

---

# Neural Text Generation with Part-of-Speech Guided Softmax

---

Zhixian Yang<sup>1</sup> Xiaojun Wan<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Neural text generation models are likely to suffer from the low-diversity problem. Various decoding strategies and training-based methods have been proposed to promote diversity only by exploiting contextual features, but rarely do they consider incorporating syntactic structure clues. In this work, we propose using linguistic annotation, i.e., part-of-speech (POS), to guide the text generation. In detail, we introduce POS Guided Softmax (POSG-Softmax) to explicitly model two posterior probabilities: (i) next-POS, and (ii) next-token from the vocabulary of the target POS. A POS guided sampling strategy is further proposed to address the low-diversity problem by enriching the diversity of POS. Extensive experiments and human evaluations demonstrate that, compared with existing state-of-the-art methods, our proposed methods can generate more diverse text while maintaining comparable quality.

## 1. Introduction

Neural text generation is of vital essence in many NLP applications, such as machine translation (Ghazvininejad et al., 2020; Kasai et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020), text summarization (Scialom et al., 2020), and dialogue systems (Jiang et al., 2019). Maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) is a standard approach to training a neural text generation model, e.g. Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017), to generate human-like text. However, existing generation systems often suffer from the low-diversity problem (Welleck et al., 2020; Holtzman et al., 2020), which leads to generating dull and repetitive text. This problem unavoidably affects the overall quality of the generations.

We conclude that the low-diversity problem is mainly manifested in two aspects: *form* and *content* (Tevet & Berant, 2020; Fu et al., 2020; Holtzman et al., 2020). As shown

Table 1, the low form diversity can be reflected in repeating some words, using similar lexicon and syntax, and more. The low content diversity can be expressed as a single and dull content with nothing different.

Several feasible fixes have been proposed, such as post-hoc sampling strategies including temperature (Caccia et al., 2020), top- $k$  (Fan et al., 2018), and nucleus sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020). Recently, some works suggest that it is the maximizing likelihood itself that should account for the low-diversity problem (Holtzman et al., 2020; Welleck et al., 2020). Holtzman et al. (2020) think that MLE can not adequately capture the rich diversity and expression in human language. Choi et al. (2020) argue that the imbalanced token distribution inherent in natural language even worsens the low-diversity problem. Based on these analysis, many training-based methods have been proposed. Welleck et al. (2020) propose the unlikelihood training to penalize repetition with auxiliary losses. Jiang et al. (2019) propose to utilize dynamically scaling losses conditioned on the token frequency in the training phase. Choi et al. (2020) factorize the probability distribution and design an elaborate token cluster algorithm for a balanced training.

Though those encouraging progress has been made in solving the low-diversity problems, we argue that current training-based methods only take plain contextual features to improve training, rarely considering incorporating syntactic structure clues. For example, when humans are writing articles, it is natural to predetermine the part-of-speech (POS) before giving the next token. Existing studies have verified that incorporating POS can improve the translation quality in neural machine translation (Sennrich & Haddow, 2016; Baniata et al., 2018; Niehues & Cho, 2017). Intuitively, since the vocabularies of different POS vary a lot, the diversity of POS will certainly lead to the diversity of text. Unfortunately, we observe that existing methods with no consideration of the inner POS structure fail to learn the diversity of POS in human language (shown in Table 3).

All these factors motivate us to address the low-diversity problem with the guidance of POS. Thus, in this work, we first present the POS guided Softmax (Figure 1), building upon a hybrid decoder that predicts two posterior probabilities: (i) next-POS, and (ii) next-token from the vocabulary of the target POS. Our work shows that, following the POS

---

<sup>1</sup>Wangxuan Institute of Computer Technology, Peking University, Center for Data Science, Peking University, The MOE Key Laboratory of Computational Linguistics, Peking University. Correspondence to: Xiaojun Wan <wanxiaojun@pku.edu.cn>.

---

**Context:** Infantry fought a series of hard battles. Simultaneously it had to send combat patrols to its rear to clear infiltrating North Koreans from Changnyong and from its supply road.

---

**Text 1:** At 08:00 am the units of the 1st Battalion attempted to attack. Kim of the 1st and 2nd Battalions attacked **the 3rd and 3rd Battalions of the 2nd Battalion of the 3rd Battalions of the 1st Battalion of the 2nd Battalion of 2nd Battalion, 7th Marines on North, 7th Marines on Hill 60.**

---

**Text 2:** **The 3rd Regiment of the NK 10th Division was to attack the North Korean forces. The 1st Regiment of the NK 12th Division was to attack the North Koreans from the north and east of the 2nd Division, and the 1st Regiment of the NK 15th Division was to attack the North Koreans from the south.**

---

**Text 3:** Meanwhile, the 2nd Regiment of the 27th Infantry, which had been sent out of Murmansk in late October, had moved to iconoclasts Pass. On the morning of September 2, the Eighth Army’s 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment was moved into a position about 10 miles to 16 km far from Highton.

---

Table 1. Examples of low-diversity generated text, given context from the Wikitext-103 dataset. Text 1 has a poor form diversity due to many useless repeating words (highlighted in blue). Text 2 keeps talking about only one single content, with similar lexicon and syntax (highlighted in orange), indicating low diversity in both terms of form and content. Though text 3 has various syntactical and lexical forms with no repetition, all the content of it is about the deployment of armies, which means low content diversity.

clue, our model can gain a deeper insight into text’s syntactic structure. Thereafter, we propose a POS guided sampling to improve the diversity of generated text lexically and syntactically while maintaining comparable quality.

To sum up, the contributions of our work are three-fold: (i) We introduce a novel POS Guided Softmax (POSG-Softmax), incorporating explicit POS tags as the observed discrete decisions to improve neural text generation. (ii) Based on POS guided Softmax, POS guided sampling is proposed to promote text diversity effectively without degrading quality. (iii) We conduct extensive experiments in language modeling and paraphrase generation. Experimental results and human evaluation show that our model can easily adapt to different downstream tasks and generate text with high diversity as well as quality.

