

AUTOMATIC GENERATION OF MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS

CHENG ZHANG

COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS LOWELL

MAY 2022

Abstract

Creating multiple-choice questions to assess reading comprehension of a given article involves generating question-answer pairs (QAPs) and adequate distractors. We present two methods to tackle the challenge of QAP generations: (1) A deep-learning-based end-to-end question generation system based on T5 Transformer with Preprocessing and Postprocessing Pipelines (TP3). We use the finetuned T5 model for our downstream task of question generation and improve accuracy using a combination of various NLP tools and algorithms in preprocessing and postprocessing to select appropriate answers and filter undesirable questions. (2) A sequence-learning-based scheme to generate adequate QAPs via meta-sequence representations of sentences. A meta-sequence is a sequence of vectors comprising semantic and syntactic tags. we devise a scheme called MetaQA to learn meta sequences from training data to form pairs of a meta sequence for a declarative sentence and a corresponding interrogative sentence. The TP3 works well on unseen data, which is complemented by MetaQA. Both methods can generate well-formed and grammatically correct questions. Moreover, we present a novel approach to automatically generate adequate distractors for a given QAP. The method is a combination of part-of-speech tagging, named-entity tagging, semantic-role labeling, regular expressions, domain knowledge bases, word embeddings, word edit distance, WordNet, and other algorithms.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Automatic Question Generation	1
1.2	Automatic Distractor Generation	3
2	Related Work	5
2.1	Automatic Question Generation	5
2.1.1	Transformative Methods	5
2.1.2	Generative Methods	6
2.2	Automatic Distractor Generation	7
3	Deep-learning-based Question Generation	9
3.1	Description of TP3	9
3.2	Processing Pipelines	11
3.2.1	Preprocessing	12
3.2.2	Question generation	15
3.2.3	Postprocessing	15
3.3	Running Samples	17
3.4	Evaluations	18
3.4.1	Automatic evaluations	19
3.4.2	Manual evaluations of TP3	19
4	Sequence-learning-based Question Generation	21
4.1	Learning phase	24

4.2	Generation phase	25
4.3	An Implementation of MetaQA for English	26
4.3.1	Preliminaries	26
4.3.2	PP, MSG, and MSL Localization	27
4.3.3	MSM Localization	28
4.3.4	QAPG Localization	28
4.3.5	SSU Merging without Segmentation	30
4.4	Running Samples	31
4.5	Evaluations	35
5	Distractor Generation	38
5.1	Distractors for Type-1 and Type-2 Targets	39
5.2	Distractors for Type-3 Targets	40
5.3	Running Samples	42
5.4	Evaluations	45
6	Conclusion	47
	References	58

Chapter 1

Introduction

In an effort to build an online learning tool for helping students improve reading comprehension, it calls for a system to automatically generate adequate multiple-choice questions (MCQs) to assess student’s understanding of a given article. An article’s main points include *direct* and *derived* points. A direct point is expressed in a declarative sentence. A derived point is inferred from multiple direct points, which could be a causal relation between them, an aggregation over them, or a conclusion drawn from them. An MCQ typically consists of a question-answer pairs (QAPs) and a fixed number of distractors.

Automatic generation of adequate MCQs can be divided into two tasks: (1) automatic generation of QAPs; (2) automatic generation of distractors. Part of this dissertation is built on my prior work on QAP and distractor generation (84; 85; 86).

1.1 Automatic Question Generation

We study automatic generation of QAPs with an emphasis on grammatical correctness of the questions and the suitability of the answers. By grammatical correctness we mean that the questions being generated are syntactically and semantically correct and conform to what a native speaker would say.

Existing methods on QAP generation are based on handcrafted features or neural networks. While they have met with certain success from different perspectives, the

grand challenge of generating adequate QAPs still remains.

We present two approach to tackling this challenge from two different perspectives. (1) A deep-learning-based end-to-end Transformer with Preprocessing and Postprocessing Pipelines (TP3) for generating adequate QAPs, and (2) A sequence-learning-based MetaQG for generating adequate QAPs via meta sequence representations of sentences.

TP3 utilizes the power of Text-to-Text Transfer (T5) Transformer model. It is a downstream task on a pretrained T5 that is finetuned on a QAP dataset, with a preprocessing pipeline to select appropriate answers and a postprocessing pipeline to filter undesirable questions.

While the TP3 system performs very well on unseen data and generates well-formed and grammatically correct questions from the given answer and context, it may still generate a few types of incoherent questions. For example, asking the type of verbs or asking clauses that express reason or purpose may generate incoherent QAPs. But these types of questions can be easily generated by MetaQA.

A meta sequence is a sequence of vectors comprising semantic and syntactic tags. In particular, we use a sequence of vectors to represent a sentence, where each vector consists of a semantic-role (SR) tag, a part-of-speech (POS) tag, and other syntactic and semantic tags, and we refer to such a sequence as a *meta sequence*. We then present a scheme called MetaQA to learn meta sequences of declarative sentences and the corresponding interrogative sentences from a training dataset. Combining and removing redundant meta sequences yields a set called MSDIP (Meta-Sequence-Declarative-Interrogative Pairs), with each element being a pair of an MD and corresponding MI(s), where MD and MI stand for, respectively, a meta sequence for a declarative sentence and for an interrogative sentence. A trained MetaQA model generates QAPs for a given declarative sentence s as follows: Generate a meta sequence for s , find a best-matched MD from MSDIP, generates meta sequences for interrogative sentences according to the corresponding MIs and the meta sequence of s , identifies the meta-sequence answer to each MI, and coverts them back to text to form a QAP.

We implement MetaQA for the English language using SR, POS, and NE (named-entity) tags. We then train MetaQA using a moderate initial dataset and show that

MetaQA generates efficiently a large number of adequate QAPs with an accuracy of 97% on the official SAT practice reading tests. These tests contain a large number of declarative sentences in different patterns, and there is no match in the initial MSDIP for some of these sentences. After learning interrogative for some of these sentences, MetaQA successfully generate many more adequate QAPs.

1.2 Automatic Distractor Generation

Given a QAP for a given article, we also study how to generate adequate distractors that are grammatically correct and semantically related to the correct answer in the sense that the distractors, while incorrect, look similar to the correct answer with a sufficient distracting effect—that is, it should be hard to distinguish distractors from the correct answer without some understanding of the underlying article. An distractor could be a single word, a phrase, a sentence segment, or a complete sentence. It must satisfy the following requirements: (1) it is an incorrect answer to the question; (2) it is grammatically correct and consistent with the underlying article; (3) it is semantically related to the correct answer; and (4) it provides distraction so that the correct answer could be identified only with some understanding of the underlying article.

In particular, we are to generate three adequate distractors for a QAP to form an MCQ. One way to generate a distractor is to substitute a word or a phrase contained in the answer with an appropriate word or a phrase that maintains the original part of speech. Such a word or phrase could be an answer itself or contained in an answer sentence or sentence segment. For convenience, we refer to such a word or phrase as a target word.

If a target word is a number with an explicit or implicit quantifier, or anything that can be converted to a number, we call it a type-1 target. If a target word is a person, location, or organization, we call it a type-2 target. Other target words (nouns, phrasal nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adjectives) are referred to as type-3 targets. We use different methods to generate distractors for targets of different types.

Our distractor generation method is a combination of part-of-speech (POS) tagging (78), named-entity (NE) tagging (51; 1; 56), semantic-role labeling (40; 71), regular expressions, domain knowledge bases on people, locations, and organizations, word embeddings (such as Word2vec (45), GloVe (55), Subwords (4), and spherical text embedding (42)), word edit distance (28), WordNet (<https://wordnet.princeton.edu>), and some other algorithms. We show that, via experiments, our method can generate adequate distractors for a QAP to form an MCQ with a high successful rate.

Chapter 2

Related Work

2.1 Automatic Question Generation

Automatic question generation (QG), first studied by Wolfe (81) as a means to aid independent study, has since attracted increasing attentions in two lines of methodologies: transformative and generative.

2.1.1 Transformative Methods

Transformative methods transform key phrases from a given single declarative sentence into factual questions. Existing methods are rule-based on syntax, semantics, or templates.

Syntactic-based methods follow the same basic strategy: Parse sentences using a syntactic parser to identify key phrases and transform a sentence to a question based on syntactic rules. These include methods to identify key phrases from input sentences and use syntactic rules for different types of questions (80), generate questions and answers using a syntactic parser, a POS tagger, and an NE analyzer (1), transform a sentence into a set of questions using a series of domain-independent rules (14), and generate questions using relative pronouns and adverbs from complex English sentences (22).

Semantic-based methods create questions using predicate-argument structures and

semantic roles (38), semantic pattern recognition (41), subtopics based on Latent Dirichlet Allocation (8), or semantic-role labeling (18).

These methods are similar. The only difference is that semantic-based methods use semantic parsing while syntactic-based methods use syntactic parsing to determine which specific words or phrases should be asked. In a language with many syntactic and semantic exceptions, such as English, these methods would require substantial manual labor to construct rules.

Template-based methods are for special-purpose applications with built-in templates. Research in this line devises a Natural Language Generation Markup Language (NLGML) (6); uses a phrase structure parser to parse text and construct questions using enhanced XML (67); devise a self-questioning strategy to help children generate questions from narrative fiction (48); use informational text to enhance the self-questioning strategy (10); apply pattern matching, variables, and templates to transform source sentences into questions similar to NLGML (83); defines a question template as pre-defined text with placeholder variables to be replaced with content from the source text (32); or incorporates semantic-based methods into a template-based method to support online learning (31).

2.1.2 Generative Methods

Recent advances of neural-network research provide new tools to build generative models. For example, the attention mechanism can help determine what content in a sentence should be asked (37), and the sequence-to-sequence (2; 12) and the long short-term memory (69) mechanisms are used to generate words to form a question (see, e.g., (16; 17; 19; 68)). These models generate questions without the corresponding correct answers. To address this issue, researchers have explored ways to encode a passage (a sentence or multiple sentences) and an answer word (or a phrase) as input, and determine what questions are to be generated for a given answer (90; 89; 74). However, as pointed out by Kim et al. (23), these methods could generate answer-revealing questions, namely, questions contain in them the corresponding answers. They then devised a new method by encoding answers separately, at the expense of

learning substantially more parameters.

More recently, researchers have explored how to use pretrained transformers to generate answer-aware questions (15; 87; 91; 60; 75; 27). For example, Kettip et al. (24) presented an architecture for a transformer to generate questions. Rather than fully encoding the context and answers as they appear in the dataset, they applied certain transformations such as the change of named entities both on the context and the answer. Lopez et al. (35) finetuned the pretrained GPT-2 (61) transformer without using any additional complex components or features to enhance its performance. Chen (11) described a fully transformer-based reinforcement learning generator evaluator architecture to generate questions.

