

# Sentence Simplification Using Paraphrase Corpus for Initialization

Kang Liu, Jipeng Qiang

Department of Computer Science, Yangzhou University

Jiangsu, China

yzuNLPlk@163.com, jpqiang@yzu.edu.cn

**Abstract**—Neural sentence simplification method based on sequence-to-sequence framework has become the mainstream method for sentence simplification (SS) task. Unfortunately, these methods are currently limited by the scarcity of parallel SS corpus. In this paper, we focus on how to reduce the dependence on parallel corpus by leveraging a careful initialization for neural SS methods from paraphrase corpus. Our work is motivated by the following two findings: (1) Paraphrase corpus includes a large proportion of sentence pairs belonging to SS corpus. (2) We can construct large-scale pseudo parallel SS data by keeping these sentence pairs with a higher complexity difference. Therefore, we propose two strategies to initialize neural SS methods using paraphrase corpus. We train three different neural SS methods with our initialization, which can obtain substantial improvements on the available WikiLarge data compared with themselves without initialization.

**Index Terms**—Sentence Simplification, Paraphrase Corpus, Seq2Seq

## I. INTRODUCTION

The goal of sentence simplification (SS) task is to rephrase a sentence into a form that is easier to read and understand, while still retaining the semantic meaning, which can help people with reading difficulties such as non-native speakers [1], [2], dyslexia [3] or autism [4]. Second language learners [5] and people with low literacy [6] can also benefit from it.

Since the 2010 year, SS task have been addressed as a monolingual machine translation problem translating from complex sentences to simplified sentences. Existing SS methods have changed from statistical sentence simplification methods [7]–[9] to neural sentence simplification methods [10]–[13]. Neural sentence simplification methods adopt sequence to sequence (Seq2Seq) models. Seq2Seq models work very well only when provided with a massive parallel corpus of complex and simplified sentences. Unfortunately, these approaches are currently limited by the scarcity of parallel corpus. For example, the biggest and widely-used SS training dataset WikiLarge [10] is composed of 296,402 sentence pairs, which align sentences from the ‘ordinary’ English Wikipedia and the ‘simple’ English Wikipedia. WikiLarge has been criticized recently [14], [15] because they contain a large proportion of noise data, which leads to systems that generalize poorly. Some work [?, [12], [16], [17] focus on unsupervised SS method for alleviating the need for SS supervised corpora. In this paper, we focus on how to reduce the dependence on parallel corpus by leveraging a careful initialization for neural SS methods.

There are large-scale paraphrase datasets [18], [19] for paraphrase generation whose aim is to generate an output sentence that preserves the meaning of the input sentence but contains variations in word choice and grammar. Comparing with paraphrase dataset, SS dataset highlights that the two sentences of each sentence pair should have difference in text complexity levels. We found that there are a large proportion of sentence pairs in paraphrase dataset that satisfy the expectations of SS task. For example, paraphrase dataset ParaBank [19] was created automatically from bilingual text by pivoting over the non-English language using neural machine translation (NMT) models. NMT models usually tend to generate more high-frequency tokens and less low-frequency tokens [20], [21]. Considering that the higher the word frequency, the simpler the word is, this phenomenon could be beneficial to SS task. Table 1 shows two sentence pairs from paraphrase corpus ParaBank. We can see that the translated target sentence is easier than the source sentence.

**Table 1** Two examples in ParaBank paraphrase corpus

<b>Source</b>	This <b>proposal</b> will be <b>communicated</b> to the trader’s creditors.
<b>Target</b>	This <b>plan</b> will be <b>sent</b> to the trader’s creditors
<b>Source</b>	It would be <b>prudent</b> for you not to be <b>deceived</b> by your masquerade .
<b>Target</b>	It would be <b>wise</b> for you not to be <b>fooled</b> by your own masquerade .