## 2. Related Works

### 2.1. Decoding-based Methods

Although greedy search and beam search are well known decoding strategies for neural text generation, Holtzman et al. (2020) have shown that these methods always generate generic, repetitive, and awkward words. To tackle this, a number of works have proposed several variants of beam search in order to promote word diversity (Vijayakumar et al., 2018; Kulikov et al., 2018). Recently, stochastic decoding methods have been widely used to enrich diversity because of its randomness in the sampling phase. However, sampling directly from the Softmax distribution may result in generating incoherent and unrelated text (Holtzman et al., 2020). Therefore, some studies propose to truncate and renormalize the Softmax distribution before sampling. Notably, top- $k$  sampling (Fan et al., 2018) only samples from the top- $k$  most probable tokens. Nucleus sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020) only samples from the smallest set whose cumulative probability is at least  $\alpha$ . Both top- $k$  and nucleus

sampling solve the long-tail problem (Martins et al., 2020) and give a better trade-off between quality and diversity. However, those decoding-based methods are not model-sensitive, which means a lack of controllability. Combined with above methods, our POS guided Softmax can further promote diversity using POS as a more controllable clue.

### 2.2. Training-based Methods

As a standard approach to training a neural text generation model, MLE has been proved to be defective. Choi et al. (2020) have shown that MLE may mislead the model because of the imbalanced token distribution. Thus, they design a greedy approach MefMax and factorize Softmax to ensure a balanced training according to the word frequency. FACE (Jiang et al., 2019) utilizes the target word frequency to modify the cross-entropy loss with a frequency-based weight factor. As an alternative to truncating sampling strategies, entmax sampling (Martins et al., 2020) has been proposed to avoid the mismatch between training and decoding. Additionally, to address the problem of neural text degeneration, Welleck et al. (2020) introduce an unlikelihood loss to implicitly reduce the frequent tokens and potential repeats. Other approaches, such as reinforcement learning (Shirai et al., 2020), imitation learning (Zhou & Lampouras, 2020), and negative training (He & Glass, 2020), have recently been applied to promote the diversity during the training phase. All above training-based methods only learn from plain contextual features, while ignoring other linguistic features. Our focus is on leveraging POS features to guide both phases of training and decoding.

## 3. Language Modeling

The goal of language models is to assign a probability to a text (i.e. word sequence)  $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_T]$ , where each  $x_t$  in the sequence is a token from a vocabulary  $\mathcal{V}$ , i.e.,




Figure 1. Illustration of POS Guided Softmax. The decoding process is decomposed into two stages: first predicts the next-POS distribution, and then decodes the next-token distribution from the vocabulary of the previously predicted POS. Since there exist some tokens with more than one POS, the final next-token distribution is the sum of all the POS’s token distributions.

$x_t \in \mathcal{V}$ , and  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ . We train the language models to learn a distribution  $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  with the goal to fit the ground-truth distribution  $p_*(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x}$ . Specifically, when the language model is a neural network,  $\theta$  is regarded as the model parameters of the neural network, and we can factorize  $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  as  $p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{t=1}^T p_\theta(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$ . The conventional approach for learning the language model parameters  $\theta$  is to maximize the log-likelihood by minimizing:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MLE}}(\theta) = - \sum_{t=1}^T \log p_\theta(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}). \quad (1)$$

In neural language models, the conditional distribution  $p_\theta(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$  is usually obtained by a Softmax function:

$$p_\theta(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \frac{\exp \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^\top \mathbf{w}_{x_t}}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \exp \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^\top \mathbf{w}_x}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_{t-1}$  is a hidden state of the context  $\mathbf{x}_{<t}$  and  $\mathbf{w}_{x_t}$  is the output embedding vector for  $x_t \in \mathcal{V}$ .

## 4. Part-of-Speech Guided Softmax

POS guided Softmax is designed to exploit syntactic structure, i.e., POS tags for text generation in both the training and decoding phases. Specifically, given text sequence  $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_T]$ , we first use off-the-shelf POS tagger

(Manning et al., 2014; Bohnet et al., 2018) to annotate corresponding POS sequence  $\boldsymbol{\rho} = [\rho_1, \dots, \rho_T]$ , where each  $\rho_t$  is a POS tag from the POS vocabulary  $\mathcal{P}$ , i.e.,  $\rho_t \in \mathcal{P}$ , and  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define all the tokens whose POS is  $\rho$  as a vocabulary  $\mathcal{V}_\rho$ , where  $\mathcal{V}_\rho \subset \mathcal{V}$ .

### 4.1. POS Guided Softmax

Figure 1 illustrates the core idea of our POS guided Softmax. Given a context, there exists various choices for the next POS, which can be modeled as the next POS distribution. For the context “no one knows”, the next possible POS includes WH-pronoun (WP), preposition (IN), etc. For example, WP is predicted as the next POS, and then the model will decode the next token from the WP vocabulary ( $\mathcal{V}_{\text{WP}}$ ) with the token distribution of WP. Consequently, the complete sequence can be “no one knows what will happen”. For another case, if IN is predicted as the next POS, the next token will be decoded from  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{IN}}$  with the corresponding token distribution. Then, the sequence may end up saying “no one knows until it finally happens”. This example also shows that the different choices of POS at each time step can result in vastly different generated text, thus promoting the text diversity.