The recent introduction of T5 has escalated NLP research in a number of ways. T5 is a encoder-decoder text-to-text transformer using the teacher forcing method on a wide variety of NLP tasks, including text classification, question answering, machine translation, and abstractive summarization. Unlike other transformer models (e.g. GPT-2 (61)) that take in text data after converting them to corresponding numerical embeddings, T5 handles each task by taking in data in the form of text and producing text outputs.

Taking the advantage of pretrained T5, Lidiya et al. (49) combined nine question-answering datasets to finetune a single T5 model and evaluated generated questions using a new semantic measure called BERTScore (88). Their method achieves so far the best results. We present a finetuned T5 model on a single SQuAD dataset to produce better results.

2.2 Automatic Distractor Generation

Methods of generating adequate distractors for MCQs are typically following two directions: domain-specific knowledge bases and semantic similarity (58; 64).

Methods in the first direction are focused on lexical information have used part-of-speech(POS) tags, word frequency, WordNet, domain ontology, distributional hypothesis, and pattern matching, to find the target word’s synonym, hyponym and

hypernym as distractor candidates. (47; 13; 76)

Methods in the second direction analyze the semantic similarity of the target word using Word2Vec model for generating distractor candidates (20; 77).

However, it is difficult to use Word2Vec or other word-embedding methods to find adequate distractors for polysemous answer words. Moreover, previous efforts have focused on finding some forms of distractors, instead of making them look more distracting. This paper is an attempt to tackle these issues.

Chapter 3

Deep-learning-based Question Generation

3.1 Description of TP3

We describe how we train and finetune a pretrained T5 transformer for our downstream task of question generation and use a combination of various NLP tools and algorithms to build the preprocessing and postprocessing pipelines for generating QAPs.

There are a number of public QAP datasets available for fine-tuning T5, including RACE (25), CoQA (65), and SQuAD (63). RACE is a large-scale dataset collected from Gaokao English examinations over the years, where Gaokao is the national college entrance examinations held once every year in mainland China. It consists of more than 28,000 passages and nearly 100,000 questions, including cloze questions. CoQA is a conversational-style question-answer dataset. It contains a series of interconnected questions and answers in conversations. SQuAD is a reading comprehension dataset, consisting of more than 100,000 QAPs posted by crowdworkers on a set of Wikipedia articles.

Among these datasets, SQuAD is more commonly used in the question generation research. We use SQuAD to finetune pretrained T5 models. For each QAP and corresponding context extracted from the SQuAD training dataset, we concatenate the answer and the context with markings in the format of $\langle answer \rangle answer_text \langle context \rangle context_text$

as input, with the question as the target, where the context is the entire article for the QAP in SQuAD. We then set the maximum input length to 512 and the target length to 128 to avoid infinite loops and repetitions of target outputs. We feed the concatenated text input and question target into a pretrained T5 model for fine-tuning and use AdamW (36) as an optimizer with various learning rates to obtain a better model.

To explore various learning rates, we first use automatic evaluation methods to narrow down a smaller range of the learning rates and then use human judges to determine the best learning rate. In particular, we first finetune the base model with a learning rate of 1.905×10^{-3} and the large model with a learning rate of 4.365×10^{-4} . The learning rates are calculated using the Cyclical Learning Rates (CLR) method (73), which is used to find automatically the best global learning rate. Evaluated by human judges, we found that the best learning rate calculated by CLR is always larger than the actual best learning rate in our experiments.

We then finetune T5-Base and T5-Large with dynamic learning rates from the learning rate calculated by CLR with a reduced learning rate for each epoch. For example, we finetune T5-Base starting from a learning rate of 1.905×10^{-3} and multiply the previous learning rate by 0.5 for the current epoch until the learning rate of 1.86×10^{-6} is reached. Likewise, we finetune T5-Large in the same way starting from 4.365×10^{-4} until the learning rate of 1.364×10^{-5} is reached. However, the generated results are still below expectations.

We therefore proceed to finetune the models with various learning rates we choose. In particular, we first finetune T5-Base with a constant learning rate from 10^{-3} to 10^{-4} with a 2.5×10^{-4} decrement for each model, and from 10^{-4} to 10^{-5} with a 2.5×10^{-5} decrement for each epoch. Likewise, we finetune T5-Large with a learning rate from 10^{-4} to 10^{-5} with a 2×10^{-5} decrement for each epoch, and from 10^{-5} to 10^{-6} with a 2×10^{-6} decrement for each epoch.

Evaluated using BLEU (53), ROUGE (30), METEOR (3) and BERTScore (88), we find that the learning rates ranging from 10^{-4} to 10^{-5} for T5-Base and the learning rates ranging from 10^{-5} to 10^{-6} for T5-Large perform better. Moreover, as expected,

the overall performance of T5-Large is better than T5-Base.

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 depict the measurement results for T5-Base and T5-Large, respectively, where R1, R2, RL, and RLsum stand for, respectively, Rouge-1, Rouge-2, Rouge-L, and Rouge-Lsum. The boldfaced number indicates the best in its column. It is evident that T5-Base with the learning rate of 3×10^{-5} and T5-Large with the learning rate of 8×10^{-6} produce the best results. For convenience, we refer to these two finetuned models as T5-Base-SQuAD₁ and T5-Large-SQuAD₁ to distinguish them with the existing T5-Base-SQuAD model. We sometimes also denote T5-Base-SQuAD₁ as T5-SQUAD₁ when there is no confusion of what size of the dataset is used to pretrain T5.

Table 3.1: Automatic Evaluation of T5-Base-SQuAD₁

Learning Rate	BLEU	R1	R2	RL	RLsum	METEOR	BERTScore	Average
5e-5	20.01	50.71	28.38	46.59	46.61	45.46	51.51	41.32
3e-5	22.63	54.90	32.22	50.97	50.99	48.98	55.82	45.22
2.5e-5	22.50	54.36	31.93	50.49	50.50	48.64	55.61	44.86
1e-5	20.17	50.46	28.38	46.79	46.81	44.97	51.82	41.34
Dynamic	20.57	51.88	28.99	47.67	47.68	47.38	53.34	42.50

Table 3.2: Automatic Evaluation on T5-Large-SQuAD₁

Learning Rate	BLEU	R1	R2	RL	RLsum	METEOR	BERTScore	Average
3e-5	23.01	54.49	31.92	50.51	50.51	50.00	56.19	45.23
1e-5	23.66	51.88	32.88	51.43	51.42	50.53	56.65	45.50
8e-6	23.83	55.48	33.08	51.58	51.58	50.61	56.94	46.15
6e-6	23.84	55.24	32.91	51.35	51.35	50.70	56.57	45.99
Dynamic	20.86	52.00	29.46	48.03	48.03	47.68	53.85	42.84

3.2 Processing Pipelines

The processing pipelines consist of preprocessing to select appropriate answers, question generation, and postprocessing to filter undesirable questions (see Fig. 3-1).




Figure 3-1: TP3 Architecture

3.2.1 Preprocessing

We observe that how to choose an answer would affect the quality of a question generated for the answer. We use a combination of NLP tools and algorithms to construct a preprocessing pipeline for selecting appropriate answers as follows:

1. *Remove unsuitable sentences.* We first remove all interrogative and imperative sentences from the given article. We may do so by, for instance, simply removing any sentence that begins with a WH word or a verb and any sentence that ends with a question mark. We then use semantic-role labeling (72) to analyze sentences and remove those that do not have any one of the following semantic-role tags: subject, verb, and object. For each remaining sentence, if the total number of words contained in it, excluding stop words, is less than 4, then remove this sentence. We then label the remaining sentences as *suitable* sentences.
2. *Remove candidate answers with inappropriate semantic-role labels.* Nouns and phrasal nouns are candidate answers. But not any noun or phrasal noun would be suitable to be an answer. We’d want a candidate answer to associate with a specific meaning. Specifically, if a noun in a suitable sentence is identified as a name entity (57) or has a semantic-role label in the set of {ARG, TMP, LOC, MNR, CAU, DIR}, then keep it as a candidate answer and remove the rest, where ARG represents subject or object, TMP represents time, LOC represents location, MNR represents manner, CAU represents cause, and DIR represents direction. If a few candidate nouns occur consecutively, we treat the sequence of these nouns as a candidate answer phrase.

For example, in the sentence “The engineers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) have taken it a step further changing the actual composition of plants in order to get them to perform diverse, even unusual functions”, the phrase “Massachusetts Institute of Technology” is recognized as a named entity, without a semantic-role label. Thus, it should not be selected as an answer. If it is selected, then the following QAP (“Where is MIT located”, “Massachusetts Institute of Technology”) will be generated, which is inadequate.

3. *Remove or prune answers with inadequate POS tags.* Using semantic-role labels to identify what nouns to keep does not always work. For example, the phrasal noun “This widget” in the sentence “This widget is more technologically advanced now” has a semantic-role label of ARG1 (subject), which leads to the generation of the following question: “What widget is more technologically advanced now?” It is evident that this QAP is inadequate even though it is grammatically correct. Note that “This” has a POS (part-of-speech) tag of PDT (predeterminer). For another example, while the word “now” in the sentence has a semantic-role label of TMP (time), its POS tag is RB (adverb). In general, we remove nouns with a POS tag in {RB, RP, CC, DT, IN, MD, PDT, PRP, WP, WDT, WRB} or prune words with such a POS tag at either end of a phrasal noun. After this treatment, the candidate answer “now” is removed and the candidate answer phrase “This widget” is pruned to “widget”. For this answer and the input sentence, the following question is generated: “What is more technologically advanced now?” Evidently this question is more adequate.
4. *Remove common answers.* We observe that certain candidate answers, such as “anyone”, “people”, and “stuff”, would often lead to generation of inadequate questions. Such words tend to be common words that should be removed. We do so by looking up the probabilities of 1-grams from the Google Books Ngram Dataset (43). If the probability of a noun word is greater than 0.15%, we remove its candidacy. Likewise, we may also treat noun phrases by looking up the probabilities n -grams for $n > 1$, but doing so would incur much more processing time.
5. *Filtering answers appearing in clauses.* We observe that a candidate answer appearing in the latter part of a clause would often lead to a generation of an inadequate QAP. Such candidate answers would appear at lower levels in a dependency tree. We use the following procedure to identify such candidate answers: For each remaining sentence s , we first generate its dependency tree (80). Let h_s be the height of the tree. Suppose that a candidate answer a appears

in a clause contained in s . If a is a single noun, let its height in the tree be h_a . If a is a phrasal noun, let the average height of the heights of the words contained in a be h_a . If $h_a \geq \frac{2}{3}h_s$, then remove a .

Take the following sentence as an example: “While I tend to buy a lot of books, these three were given to me as gifts, which might add to the meaning I attach to them.” In this sentences, the following noun “gifts” and phrasal nouns “a lot of books” and “the meaning I attach to them” are labeled as object. However, T5 resolves multiple objects poorly, and if we choose “the meaning I attach to them” as an answer, T5 will generate the following question: “What did the gifts add to the books”, which is inadequate. Since this phrasal noun appears in a clause and at a lower level of the dependency tree, it is removed from being selected as a candidate answer.