In this paper, we will try to utilize paraphrase corpus to initialize neural SS methods, and then fine-tune these methods on real SS dataset. Specifically, we design two strategies for initialization. (1) We directly utilize the whole paraphrase corpus to train an initial SS method. (2) Considering many sentences pairs in paraphrase corpus cannot satisfy the expectations of SS task, we only select these sentence pairs with a higher complexity difference using text readability formula (Flesch reading ease score [22]), which is designed to indicate how difficult a sentence is to understand. Experimental results show that neural SS methods based on our initialization outperform themselves without initialization.

The following sections are organized as follows: Section 2 describes the related work; Section 3 presents how to initialize neural SS methods; Section 4 shows the experimental results; Section 5 summarizes the paper.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Sentence Simplification

Automatic SS is a complicated natural language processing (NLP) task, which consists of lexical and syntactic simplification levels. It has attracted much attention recently as it could make texts more accessible to wider audiences, and used as a pre-processing step, improve performances of various NLP tasks and systems. Usually, hand-crafted, supervised, and unsupervised methods based on resources like English Wikipedia and Simple English Wikipedia (EW-SEW) [23] are utilized for extracting simplification rules. It is very easy to mix up the automatic TS task and the automatic summarization task [7], [24]. TS is different from text summarization as the focus of text summarization is to reduce the length and redundant content.

At the lexical level, lexical simplification often substitutes difficult words using more common words, which only require a large corpus of regular text to obtain word embeddings to get words similar to the complex word [25]–[28]. Woodsend and Lapata [29] presented a data-driven model based on a quasi-synchronous grammar, a formalism that can naturally capture structural mismatches and complex rewrite operations. Wubben et al. [30] proposed a phrase-based machine translation (PBMT) model that is trained on ordinary-simplified sentence pairs. Xu et al. [9] proposed a syntax-based machine translation model using simplification-specific objective functions and features to encourage simpler output.

Neural machine translation has shown to produce state-of-the-art results [21], [31], [32], which are based on sequence-to-sequence (Seq2Seq) architecture. In recent years, many neural SS models based on Seq2Seq are proposed and achieve good results [10]–[13], [33], [34]. The main limitation of the aforementioned neural SS models depended on the parallel ordinary-simplified sentence pairs [15]. Because ordinary-simplified sentence pairs are expensive and time-consuming to build, the available largest data is WikiLarge [10] that only has 296,402 sentence pairs. The dataset is insufficiency for neural SS model if we want to they can obtain the best parameters. Considering paraphrase corpus includes a large number of sentence pairs that satisfy the expectations of SS task. In this paper, we investigate the use of paraphrase data for text simplification. We are the first to show that we can effectively adapt paraphrase data for SS task.

### B. Unsupervised Sentence Simplification

To overcome the scarcity of parallel SS corpus, unsupervised SS methods without using any parallel corpus have attracted much attention. Existing unsupervised SS methods can be divided into two classifications. The first scheme focuses on how to design an unsupervised SS method, and the second scheme concentrates on how to build a parallel SS corpus.

[35] and [36] are the pipeline-based unsupervised framework, where the pipeline of Narayan and Gardent is composed of lexical simplification, sentence splitting, and phrase deletion, the pipeline of Kumar et al. includes deletion, reordering,

and lexical simplification. [37] proposed an unsupervised neural text simplification based on a shared encoder and two decoders, which only learn the neural network parameters from simple sentences set and complex sentences set. In other languages, there are unsupervised statistical machine translations for Japanese [38] and back-translation in Spanish and Italian [39]. The performance of the above unsupervised SS methods is however often below their supervised counterparts.

Some work [12], [16] constructed SS corpora by searching the most similar sentences using sentence embedding modeling, and train SS methods using the constructed SS corpora. [16] calculated the similarity between the sentences from English Wikipedia by Word Mover’s distance [40]. [12] adopted multilingual sentence embedding modeling LASER [32] to calculate the similarity between the sentences from 1 billion sentences from CCNET [41]. Since the aim of the two works is to find the most similar sentences from a large corpus, they cannot guarantee that the aligned sentences preserve the same meanings. Lv et al. [42] construct large-scale pseudo parallel SS data by taking the pair of the source sentences of translation corpus and the translations of their references in a bridge language.

