ is a two-layer feedforward neural network, P_{quest} is a $|V_{quest}|$ -dimensional probability distribution, and $|V_{quest}|$ is the size of vocabulary of question words. We employ the average pooling function to calculate the answer embedding.

$$v_{answer} = \frac{\sum_{t=l'}^{r'} h_t}{r' - l' + 1} \quad (7)$$

Three-action Combination To control the balance among different actions, we introduce a three-dimensional switch probability, acting as a three-way soft switch:

$$p_{quest}, p_{copy}, p_{trans} = \text{Softmax}(f(c_t, s_t, w_t)) \quad (8)$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is a one layer feedforward network. We compute the final probability distribution through a weighted summation of the three action probability distributions:

$$P(w) = p_{copy}P_{copy}(w) + p_{trans}P_{trans}(w) + p_{quest}P_{quest}(w) \quad (9)$$

3.3 Reforming UNILM

UNILM is a pre-trained language model which has the same structure as BERT(Devlin et al., 2019) but can be used for natural language generation tasks. The model is firstly pre-trained on a large scale corpus which enables it to learn flexible language representations. Then, it is fine-tuned on the dataset of the downstream tasks using the sequence-to-sequence language model objective. In UNILM, there is no explicit separation between the encoder and decoder. In contrast, the source and target sequence are fed to the model together. The sequence-to-sequence generation is implemented by a special self-attention mask M .




Figure 3: Model architecture of the improved version based on UNILM. Note that there should be L transformer layers. For simplicity, we only keep two of them in this figure.

Following Dong et al. (2019), we concatenate the answer segment $(x'_{l'}, \dots, x'_{r'})$ and the text segment $(x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{T'_x})$ forming the new source segment $X = (x'_1, \dots, x'_{T'_x}, [\text{EOS}], x'_{l'}, \dots, x'_{r'})$. Next, we concatenate the new source segment and the target segment $Y = (y'_1, y'_2, \dots, y'_{T'_y})$ as input, i.e., $[\text{SOS}]X[\text{EOS}]Y[\text{EOS}]$. Then we feed the input to the model. In training, we randomly replace tokens with $[\text{MASK}]$ in Y at a rate of 0.8.

For each input token, its embedding is the sum of the token embedding, position embedding and segment embedding. As shown in Figure 3, we get token embeddings $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{T_x^* + T_y' + 3})$, which is then feed into L -layer transformers to get the deep representation $H^l = h_i^l, i \in [1, T_x^* + T_y' + 3]$.

$$h_i^l = \text{Transformer}(h_i^{l-1}), l = 1, 2, 3, \dots, L \quad (10)$$

where H^0 is initialized with w . The output of the self-attention head of the l -th transformer is calculated by:

$$Q_l = H^{l-1}W^Q, K_l = H^{l-1}W^K, V_l = H^{l-1}W^V \quad (11)$$

$$A_l = \text{Softmax}\left(\frac{Q_l K_l^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} + M\right)V_l \quad (12)$$

where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{(T_x^* + T_y' + 3) \times (T_x^* + T_y' + 3)}$. $M_{ij} = 0$ means it is allowed to attend, while $M_{ij} = -\infty$ indicates it is not allowed to attend. We can find that the special self-attention mask M allows the token to be generated to attend to all of the source tokens and the preceding generated tokens. This mechanism allows the model to generate text in a sequence-to-sequence fashion.

To adopt the word transformation approach, we directly compute the distributions associated with

the three actions based on the hidden state of the current step. The details are shown as follows.

Word Copying The attention distribution over the source tokens is obtained by an extra attention module which computes the attention scores using dot product:

$$P_{copy} = \text{Softmax}(g_3(h_t)) \quad (13)$$

$$g_3(h_t) = [g_3(h_t)_i]_{i=1}^{T'_x} = [h_t \cdot h_i]_{i=1}^{T'_x} \quad (14)$$

where h_t is the hidden state of t -th token output by the last layer of transformer. The output of $g_3(h_t)$ is the dot product between h_t and hidden states of all of the input tokens.