Following the core idea, we assume that the decoding process can be divided into two stages: for each time  $t$ , a POS tag  $\rho_t$  is predicted first, and then the model decodes next-token  $x_t$  from  $\mathcal{V}_{\rho_t}$ . Therefore, the joint conditional

probability of  $x_t$  together with its corresponding POS tag  $\rho_t$  is formulated as:

$$p_{\theta}(x_t, \rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = p_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) \times p_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t}), \quad (3)$$

where  $p_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$  is the next-POS probability and  $p_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t})$  is the next-token probability conditioned on  $\rho_t$ . These probabilities are defined empirically by applying a linear output embedding on  $\mathbf{h}_{t-1}$  and then a Softmax function respectively:

$$p_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \frac{\exp \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^{\top} \mathbf{o}_{\rho_t}}{\sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}} \exp \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^{\top} \mathbf{o}_{\rho}},$$

$$p_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^{\top} \mathbf{w}_{x_t}}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}_{\rho_t}} \exp \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^{\top} \mathbf{w}_x}, & \text{if } x_t \in \mathcal{V}_{\rho_t} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{o}_{\rho_t}$  and  $\mathbf{w}_{x_t}$  are the output embeddings for  $\rho_t \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $x_t \in \mathcal{V}_{\rho_t}$ , respectively. In this way, we regard POS tags as observed sequential variables, which also contributes to the model interpretability and controllability. Then, the final next-token distribution can be formulated as:

$$p_{\theta}(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \sum_{\rho_t \in \mathcal{P}} p_{\theta}(x_t, \rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}). \quad (5)$$

Note that some tokens may have more than one POS, and  $p_{\theta}(x_t, \rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = 0$  for  $x_t \notin \mathcal{V}_{\rho_t}$ . Since the number of POS in a specific language family is fixed, there is no problem of insufficient exploration in variables' space. As mentioned before, we think of POS tags as observed sequential variables and extend the training text set with annotated POS sequences, so we define the the POS guided training objective as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{POS-Guided}}(\theta) = - \sum_{t=1}^T [\log p_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) + \log p_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t})]. \quad (6)$$

## 4.2. POS Guided Sampling

We propose POS guided sampling based on POS guided Softmax. Consistent with POS guided Softmax, the key idea is to divide the whole sampling sample process into two stages: *POS sampling* and *token sampling*. In POS sampling, we first sample a POS, and then in token sampling, we use the sampled POS to control the sampling of tokens. Note that arbitrary sampling strategies can be adopted to both the POS sampling and token sampling. Here, we use nucleus sampling for both stages as an example, and then

we can formulate our POS guided sampling as follows:

$$p'_{\theta}(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \sum_{\rho_t \in \mathcal{P}} [p'_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) \times p'_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t})],$$

$$p'_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \begin{cases} \frac{p_{\theta_1}(\rho_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\theta_1}}, & \text{if } \rho_t \in \mathcal{P}' \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$p'_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \begin{cases} \frac{p_{\theta_2}(x_t | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\theta_2}}, & \text{if } x_t \in \mathcal{V}'_{\rho_t} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\theta_1} = \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}'} p_{\theta_1}(\rho | \mathbf{x}_{<t}),$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\theta_2} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}'_{\rho_t}} p_{\theta_2}(x | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t}),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}$  is the smallest POS set such that  $\sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}'} p_{\theta_1}(\rho | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) \geq \alpha^{(\text{POS})}$  and  $\mathcal{V}'_{\rho_t} \subset \mathcal{V}_{\rho_t}$  is the smallest token set such that  $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}'_{\rho_t}} p_{\theta_2}(x | \rho_t, \mathbf{x}_{<t}) \geq \alpha^{(\text{token})}$ .  $\alpha^{(\text{POS})}$  ( $0 < \alpha^{(\text{POS})} \leq 1$ ) and  $\alpha^{(\text{token})}$  ( $0 < \alpha^{(\text{token})} \leq 1$ ) are the hyperparameters for the sampling of POS and token, respectively.

For other sampling strategies used in POS sampling and token sampling, POS guided sampling can be similarly defined. For example, if we adopt top- $k$  sampling in POS sampling and nucleus sampling in token sampling, we can redefine the POS guided sampling by only changing the definition of  $\mathcal{P}'$  to the set of size  $k$  which maximizes  $\sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}'} p_{\theta_1}(\rho | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$ , with Equation 7 unchanged.

## 5. Experiments

We systematically evaluate our proposed methods on language modeling task (Section 5.2) and paraphrase generation task (Section 5.3).

### 5.1. Experimental Setup

#### 5.1.1. MODEL ARCHITECTURE

Since our proposed methods are architecture agnostic, we implement POS guided Softmax on the Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017), a widely used architecture for neural text generation. For the language modeling task, we use a 12-layer Transformer Decoder with 8 attention heads, embedding dimension 512, and projection dimension 2048. For the paraphrase generation task, we use a 6-layer Transformer Encoder and Decoder with the same other settings.

#### 5.1.2. BASELINE MODELS

We compare our **POS Guided Softmax (POSG-Softmax)** with the following baselines:

**Maximum likelihood estimation (MLE)**, a standard ap-

proach for neural text generation.

**Frequency-Aware Cross-Entropy (FACE)** (Jiang et al., 2019) dynamically weights the cross-entropy losses conditioned on the token frequency.

**Frequency Factorization Softmax (F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax)** (Jiang et al., 2019) factorizes the standard Softmax based on the token frequency.

**Unlikelihood training (UL)** (Welleck et al., 2020) is to enhance the log-likelihood loss with an unlikelihood loss that penalizes the generation of repeated tokens.

Note that all the baseline models have the same basic model architecture as our POS guided Softmax. Details of the experimental setup for each task are shown in Appendix A.

## 5.2. Language Modeling

### 5.2.1. DATASET

We performed experiments on the Wikitext-103<sup>1</sup> dataset (Merity et al., 2017), a large-scale benchmark containing more than 29 thousand Wikipedia articles with over 100 million words in total. Wikitext-103 has been widely used in many language modeling models (Welleck et al., 2020; Martins et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2020), but in order to train our POS guided Softmax, we need the corresponding POS tags. We use the Stanford CoreNLP’s POS tagger<sup>2</sup> (Manning et al., 2014) to annotate words in Wikitext-103 with XPOS<sup>3</sup> tags (Hornby et al., 2017). In our implementation, there are 45 different POS tags in total.

### 5.2.2. GENERATION DETAILS

We conduct the text completion task to evaluate models on the test set. Specifically, for each sample, we truncate 50 tokens as the prefix, and then guide model to decode following 100 tokens as the continuation from the given prefix. We use stochastic decoding to generate text. Note that all the baselines have only one sampling stage, i.e., token sampling, while our POS guided Softmax has an additional POS sampling. We adopt nucleus sampling for token sampling (for all models including baselines), and adopt top- $k$  sampling for POS sampling. We report the results of the models that have the smallest perplexity on the validation set.  $\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.5$  is selected for the token’s nucleus sampling. Results of other sampling hyperparameters are reported in Appendix C.