### C. Paraphrase Mining

Some work has focused on generating paraphrase corpus for neural machine translation (NMT) systems using back-translation, where back-translation [43] is a technique widely used in NMT to enhance the target monolingual data during the training process. Specifically, the back-translation technique is used by translating the non-English side of bitexts back to English [44] and pairing translations with the references. Two large paraphrase corpora (PARANMT [?] and PARABANK [19]) are built based on this idea, and has been proven to have great potential in different translation-core tasks. Round-trip translation is also used in mining paraphrases [45] by translating sentences into another language then translating the result back into the original language. Similar to machine translation, back-translation is used to improve the performance of neural SS methods [38], [39], [46]. [?] trained a paraphrasing model by generating a paraphrase corpus using back-translation, which is used to preprocess source sentences of the low-resource language pairs before feeding into the NMT system.

The above work for building a large paraphrase corpus is to serve for NMT and other tasks, which is not fit for SS task. The difference of sentence complexity between the original sentence and the translated sentence for each sentence pair has not been taken into consideration, which is vitally important for SS task. Therefore, we focus on how to build a sentence simplification corpus, instead of a paraphrase corpus.

## III. METHOD

In this section, we will present how to utilize paraphrase corpus to initialize neural SS models.

### A. Relation between Paraphrase Corpus and SS Corpus

Some work has focused on generating paraphrase corpus for neural machine translation (NMT) systems using back-translation technique, where back-translation [47] is a technique widely used in NMT to enhance the target monolingual data during the training process. Specifically, the back-translation technique is used by translating the non-English side of bitexts back to English [48] and pairing translations with the references. We can see that the two sentences of each sentence pair of paraphrase corpus should preserve the same meaning.

**Hypothesis 1: SS corpus can be regarded as a subset of paraphrase corpus.** Based on the definition of SS task, SS corpus should satisfy the following two requirements: (1) The two sentences of each sentence pair should convey the same meaning. (2) The two sentences of each sentence pair should have difference in text complexity levels. Paraphrase only needs to satisfy the first requirement, and SS corpus needs to satisfy both the requirements.

**Hypothesis 2: Paraphrase corpus includes a large proportion of sentence pairs belonging to SS corpus.** Neural machine translation model usually tends to generate more high-frequency tokens and less low-frequency tokens [20], [21]. The frequency of words is one of the most popular choices by sentence simplification [26], [46]. In general, the higher the frequency, the easier the word. Many empirical results supported the hypothesis, as shown in Table 1.

### B. Our Initialization Strategy

We provide two strategies to initialize neural SS models.

**(1) First Initialization Strategy:** Based on Hypothesis 2, we directly utilize paraphrase corpus to train initial neural SS modeling. Here, we choose ParaBank as our using paraphrase corpus. Due to the memory size of our computer, we only randomly choose 2 million sentence pairs from ParaBank [19]. Finally, we train neural SS modeling on real SS corpus.

**(2) Second Initialization Strategy:** Our second initialization strategy is shown in Figure 1. Different from the first one, we only select these sentence pairs from paraphrase corpus that have difference in text complexity levels. We measure the difference of text complexity using Flesch reading ease score (FRES) [22], which is designed to indicate how difficult a sentence is to understand, and is widely used to evaluate the performance of SS. FRES proposed in 1975 is a classical formula in the field of text assessment, whose coefficients are set by linguists. It is based on text features such as the average sentence length and the average number of syllables per word. A higher score indicates that the sentence is simpler to read. FRES grades the text from 0 to 100. The higher scores indicate the sentences are easier to read. As usual, the difference of one school grade level in FRES is 10, e.g., 5th grade (100.0-90.00) and 6th grade (90.0-80.0). The formula of FRES is,

$$206.835 - 1.015 \left( \frac{\# \text{ words}}{\# \text{ sentences}} \right) - 84.6 \left( \frac{\# \text{ syllables}}{\# \text{ words}} \right) \quad (1)$$

To ensure simplicity, we only keep the sentence pairs with a FRES difference higher than a threshold  $h_{FRES}$ . In our experiments, we set  $h_{FRES} = 10.0$ , where  $h_{FRES} = 10.0$  means that for each sentence pair, the simplified version should be at least one school level simpler than its complex counterpart.