6. *Removing redundant answers.* If a candidate answer word or phrase is contained in another candidate answer phrase and appear in the same sentence, we extract from the dependency tree of the sentence the subtree T_s for the shorter candidate phrase and subtree T_l for the longer candidate phrase, then T_s is also a subtree of T_l . If T_s and T_l share the same root, then the shorter candidate answer is more syntactically important than the longer one, and so we remove the longer candidate answer. Otherwise, remove the shorter candidate answer.

Take the sentence “The longest track and field event at the Summer Olympics is the 50-kilometer race walk, which is about five miles longer than the marathon” as an example. The shorter phrase “Summer Olympics” is recognized as a named entity, which leads to the generation of the following inadequate QAP: (“What is the longest track and field event”, “Summer Olympics”). On the other hand, the longer phrase “The longest track and field event at the Summer Olympics” is labeled as subject for its semantic role, which leads to the generation of the following adequate QAP: (“What is the 50-kilometer race walk”, “The longest track and field event at the Summer Olympics”). Since the root word for the longer phrase is “event” that is not contained in the shorter phrase, so the

shorter phrase is removed to avoid generating the inadequate QAP.

3.2.2 Question generation

After extracting all candidate answers from the preprocessing pipeline, for each answer extracted, we use three adjacent sentences as the context, with the middle sentence containing the answer, and concatenate the answer and the context with marks into the following format as input to a fine-tuned T5 model: $\langle answer \rangle answer_text \langle context \rangle context_text$, to generate candidate questions. We note that the greedy search in the decoder of the T5 model does not guarantee the optimal result, we use beam search with 3 beams to select the word sequences with the top 3 probabilities from the probability distribution and acquire 3 candidate questions. We then concatenate each candidate question with the corresponding answer as a new sentence and generate an embedding vector representation for it using the pretrained RoBERTa-Large model (34; 66), and select the most semantically similar question to the context as the final target question.

3.2.3 Postprocessing

Recall that in the preprocessing pipeline, we have removed inappropriate candidate answers. However, some of the remaining answers may still lead to generating inappropriate questions. Thus, in the postprocessing pipeline, we proceed to remove inadequate questions as follows:

1. *Remove questions that contain the answers.* Remove a question if the corresponding answer or the main body of the answer is contained in the question. If the answer includes a clause, we extract the main body of the answer as follows: Parse the answer to constituency tree (21) and remove the subtree rooted with a subordinate clause label SBAR, the remaining part of the phrase is the main body of the answer.

For example, in the sentence “The first, which I take to reading every spring is Ernest Hemningway’s A Moveable Feast”, “The first, which I take to reading every spring” is labeled as subject. Using it as a candidate answer generates an

inadequate question for the answer “What is the first book I reread?” Note that the phrase “The first” can be extracted as the main body of the answer, which is contained in the question. Thus, this QAP is removed.

2. *Remove short questions.* If the generated question, after removing stop words, consists of only one word, then remove the question. For example, “What is it?” and “Who is she?” will be removed because after removing stop words, the former becomes “What” and the latter becomes “Who”. On the other hand, “Where is Boston?” will remain.
3. *Remove unsuitable questions.* Recall that we generate the question from the adjacent three sentences in the article, with the middle sentence containing the answer. However, the middle sentence may not be the only sentence containing the answer. In other words, the first or the last sentences may also contain the answer. Assuming that all three sentences contain the answer, our finetuned T5 transformer may generate a question based on the first sentence or the last sentence. If the first sentence or the last sentence is not a suitable sentence we labeled in the preprocessing pipeline, the question being generated may be inappropriate. We’d want to make sure that the question is generated for a suitable sentence. For this purpose, we first identify which sentence the question is generated for. In particular, let s_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ be the 3 sentences and (q, a) be the question generated for answer a . Let QA denote the union of the set of words in q and the set of words in a . Likewise, let S_i be the set of words in s_i . If $QA \cap S_i$ is the largest among the other two intersections, then q is likely generated from s_i for a . If s_i is not suitable, then remove q .

Note that we may also consider word sequences in addition to word sets. For example, we may consider longest common subsequences or longest common substrings when comparing two word sequences. But in our experiments, they don’t seem to add extra benefits.

3.3 Running Samples

Suppose that the following sentences are given as a article:

Returning to a book you've read many times can feel like drinks with an old friend. There's a welcome familiarity - but also sometimes a slight suspicion that time has changed you both, and thus the relationship. But books don't change, people do. And that's what makes the act of rereading so rich and transformative. The beauty of rereading lies in the idea that our bond with the work is based on our present mental register. It's true, the older I get, the more I feel time has wings. But with reading, it's all about the present. It's about the now and what one contributes to the now, because reading is a give and take between author and reader. Each has to pull their own weight. There are three books I reread annually. The first, which I take to reading every spring is Ernest Hemningway's A Moveable Feast. Published in 1964, it's his classic memoir of 1920s Paris. The language is almost intoxicating, an aging writer looking back on an ambitious yet simpler time. Another is Annie Dillard's Holy the Firm, her poetic 1975 ramble about everything and nothing. The third book is Julio Cortazar's Save Twilight: Selected Poems, because poetry. And because Cortazar. While I tend to buy a lot of books, these three were given to me as gifts, which might add to the meaning I attach to them. But I imagine that, while money is indeed wonderful and necessary, rereading an author's work is the highest currency a reader can pay them. The best books are the ones that open further as time passes. But remember, it's you that has to grow and read and reread in order to better understand your friends.

The following QAPs are generated by TP3:

1. Question: Who wrote Holy the Firm?

Answer: Annie Dillard

2. Question: Who wrote A Moveable Feast?

Answer: Ernest Hemningway

3. Question: What is the first book I reread every spring?

Answer: Ernest Hemningway’s A Moveable Feast

4. Question: Which book by Annie Dillard is a 1975 ramble about everything and nothing?

Answer: Holy the Firm

5. Question: What is the name of the book I reread every year?

Answer: Julio Cortazar’s Save Twilight

6. Question: What Ernest Hemingway book do I reread every spring?

Answer: A Moveable Feast

7. Question: What is intoxicating about Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast?

Answer: The language

8. Question: How many books do I tend to buy?

Answer: a lot of books

9. Question: Who is Ernest Hemningway?

Answer: an aging writer

10. Question: Rereading an author’s work is what do I imagine a reader can pay them?

Answer: the highest currency

3.4 Evaluations

To evaluate the quality of QAPs generated by TP3-Base and TP3-Large, we use the standard automatic evaluation metrics as well as human judgments.

3.4.1 Automatic evaluations

We first compare T5-SQuAD₁ with the exiting QG models with the standard automatic evaluation metrics as before: BLEU, ROUGE-1 (R1), ROUGE-2 (R2), ROUGE-L (RL), ROUGE-LSum (RLsum), METEOR (MTR), and BERTScore (BScore). Since most existing QG models are based on pretrained transformers with the base dataset, we will compare T5-Base-SQuAD₁ with the existing QG models.

Table 3.3: Automatic evaluation results

Model	Size	BLEU	R1	R2	RL	RLsum	MTR	BScore	Average
ProphetNet	Large	22.88	51.37	29.48	47.11	47.09	41.46	49.31	41.24
BART-hl	Base	21.13	51.88	29.43	48.00	48.01	40.23	54.33	41.86
BART-SQuAD	Base	22.09	52.75	30.56	48.79	48.78	41.39	54.86	42.75
T5-hl	Base	23.19	53.52	31.22	49.40	49.40	42.68	55.48	43.56
T5-SQuAD	Base	23.74	54.12	31.84	49.82	49.81	43.63	55.68	44.09
MixQG ₁	Base	23.53	54.39	32.06	50.05	50.02	43.83	55.66	44.22
MixQG ₂	Base	23.74	54.28	32.23	50.35	50.34	43.91	55.71	44.37
MixQG-SQuAD	Base	23.46	54.48	32.18	50.14	50.10	44.15	55.82	44.33
T5-SQuAD ₁	Base	22.62	54.87	32.20	50.99	50.98	48.98	55.82	45.21

Table 3.3 shows automatic evaluation comparison results with ProphetNet (59), BART (29), T5 (62) and MixQG (50). BART-SQuAD, T5-SQuAD, and MixQG-SQuAD are corresponding models finetuned on the SQuAD dataset. BART-hl and T5-hl are augmented models using the “highlight” encoding scheme introduced by Chan and Fan (9).

The results of MixQG₁ were presented in the original paper (50), and the results of MixQG₂ were computed by us using the pretrained model posted on HuggingFace (<https://huggingface.co/Salesforce/mixqg-base>). The results show that, except BLEU, T5-SQuAD₁ outperforms all other models on the ROUGE and METEOR metrics, produces the same BERTScore score as that of MixQG-SQuAD. Overall, T5-SQuAD₁ performs better than all the models in comparison.

3.4.2 Manual evaluations of TP3

A number of publications (e.g., see (7; 33; 52)) have shown that the aforementioned automatic evaluation metrics based on n-gram similarities do not always correlate well with human judgments about the answerability of a question. Thus, we’d also need to

use human experts to evaluate the qualities of QAPs generated by TP3. We do so on the Gaokao-EN dataset consisting of 85 articles, where each article contains 15 to 20 sentences. We chose Gaokao-EN because expert evaluations are provided to us from a project we work on. Table 3.4 depicts the evaluation results. Title abbreviations are explained below, where the numbers in boldface are the best in the corresponding columns:

1. **Total** means the total number of QAPs generated by TP3.
2. **ADQT** means the total number of adequate QAPs. These QAPs can be directly used without any modification.
3. **ACPT** means the total number of QAPs where the question, while semantically correct, contains a minor English issue that can be corrected with a minor effort. For example, a question may simply be missing a word or a phrase at the end. Such QAPs may be deemed acceptable.
4. **UA** means unacceptable QAPs.
5. **ADQT-R** means the ratio of the adequate QAPs over all the QAPs being generated.
6. **ACPT-R** means the ratio of the adequate and acceptable QAPs over all the QAPs being generated.

Table 3.4: Manual evaluation results for TP3-Base and TP3-Large over Gaokao-EN

TP3	Learning Rate	Total	ADQT	ACPT	UA	ADQT-R	ACPT-R
Base	3e-5	1290	1145	63	82	88.76	93.64
Large	3e-5	1287	1162	49	76	90.29	94.09
	1e-5	1271	1166	39	76	91.74	94.81
	8e-6	1270	1162	39	69	91.50	94.57
	6e-6	1273	1172	45	56	92.07	95.60
	Dynamic	1288	1116	51	121	86.65	90.61

Chapter 4

Sequence-learning-based Question Generation

We present a learning scheme to generate QAPs via meta sequence representations of sentences. A meta sequence is a sequence of vectors comprising semantic and syntactic tags.