<sup>1</sup><https://s3.amazonaws.com/research.metamind.io/wikitext/wikitext-103-v1.zip>

<sup>2</sup><https://stanfordnlp.github.io/CoreNLP/index.html>

<sup>3</sup>The XPOS tags are language-specific part-of-speech tags from the Universal Dependency Treebanks.

### 5.2.3. METRICS

Similar to Choi et al. (2020), we evaluate the generated text with two types of metrics:

**Quality:** We measure the perplexity (PPL) (Mnih & Teh, 2012), KL-Divergence (KLD) (Kullback, 1997) on unigram distributions, and MS-Jaccard (Montahaei et al., 2019) on  $n$ -gram. All of above metrics are calculated between the generated continuations as hypotheses and the ground truths as references.

**Diversity:** We use Self-BLEU (Zhu et al., 2018) which is calculated by computing BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) of each generated text with all other generations as references. Moreover, we also compute the generated continuations’ unique tokens (Uniq), distinct  $n$ -gram (Distinct- $n$ ), and repetition (Rep) (Holtzman et al., 2020) which is the percentage of continuations ending with a repetition loop.

### 5.2.4. AUTOMATIC EVALUATION

Table 2 shows the automatic evaluation results comparing different training-based models on language modeling task. In terms of Self-BLEU<sub>4</sub>, our POS guided Softmax performs much better than MLE, F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax and unlikelihood training, indicating that our proposed model can generate diverse text effectively. The FACE reaches a Self-BLEU<sub>4</sub> score that is very close to our model, and it performs the best in Uniq. However, by checking the outputs (Table 7), we find that FACE produces more incoherent text that is hard to understand. Moreover, the Rep of our proposed model is perfectly 0.000, which means no continuations get stuck in repetition loops.

In terms of Distinct- $n$ , POS guided Softmax outperforms all baselines (except the unlikelihood training on Distinct-1), which further validates our model’s effectiveness in promoting text diversity. In order to verify that the text diversity is closely correlated with the POS diversity, we conduct a correlation test. We first annotate all the generated text with Stanford CoreNLP’s POS tagger, and define a  $n$ -POS to be contiguous  $n$  POS tags from the annotated POS tag sequence. Then, we can describe the degree of POS diversity by calculating the proportion of the distinct  $n$ -POS. Table 3 presents results of distinct  $n$ -gram and  $n$ -POS with corresponding Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. In terms of distinct  $n$ -POS, POS guided Softmax also surpasses all the baselines. This demonstrates that our proposed model can substantially promote the POS diversity. Additionally, the Pearson correlations between distinct  $n$ -POS and  $n$ -gram are extremely high, which indicates that the high POS diversity indeed leads to the high text diversity.

Since these training-based methods including ours make a trade-off between the text diversity and the likelihood of ground truth, MLE gets the lowest PPL, as shown in Table 2.

Models	PPL ↓	KLD ↓	MS-Jaccard ↑			Self-BLEU4 ↓	Rep ↓	Uniq ↑	Distinct ↑		
			n=1	n=2	n=3				n=1	n=2	n=3
MLE	<b>32.7</b>	1.34	56.9	38.2	25.4	46.9	1.86	11.7k	50.2	77.2	86.2
FACE	36.1	1.18	58.6	37.6	24.0	34.2	1.56	<b>14.9k</b>	60.0	85.1	90.6
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	35.0	1.58	51.5	33.7	22.4	51.5	4.09	10.8k	42.4	65.3	75.2
UL	37.0	1.20	61.2	40.4	<b>26.2</b>	42.4	0.240	12.8k	<b>61.2</b>	87.8	93.3
POSG-Softmax	34.4	<b>1.17</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>40.7</b>	25.9	<b>34.1</b>	<b>0.000</b>	13.8k	60.2	<b>88.8</b>	<b>94.3</b>

Table 2. Automatic evaluation results for different models on language modeling task. Numbers  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  in the column heads under MS-Jaccard and Distinct refer to  $n$ -gram. The best value is **bolded**. We report the results of POS guided Softmax that adopts top- $k$  sampling with  $k = 20$  in POS sampling.

Models	Distinct ↑					
	1-P	1-G	2-P	2-G	3-P	3-G
MLE	17.9	50.2	47.1	77.2	67.6	86.2
FACE	19.4	60.0	54.1	85.1	75.4	90.6
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	16.4	42.4	39.3	65.3	56.0	75.2
UL	19.4	61.2	54.0	87.8	76.2	93.3
POSG-Softmax	20.0	60.2	58.9	88.8	81.7	94.3
Human	21.7	67.7	61.8	93.0	83.8	95.9
PPMCC	0.978		0.983		0.984	

Table 3. Results of distinct  $n$ -gram and  $n$ -POS with corresponding Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (PPMCC).  $n$ -P and  $n$ -G where  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  are abbreviated notations for  $n$ -POS and  $n$ -gram, respectively.

Models	Quality ↑	Diversity ↑
MLE	3.10	2.86
FACE	3.18	3.32
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	2.80	2.35
UL	<b>3.20</b>	3.36
POSG-Softmax	3.11	<b>3.42</b>

Table 4. Human evaluation on language modeling task.

However, the optimal performance of other quality metrics, such as KLD and MS-Jaccard, confirms that POS guided Softmax can still maintain comparable generation quality.

### 5.2.5. HUMAN EVALUATION

We perform an extensive human evaluation to better assess the quality and diversity of generated text. For language modeling task, we randomly sample 100 generated continuations from each model. Each of them is scored between 1 to 5 (5 is the best), by five workers to evaluate the overall quality and diversity. Specifically, we ask workers to evaluate the overall diversity of a text from *form* (How to say it?) and *content* (What to say?), which is consistent with the definition of the low-diversity problem in Section 1. The detailed questionnaire is shown in Appendix B.

The results of the human evaluation are shown in Table 4.