Transformation Type Generation The transformation type distribution is obtained by computing the dot product between the current hidden state and the embeddings of the transformation types.

$$P_{trans} = \text{Softmax}(g_4(h_t)) \quad (15)$$

$$g_4(h_t) = [g_4(h_t)_i]_{i=1}^{|V_{trans}|} = [h_t \cdot e_i^T]_{i=1}^{|V_{trans}|} \quad (16)$$

where e^T is the embedding of the transformation types. $g_4(h_t)$ is the dot product between h_t and the embeddings of all of the transformation types. P_{trans} denotes the probability distribution of transformation types.

Question Word Generation Similar to the calculation of the distribution of the transformation types, the distribution of the question words is obtained by the dot product between the current hidden state and the embeddings of the question words.

$$P_{quest} = \text{Softmax}(g_5(h_t)) \quad (17)$$

$$g_5(h_t) = [g_5(h_t)_i]_{i=1}^{|V_{quest}|} = [h_t \cdot e_i^Q]_{i=1}^{|V_{quest}|} \quad (18)$$

where e^Q is the embedding of the question words. $g_5(h_t)$ is the dot product between h_t and the embeddings of all of the question words e^Q .

Three-action Combination The three-dimensional switch probability is obtained by the current hidden state h_t .

$$p_{quest}, p_{copy}, p_{trans} = \text{Softmax}(f_1(h_t)) \quad (19)$$

where $f_1(\cdot)$ is a one layer feedforward network. The final probability distribution is computed as the same as Equation 9.

Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Pointer	40.49	26.11	18.94	14.34	42.15	18.71
Pointer + WT	45.08	29.56	21.54	16.41	45.40	20.61
UniLM	49.82	34.48	26.03	20.39	49.02	23.52
UniLM + WT	51.56	35.78	27.06	21.24	50.46	23.93

(a)

Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Pointer	44.45	31.85	23.32	17.90	46.07	20.02
Pointer + WT	56.14	39.36	29.04	22.10	59.29	26.40
UniLM	60.57	43.14	32.38	25.01	60.58	29.31
UniLM + WT	62.65	45.33	34.31	26.55	62.85	29.72

(b)

Table 2: The main experimental results of baselines and improved versions on SQuAD (a) and MARCO (b). “WT” means the proposed word transformation approach.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experiment Settings

Dataset We conduct the experiments on SQuAD and MARCO datasets. Since the test sets of these datasets are not publicly available, we follow Zhou et al. (2017) to randomly split the development set into two parts and use them as the development set and test set for the QG task. In SQuAD, there are 86,635, 8,965 and 8,964 question-answer pairs in our training set, development set and test set, respectively. We directly use the extracted features² shared by Zhou et al. (2017). In MARCO, there are 74,097, 4,539 and 4,539 question-answer pairs in our training set, development set and test set, respectively. We use Stanford CoreNLP³ to extract lexical features.

Implementation Details We set the cutoff length of the input sequence as 128 words. The encoder vocabulary contains the most frequent 30,000 words in each training set. The decoder vocabulary contains two sub-vocabularies. One is the question word vocabulary which contains most frequent 1000 words in the reference questions of the training set. The other one is the transformation type vocabulary, including 9 transformation types as described in Section 3. For the RNN-based model, we use the pre-trained Glove word vectors⁴ with 300 dimensions to initialize the word embeddings that will be further fine-tuned in the training stage. The representations of answer position feature and lexical features at the embedding layer of the encoder are randomly initialized to 32 dimensional vectors that are trainable during training stage. The

size of hidden states of both the encoder and decoder is 512. We use dropout only in the encoder with a dropout rate 0.20. The size of answer embedding is 512. We use the optimization algorithm Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with the learning rate 0.002 and we set the batch size as 32. As for the UniLM, we adopt the base version of the UniLM and use the recommended parameters as detailed by Dong et al. (2019). After training, we select the best model on the development set for testing.

Evaluation Metrics We evaluate our approach using n-gram similarity metrics, i.e., BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE-L (Lin, 2004) and METEOR (Lavie and Denkowski, 2009).

Competitors In the experiments, we have the following four competitors for comparisons, where Pointer and UniLM are baselines and the other two are corresponding improved versions.