In particular, we use a sequence of vectors to represent a sentence, where each vector consists of a semantic-role (SR) tag, a part-of-speech (POS) tag, and other syntactic and semantic tags, and we refer to such a sequence as a *meta sequence*. We then present a scheme called MetaQA to learn meta sequences of declarative sentences and the corresponding interrogative sentences from a training dataset. Combining and removing redundant meta sequences yields a set called MSDIP (Meta-Sequence-Declarative-Interrogative Pairs), with each element being a pair of an MD and corresponding MI(s), where MD and MI stand for, respectively, a meta sequence for a declarative sentence and for an interrogative sentence. A trained MetaQA model generates QAPs for a given declarative sentence s as follows: Generate a meta sequence for s , find a best-matched MD from MSDIP, generates meta sequences for interrogative sentences according to the corresponding MIs and the meta sequence of s , identifies the meta-sequence answer to each MI, and coverts them back to text to form a QAP.

Our objective is to generate adequate QAPs on a given declarative sentence written in a given language L . We assume that L has an oracle O_L to provide syntactic and

semantic information on a given sentence.

1. O_L can distinguish simple sentences (i.e., there is only one predicate) and complex sentences (i.e., there are two or more predicates). A complex sentence has two kinds: The first kind consists of a simple sentence as a main clause and a few subordinate clauses (simple or complex sentences) or sentence segments with normalized verbs. The second kind consists of a few independent sentences (simple or complex) connected by conjunction.
2. O_L can segment sentences into a sequence of basic units. A basic unit could be a phrasal verb, a phrasal noun, or simply a word that does not belong to any phrase (if any) contained in the sentence.
3. O_L can assign each basic unit in a sentence with an SR tag and a POS tag. For a complex sentence of the first kind, O_L can tag the main clause as a simple sentence and each subordinate clause with one SR tag (such as time and cause), and tag each subordinate clause itself as a sentence. For a complex sentence of the second kind, O_L simply separates the sentence into a collection of individual sentences and tags them accordingly. Moreover, O_L may be able to produce other semantic or syntactic tags for each basic unit.
4. O_L can identify an interrogative pronoun by a POS tag. An interrogative sentence, however, may or may not include an interrogative pronoun.

For example, exiting NLP tools for the English language provide a reasonable approximation to such an oracle. Better approximations are expected when more NLP techniques are developed.

Definition 1. Let $k \geq 2$ be a number of tags that O_L can assign to a basic unit. A k -semantic-syntactic unit (k -SSU) is a k -dimensional vector of tags, denoted by (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k) , where t_1 is an SR tag, t_2 is a POS tag, and t_i ($i > 2$) represent other tags of fixed types.

For example, we may add an NE tag to a basic unit to form a 3-SSU; adding one more tag on sentiment forms a 4-SSU. Let $U = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k)$ be an SSU. Denote by $U.i = t_i$ ($i \geq 1$). The prefix k is omitted when there is no confusion.

Two consecutive SSUs A and B with $A.1 = B.1$ (i.e., they have the same SR tag) and A appearing on the left side of B in a sentence may be merged to a new SSU C as follows: (1) If $A = B$, then set $C \leftarrow A$. (2) Otherwise, based on the underlying language L , either set $C.2 \leftarrow A.2$ (i.e., use the POS tag on the left) or set $C.2 \leftarrow B.2$. For the rest of the tags in C , select a corresponding tag in A or B according to L . The following proposition is evident:

Proposition 1. *For any sequence of SSUs, after merging, the new sequence of SSUs does not have two consecutive SSUs with the same SR tag.*

To accommodate the situation without proper segmentation of phrasal verbs, it is desirable to allow a fixed number of consecutive SSUs to have the same SR tag in a meta sequence.

Definition 2. *A meta sequence is a sequence of SSUs such that each SR tag appears at most r times, with interrogative pronouns (if any) left as is without tagging, where $r \geq 1$ is a positive constant.*

We assume the availability of *sentence segmentation* that can segment a complex sentence to form simple sentences for each clause (main and subordinate), and we treat such a sentence as a set of simple sentences. If a clause itself is a complex sentence, it can be further segmented as a set of simple sentences. A declarative sentence consists of at least three different SR tags corresponding to subject, object, and predicate.

Since a complex sentence can be treated as a list of simple sentences, MetaQA learns meta sequences of declarative sentences and the corresponding interrogative sentences from a training dataset consisting of such pairs of sentences, where a declarative sentence is a simple sentence.

However, there are complex sentence that are not easily segmented into a set of simple sentences using the existing NLP tools. To represent this type of complex sentences, we may define a meta sequence as a recursive list of SSUs with a tree structure to represent a sentence using the notion of *list* in the LISP programming language. This will be addressed in a separate paper.

MetaQA consists of two phases: learning and generation. In the learning phase, MetaQA learns meta sequence pairs from an initial training dataset to generate an initial MSDIP. In the generation phase, it takes a declarative sentence as input and generates QAPs using MSDIP. Figure 4-1 depicts the general architecture and data flow of MetaQA, which consists of six components: Preprocessing (PP), Meta Sequence Generation (MSG), Meta Sequence Learning (MSL), Meta Sequence Matching (MSM), and QAP Generation (QAPG)




Figure 4-1: MetaQA architecture and data flow

Both phases use the same PP and MSG components. The PP component is responsible for tagging basic units in a given sentence (declarative or interrogative) with SR tags, POS tags, and other syntactic and semantic tags, and segmenting complex sentences into a set of simple sentences using oracle O_L . The MSG component is responsible for merging SSUs to form a meta sequence. Moreover, for an input sentence in the generation phase, MSG also maps each SSU after merging to the underlying text.

4.1 Learning phase

The MSL component removes redundant meta sequences for each pair of MD and MI generated from MSG and stores the remaining pairs in the MSDIP database. Recall that an interrogative pronoun identified by POS tag in an MI is left as is without using its SSU

Note that for any language, k is a constant, so are the number of SR tags, the number of POS tags, and the number of other tags. The following proposition is straightforward.

Proposition 2. (1) *For a given language, the length of a meta sequence is bounded above by a constant, so is the size of MSDIP.* (2) *The length of a meta sequence for a declarative sentence is at least 3.*

4.2 Generation phase

Let M be a meta sequence. Denote by M' the set of SSUs contained in M and $|M|$ the size of M' . After MetaQA is trained, it generates QAPs from a given declarative sentences s using the following *QAP-generation algorithm*, where X_s is the meta sequence for s generated from MSG. Recall that the text for each SSU is stored in the SSU-Text Map.

Step 1. Find a meta sequence MD X from (MD, MI) pairs in MSDIP that is the *best match* of X_s . This means that the longest common substring of X and X_s , denoted by $Z = \text{LCS}(X, X_s)$, is the longest among all MDs in MSDIP. A substring is a sub-sequence of consecutive SSUs. If Z contains SSUs for, respectively, a subject, a predicate, and an object, then we say that it is a *successful* match. If furthermore, $Z = X = X_s$, then we say that it is a *perfect* match. If Z is missing a subject SSU, a predicate SSU, or an object SSU, then it is an *unsuccessful* matching. If a match is successful, got Step 2. If a match is unsuccessful or successful but not perfect, then notify the user that MetaQA needs to learn a new pattern and ask for interrogative sentences for s from the user. After this, go to Step 2.

Step 2. The goal is to generate all possible interrogative sentences for s . For each pair $(X, Y) \in \text{MSDIP}$, generate a meta sequence Y_s from Y with

$$Y'_s = [Y' - (X' \cap Y' - X'_s)] \cup (X'_s - Z').$$

This means that Y'_s is obtained from Y' by removing SSUs that are in both meta

sequences in the matched pair but not in the input sentence, and adding SSUs in the input sentence but not in the matched MD. Since $Z = \text{LCS}(X, X_s)$, the following proposition is straightforward:

Proposition 3. $X'_s - Z' = X'_s - X'$.

Order SSUs in Y'_s appropriately to form Y_s , which requires localization according to the underlying language. If an SSU in Y'_s has the corresponding text stored in Step 1, then replace it. If not, then it requires localization to resolve it. This generate an interrogative sentence Q_s for s .

Step 3. For each interrogative sentence Q_s generated in Step 3, the SSUs in $A'_s = X' - Y'$ represent a correct answer. Place SSUs in A'_s in the same order as in X'_s and replace each SSU with the corresponding text in s to obtain an answer A_s for Q_s .

4.3 An Implementation of MetaQA for English

SR, POS, and NE tags are used in this implementation. Existing NLP tools for generating these tags are for words, not for phrases. We could, however, use phrase segmentation to resolve this by appropriate merging operations. While word segmentation is not needed in alphabetic languages such as English, phrase segmentation provides a better interpretation of the underlying sentence. We first assume the existence of an ideal phrase segmentation for English, and then discuss how to get around it at the end of this section.

4.3.1 Preliminaries

The following NLP tools are used to generate tags: Semantic-Role Labeling (SRL) (71) for SR tags, POS Tagging (78) for POS tags, and Named-Entity Recognition (NER) (56) for NE tags.

SR tags are defined in PropBank¹ (5; 40), which consist of three types: ArgN (arguments of predicates), ArgM (modifiers or adjuncts of the predicates) , and V

¹<https://verbs.colorado.edu/~mpalmer/projects/ace/EPB-annotation-guidelines.pdf>

(predicates). ArgN consists of six tags: ARG0, ARG1, . . . , ARG5, and ArgM consist of multiple subtypes such as LOC as location, EXT as extent, DIS as discourse connectives, ADV as general purpose, NEG as negation, MOD as modal verb, CAU as cause, TMP as time, PRP as purpose, MNR as manner, GOL as goal, and DIR as direction.

POS tags² are defined in the Penn Treebank tagset (78; 39). For example, NNP is for singular proper noun, VBZ for third-person-singular-present-tense verb, DT for determiner, and IN for preposition or subordinating conjunction.

NE tags include PER for persons, ORG for organization, LOC for locations, and numeric expressions for time, date, money, and percentage.

4.3.2 PP, MSG, and MSL Localization

The PP, MSG, and MSL components, on top of what is described in Section 4.2, incur the following localization. PP first replaces contractions and slang with words or phrases to help improve tagging accuracy. For example, contractions *'m*, *'s*, *'re*, *'ve*, *n't*, *e.g.*, *i.e.*, *a.k.a.* are replaced by, respectively, *am*, *is*, *are*, *have*, *not*, *for example*, *that is*, *also known as*. Slang *gonna*, *wanna*, *gotta*, *gimme*, *lemme*, *ya* are replaced by, respectively, *going to*, *want to*, *got to*, *give me*, *let me*, *you*.

PP then segments sentences and tags words in sentences using SRL, POS Tagging, and NER for the training dataset and later for input sentences for generating QAPs. Use SRL to segment a complex sentence into a set of simple sentences and discard all simple sentences without a subject or an object. Note that there are complex sentences that are hard to segment using SRL. Moreover, for each sentence, PP removes all the words with a CC (coordinating conjunction) as POS tag before its subject, including *and*, *but*, *for*, *or*, *plus*, *so*, *therefore*, and *because*.