After obtaining pseudo SS corpus, we first initialize neural SS method using pseudo SS corpus, and train neural SS method on real SS corpus.

### (3) Statistics of our choosing paraphrase corpora:

We report the statistics of our choosing paraphrase corpora in Table 2. Here, we report the statistics of real SS corpus WikiLarge for a comparison. WikiLarge is the most popular and widely used SS corpus. Because the SS task is a paraphrase generation task using easier words, the length of the complex sentence and the simple sentence are roughly the same, and the size of the vocabulary in the simple sentence set should be smaller than the complex sentence set. In contrast to the paraphrase corpora, the length of the complex sentence in WikiLarge is longer than the simple sentence, because it focuses on the deletion of content.

**Table 2** Statistics of our choosing paraphrase corpora in two strategies compared with WikiLarge. Avg(complex) and Avg(simple) are the average numbers of words in the complex sentences and the simpler sentences, respectively.

	WikiLarge	First	Second
<b>Vocab(complex)</b>	169,349	282,279	96,524
<b>Vocab(simple)</b>	135,607	245,447	92,156
<b>Avg(complex)</b>	21.93	12.04	10.49
<b>Avg(simple)</b>	16.14	12.65	11.31
<b>Total pairs</b>	296,402	2,000,000	321,900

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

### A. Experimental setup

**Neural SS methods:** To validate that our two initialization strategies (First and Second) are effective for different neural SS methods, we apply our two initialization on the following three methods:

- **LSTM** that is composed of RNN network and soft attention layer.
- **Transformer** that is based solely on attention mechanisms.
- **Bart**<sup>1</sup> that is sequence-to-sequence model trained with denoising as pretraining objective

We implement the above three methods via the opensource toolkit fairseq [49]. We adopt the Adam optimizer with  $\beta_1 = 0.9$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.98$ ,  $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$  and Dropout is set 0.3 for the three methods. The initial learning rate are set to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ ,  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ ,  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  for LSTM-based, Transformer-based and BART-based models, respectively.

**Evaluation Dataset:** We select WikiLarge as the training SS corpus. For evaluating neural SS methods, we select

<sup>1</sup><https://dl.fbaipublicfiles.com/fairseq/models/bart.base.tar.gz>




Fig. 1. The overview of our approach for training. A pseudo SS corpus is synthesized by selecting these complex-simple sentence pairs with a higher complexity difference. Then, we first train neural SS method using the pseudo SS corpus, and train neural SS method using the real SS corpus.

TurkCorpus [9] as our evaluation benchmark dataset. The corpus consists of 2000 valid sentences and 359 test sentences. In TurkCorpus, each complex sentence has 8 kinds of simplification for reference.

**Evaluation Metrics:** SARI [9] is the main metric to evaluate text simplification models, which calculates the arithmetic mean of the  $n$ -gram F1 scores of three operations (keeping, adding, and deleting) through comparing the generated sentences to multiple simplification references and the original sentences. A Higher SARI score means better simplification performance. We use SS evaluation tools Easse [50] to calculate the SARI metric.