It can be seen that our POS guided Softmax outperforms all other baselines in terms of diversity, and performs relatively well in terms of quality. Additionally, we observe that F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax performs worst in both automatic evaluation and human evaluation. By checking the outputs, we find that F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax suffers from a serious repetition problem. The F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax’s outputs always get stuck in repetition loops which severely affect the quality and diversity. However, F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax performs relatively well on the paraphrase generation task. Therefore, also as an improved method of Softmax, one more advantage of our POS guided Softmax lies in its insensitivity to the training set.

## 5.3. Paraphrase Generation

### 5.3.1. DATASET

We use the the ParaNMT-50M<sup>4</sup> paraphrase dataset (Wieting & Gimpel, 2018) for paraphrase generation. ParaNMT-50M consists of over 50 million paraphrases, generated by back-translation. For better training, we first remove the sentences that are less than 10 tokens. Moreover, ParaNMT-50M dataset has provided translation scores to measure the quality of back-translation, that a low translation score means semantically inconsistent, while a high translation score usually accompanies low diversity. Therefore, we only keep the paraphrase pairs whose translation scores are between 0.7 to 0.8. Finally, we get a filtered dataset containing 1.6 million paraphrase pairs with both high quality and diversity. We also use the Stanford CoreNLP to tokenize the text and annotate corresponding POS tags.

### 5.3.2. GENERATION DETAILS

We conduct the standard sequence-to-sequence paraphrase generation for testing. In this task, we find that using nucleus sampling in the POS sampling stage can better guarantee text quality while promoting diversity. Thus, we adopt nucleus sampling for both the token sampling and POS

<sup>4</sup><https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rbF3daJjCsa1-fu2GANEJd2FBXoslugD/view>

Models	BERTScore $\uparrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$				Self-WER $\uparrow$	Self-BLEU $\downarrow$			
		n=1	n=2	n=3	n=4		n=1	n=2	n=3	n=4
MLE	45.8	45.6	30.6	20.2	13.4	57.6	54.9	41.6	30.9	22.6
FACE	48.0	46.5	31.5	21.1	14.1	54.6	56.0	42.7	32.3	23.9
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	<b>52.8</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	50.2	59.5	46.8	36.4	27.7
UL	46.1	45.2	30.0	19.9	13.1	57.3	<b>54.7</b>	41.2	30.6	22.2
POSG-Softmax	47.1	46.5	31.3	21.0	14.2	<b>58.6</b>	55.0	<b>41.1</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>21.6</b>

Table 5. Automatic evaluation results for different models on paraphrase generation task. Numbers  $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  in the column heads under BLEU and Self-BLEU refer to  $n$ -gram. The best value is **bolded**. We report the results of POS guided Softmax that adopts nucleus sampling with  $\alpha^{(\text{POS})} = 0.9$  in POS sampling.




Figure 2. Quality-diversity trade-off for different models. The x-axis measures BLEU4 for quality, and the y-axis measures negative Self-BLEU4 for diversity. Both are the bigger the better.

Models	Flu. $\uparrow$	Rel. $\uparrow$	Div. $\uparrow$	
			Lex.	Syn.
MLE	3.34	3.09	2.92	2.65
FACE	<b>3.60</b>	3.35	2.91	2.58
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	3.59	<b>3.38</b>	2.77	2.57
UL	3.37	3.17	3.00	2.68
POSG-Softmax	3.58	3.35	<b>3.02</b>	<b>2.79</b>

Table 6. Human evaluation on paraphrase generation task.

sampling.  $\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.8$  is selected in all the models' token sampling. Results of other sampling hyperparameters are reported in Appendix C.

### 5.3.3. METRICS

We evaluate the generated paraphrases with following two types of metrics:

**Quality:** We use the BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020) to measure the semantic consistency between the generated paraphrases and input sentences. Besides, we also calculate BLEU score on  $n$ -gram to evaluate the closeness of the

generated paraphrases to references.

**Diversity:** To assess how different the generated paraphrases are compared to the original sentences, we calculate BLEU and Word Error Rate (WER) (Goyal & Durrett, 2020) between the generated paraphrases and input sentences. We denote them as Self-BLEU and Self-WER, respectively.

### 5.3.4. AUTOMATIC EVALUATION

The experimental results of our model and baselines on paraphrase generation task are shown in Table 5. Our proposed model outperforms other baselines on most of the diversity metrics. In both Table 2 and Table 5, we observe that for those diversity metrics computing on  $n$ -gram, the improvements of our model over other baselines increase with the growth of  $n$ . This is because POS is the morpho-syntactic tag of a sentence, and the diversity of POS can contribute to the diversity of text lexically and syntactically, which can also be seen from the human evaluation results in Table 6.

In terms of quality metrics, our POS guided Softmax performs better than MLE and UL, while the best model in quality, i.e., F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax performs worst in diversity. This demonstrates that our model can generate more diverse paraphrases while keeping semantically consistent and high-quality. To make a more intuitive comparison, we tune the sampling hyperparameters to draw the quality-diversity trade-off in Figure 2. Clearly, POS guided Softmax surpasses all the baselines with a significant gap. These results confirm that our model can produce equally high-quality text that is more diverse, and vice versa.

### 5.3.5. HUMAN EVALUATION

We also conduct a human evaluation for the generated paraphrases. 100 examples are randomly sampled from each models' outputs, respectively. Each of them are evaluated by five workers from the following four aspects: (i) *Fluency*: how fluent are the generated paraphrases? (ii) *Relevance*: how semantically consistent are between generated paraphrases and the input sentences? (iii) *lexical diversity*: how

**Prefix:** Below them, North Koreans continued crossing the river and moving supplies forward to their combat units, some of them already several miles eastward. The North Koreans quickly discovered Task Force Manchu group. They first attacked it at 14:00 that afternoon, and were repulsed

**MLE:** by the North Koreans. On the morning of September 8, the North Korean forces launched a surprise attack on the high ground west of the Kum River. At 16:30, the North Korean force launched a massive attack on the North Korean force, but the initial attack was not successful. The North Korean offensive was halted by the remnants of the North Korean forces

**FACE:** by heavy machine-gun fire. In the early morning hours of 8 September, North Korean troops were alerted to attack on the perimeter. On 9 September, a force of 20,000 men led by Lieutenant Colonel Robert E. telluride began to attack the North Korean lines, suffering little damage. By 14:00 on 9 September, North Korean forces had crossed the Naktong River just before midnight.