MSG then merges the remaining SSUs if two consecutive SSUs are identical. If they are not identical but have the same SR tag, then use this SR tag in the merged SSU, and the POS tag in the first SSU from the right. If they contain a noun, use the first SSU from the right with a noun POS tag. Moreover, the NE tag in the merged

²https://www.ling.upenn.edu/courses/Fall_2003/ling001/penn-treebank-pos.html

SSU is null if both SSUs contain a null NE tag; otherwise, use the first non-empty NE tag from the right.

4.3.3 MSM Localization

The MSM component takes a meta sequence X_s of a sentence s as input and executes Step 1 in the QAP-generation algorithm described in Section 4.2 using Ukkone’s Suffix-Tree algorithm (79) to compute a longest common substring of two meta sequences, which runs in linear time. During matching, the POS tags for various types of nouns are treated equal; they are NN, NNP, NNS, and NNPS, The POS tags for third-person-singular-present verbs are treated equal; they are VBP and VBZ. To use Ukkone’s algorithm,, we encode a meta sequence as a sequence of symbols using / to separate tags in an SSU. That is, vector (t_1, t_2, t_3) is now written as $t_1/t_2/t_3$. If t_2 is null, then write it as $t_1//t_3$. If t_3 is null, then write it as $t_1/t_2/$. If both are null, then write it as $t_1//$. SSUs in a sequence are just written as concatenation. For example, the sentence “Abraham Lincoln the 16th president of the United States” has the following SSUs:

Abraham (ARG1/NNP/PER) Lincoln (ARG1/NNP/PER) was (V/VBZ/) the (ARG2/DT/) 16th (ARG2/JJ/) president (ARG2/NN/) of (ARG2/IN/) the (ARG2/DT/) United (ARG2/NNP/LOC) States (ARG2/NNP/LOC).

The meta sequence for this sentence is, after merging: ARG1/NNP/PER V/VBZ/ ARG2/NNP/LOC.

Let X be an MD in MSDIP such that $\text{LCS}(X, X_s)$ is the longest among all MDs in MDDIP, denoted by Z .

4.3.4 QAPG Localization

The QAPG component executes Steps 2–3 in the QAP-generation algorithm described in Section 4.2. Recall that $Z = \text{LCS}(X, X_s)$ is the longest match among all MDs in MSDIP, and after the set of SSUs Y'_s is generated, localization is needed to form Y_s .

Case 1: $Z = X_s$. Then $Y_s = Y$.

Case 2: Z is a proper substring of X_s . Then each SSU in $X'_s - Z$ appears either before Z or after Z . Form a string Y_b and Y_a of the SSUs that appear, respectively, before and after Z in the same order as they appear in X_s . Let $Y_s = [Y - (X' \cap Y' - X'_s)]Y_aY_b$, where $Y - (X' \cap Y' - X'_s)$ means to remove from Y the SSUs in $X' \cap Y' - X'_s$.

For each SSU in Y_s if a corresponding text can be found in the SSU-Text Map, then replace it with the text. An SSU that doesn't have a matched text in the SSU-Text Map is due to the helping verbs added in the interrogative sentence that generates Y . There are five POS tags for verbs: VBG for gerund or present participle, VBD past tense, VBN past participle, VBP non-3rd person singular present, and VBZ 3rd person singular present. Present participle and past participle have already included helping verbs, and so do the negative forms of past tense and present tense. Thus, only positive forms of past tense (VBD) and present tense (VBP, VBZ) do not include helping verbs, which need to be resolved.

Rule for resolving helping verbs

The first V-SSU in Y (i.e., the SSU that contains the SR tag of V) is a helping verb. To determine its form, check the POS tag in the subject SSU (usually it is ARG0) and determine if it is singular or plural. Then check the POS tag in the first V-SSU in Y to determine the tense. Replace the second V-SSU with the verb in its original form for the V-SSU in the SSU-Text MAP.

For example, suppose that the following declarative sentence “John traveled to Boston last week” and its interrogative sentence about location “Where did John travel to last week” are in the training dataset, which generate the following SSUs before merging:

John (ARG0/NNP/PER) traveled (V/VBD/) to (ARG1/IN/) Boston (ARG1/NNP/LOC) last (TMP/NN/) week (TMP/NN/).

Where (Where) did (V/VBD) John (ARG0/NNP/PER) travel (V/VB/) to (ARG1/IN/) last (TMP/NN/) week (TMP/NN/)?

Since “travel to” is a phrasal verb, after merging, we have

John (ARG0/NNP/PER) traveled to (V/VBD/) Boston (ARG1/NNP/LOC) last week (TMP/NN/).

Where (Where) did (V/VBD) John (ARG0/NNP/PER) travel to (V/VB/) last week (TMP/NN/)?

The following meta-sequence pair (X, Y) is learned for MSDIP:

$X = \text{ARG0/NNP/PER V/VBD/ ARG1/NNP/LOC TMP/NN/}$

$Y = \text{Where V/VBD/ ARG0/NNP/PER V/VB/ TMP/NN/}$

Suppose that we are given a sentence $s = \text{“Mary flew to London last month.”}$. Its meta sequence X_s is exactly the same as X , with ARG0/NNP/PER for “Mary”, V/VBD/ for “flew to”, ARG1/NNP/LOC for “London”, and TMP/NN/ for “last month”, which are stored in the SSU-Text Map. Thus, $Y_s = Y$. We can see that the SSU of V/VB/ in Y is not in the SSU-Text Map. To resolve the unmatched V/VB/, check the POS tag in the ARG0-SSU, which is NNP, indicating a singular noun. The POS tag in the first V-SSU is VBD, indicating past tense. Thus, the correct form of the helping verb is “did”. The text for V/VBD is “flew to” in the SSU-Text Map. The original form of the verb is “fly”. Thus, the second V-SSU is replaced with “fly”. This generates the following interrogative sentence: “Where did Mary fly to last month?” The answer SSU is $X' - Y'$, which is ARG1/NNP/LOC, corresponding to “London”.

4.3.5 SSU Merging without Segmentation

To the best of our knowledge, no tools exist at this point that can segment English sentences to identify phrasal nouns and phrasal verbs. It is worth mentioning that AutoPhrase (70) can be used for identifying certain phrasal nouns. We could deal with phrasal verbs using a list of common phrasal verbs or by modifying merging operations. A phrasal verb consists of a preposition or an adverb, or both. There are four POS tags IN for preposition or subordinating conjunction, RB for adverb, RBR for comparative adverb, and RBS for superlative adverb.

To see this problem, let us look at the same example aforementioned. After merging, we have

John (ARG0/NNP/PER) traveled (V/VBD/) to Boston (ARG1/NNP/LOC) last week (TMP/NN/).

Where (Where) did (V/VBD/) John (ARG0/NNP/PER) travel (V/VB/) to (ARG1/IN/) last week (TMP/NN/)?

For the input sentence we have

Mary (ARG0/NNP/PER) flew (V/VBD/) to London (ARG1/NNP/LOC) last moth (TMP/NN/).

The interrogative sentence is “Where did Mary fly ARG1/IN/ last week?” after replacing SSUs with text in the SSU-Text Map, with ARG1/IN/ unmatched with text. We can resolve this by modifying the merging operation as follows: When an SSU with a POS tag for preposition or adverb appears before or after a V-SSU, leave it as is without merging it with its neighboring SSUs of the same SR tag, unless the POS tags in them are also for prepositions or adverbs. The rest of the merging operations are the same. Then we have, after merging,

John (ARG0/NNP/PER) traveled (V/VBD/) to (ARG1/IN/) Boston (ARG1/NNP/LOC) last week (TMP/NN/).

Where (Where) did (V/VBD/) John (ARG0/NNP/PER) travel (V/VB/) to (ARG1/IN/) last week (TMP/NN/)?

Now the input sentence becomes, after SSU merging,

Mary (ARG0/NNP/PWR) flew (V/VBD) to (ARG1/IN/) London (ARG1/NNP/LOC) last moth (TMP/NN/).

All the SSUs in the meta sequence “Where V/VBD/ ARG0/NNP/PER V/VB/ ARG1/IN/ TMP/NN/” have corresponding text in the SSU-Text Map after resolving for helping verbs. The answer SSU is in $X' - Y' = \text{ARG1/NNP/LOC}$, which is “London”.

4.4 Running Samples

Example 1. Suppose that the following declarative sentence and the corresponding two interrogative sentences are given as training data at the learning phase:

“Amanda has a story book on the American history.”

“Who has a story book on the American history?”

“What does Amanda have?”

PP generates corresponding SSUs as follows:

Amanda (ARG0/NNP/PER) has (V/VBZ/) a (ARG1/NN/) nice (ARG1/NN/) textbook (ARG1/NN/) on (ARG1/NN/) programming (ARG1/NN/).

Who (Who) has (V/VBZ/) a (ARG1/NN/) nice (ARG1/NN/) textbook (ARG1/NN/) on (ARG1/NN/) programming (ARG1/NN/)?

What (What) does (V/VBZ/) Amanda (ARG0/NNP/PER) have (V/VB/)?

MSG merges SSUs and MSL places two pairs $(X_1, Y_{1,1})$ and $(X_1, Y_{1,2})$ in MSDIP if they are not already present, where

$X_1 = \text{ARG0/NNP/PER V/VBZ/ ARG1/NN/},$

$Y_{1,1} = \text{Who V/VBZ/ ARG1/NN/},$

$Y_{1,2} = \text{What V/VBZ/ ARG.}$

Suppose that the following two declarative sentences are given at the generation phrase:

$s_1 = \text{“Tom has a story book on the American history.”}$

$s_2 = \text{“Duncan Watts agrees with the conclusion.”}$

PP generates SSUs as follows, with “agrees with” recognized as a phrasal verb.

Tom (ARG0/NNP/PER) has (V/VBZ/) a (ARG1/NN/) story (ARG1/NN/) book (ARG1/NN/) on (ARG1/NN/) the (ARG1/NN/) American (ARG1/NN/) history (ARG1/NN/).

Duncan (ARG0/NNP/PER) Watts (ARG0/NNP/PER) agrees (V/VBZ/) with (ARG1/IN/) the (ARG1/NN/) conclusion (ARG1/NN/).

MSG merges SSUs, generates the following two meta sequences:

$X_{s_1} = X_{s_2} = \text{ARG0/NNP/PER V/VBZ/ ARG1/NN/},$

and places the following in the SSU-Text Map:

Tom (ARG0/NNP/PER) has (V/VBZ/) a story book on the American history (ARG1/NN/).

Duncan Watts (ARG0/NNP/PER) agrees with (V/VBZ/) the conclusion (ARG1/NN/).