## B. Experimental Results

**Table 3** The evaluation result of the experiments.

Model	Condition	SARI
LSTM	-	35.77
	First	36.25
	Second	<b>36.45</b>
Transformer	-	37.29
	First	37.64
	Second	<b>38.17</b>
Bart	-	38.03
	First	38.29
	Second	<b>38.77</b>

The final evaluation results are shown in Table 3. We can see that the three neural SS methods (LSTM, Transformer and Bart) with our First initialization strategy outperform themselves without initialization. The results indicate that our first initialization strategy is effective for neural SS methods. As we expected, the Second initialization method with a selector indeed further improves the performance of neural SS methods. With a selector, our paraphrase corpus becomes more suitable for SS task. The selector makes SARI score get 0.68 improved for LSTM, 0.88 improved for Transformer, 0.74 improved for Bart-based compared with themselves without initialization. From the simplified sentences, we found that Second also improves the readability of simplification results in varying degrees compared with the First initialization method without

a selector. This indicates that the noise sentences in the paraphrase really harm the model training through the First initialization method. We can conclude that Second is a more reasonable and better method.

**Table 4** The examples of simplified results generated by Transformer with the second initialization.

Complex	it was <b>originally</b> thought that the debris thrown up by the collision filled in the smaller craters .
Reference	it was <b>first</b> thought that the debris thrown up by the collision filled in the smaller craters .
Transformer	it was <b>originally</b> thought that the debris thrown up by collision filled in the smaller craters .
Second	it was <b>first</b> thought that the debris thrown up by the collision filled in the smaller craters .
Complex	both names became defunct in 2007 when they were <b>merged</b> into the national museum of scotland .
Reference	both names <b>merged with each other in 2007</b> to <b>become</b> the national museum of scotland .
Transformer	both names became defunct in 2007 when they were <b>merged</b> into the national museum of scotland .
Second	both names became defunct in 2007 when they were <b>joined</b> into the national museum of scotland .

Table 4 shows the examples of the simplification result generated by Transformer without initialization and Transformer with our second initialization method. In the first example, we can find that our proposed method replaces 'originally' with 'first' which is the same as the reference while Transformer only repeats the original sentence. In the second example, our method replaces 'merged' with 'joined' while Transformer still repeats. This indicates that our initialization method can make more simplification with word replacement compared with the baseline method.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Considering the relationship between paraphrase corpus and SS corpus, we propose two strategies to initialize neural sentence simplification (SS) model using paraphrase corpus. Experimental results verify that neural SS methods without our initialization outperform themselves without initialization. In this paper, we use a small version of the paraphrase corpus. In future work, we can use a bigger paraphrase corpus. In