**F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax:** by the North Koreans. The North Koreans were ordered to withdraw to the rear of the North Koreans. They then launched a frontal attack on the south side of the river. The North Koreans then launched a frontal attack on the North Korean right flank. The North Korean right flank was soon overrun by the North Koreans. The North Koreans were subsequently repulsed by the North Koreans,

**UL:** by North Korean fire, which forced the North Koreans to retreat. A further assault by the 1st U.S. Infantry Regiment followed in the afternoon, and after seven hours of fighting, the 2nd U.S. Infantry Regiment broke off the attack and retreated across the river. The survivors of the Battle of Tellers managed to escape to a new bridge. Task Force presaged, but by 20:00 the North Koreans were completely surrounded by North Korean troops.

**POSG-Softmax:** by the North Koreans, beginning their advance south of Osan on 18 September. By nightfall on 24 September, Ho Chi Minh had secured its flank, while the South Koreans had captured the town of Phong on the west of Taejon. The North Koreans had retreated to Pyongtaek, and in the afternoon of 22 September on 30 September two North Koreans were killed there, leaving behind the town to the survivors.

Table 7. Examples of language modeling on Wikitext-103 dataset. Wrong repeating text is highlighted in blue, dull text with one single context is highlighted in orange, and incoherent text is highlighted in red.

**Source Sentence:** that it would be good for the city in a certain economic sense .

**MLE:** this will be an economic sense for the entire city .

**FACE:** this will create a good economic point in the city .

**F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax:** this will make sense of economic sense for the city .

**UL:** this will be considerable economic considerations for the city 's going to be able to economic point of the city .

**POSG-Softmax:** it is what makes good economic sense to the city .

Table 8. Examples of paraphrase generation on ParaNMT-50M.

lexically diverse are the generated sentences? (iv) *syntactical diversity*: how syntactically diverse are the generated sentences? All these aspects are scored between 1 to 5, the higher the better.

As shown in Table 6, the results of the human evaluation are strongly consistent with the automatic evaluation. Compared with MLE, POS guided Softmax substantially improves the generation quality, and it only has a tiny gap from the best model in fluency and relevance scores. Meanwhile, POS guided Softmax has the best scores in diversity, which further verifies that our proposed methods can benefit from POS to generate more lexically and syntactically diverse paraphrases.

#### 5.4. Qualitative Analysis

Table 7 provides examples of text completion produced by our model and other baselines. It can be observed that MLE and F<sup>2</sup>-Softmax both suffer from a severe repetition problem, and they also generate many similar sentences about a single content. FACE produces a large amount of incoherent text, making the text somewhat hard to read. UL and our POS guided Softmax alleviate those problems, while our model performs relatively better. Additionally, examples of paraphrase generation task are shown in Table 8. We observe that almost all models can generate high-quality paraphrases with well-preserved semantic meanings, while our POS guided Softmax exhibits more syntactic diversity than other baselines.

#### 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced POS guided Softmax, a simple but effective method to address the low-diversity problem in text generation. POS guided Softmax enables models to capture contextual and syntactical information in human language by leveraging POS as an observed and controllable clue in both the training and decoding phases. Experimental results and human evaluation on language modeling and paraphrase generation have demonstrated the effectiveness of our proposed method, yielding significant gains in text diversity lexically and syntactically. In future work, we will extend our method into a subword level and adapt tree-structured syntax information to guide text generation.

## References

- Baniata, L. H., Park, S., and Park, S.-B. A multitask-based neural machine translation model with part-of-speech tags integration for arabic dialects. *Applied Sciences*, 8 (12):2502, 2018.
- Bohnet, B., McDonald, R. T., Simões, G., Andor, D., Pitler, E., and Maynez, J. Morphosyntactic tagging with a meta-bilstm model over context sensitive token encodings. In Gurevych, I. and Miyao, Y. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, volume 1, pp. 2642–2652, 2018.
- Caccia, M., Caccia, L., Fedus, W., Larochelle, H., Pineau, J., and Charlin, L. Language gans falling short. In *In 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Choi, B., Hong, J., Park, D. K., and Lee, S. W.  $F^2$ -softmax: Diversifying neural text generation via frequency factorized softmax. In Webber, B., Cohn, T., He, Y., and Liu, Y. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9167–9182, 2020.
- Fan, A., Lewis, M., and Dauphin, Y. N. Hierarchical neural story generation. In Gurevych, I. and Miyao, Y. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, volume 1, pp. 889–898, 2018.
- Fu, Z., Lam, W., So, A. M.-C., and Shi, B. A theoretical analysis of the repetition problem in text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14660*, 2020.
- Ghazvininejad, M., Karpukhin, V., Zettlemoyer, L., and Levy, O. Aligned cross entropy for non-autoregressive machine translation. In *In Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3515–3523, 2020.
- Goyal, T. and Durrett, G. Neural syntactic preordering for controlled paraphrase generation. In Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schluter, N., and Tetreault, J. R. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 238–252, 2020.
- He, T. and Glass, J. R. Negative training for neural dialogue response generation. In Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schluter, N., and Tetreault, J. R. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2044–2058, 2020.
- Holtzman, A., Buys, J., Du, L., Forbes, M., and Choi, Y. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *In 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Hornby, R., Taylor, C., and Park, J. Corpus selection approaches for multilingual parsing from raw text to universal dependencies. In Hajic, J. and Zeman, D. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pp. 198–206, 2017.
- Jiang, S., Ren, P., Monz, C., and de Rijke, M. Improving neural response diversity with frequency-aware cross-entropy loss. In Liu, L., White, R. W., Mantrach, A., Silvestri, F., McAuley, J. J., Baeza-Yates, R., and Zia, L. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference*, pp. 2879–2885, 2019.
- Kasai, J., Cross, J., Ghazvininejad, M., and Gu, J. Non-autoregressive machine translation with disentangled context transformer. In *In Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5144–5155, 2020.
- Kulikov, I., Miller, A. H., Cho, K., and Weston, J. Importance of a search strategy in neural dialogue modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00907*, 2018.
- Kullback, S. *Information theory and statistics*. Courier Corporation, 1997.
- Li, J., Li, C., Wang, G., Fu, H., Lin, Y., Chen, L., Zhang, Y., Tao, C., Zhang, R., Wang, W., Shen, D., Yang, Q., and Carin, L. Improving text generation with student-forcing optimal transport. In Webber, B., Cohn, T., He, Y., and Liu, Y. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9144–9156, 2020.
- Manning, C. D., Surdeanu, M., Bauer, J., Finkel, J. R., Bethard, S., and McClosky, D. The stanford corenlp natural language processing toolkit. In *In Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics System Demonstrations*, pp. 55–60, 2014.
- Martins, P. H., Marinho, Z., and Martins, A. F. T. Sparse text generation. In Webber, B., Cohn, T., He, Y., and Liu, Y. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 4252–4273, 2020.
- Merity, S., Xiong, C., Bradbury, J., and Socher, R. Pointer sentinel mixture models. In *In 5th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Mnih, A. and Teh, Y. W. A fast and simple algorithm for training neural probabilistic language models. In *In Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2012.