MSM finds a match $X_1 = X_{s_1} = X_{s_2}$. QAPG generates

$Y_{s_1,1} = Y_{s_2,1} = \text{Who V/VBZ/ ARG1/NN/},$

$Y_{s_1,2} = Y_{s_2,2} = \text{What V/VBZ/ ARG0/NNP/PER V/VB/}.$

The corresponding interrogative sentences are, after applying the rule for resolving VB for $Q_{s_1,2}$ and $Q_{s_2,2}$:

$Q_{s_1,1} = \text{“Who has a story book on the American history?”}$

$Q_{s_1,2} = \text{“What does Tom have?”}$

$Q_{s_1,1} = \text{“Who agrees with the conclusion?”}$

$Q_{s_1,2} = \text{“What does Duncan Watts agree with?”}$

The SSU for the answer to $Y_{s_1,1}$ is ARG0/NNP/PER with “Tom” being the text and the answer to $Y_{s_1,2}$ is ARG1/NN/ with “a story book on American history” being the text. Likewise, the SSU for the answer to $Y_{s_2,1}$ is ARG0/NNP/PER with “Duncan Watts” being the text and the answer to $Y_{s_2,2}$ is ARG1/NN/ with “the conclusion” being the text.

Remark. Using the modified merging operation without using segmentation, we have $X_{s_2} = \text{ARG0/NNP/PER V/VBZ/ ARG1/IN/ ARG1/NN/}$, and so X is no longer a successful match. A new pattern is needed to learn for MSDIP.

Example 2. Suppose that the following two pairs of declarative and interrogative sentences are in the training dataset:

“A doughnut is a fried dough confection.”

“What is a doughnut?”

“Uranus is a unusual planet because it is tilted.”

“Why is Uranus an unusual planet?”

The SSUs for these sentences are

A (ARG1/NN/) doughnut (ARG1/NN/) is (V/VBZ/) a (ARG2/NN/) fried (ARG2/NN/) dough (ARG2/NN/) confection (ARG2/NN/).

What (What) is (V/VBZ/) a (ARG2/NN/) doughnut (ARG2/NN/)?

Uranus (ARG1/NNP/) is (V/VBZ/) an (ARG2/NN/) unusual (ARG2/NN/) planet (ARG2/NN/) because (CAU/VBN/) it (CAU/VBN/) is (CAU/VBN/) tilted

(CAU/VBN/).

Why (Why) is (V/VBZ/) Uranus (ARG1/NNP/) an (ARG2/NN/) unusual (ARG2/NN/) planet (ARG2/NN/)?

After merging SSUs, the following two meta-sequence pairs are learned:

$(X_2Y_2) = (\text{ARG1/NN/ V/VBZ/ ARG2/NN/}, \text{What V/VBZ/ ARG2/NN/}),$

$(X_3, Y_3) = (\text{ARG1/NNP/ V/VBZ/ ARG2/NN/ CAU/VBN/}, \text{Why V/VBZ/ ARG1/NNP/ ARG2/NN/}).$

Now suppose $s_3 =$ “The solar panel manufacturing industry is in the doldrums because supply far exceeds demand” is an input sentence for generating QAPs, which has the following SSUs:

The (ARG1/NN/) solar (ARG1/NN/) panel (ARG1/NN/) manufacturing (ARG1/NN/) industry (ARG1/NN/) is (V/VBZ/) in (ARG2/NN/) the (ARG2/NN/) doldrums (ARG2/NN/) because (CAU/NN/) supply (CAU/NN/) far (CAU/NN/) exceeds (CAU/NN/) demand (CAU/NN/).

After merging SSUs we have a meta sequence $X_{s_3} = \text{ARG1/NN/ V/VBZ/ ARG2/NN/ CAU/NN/}$ with the following SSU-Text Map:

The solar panel manufacturing industry (ARG1/NN/) is (V/VBZ/) in the doldrums (ARG2/NN/) because supply far exceeds demand (CAU/NN/).

We can see that $\text{LCS}(X_2, X_{s_3}) = \text{LCS}(X_3, X_{s_3}) = \text{ARG1/NN/ V/VBZ/ ARG2/NN/}$, which generates the following two meta sequences:

$Y_{s_3,1} = (\text{What V/VBZ/ ARG2/NN/}),$

$Y_{s_3,2} = (\text{Why V/VBZ/ ARG1/NNP/ ARG2/NN/ CAU/VBN/}, \text{where CAU/VBN/})$
 $\in X'_{s_3} - X'_2$ is added to Y_3 to get $Y_{s_3,2}$.

The corresponding interrogative sentences are, after applying the rule for resolving helping verbs:

$Q_{Y_{s_3,1}} = \text{“What is in the doldrums because supply far exceeds demand?”}$

$Q_{Y_{s_3,2}} = \text{“Why is the solar panel manufacturing industry in the doldrums?”}$

The answer to $Q_{Y_{s_3,1}}$ is the text for $\text{SSU} \in X'_2 - Y'_2 = \text{ARG1/NN/}$, which is “The solar panel manufacturing industry.” Likewise, the answer to $Q_{Y_{s_3,2}}$ is the text for $\text{SSU} \in X'_3 - Y'_3 = \text{CAU/NN/}$, which is “because supply far exceeds demand.”

4.5 Evaluations

To evaluate MetaQA, we need to have appropriate evaluation measures, training data, and evaluation data. BLUE (54), ROUGE (30), and Meteor (26) are standard evaluation metrics for measuring automatic summarization and machine translation, which are good for computing text similarity and have also been used to evaluate QG. Another commonly-used measure is human judgments. BLEU and ROUGE-N count the number of overlapping units between the candidate text and the reference text by using N-grams. ROUGE-L measures the cognateness between the candidate text and the reference text by using Longest common sub-sequence. Meteor compares the candidate text with the reference text in terms of exact, stem, synonym, and paraphrase matches between words and phrases. These metrics, however, do not evaluate grammatical correctness. Thus, human judgment is the only liable measure for grammatical correctness.

SQuAD (63) is a dataset that has been used for training and evaluating generative methods for QG. However, not all QAPs in SQuAD are well-formed or with correct answers. There are also about 20% of questions in the dataset that require paragraph-level information. Thus, SQuAD is unsuitable for evaluating QAPs for our purpose. Instead, we constructed an initial training dataset by writing a number of declarative sentences and the corresponding interrogative sentences to cover the major tense, participles, voice, modal verbs, and some common phrasal verbs such as “be going to” and “be about to” for the following six interrogative pronouns: *Where*, *Who*, *What*, *When*, *Why*, *How many*. A total of 112 meta-sequence pairs (MD, MI) were learned as the initial MSDIP.

To evaluate MetaQA, we extracted declarative sentences from the official SAT practice reading tests³, for the reason that SAT practice reading tests provide a large number of different patterns of declarative sentences. There are a total of eight SAT practice reading tests, each consisting of five articles and each article consisting of around 25 sentences, for a total of 40 articles and 1,136 sentences. After removing

³<https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/practice/full-length-practice-tests>

easy-to-identify interrogative sentences and imperative sentences, we harvested a total of 1,025 sentences (which may still contain imperative sentences). Using the initial MSDIP, MetaQA generated a total of 796 QAPs.

Three native Chinese speakers evaluated the QAPs on a shared Google doc file based on the following criteria: For questions: Check both syntax and semantics: (1) correct; (2) acceptable (e.g., a minor would make it correct); (3) not acceptable. For answers: (1) matched—the answer matches well with the question; (2) acceptable; (3) not acceptable. The final results were agreed by the three judges. Presented below are questions generated with detailed breakdowns in each category, where “all correct” means both syntactically and semantically correct and conforming to native-speaker norms, “not acceptable” means either syntactically or semantically unacceptable, and “How” means “How many”:

	Where	Who	What	When	Why	How	Total
MSDIP pairs	18	45	23	22	6	8	122
QAPs generated	26	216	466	51	15	22	796
All correct	21	208	458	51	15	20	773
Syntactically acceptable	4	4	3	0	0	2	13
Semantically acceptable	1	2	5	0	0	0	8
Not acceptable	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

The percentage of generated questions that are both syntactically and semantically correct is 97%. We noticed that there is a strong correlation between the correctness of the questions and their answers. In particular, when a generated question is all correct, its answer is also all correct. When a question is acceptable, its answer may be all correct or acceptable. Only when a question is unacceptable, its answer is also unacceptable.

The 13 incorrect but syntactically acceptable questions are mostly due to some minor issues in segmenting a complex sentence into simple sentences, where a better handling of sentence segmentation is expected to correct these issues. Two questions

whose interrogative pronoun should be “how much” are mistakenly using “how many”. Further refinement of POS tagging that distinguish uncountable nouns from countable nouns would solve this problem. The eight semantically acceptable questions are all due to NE tags that cannot distinguish between persons, location, and things. Further refinement of NE tagging will solve this problem. The two unacceptable questions are due to serious errors induced when segmenting complex sentences. This suggests that we should look into using a recursive list to represent complex sentences.

There were 589 sentences for which no matched meta sequences are found from the initial MSDIP. By learning new meta sequences from user inputs, 535 of these sentences found perfect matching, which generate QAPs that are both syntactically and semantically correct. For the remaining 84 sentences, some of them are imperative sentences without a clear structure of subject-predicate-object, and some are hard to segment into a set of simple sentences due to inaccurate SR tagging and so no appropriate (MD, MI) pairs were learned. This suggests that we should look into better sentence segmentation methods or meta trees as recursive lists of meta sequences to represent complex sentences as a whole, which is left for future work.

Chapter 5

Distractor Generation

Our distractor generation method takes the original article and the answer as input, and generates distractors as output. Figure 5-1 depicts the data flow of our method.




Figure 5-1: Distractor generation flowchart

Answers in QAPs are classified into two kinds. The first kind consists of just a single target word while the second kind consists of multiple target words. The latter is the case when the answer is a sentence or a sentence segment.

For an answer of the first kind, if it is a type-1 or type-2 target, we use the methods described in Section 5.1 to generate three distractors; if it is a type-3 target, we use the method described in Section 5.2 to generate distractor candidates. If there are at least three candidates, then select three candidates with the highest ranking scores.

For an answer of the second kind, for each type of a target word contained in it, we use the methods described in both Sections 5.1 and 5.2 to generate distractors for target words in a fixed ordered preference of subjects, objects, adjectives for subjects, adjectives for objects, predicates, adverbs, which can be obtained by semantic-role labeling. Target words are replaced according to the following preference: type-1 temporal, type-1 numerical value, type-2 person, type-2 location, type-2 organization, type-3 noun (phrasal noun), type-3 adjective, type-3 verb (phrasal verb), and type-3 adverb.

If the number of distractors for a given preference is less than three, then we generate extra distractors for a target word in the next preference. If all preference is gone through we still need more distractors, we could extend the selection threshold values to allow more candidates to be selected.

5.1 Distractors for Type-1 and Type-2 Targets

If a type-1 target is a point in time, a time range, a numerical number, an ordinal number, or anything that can be converted to a numerical number or an ordinal number (e.g. Friday may be converted to 5), which can be recognized by regular expressions based on a POS tagger, then we devise several algorithms to alter time and number, and randomly select one of these algorithms when generating distractors. For example, we may increase or decrease the answer value by one or two units, change the answer value at random from a small range of values around the answer, or simply change the answer value at random. If a numerical value or an ordinal number is converted from a word, then the result is converted back to the same form. For example, suppose that the target word is “Friday”, which is converted to a number 5. If the distractor is a number 4, then it is converted to Thursday.