addition to that, we can also build a new paraphrase corpus with different kinds of selectors not just FRES selector.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. H. Paetzold, *Lexical Simplification for Non-Native English Speakers*. PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 2016.
- [2] J. Qiang, X. Lv, Y. Li, Y. Yuan, and X. Wu, “Chinese lexical simplification,” *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 1819–1828, 2021.
- [3] L. Rello, R. Baeza-Yates, S. Bott, and H. Saggion, “Simplify or help? text simplification strategies for people with dyslexia,” in *Proceedings of the 10th International Cross-Disciplinary Conference on Web Accessibility*, pp. 1–10, 2013.
- [4] R. Evans, C. Orasan, and I. Dornescu, “An evaluation of syntactic simplification rules for people with autism,” Association for Computational Linguistics, 2014.
- [5] M. Xia, E. Kochmar, and T. Briscoe, “Text readability assessment for second language learners,” in *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, (San Diego, CA), pp. 12–22, June 2016.
- [6] W. M. Watanabe, A. C. Junior, V. R. Uzêda, R. P. d. M. Fortes, T. A. S. Pardo, and S. M. Aluísio, “Facilita: reading assistance for low-literacy readers,” in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on Design of communication*, pp. 29–36, 2009.
- [7] Z. Zhu, D. Bernhard, and I. Gurevych, “A monolingual tree-based translation model for sentence simplification,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2010)*, pp. 1353–1361, 2010.
- [8] S. Narayan and C. Gardent, “Hybrid simplification using deep semantics and machine translation,” in *The 52nd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pp. 435–445, 2014.
- [9] W. Xu, C. Napoles, E. Pavlick, Q. Chen, and C. Callison-Burch, “Optimizing statistical machine translation for text simplification,” *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 4, pp. 401–415, 2016.
- [10] X. Zhang and M. Lapata, “Sentence simplification with deep reinforcement learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, (Copenhagen, Denmark), pp. 584–594, Sept. 2017.
- [11] S. Surya, A. Mishra, A. Laha, P. Jain, and K. Sankaranarayanan, “Unsupervised neural text simplification,” in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, (Florence, Italy), pp. 2058–2068, July 2019.
- [12] L. Martin, A. Fan, É. de la Clergerie, A. Bordes, and B. Sagot, “Multilingual unsupervised sentence simplification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00352*, 2020.
- [13] S. Agrawal, W. Xu, and M. Carpuat, “A non-autoregressive edit-based approach to controllable text simplification,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, (Online), pp. 3757–3769, Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021.
- [14] W. Xu, C. Callison-Burch, and C. Napoles, “Problems in current text simplification research: New data can help,” *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 3, pp. 283–297, 2015.
- [15] S. Štajner, “Automatic text simplification for social good: Progress and challenges,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, (Online), pp. 2637–2652, Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021.
- [16] T. Kajiwara and M. Komachi, “Text simplification without simplified corpora,” *The Journal of Natural Language Processing*, vol. 25, pp. 223–249, 2018.
- [17] J. Qiang, K. Liu, Y. Li, Y. Yuan, and Y. Zhu, “Parals: Lexical substitution via pretrained paraphraser,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08146*, 2023.
- [18] J. Wieting and K. Gimpel, “Pushing the limits of paraphrastic sentence embeddings with millions of machine translations,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1711.05732, 2017.
- [19] J. E. Hu, R. Rudinger, M. Post, and B. Van Durme, “Parabank: Monolingual bitext generation and sentential paraphrasing via lexically-constrained neural machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, pp. 6521–6528, 2019.
- [20] S. Jiang, P. Ren, C. Monz, and M. de Rijke, “Improving neural response diversity with frequency-aware cross-entropy loss,” in *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW ’19*, (New York, NY, USA), p. 2879–2885, Association for Computing Machinery, 2019.
- [21] S. Gu, J. Zhang, F. Meng, Y. Feng, W. Xie, J. Zhou, and D. Yu, “Token-level adaptive training for neural machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, (Online), pp. 1035–1046, Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2020.
- [22] J. P. Kincaid, R. P. Fishburne Jr, R. L. Rogers, and B. S. Chissom, “Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count and flesch reading ease formula) for navy enlisted personnel,” tech. rep., Naval Technical Training Command Millington TN Research Branch, 1975.
- [23] W. Coster and D. Kauchak, “Simple english wikipedia: a new text simplification task,” in *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: short papers-Volume 2*, pp. 665–669, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2011.
- [24] A. M. Rush, S. Chopra, and J. Weston, “A neural attention model for abstractive sentence summarization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.00685*, 2015.
- [25] G. Glavaš and S. Štajner, “Simplifying lexical simplification: do we need simplified corpora?,” in *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, vol. 2, pp. 63–68, 2015.
- [26] J. Qiang, Y. Li, Y. Zhu, Y. Yuan, and X. Wu, “Lexical simplification with pretrained encoders,” pp. 8649–8656, 2020.
- [27] J. Qiang, S. Zhu, Y. Li, Y. Zhu, Y. Yuan, and X. Wu, “Natural language watermarking via paraphraser-based lexical substitution,” *Artificial Intelligence*, p. 103859, 2023.
- [28] J. Qiang, Y. Li, Y. Zhu, Y. Yuan, Y. Shi, and X. Wu, “Lsbert: Lexical simplification based on bert,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3064–3076, 2021.
- [29] K. Woodsend and M. Lapata, “Learning to simplify sentences with quasi-synchronous grammar and integer programming,” in *Proceedings of the conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pp. 409–420, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2011.
- [30] S. Wubben, A. V. D. Bosch, and E. Krahmer, “Sentence simplification by monolingual machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pp. 1015–1024, In Proceedings of the 50th ACL, 2012.
- [31] D. Bahdanau, K. Cho, and Y. Bengio, “Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*, 2014.
- [32] M. Artetxe, G. Labaka, and E. Agirre, “Unsupervised statistical machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, (Brussels, Belgium), pp. 3632–3642, Association for Computational Linguistics, Oct.-Nov. 2018.
- [33] S. Nisioi, S. Štajner, S. P. Ponzetto, and L. P. Dinu, “Exploring neural text simplification models,” in *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, vol. 2, pp. 85–91, 2017.
- [34] J. Qiang, P. Chen, W. Ding, T. Wang, F. Xie, and X. Wu, “Heterogeneous-length text topic modeling for reader-aware multi-document summarization,” *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–21, 2019.
- [35] S. Narayan and C. Gardent, “Unsupervised sentence simplification using deep semantics,” pp. 111–120, 2015.
- [36] D. Kumar, L. Mou, L. Golab, and O. Vechtomova, “Iterative edit-based unsupervised sentence simplification,” in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, (Online), pp. 7918–7928, Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2020.
- [37] S. Surya, A. Mishra, A. Laha, P. Jain, and K. Sankaranarayanan, “Unsupervised neural text simplification,” in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, (Florence, Italy), pp. 2058–2068, Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2019.
- [38] A. Katsuta and K. Yamamoto, “Improving text simplification by corpus expansion with unsupervised learning,” in *2019 International Conference on Asian Language Processing (IALP)*, pp. 216–221, IEEE, 2019.
- [39] A. Palmero Aprosio, S. Tonelli, M. Turchi, M. Negri, and A. Di Gangi Mattia, “Neural text simplification in low-resource conditions using weak supervision,” in *Workshop on Methods for Optimizing and Evaluating Neural Language Generation (NeuralGen)*, pp. 37–44, Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), 2019.

