

Hierarchical Curriculum Learning for AMR Parsing

Peiyi Wang^{1†} Liang Chen^{1†} Tianyu Liu² Baobao Chang¹ Zhifang Sui¹

¹ Key Laboratory of Computational Linguistics, Peking University, MOE, China

² Tencent Cloud Xiaowei

wangpeiyi9979@gmail.com; leo.liang.chen@outlook.com

rogertyliu@tencent.com; {chbb, szf}@pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) parsing translates sentences to the semantic representation with hierarchical structure, which is recently empowered by pretrained encoder-decoder models. However the flat sentence-to-AMR training paradigm impedes the representation learning of concepts and relations in the deeper AMR sub-graph. To make the sequence-to-sequence models better adapt to the inherent AMR structure, we propose a hierarchical curriculum learning (HCL) which consists of (1) structure-level curriculum (SC) and (2) instance-level curriculum (IC). SC switches progressively from shallow to deep AMR sub-graphs while IC transits from easy to hard AMR instances during training. Extensive experiments show that BART trained with HCL achieves the state-of-the-art performance on the AMR-2.0 and AMR-3.0 benchmark, and significantly outperforms baselines on the structure-dependent evaluation metrics and hard instances.

1 Introduction

Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) (Banasescu et al., 2013) parsing aims to translate a natural sentence into a directed acyclic graph. Figure 1 illustrates an AMR graph where nodes represent concepts, e.g., ‘die-01’ and ‘soldier’, and edges represent relations, e.g., ‘:ARG1’ and ‘:quant’. AMR has been widely exploited in the downstream NLP tasks, including information extraction (Rao et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017; Zhang and Ji, 2021), text summarization (Liao et al., 2018; Hardy and Vlachos, 2018) and question answering (Mitra and Baral, 2016; Sachan and Xing, 2016).

The powerful pretrained encoder-decoder models, e.g., BART (Lewis et al., 2019), have been




Figure 1: The AMR (sub-)graphs of the sentence “Nine of the twenty soldiers died”. The deeper sub-graphs contain more sophisticated semantics compared with shallower ones.

successfully adapted to the AMR parsing (Xu et al., 2020b; Bevilacqua et al., 2021), which generates the linearized AMR graph (Figure 1) from the sentence. Recently the sequence-to-sequence learning with pretrained models has swept the AMR leaderboard (Bevilacqua et al., 2021). However, there exists a gap between flat sentence-to-AMR training objective and the inherent hierarchical structure of AMR graph. The concepts and relations that locate in the different layers of AMR graph correspond to different level of abstraction in terms of semantic representation as depicted in Figure 1.

To this end, we propose a hierarchical curriculum learning framework with two curriculums to help the flat pretrained model progressively adapt to the structured AMR graph. *a)* **Structure-level Curriculum (SC)**. AMR graphs are organized in a hierarchy that the core semantics stay closely to the root node (Cai and Lam, 2019). Motivated by human learning process, i.e., **core concepts first, then details**, instead of parsing the complete lin-

[†]Equal Contribution.




Figure 2: The average SMATCH scores for AMR graphs with different depths. The AMR graphs with at least 7 layers accounted for 43.6% in the AMR-2.0 test set.

earized AMR graph in the entire training stage, SC first enumerates all AMR sub-graphs with different depths, and then transits from shallow to deep AMR sub-graphs during training. *b) Instance-level Curriculum (IC)*. Our preliminary study in Figure 2 shows that the performance of BART baseline would drop rapidly as the depth of AMR graph grows, which verifies that pretrained models may be clumsy while handing deeper AMR semantics. Inspired by human cognition, i.e., **easy first, then hard**, we propose IC which trains the model to start from easy instances with shallower AMR structure and then gradually transfer to hard instances.

To sum up: (1) Inspired by human learning process, i.e., starting from core concepts and easy instances, we propose a hierarchical curriculum learning (HCI) framework for AMR parsing. (2) Extensive experiments show that our HCI method achieves the new state-of-the-art performance on two popular benchmarks of AMR parsing, and significantly outperforms the baselines on the structure-dependent evaluation metrics and deeper AMR graphs.

2 Related Work

2.1 AMR Parsing

AMR parsing is a challenging task due to the inherent hierarchical structure of the AMR graph. Previous methods formulate AMR as different structures, e.g., sequence, tree, graph and actions, thus they can be broadly divided into 4 categories, sequence-to-sequence approaches (Ge et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2020b; Bevilacqua et al., 2021), sequence-to-tree approaches (Zhang et al., 2019b,a), sequence-to-graph approaches (Lyu and Titov, 2018; Cai and Lam, 2020) and transition-based approaches (Naseem et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021). Recently, the sequence-to-sequence approaches based on pretrained models achieve promising performance in AMR parsing

(Xu et al., 2020b; Bevilacqua et al., 2021), and they do not need the complex, dataset-specific pre- and post-processing, which is easier in implementation and better in generalization.