If a type-2 target is a person, then we first look for different person names that appear in the article using an NE tagger to identify them, and then randomly choose a name as a distractor. If there are no other names in the article, then we use Synonyms (<http://www.synonyms.com>) or a domain knowledge base on notable

people we constructed to find a distractor. If a type-2 target is a location or an organization, we find a distractor in the same way by first looking for other locations or organizations in the article, and then using Synonyms and domain knowledge bases to look for them if they cannot be found in the article. For example, If the target word is a city, then a distractor should also be city that is "closely" related to the target word. Distractors to the answer word "New York" should be cities in the same league, such as "Boston", "Philadelphia", and "Chicago".

5.2 Distractors for Type-3 Targets

For a type-3 target, we find distractor candidates using word embeddings with similarity in a threshold interval (e.g., [0.6, 0.85]) so that a candidate is not too close nor too different from the correct answer and hypernyms using WordNet (46). Note that a similarity interval of [0.6, 0.85] for word embeddings often include antonyms of the target word, and we can use WordNet or an online dictionary to determine antonyms.

Not all distractor candidates are suitable. Thus, we first filter out unsuitable candidates as follows:

1. Remove distractor candidates that contain the target word, for it may be too close to the correct answer. For example, if "breaking news" is a generated distractor candidate for the target word "news", then it is removed from the candidate list since it contains the target word.
2. Remove distractor candidates that have the same prefix of the target word with edit distance less than three, for such candidates may often be misspelled words from the target word. For example, suppose the target word is "knowledge", then Word2vec may return a misspelled candidate "knowladge" with a high similarity, which should be removed.

We then rank each remaining candidate using the following measure:

1. Compute the Word2vec cosine similarity score S_v for each distractor candidate

w_c with the target word w_t . Namely,

$$S_v = \text{sim}(v(w_c), v(w_t)),$$

where $v(w)$ denotes a word embedding of w .

2. Compute the WordNet WUP score (82) S_n for each distractor candidate with the target word. If the distractor candidate cannot be found in the WordNet dataset, set the WUP score to 0.1 for the following reason: If a word with a high score of word-embedding similarity to the target word but does not exist in the WordNet dataset, then it is highly likely that the word is misspelled, and so its ranking score should be reduced.
3. Compute the edit distance score S_d of each distractor candidate with target word by the following formula:

$$S_d = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^E},$$

where E is the edit distance. Thus, a larger edit distance E results in a smaller score S_d .

4. Compute the final ranking score R for each distractor candidate w_c with respect to the target word w_t by

$$R'(w_c, w_t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}(2S_v + S_n + S_d), & \text{if } w_c \text{ is an} \\ & \text{antonym of } w_t, \\ \frac{1}{3}(S_v + S_n + S_d), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$R(w_c, w_t) = -R'(w_c, w_t) \log R'(w_c, w_t).$$

Note that S_v, S_n, S_d are each between 0 and 1, and so $R'(w_c, w_t)$ is between 0 and 1, which implies that $-\log R'(w_c, w_t) > 0$. Also note that we give more weight to antonyms.

5.3 Running Samples

Given below are a few adequate MCQs with automatically generated distractors by our method:

Example 1

Question: What does no man like to acknowledge? (SAT practice test 2 article 1)

Correct answer: that he has made a mistake in the choice of his profession.

Distractors:

1. that he has made a mistake in the choice of his association.
2. that he has made a mistake in the choice of his engineering.
3. that he has made a mistake in the way of his profession.

Example 2

When should ethics apply? (SAT practice test 2 article 2)

Correct answer: when someone makes an economic decision.

Distractors:

1. when someone makes an economic request.
2. when someone makes an economic proposition.
3. when someone makes a political decision.

Example 3

Question: What did Chie hear? (SAT practice test 1 article 1)

Correct answer: her soft scuttling footsteps, the creak of the door.

Distractors:

1. her soft scuttling footsteps, the creak of the driveway.
2. her soft scuttling footsteps, the creak of the stairwell.

3. her soft scuttling footsteps, the knock of the door.

Example 4

Question: Who might duplicate itself? (SAT practice test 1 article 3)

Correct answer: the deoxyribonucleic acid molecule.

Distractors:

1. the deoxyribonucleic acid coenzyme.
2. the deoxyribonucleic acid polymer.
3. the deoxyribonucleic acid trimer

Example 5

Question: When does Deep Space Industries of Virginia hope to be harvesting metals from asteroids? (SAT practice test 1 article 5)

Correct answer: by 2020.

Distractors:

1. by 2021.
2. by 2030.
3. by 2019.

Example 6

Question: What did a British study of the way women search for medical information online indicate? (SAT practice test 2 article 3)

Correct answer: An experienced Internet user can, at least in some cases, assess the trustworthiness and probable value of a Web page in a matter of seconds.

Distractors:

1. An experienced Supernet user can, at least in some cases, assess the trustworthiness and probable value of a Web page in a matter of seconds.

2. An experienced CogNet user can, at least in some cases, assess the trustworthiness and probable value of a Web page in a matter of seconds.
3. An inexperienced Internet user can, at least in some cases, assess the trustworthiness and probable value of a Web page in a matter of seconds.

Example 7

What does a woman know better than a man? (SAT test 2 article 4)

Correct answer: the cost of life.

Distractors:

1. the cost of happiness.
2. the cost of experience.
3. the risk of life.

Example 8

This example presents a distractor without sufficient distraction.

Question: What are subject to egocentrism, social projection, and multiple attribution errors?

Correct answer: their insights.

Distractors:

1. their perspectives.
2. their findings.
3. their valuables.

The last distractor can be spotted wrong by just looking at the question: It is easy to tell that it is out of place without the need to read the article.

5.4 Evaluations

We implemented our method using the latest versions of POS tagger¹, NE tagger (56), semantic-role labeling (71), and fastText (44). We used the US SAT practice reading tests² as a dataset for evaluations. There are a total of eight SAT practice reading tests, each consisting of five articles for a total of 40 articles. Each article in the SAT practice reading tests consists of around 25 sentences and we generated about 10 QAPs from each article. To evaluate our distractor generation algorithm, we selected independently at random slightly over 100 QAPs. After removing a smaller number of QAPs with pronouns as target words, we have a total of 101 QAPs for evaluations.

We generated 3 distractors for each QAP for a total of 303 distractors, and evaluated distractors based on the following criteria:

1. A distractor is *adequate* if it is grammatically correct and relevant to the question with distracting effects.
2. An MCQ is *adequate* if each of the three distractors is adequate.
3. An MCQ is *acceptable* if one or two distractors are adequate.

We define two levels of distracting effects: (1) *sufficient distraction*: It requires an understanding of the underlying article to choose the correct answer; (2) *distraction*: It only requires an understanding of the underlying question to choose the correct answer. A distractor has no distracting effect if it can be determined wrong by just looking at the distractor itself.

Evaluations were carried out by humans and the results are listed below:

1. All distractors generated by our method are grammatically correct.
2. 98% distractors (296 out of 303) are relevant to the QAP with distraction.
3. 96% distractors (291 out of 303) provide sufficient distraction.
4. 84% MCQs are adequate.

¹<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tagger.shtml>

²<https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/practice/full-length-practice-tests>

5. All MCQs are acceptable (i.e., with at least one adequate distractor).

Chapter 6

Conclusion

We presented 3 methods for generating MCQs.

1. TP3, a deep-learning-based end-to-end Transformer with preprocessing and postprocessing pipelines, the large model achieved over 95% of accuracy on Gaokao-EN dataset.
2. MetaQA, a meta-sequence-learning-based scheme, which achieved 97% of accuracy on SAT dataset.
3. A distractor generation method, a combination of various NLP tools and algorithms, which also achieved a high accuracy.

The TP3 works very well on unseen data, it can generate a large number of QAPs. On the other hand, the MetaQA can generate QAPs based on the meta sequences it has learned, but rarely generate inadequate question, which good complement the TP3.

All generated adequate questions are grammatically correct, and the corresponding answer is correct to the question.

The generated adequate distractors are the incorrect answers to the question, relate to the correct answer, and provide enough degree of distraction.

Overall, our methods for generating MCQs achieved over 95% of accuracy.

Bibliography

- [1] Ali, H., Chali, Y., and Hasan, S. A. (2010). Automation of question generation from sentences. In *Proceedings of QG2010: The Third Workshop on Question Generation*, pages 58–67.
- [2] Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., and Bengio, Y. (2014). Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*.
- [3] Banerjee, S. and Lavie, A. (2005). METEOR: an automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, pages 65–72, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [4] Bojanowski, P., Grave, E., Joulin, A., and Mikolov, T. (2017). Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- [5] Bonial, C., Hwang, J., Bonn, J., Conger, K., Babko-Malaya, O., and Palmer, M. (2012). English propbank annotation guidelines. *Center for Computational Language and Education Research Institute of Cognitive Science University of Colorado at Boulder*, 48.
- [6] Cai, Z., Rus, V., Kim, H.-J. J., Susarla, S. C., Karnam, P., and Graesser, A. C. (2006). Nlgml: 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).
- [7] Callison-Burch, C., Osborne, M., and Koehn, P. (2006). Re-evaluating the role of Bleu in machine translation research. In *11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 249–256, Trento, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
 - [8] Chali, Y. and Hasan, S. A. (2015). Towards topic-to-question generation. *Computational Linguistics*, 41(1):1–20.
 - [9] Chan, Y.-H. and Fan, Y.-C. (2019). A recurrent BERT-based model for question generation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Machine Reading for Question Answering*, pages 154–162.
 - [10] Chen, W. (2009). Aist, g., mostow, j.: Generating questions automatically from informational text. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Question Generation (AIED 2009)*, pages 17–24.
 - [11] Chen, Y., Wu, L., and Zaki, M. J. (2020). Reinforcement learning based graph-to-sequence model for natural question generation. *ArXiv*, abs/1908.04942.
 - [12] Cho, K., van Merriënboer, B., Gulcehre, C., Bahdanau, D., Bougares, F., Schwenk, H., and Bengio, Y. (2014). Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder–decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1724–1734, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
 - [13] Correia, R., Baptista, J., Eskenazi, M., and Mamede, N. (2012). Automatic generation of cloze question stems. In Caseli, H., Villavicencio, A., Teixeira, A., and Perdigão, F., editors, *Computational Processing of the Portuguese Language*, pages 168–178, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
 - [14] Danon, G. and Last, M. (2017). A syntactic approach to domain-specific automatic question generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.09827*.