- [40] M. Kusner, Y. Sun, N. Kolkin, and K. Weinberger, "From word embeddings to document distances," in *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 957–966, PMLR, 2015.
- [41] G. Wenzek, M. Lachaux, A. Conneau, V. Chaudhary, F. Guzmán, A. Joulin, and E. Grave, "Ccnet: Extracting high quality monolingual datasets from web crawl data," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1911.00359, 2019.
- [42] X. Lu, J. Qiang, Y. Li, Y. Yuan, and Y. Zhu, "An unsupervised method for building sentence simplification corpora in multiple languages," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pp. 227–237, 2021.
- [43] R. Sennrich, B. Haddow, and A. Birch, "Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06709*, 2015.
- [44] J. Wieting, J. Mallinson, and K. Gimpel, "Learning paraphrastic sentence embeddings from back-translated bibtex," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.01847*, 2017.
- [45] J. Mallinson, R. Sennrich, and M. Lapata, "Paraphrasing revisited with neural machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pp. 881–893, 2017.
- [46] J. Qiang and X. Wu, "Unsupervised statistical text simplification," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1802–1806, 2021.
- [47] R. Sennrich, B. Haddow, and A. Birch, "Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data," in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, (Berlin, Germany), pp. 86–96, Aug. 2016.
- [48] J. Wieting and K. Gimpel, "ParaNMT-50M: Pushing the limits of paraphrastic sentence embeddings with millions of machine translations," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, (Melbourne, Australia), pp. 451–462, July 2018.
- [49] M. Ott, S. Edunov, A. Baevski, A. Fan, S. Gross, N. Ng, D. Grangier, and M. Auli, "fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations)*, (Minneapolis, Minnesota), pp. 48–53, June 2019.
- [50] F. Alva-Manchego, L. Martin, C. Scarton, and L. Specia, "EASSE: Easier automatic sentence simplification evaluation," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP): System Demonstrations*, (Hong Kong, China), pp. 49–54, Nov. 2019.