2.2 Curriculum Learning

Curriculum Learning (CL) (Bengio et al., 2009) is a learning strategy inline with human cognition, which first starts out with easy tasks and then increase the task difficulty. CL mainly consists of two elements, the difficulty measurer, which calculates the difficulty of each task, and the training scheduler, which selects the training tasks based on their difficulties in each training step. CL has demonstrated its benefits in various NLP tasks (Su et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020a; Guo et al., 2020; Platanios et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018). In this paper, motivated by human learning process, i.e., core concepts and easy instances first, we propose a hierarchical curriculum learning framework to help the flat sequence-to-sequence model progressively adapt to the structured AMR graphs.

3 Methodology

Task Formulation We formulate AMR parsing as a sequence-to-sequence transformation. Given a sentence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, the model aims to generate a linearized AMR graph $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_M)$. As shown in Figure 1, following Bevilacqua et al. (2021), the AMR graph was linearized with Depth-First Search (DFS) traversal, and the nodes in AMR are replaced with a series of special tokens $\langle R0 \rangle$, ..., $\langle Rk \rangle$.

Method Overview Figure 3 shows our hierarchical curriculum learning framework with structure-level and instance-level curricula.

3.1 Structure-level Curriculum

Motivated by the human learning process, i.e., core concepts first, we propose Structure-level Curriculum (SC). AMR graphs are organized in a hierarchy where the core semantics stay closely to the root (Cai and Lam, 2019), thus SC divides all AMR sub-graphs into N buckets $\{S_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ according to their depths, where S_i contains AMR sub-graphs with the depth i . As shown in the left part of Figure 3, the SC has N training episodes, and each episode consists of T_{sc} steps. In each step of the i -th episode, the training scheduler samples a batch of examples from buckets $\{S_j : j \leq i\}$ to train the model. When parsing a sentence into a




Figure 3: The overview of our hierarchical curriculum learning framework with two curricula, Structure-level and Instance-level Curriculum (IC). During training, SC follows the human learning process to firstly learn the core semantics, which switches progressively from shallow to deep AMR sub-graphs while IC follows the human intuition to start with easy instances, which transits from easy to hard AMR instances.

sub-graph with depth d , we replace the start token of the decoder (e.g., $\langle s \rangle$ in BART) to an artificial token $\langle d \rangle$.

3.2 Instance-level Curriculum

Inspired by human cognition, i.e., learning easy instances first, we propose Instance-level Curriculum (IC). Figure 2 shows AMR graphs with deeper layers can be regarded as harder instances, thus IC divides all AMR graphs into M buckets $\{I_i : i = 1, \dots, M\}$ according to their depths, where I_i contains AMR graphs with the depth i . As shown in the right part of Figure 3, IC has M training episodes, and each episode consists of T_{ic} steps. In each step of the i -th episode, the training scheduler samples a batch of examples from buckets $\{I_j : j \leq i\}$ to train the model. It is important to note that although SC and IC have the same difficulty measurer and training scheduler, they are in different hierarchies. SC trains the model on AMR sub-graphs, which follows the principle of learning the core semantic first, while IC trains the model on full-AMR graphs, which obeys the rule of learning easy instances first.

4 Experiments

Datasets and Evaluation Metrics We evaluate our hierarchy curriculum learning framework on two popular AMR benchmark datasets, AMR2.0 (LDC2017T10) and AMR3.0 (LDC2020T02). AMR2.0 contains 36521, 1368 and 1371 sentence-AMR pairs in training, development and testing sets, respectively. AMR3.0 is larger in size, with 55635, 1722 and 1898 sentence-AMR pairs for training development and testing set, respectively.

For evaluation, we use the SMATCH scores (Cai and Knight, 2013) and further the fine-grained eval-

uation metrics (Damonte et al., 2016) to evaluate the performance of AMR models.

Experiment Setups Our implementation is based on Huggingface’s transformers library (Wolf et al., 2019). We use BART-large as our sequence-to-sequence model the same as (Bevilacqua et al., 2021). We utilizes RAdam (Liu et al., 2019) as our optimizer and set the learning rate to $3e-5$. The batch size is 2048 graph linearization tokens and the gradient accumulation is 10 steps. Dropout is set to 0.25 and beam size is 5. The training steps T_{sc} is 1000 and T_{ic} is 500. After the curriculum training, the model are trained for 30 epochs on the training set. We use the cross-entropy as our loss function.

Main Results We compare our method with previous approaches in Table 1. As is shown, our hierarchical curriculum learning model achieves 84.6 ± 0.1 and 84.1 ± 0.1 SMATCH scores on AMR2.0 and AMR3.0, respectively, which outperforms previous best model (Bevilacqua et al., 2021) on both two benchmarks. For the fine-grained results, our model achieves the best performance in 6 out of 8 metrics on AMR2.0 and all metrics on AMR3.0. Although (Cai and Lam, 2020) outperforms our model on in Neg. and Wiki. on AMR2.0, they adopt a complex pre- and post-processing algorithm, which is not conducive to the generalization ability of models.