- Montahaei, E., Alihosseini, D., and Baghshah, M. S. Jointly measuring diversity and quality in text generation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03971*, 2019.
- Niehues, J. and Cho, E. Exploiting linguistic resources for neural machine translation using multi-task learning. In Bojar, O., Buck, C., Chatterjee, R., Federmann, C., Graham, Y., Haddow, B., Huck, M., Jimeno-Yepes, A., Koehn, P., and Kreutzer, J. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the Second Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 80–89, 2017.
- Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., and Zhu, W. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *In Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 311–318, 2002.
- Scialom, T., Dray, P., Lamprier, S., Piwowarski, B., and Staliano, J. Discriminative adversarial search for abstractive summarization. In *In Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 8555–8564, 2020.
- Sennrich, R. and Haddow, B. Linguistic input features improve neural machine translation. In *In Proceedings of the First Conference on Machine Translation*, pp. 83–91, 2016.
- Shirai, K., Hashimoto, K., Eriguchi, A., Ninomiya, T., and Mori, S. Neural text generation with artificial negative examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14124*, 2020.
- Tevet, G. and Berant, J. Evaluating the evaluation of diversity in natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.02990*, 2020.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. In Guyon, I., von Luxburg, U., Bengio, S., Wallach, H. M., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S. V. N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 5998–6008, 2017.
- Vijayakumar, A. K., Cogswell, M., Selvaraju, R. R., Sun, Q., Lee, S., Crandall, D. J., and Batra, D. Diverse beam search for improved description of complex scenes. In McIlraith, S. A. and Weinberger, K. Q. (eds.), *In Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 7371–7379, 2018.
- Welleck, S., Kulikov, I., Roller, S., Dinan, E., Cho, K., and Weston, J. Neural text generation with unlikelihood training. In *In 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Wieting, J. and Gimpel, K. Parantmt-50m: Pushing the limits of paraphrastic sentence embeddings with millions of machine translations. In Gurevych, I. and Miyao, Y. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 451–462, 2018.
- Zhang, T., Kishore, V., Wu, F., Weinberger, K. Q., and Artzi, Y. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with BERT. In *In 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Zhou, G. and Lampouras, G. Generating safe diversity in nlg via imitation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14364*, 2020.
- Zhu, Y., Lu, S., Zheng, L., Guo, J., Zhang, W., Wang, J., and Yu, Y. Taxygen: A benchmarking platform for text generation models. In Collins-Thompson, K., Mei, Q., Davison, B. D., Liu, Y., and Yilmaz, E. (eds.), *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, pp. 1097–1100, 2018.

## A. Experimental Setup

### A.1. Dataset

The dataset statistics of Wikitext-103 and ParaNMT-50M are reported in Table 9 and Table 10, respectively. Specifically, we use the original settings of Wikitext-103 dataset for training, validation, and test set splitting.

	Train	Valid	Test
#Articles	28,475	60	60
#Tokens	103,227,021	217,646	245,569

Table 9. Statistics of Wikitext-103.

	Train	Valid	Test
#Sentence	1,640,709	3,000	1,500

Table 10. Statistics of ParaNMT-50M.

### A.2. Hyperparameters Setting

All the algorithms are implemented in Pytorch and trained on an NVIDIA TITAN RTX GPU for 10 epochs with the hyperparameters reported in Table 11.

Hyperparameters	Wikitext-103	ParaNMT-50M
Batch size	12	96
Learning rate	0.0001	0.0001
Finetuning LR	0.00001	0.00001
Finetuning step	1500	1500
Gradient clipping	0.25	0.25
Weight decay	0.001	0.001
Droupout	0.1	0.1
Optimizer	Adam	Adam
$-\beta_1$	0.9	0.9
$-\beta_2$	0.999	0.999
$-\epsilon$	1e-8	1e-8

Table 11. Hyperparameter settings for different datasets.

We choose the batch sizes according to the GPU memory constraint. Note that we use FACE-OPR among the four variants of FACE, and we train it in the way of finetuning with corresponding fineturning LR and fineturning step.

## B. Human Evaluation Questionnaire

In the human evaluation of both tasks, workers are given 100 randomly sampled inputs, and corresponding outputs from each model. Then, they need to score those outputs according to the description in the questionnaire, as shown in Table 12 and Table 13.

The goal of this review is to evaluate the quality and diversity of generated texts. In this review, you will read an excerpt from Wikipedia with first 50 words as prefixes, and its corresponding 100-word continuations. You should rate the continuations between 1 - 5 in two ways:

(1) Quality. The overall quality of a text can be evaluated in many different aspects, such as fluency, readability, coherence, and so on. (1 = The continuation is incoherent, difficult to understand, not related to the prefix, and has many syntactically and semantically errors; 5 = The continuation is coherent, easy to understand, related to the prefix, and grammatically correct)

(2) Diversity. The overall diversity of a text can be evaluated from form (How to say it?) and content (What to say?). (1 = The continuation is always repeating some words, its sentences share the similar forms syntactically and lexically, and its content is dull; 5 = The continuation seldom repeats words, its sentences have various syntactical and lexical forms, and it contains different things related to the prefix) You should score between 1 - 5, where 5 is best and 1 is worst. You can consider and make a final decision by comparing different continuations of the same prefix.