- **Pointer generator network (Pointer)** It is a typical RNN-based sequence-to-sequence model with the copy mechanism (See et al., 2017). To make a fair comparison, the lexical features are added to the embedding layer as same as Zhou et al. (2017).
- **Pointer generator network plus Word Transformation approach (Pointer + WT)** We enhance the Pointer model with the proposed word transformation approach.
- **UniLM (Dong et al., 2019)** It is a pre-trained language model which can be applied to natural language generation tasks.
- **UniLM + WT** We combine the UniLM model with the proposed word transformation approach.

Pointer and Pointer + WT are implemented with

²<https://res.gyzhou.me/redistribute.zip>

³<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/>

⁴<http://nlp.stanford.edu/data>

Tensorflow, while UNILM and UNILM + WT are implemented by PyTorch.

4.2 Performance Evaluation

Table 2 shows the main results, and we have the following observations:

- The Pointer + WT model performs better than the original Pointer model which indicates that generating questions by word transformation is effective.
- UNILM + WT model can still significantly outperform the powerful UNILM, which indicates the effectiveness of applying our approach to the pre-trained language models for QG tasks.
- Our approach makes greater improvement over MARCO than SQuAD. That might be because MARCO is extracted from the search engine, which induces a bias over word copying and word transformation generation from source text.

Besides generation quality, we also compare baselines with the corresponding improved versions on efficiency of decoding. We record the time of generating a word of a question given the test text with a beam size of 12 and calculate the average value. Note that we regard the decoding of root word and its corresponding transformation type as one word in efficiency comparison. The comparison is conducted on a GPU environment with a single Tesla V100. For the RNN-based models, the Pointer + WT model is more efficient which can save more than **39%** (from 0.0081s to 0.0049s) decoding time compared to original model. For the pre-trained models, the UNILM + WT model can save **13%** decoding time (from 0.0144s to 0.0125s). We also find that UNILM behaves better than Pointer on generation quality, but it sacrifices efficiency. Specifically, it is nearly one time slower than the RNN-based models. From the comparisons on both effectiveness and efficiency, we can conclude that this word transformation approach can enhance the quality of QG and speed up the decoding at the same time.

4.3 Human Evaluation

We further conduct human evaluation to analyze the generation quality of the Pointer model and the Pointer + WT model. We randomly sample 200 cases from the SQuAD dataset and ask three

Text: In the March Battle of Fort Bull, French forces destroyed the fort and large quantities of supplies , including 45,000 pounds of gunpowder .

Answer: 45,000

Reference question: How much gun powder was destroyed in attack ?

Pointer: How much of gunpowder **'s** were **killed** in the March Battle of Fort Bull ?

Pointer + WT: How much gunpowder was destroyed in the March Battle of Fort Bull ?

Table 3: A case where the Pointer model generates unrelated words, i.e., “**killed**” and “**'s**”, while the model incorporating word transformation approach can generate the question more correctly.

annotators specialized in language to compare the generation quality. The annotators are shown two questions, one generated by the Pointer model and the other one by the Pointer + WT model. They are asked which one is better by three factors, i.e., fluency, completeness, and answerability. These three factors are equally important in this evaluation. The final label is determined by majority voting. By the metric value, we get that the Pointer + WT model outperforms the Pointer model. Specifically, in **73/200** cases, the Pointer + WT model is better compared to the Pointer model. In 91/200 cases, the two models behave nearly the same. In 36/200 cases, the Pointer + WT model behaves worse than the baseline.

Table 3 gives a case to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach. As shown in Table 3, the Pointer model generates unrelated words, i.e., “**killed**” and “**'s**”. It might be because the Pointer model generates from a large and noisy vocabulary. However, the Pointer + WT model can generate the question more correctly, which can be definitely owed to our approach.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we discover two major issues in the existing neural QG models. To tackle the two issues, we propose this enhancing approach for QG and apply the approach to two typical sequence-to-sequence models, i.e., the pointer generator network and UNILM. We further conduct extensive experiments using SQuAD and MARCO datasets. The experimental results show that improved versions of models can significantly enhance the quality of QG and speed up the decoding.