- [15] Dong, L., Yang, N., Wang, W., Wei, F., Liu, X., Wang, Y., Gao, J., Zhou, M., and Hon, H.-W. (2019). Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation. In *33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*.
- [16] Du, X., Shao, J., and Cardie, C. (2017). Learning to ask: neural question generation for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1342–1352, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [17] Duan, N., Tang, D., Chen, P., and Zhou, M. (2017). Question generation for question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 866–874, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [18] Flor, M. and Riordan, B. (2018). A semantic role-based approach to open-domain automatic question generation. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth workshop on innovative use of NLP for building educational applications*, pages 254–263.
- [19] Harrison, V. and Walker, M. (2018). Neural generation of diverse questions using answer focus, contextual and linguistic features. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [20] Jiang, S. and Lee, J. (2017). Distractor generation for chinese fill-in-the-blank items. In *BEA@EMNLP*.
- [21] Joshi, V., Peters, M. E., and Hopkins, M. (2018). Extending a parser to distant domains using a few dozen partially annotated examples. In *ACL*.
- [22] Khullar, P., Rachna, K., Hase, M., and Shrivastava, M. (2018). Automatic question generation using relative pronouns and adverbs. In *Proceedings of ACL 2018, Student Research Workshop*, pages 153–158.
- [23] Kim, Y., Lee, H., Shin, J., and Jung, K. (2019). Improving neural question

- generation using answer separation. volume 33, page 6602–6609. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI).
- [24] Kriangchaivech, K. and Wangperawong, A. (2019). Question generation by transformers.
- [25] Lai, G., Xie, Q., Liu, H., Yang, Y., and Hovy, E. (2017). Race: Large-scale reading comprehension dataset from examinations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04683*.
- [26] Lavie, A. and Denkowski, M. J. (2009). The meteor metric for automatic evaluation of machine translation. *Machine Translation*, 23(2—3):105–115.
- [27] Lelkes, A. D., Tran, V. Q., and Yu, C. (2021). Quiz-style question generation for news stories. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, WWW ’21, page 2501–2511, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [28] Levenshtein, V. I. (1966). Binary Codes Capable of Correcting Deletions, Insertions and Reversals. *Soviet Physics Doklady*, 10:707.
- [29] Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., Stoyanov, V., and Zettlemoyer, L. (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.
- [30] Lin, C.-Y. (2004). ROUGE: a package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [31] Lindberg, D., Popowich, F., Nesbit, J., and Winne, P. (2013). Generating natural language questions to support learning on-line. In *Proceedings of the 14th European Workshop on Natural Language Generation*, pages 105–114.
- [32] Lindberg, D. L. (2013). *Automatic question generation from text for self-directed learning*. PhD thesis, Applied Sciences: School of Computing Science.

- [33] Liu, C.-W., Lowe, R., Serban, I., Noseworthy, M., Charlin, L., and Pineau, J. (2016). How NOT to evaluate your dialogue system: an empirical study of unsupervised evaluation metrics for dialogue response generation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2122–2132, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [34] Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., Levy, O., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L., and Stoyanov, V. (2019). Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *ArXiv*, abs/1907.11692.
- [35] Lopez, L. E., Cruz, D. K., Cruz, J. C. B., and Cheng, C. K. (2020). Transformer-based end-to-end question generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.01107.
- [36] Loshchilov, I. and Hutter, F. (2019). Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [37] Luong, T., Pham, H., and Manning, C. D. (2015). Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1412–1421, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [38] Mannem, P., Prasad, R., and Joshi, A. (2010). Question generation from paragraphs at upenn: Qgstec system description. In *Proceedings of QG2010: The Third Workshop on Question Generation*, pages 84–91.
- [39] Marcus, M., Santorini, B., and Marcinkiewicz, M. A. (1993). Building a large annotated corpus of english: The penn treebank.
- [40] Martha, P., Dan, G., and Paul, K. (2005). The proposition bank: a corpus annotated with semantic roles. *Computational Linguistics Journal*, 31(1):10–1162.
- [41] Mazidi, K. and Nielsen, R. (2014). Linguistic considerations in automatic question generation. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 321–326.

- [42] Meng¹, Y., Huang, J., Wang, G., Zhang, C., Zhuang, H., Kaplan, L., and Han¹, J. (2019). Spherical text embedding. In *33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*.
- [43] Michel, J.-B., Shen, Y. K., Aiden, A. P., Veres, A., Gray, M. K., null null, Pickett, J. P., Hoiberg, D., Clancy, D., Norvig, P., Orwant, J., Pinker, S., Nowak, M. A., and Aiden, E. L. (2011). Quantitative analysis of culture using millions of digitized books. *Science*, 331(6014):176–182.
- [44] Mikolov, T., Grave, E., Bojanowski, P., Puhersch, C., and Joulin, A. (2018). Advances in pre-training distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.
- [45] Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G., and Dean, J. (2013). Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2*, NIPS’13, pages 3111–3119, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- [46] Miller, G. A. (1995). Wordnet: A lexical database for english. *Commun. ACM*, 38(11):39–41.
- [47] Mitkov, R. and Ha, L. A. (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*, HLT-NAACL-EDUC ’03, page 17–22, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [48] Mostow, J. and Chen, W. (2009). Generating instruction automatically for the reading strategy of self-questioning. In *AIED*, pages 465–472.
- [49] Murakhovs’ka, L., Wu, C.-S., Niu, T., Liu, W., and Xiong, C. (2021a). Mixqg: Neural question generation with mixed answer types.
- [50] Murakhovs’ka, L., Wu, C.-S., Niu, T., Liu, W., and Xiong, C. (2021b). Mixqg: Neural question generation with mixed answer types.

- [51] Nadeau, D. and Sekine, S. (2007). A survey of named entity recognition and classification. *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 30(1):3–26.
- [52] Nema, P. and Khapra, M. M. (2018). Towards a better metric for evaluating question generation systems. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3950–3959, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [53] Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., and Zhu, W.-J. (2002a). Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [54] Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., and Zhu, W.-J. (2002b). BLEU: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL’02*, page 311–318, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [55] Pennington, J., Socher, R., and Manning, C. (2014). GloVe: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [56] Peters, M., Ammar, W., Bhagavatula, C., and Power, R. (2017a). Semi-supervised sequence tagging with bidirectional language models. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1756–1765, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [57] Peters, M. E., Ammar, W., Bhagavatula, C., and Power, R. (2017b). Semi-supervised sequence tagging with bidirectional language models. In *ACL*.
- [58] Pho, V.-M., André, T., Ligozat, A.-L., Grau, B., Illouz, G., and François, T. (2014). Multiple choice question corpus analysis for distractor characterization.

- In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)*, pages 4284–4291, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- [59] Qi, W., Yan, Y., Gong, Y., Liu, D., Duan, N., Chen, J., Zhang, R., and Zhou, M. (2020a). Prophetnet: Predicting future n-gram for sequence-to-sequence pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 2401–2410.
- [60] Qi, W., Yan, Y., Gong, Y., Liu, D., Duan, N., Chen, J., Zhang, R., and Zhou, M. (2020b). ProphetNet: Predicting future n-gram for sequence-to-SequencePre-training. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2401–2410, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [61] Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. (2019). Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- [62] Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., and Liu, P. J. (2020). Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer.
- [63] Rajpurkar, P., Zhang, J., Lopyrev, K., and Liang, P. (2016). Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [64] Rao, D. and Saha, S. K. (2018). Automatic multiple choice question generation from text : A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, pages 14–25.
- [65] Reddy, S., Chen, D., and Manning, C. D. (2019). Coqa: A conversational question answering challenge.
- [66] Reimers, N. and Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [67] Rus, V., Cai, Z., and Graesser, A. C. (2007). Experiments on generating questions about facts. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Text Processing and Computational Linguistics*, pages 444–455. Springer.
- [68] Sachan, M. and Xing, E. (2018). Self-training for jointly learning to ask and answer questions. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 629–640, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [69] Sak, H., Senior, A. W., and Beaufays, F. (2014). Long short-term memory recurrent neural network architectures for large scale acoustic modeling. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- [70] Shang, J., Liu, J., Jiang, M., Ren, X., Voss, C. R., and Han, J. (2018). Automated phrase mining from massive text corpora. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 30(10):1825–1837.
- [71] Shi, P. and Lin, J. (2019). Simple BERT Models for Relation Extraction and Semantic Role Labeling. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1904.05255.
- [72] Shi, P. and Lin, J. J. (2019). Simple bert models for relation extraction and semantic role labeling. *ArXiv*, abs/1904.05255.
- [73] Smith, L. N. (2017). Cyclical learning rates for training neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 464–472.
- [74] Song, L., Wang, Z., Hamza, W., Zhang, Y., and Gildea, D. (2018). Leveraging context information for natural question generation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 569–574, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [75] Su, D., Xu, Y., Dai, W., Ji, Z., Yu, T., and Fung, P. (2020). Multi-hop question generation with graph convolutional network. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4636–4647, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [76] Susanti, Y., Iida, R., and Tokunaga, T. (2015). Automatic generation of english vocabulary tests. In *CSEDU*.
- [77] Susanti, Y., Tokunaga, T., Nishikawa, H., and Obari, H. (2018). Automatic distractor generation for multiple-choice english vocabulary questions. In *RPTEL 13*.
- [78] Toutanova, K., Klein, D., Manning, C. D., and Singer, Y. (2003). Feature-rich part-of-speech tagging with a cyclic dependency network. In *Proceedings of the 2003 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics on human language technology-volume 1*, pages 173–180. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [79] Ukkonen, E. (1985). Algorithms for approximate string matching. *Information and control*, 64(1-3):100–118.
- [80] Varga, A. and Ha, L. A. (2010). Wlv: a question generation system for the QGSTEC 2010 task b. *Boyer & Piwek (2010)*, pages 80–83.
- [81] Wolfe, J. H. (1976). Automatic question generation from text-an aid to independent study. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCSE-SIGCUE technical symposium on Computer science and education*, pages 104–112.
- [82] Wu, Z. and Palmer, M. (1994). Verbs semantics and lexical selection. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '94, page 133–138, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [83] Wyse, B. and Piwek, P. (2009). Generating questions from openlearn study units.

- [84] Zhang, C., Sun, Y., Chen, H., and Wang, J. (2020). Generating adequate distractors for multiple-choice questions. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management - KDIR*, pages 310–315. INSTICC, SciTePress.
- [85] Zhang, C. and Wang, J. (2020). Meta sequence learning for generating adequate question-answer pairs.
- [86] Zhang, C., Zhang, H., and Wang, J. (2022). Downstream transformer generation of question-answer pairs with preprocessing and postprocessing pipelines.
- [87] Zhang, S. and Bansal, M. (2019). Addressing semantic drift in question generation for semi-supervised question answering. In *EMNLP*.
- [88] Zhang, T., Kishore, V., Wu, F., Weinberger, K. Q., and Artzi, Y. (2020). Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [89] Zhao, Y., Ni, X., Ding, Y., and Ke, Q. (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, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [90] Zhou, Q., Yang, N., Wei, F., Tan, C., Bao, H., and Zhou, M. (2018). Neural question generation from text: a preliminary study. In Huang, X., Jiang, J., Zhao, D., Feng, Y., and Hong, Y., editors, *Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*, pages 662–671, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- [91] Zhou, W., Zhang, M., and Wu, Y. (2019). Question-type driven question generation. In *EMNLP*.