Table 12. Human evaluation questionnaire for language modeling.

The goal of this review is to evaluate the quality and diversity of a text paraphrase dataset. In this review, you will be given an original sentence, and its corresponding paraphrases. You should rate the paraphrases between 1 - 5 in four ways:

(1) Fluency: how fluent are the generated paraphrases?

(2) Relevance: how semantically consistent are between generated paraphrases and the input sentences?

(3) Lexical Diversity: how lexically diverse are the generated sentences?

(4) Syntactical Diversity: how syntactically diverse are the generated sentences?

You should score between 1 - 5, where 5 is best and 1 is worst. You can consider and make a final decision by comparing different paraphrases of the same original sentence.

Table 13. Human evaluation questionnaire for paraphrase generation.

## C. Additional Evaluation Results

Additional automatic evaluation results on different sampling hyperparameters are presented in Table 14 and Table 15. POS guided Softmax also performs generally best in terms of diversity, while maintaining comparable quality. Those results further confirm the effectiveness of our proposed methods.

Neural Text Generation with Part-of-Speech Guided Softmax

Models	PPL ↓	KLD ↓	MS-Jaccard ↑			Self-BLEU4 ↓	Rep ↓	Uniq ↑	Distinct ↑		
			n=1	n=2	n=3				n=1	n=2	n=3
$\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.3$											
MLE	<b>32.7</b>	1.74	51.2	33.6	22.5	52.9	2.64	9.05k	39.2	61.0	70.8
FACE	36.1	1.41	53.6	34.5	22.3	42.0	1.74	<b>12.0k</b>	49.8	73.0	80.8
F2-Softmax	35.0	1.62	51.5	33.7	22.4	51.5	4.57	10.4k	41.1	63.8	74.0
UL	37.0	1.53	55.1	36.1	23.8	52.5	0.720	10.4k	51.7	76.8	85.2
POSG-Softmax	34.4	<b>1.34</b>	<b>59.3</b>	<b>38.9</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>38.9</b>	<b>0.420</b>	11.8k	<b>56.2</b>	<b>85.3</b>	<b>92.3</b>
$\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.4$											
MLE	<b>32.7</b>	1.53	53.7	35.6	23.9	50.5	5.83	10.3k	44.6	69.3	79.2
FACE	36.1	1.27	56.5	36.4	23.4	39.0	3.06	<b>13.5k</b>	55.5	80.3	87.1
F2-Softmax	35.0	1.65	50.8	33.0	21.9	52.8	4.15	10.3k	40.0	61.7	71.6
UL	37.0	1.34	58.8	38.7	<b>25.4</b>	47.3	1.26	11.5k	56.7	83	90.1
POSG-Softmax	34.4	<b>1.25</b>	<b>60.4</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>0.540</b>	12.9k	<b>58.1</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>93.3</b>
$\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.5$											
MLE	<b>32.7</b>	1.34	56.9	38.2	25.4	46.9	1.86	11.7k	50.2	77.2	86.2
FACE	36.1	1.18	58.6	37.6	24.0	34.2	1.56	<b>14.9k</b>	60.0	85.1	90.6
F2-Softmax	35.0	1.58	51.5	33.7	22.4	51.5	4.09	10.8k	42.4	65.3	75.2
UL	37.0	1.20	61.2	40.4	<b>26.2</b>	42.4	0.240	12.8k	<b>61.2</b>	87.8	93.3
POSG-Softmax	34.4	<b>1.17</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>40.7</b>	25.9	<b>34.1</b>	<b>0.000</b>	13.8k	60.2	<b>88.8</b>	<b>94.3</b>

Table 14. Automatic evaluation results for language modeling task on different sampling hyperparameters.

Models	BERTScore ↑	BLEU ↑				Self-WER ↑	Self-BLEU ↓			
		n=1	n=2	n=3	n=4		n=1	n=2	n=3	n=4
$\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.6$										
MLE	52.5	48.5	33.8	23.3	16.0	50.7	59.7	47.4	37.1	28.5
FACE	52.4	48.3	33.6	23.1	15.7	49.9	59.6	47.5	37.3	28.7
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	<b>57.0</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>36.2</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>17.8</b>	46.7	62.9	51.3	41.5	32.8
UL	53.0	48.5	33.4	22.9	15.8	49.9	59.9	47.4	37.2	28.6
POSG-Softmax	49.0	47.3	32.0	21.5	14.5	<b>57.2</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>22.7</b>
$\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.7$										
MLE	50.0	48.0	33.1	22.6	15.3	53.1	58.3	45.2	34.6	25.8
FACE	50.9	48.1	33.3	22.7	15.3	51.4	58.6	45.8	35.4	26.8
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	<b>55.4</b>	<b>49.8</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>17.1</b>	48.2	61.4	49.5	39.5	30.8
UL	49.9	47.1	32.0	21.6	14.6	53.2	57.5	44.8	34.5	26.0
POSG-Softmax	47.8	46.9	31.5	21.1	14.1	<b>58.0</b>	<b>55.7</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>22.1</b>
$\alpha^{(\text{token})} = 0.8$										
MLE	45.8	45.6	30.6	20.2	13.4	57.6	54.9	41.6	30.9	22.6
FACE	48.0	46.5	31.5	21.1	14.1	54.6	56.0	42.7	32.3	23.9
F <sup>2</sup> -Softmax	<b>52.8</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	50.2	59.5	46.8	36.4	27.7
UL	46.1	45.2	30.0	19.9	13.1	57.3	<b>54.7</b>	41.2	30.6	22.2
POSG-Softmax	47.1	46.5	31.3	21.0	14.2	<b>58.6</b>	55.0	<b>41.1</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>21.6</b>

Table 15. Automatic evaluation results for paraphrase generation task on different sampling hyperparameters.