References

- Husam Ali, Yllias Chali, and Sadid A Hasan. 2010. Automation of question generation from sentences. In *Proceedings of QG2010: The Third Workshop on Question Generation*, pages 58–67.
- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*.
- Zhiqiang Cai, Vasile Rus, Hyun-Jeong Joyce Kim, Suresh C Susarla, Pavan Karnam, and Arthur C Graesser. 2006. Nlglm: A markup language for question generation. In *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education*, pages 2747–2752. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Yllias Chali and Sadid A Hasan. 2015. Towards topic-to-question generation. *Computational Linguistics*, 41(1):1–20.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 13063–13075.
- Xinya Du, Junru Shao, and Claire Cardie. 2017. Learning to ask: Neural question generation for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00106*.
- Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. Drop: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00161*.
- Nan Duan, Duyu Tang, Peng Chen, and Ming Zhou. 2017. Question generation for question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 866–874.
- Michael Heilman. 2011. *Automatic factual question generation from text*. Ph.D. thesis, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Michael Heilman and Noah A Smith. 2009. Question generation via overgenerating transformations and ranking. Technical report, CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV PITTSBURGH PA LANGUAGE TECHNOLOGIES INST.
- Michael Heilman and Noah A Smith. 2010. Good question! statistical ranking for question generation. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 609–617. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sathish Reddy Indurthi, Dinesh Raghu, Mitesh M Khapra, and Sachindra Joshi. 2017. Generating natural language question-answer pairs from a knowledge graph using a rnn based question generation model. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 376–385.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Alon Lavie and Michael J Denkowski. 2009. The meteor metric for automatic evaluation of machine translation. *Machine translation*, 23(2-3):105–115.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- David Lindberg, Fred Popowich, John Nesbit, and Phil Winne. 2013. Generating natural language questions to support learning on-line. In *Proceedings of the 14th European Workshop on Natural Language Generation*, pages 105–114.
- Cao Liu, Kang Liu, Shizhu He, Zaiqing Nie, and Jun Zhao. 2019. Generating questions for knowledge bases via incorporating diversified contexts and answer-aware loss. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13108*.
- Ruslan Mitkov and Le An Ha. 2003. Computer-aided generation of multiple-choice tests. In *Proceedings of the HLT-NAACL 03 workshop on Building educational applications using natural language processing-Volume 2*, pages 17–22. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Preksha Nema, Akash Kumar Mohankumar, Mitesh M Khapra, Balaji Vasan Srinivasan, and Balaraman Ravindran. 2019. Let’s ask again: Refine network for automatic question generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05355*.
- Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09268*.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting on association for computational linguistics*, pages 311–318. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250*.
- Abigail See, Peter J Liu, and Christopher D Manning. 2017. Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04368*.
- Iulian Vlad Serban, Alberto García-Durán, Caglar Gulcehre, Sungjin Ahn, Sarath Chandar, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. Generating factoid questions with recurrent neural networks: The 30m factoid question-answer corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.06807*.
- Linfeng Song and Lin Zhao. 2016. Domain-specific question generation from a knowledge base. *CoRR*.
- Xingwu Sun, Jing Liu, Yajuan Lyu, Wei He, Yanjun Ma, and Shi Wang. 2018. Answer-focused and position-aware neural question generation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3930–3939.
- Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Tao Qin, and Ming Zhou. 2017. Question answering and question generation as dual tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02027*.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*.
- Xingdi Yuan, Tong Wang, Caglar Gulcehre, Alessandro Sordani, Philip Bachman, Sandeep Subramanian, Saizheng Zhang, and Adam Trischler. 2017. Machine comprehension by text-to-text neural question generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.02012*.
- Yao Zhao, Xiaochuan Ni, Yuanyuan Ding, and Qifa Ke. 2018. Paragraph-level neural question generation with maxout pointer and gated self-attention networks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3901–3910.
- Qingyu Zhou, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, Chuanqi Tan, Hangbo Bao, and Ming Zhou. 2017. Neural question generation from text: A preliminary study. In *National CCF Conference on Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*, pages 662–671. Springer.