5 Analysis

Structure Benefit As shown in Table 1, compared with our baselines, our method achieves significant gains on 3 structure-dependent metrics (unlabelled, re-entrancy and SRL), which proves our hierarchical curriculum learning framework helps

Model	SMATCH	Structure-independent					Structure-dependent			
		NoWSD	Conc.	NER	Neg.	Wiki.	Unll.	Reen.	SRL	
AMR2.0	Lyu and Titov (2018) ^G	74.4	75.5	85.9	86.0	58.4	75.7	77.1	52.3	69.8
	Zhang et al. (2019a)	76.3	76.8	84.8	77.9	75.2	85.8	79.0	60.0	69.7
	Zhang et al. (2019b) ^G	77	78	86	79	77	86	80	61	71
	Cai and Lam (2020) ^G	80.2	80.8	88.1	81.1	78.9	86.3	82.8	64.6	74.2
	Astudillo et al. (2020)	80.2	80.7	88.1	87.5	64.5	78.8	84.2	70.3	78.2
	Zhou et al. (2021)	81.8	82.3	88.7	88.5	69.7	78.8	85.5	71.1	80.8
	Bevilacqua et al. (2021)	83.8	84.4	90.2	90.6	74.4	84.3	86.1	70.8	79.6
	Ours	84.6	85.1	90.2	91.6	73.1	82.3	88.0	74.7	82.6
AMR3.0	Cai and Lam (2020)	78.0	78.5	88.5	83.7	68.9	75.7	81.9	63.7	73.2
	Cai and Lam (2020) ^G	76.7	77.2	86.5	74.7	72.6	77.3	80.6	62.6	72.2
	Zhou et al. (2021)	80.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Bevilacqua et al. (2021)	83.0	83.5	89.8	87.2	73.0	82.7	85.4	70.4	78.9
	Ours	84.1	84.5	89.8	89.0	73.0	82.7	87.2	73.9	82.4

Table 1: The SMATCH scores and 5 structure-independent and 3 structure-dependent fine-grained F1 scores on the AMR 2.0 and 3.0 test set, among models that do not use extra silver data. Models^G indicates these models adopt the graph re-categorization (a data processing method that may hurt the model generalization (Bevilacqua et al., 2021)).

Model	AMR2.0	AMR3.0
Ours	84.6 ± 0.1	84.1 ± 0.1
w/o structure curriculum	84.2 ± 0.2	83.4 ± 0.1
w/o instance curriculum	84.3 ± 0.1	83.7 ± 0.2
w/ inverse curriculum	83.7 ± 0.2	82.8 ± 0.1

Table 2: The effect of our proposed curriculums on AMR2.0 and AMR3.0. We report the SMATCH scores with standard deviation on 3 different seeds. ‘w/ inverse curriculum’ trains the model from deep to shallow AMR sub-graphs, and hard to easy instances.

the sequence-to-sequence model better adapt to AMR with the hierarchical and complex structure.

Performance on Hard Instances Figure 4 shows the performances of BART trained by our hierarchical curriculum learning (HCL) method and the origin random sampling (Random) method. As is shown, as the number of layers increases, HCL exceeds Random greater, which shows our HCL help the model better handle hard instances.

Ablation Study To illustrate the effect of our proposed curriculums. We conduct ablation studies by removing one curriculum at a time. Table 2 shows the SMACH scores on both AMR2.0 and AMR3.0. As shown in Table 2, we can see both curricula are conducive to the performance of the model, and they are complimentary to each other. We also conduct an experiment named ‘w/ inverse




Figure 4: The average SMATCH scores with different layers in the AMR2.0 test set. ‘HCL’ and ‘Random’ denote models trained by our hierarchical curriculum learning and random sampling, respectively.

curriculum’. As is shown, ‘w/ inverse curriculum’ harms the model performance on both two benchmarks, which also proves the effectiveness of our hierarchical curriculum learning framework.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a Hierarchical Curriculum Learning (HCL) framework for AMR parsing, which consists of Structure-level Curriculum (SC) and Instance-level Curriculum (IC). SC follows the principle of learning the core concepts of AMR first, and IC obeys the rule of learning easy instances first. SC and IC train the model on different hierarchies, and both of them are inspired by the human cognition. Extensive experiments show that BART trained with HCL achieves the state-of-the-art performance on two benchmarks, and significantly outperforms previous methods on

structure-dependent metrics and hard instances.

References

- Ramon Fernandez Astudillo, Miguel Ballesteros, Tahira Naseem, Austin Blodgett, and Radu Florian. 2020. Transition-based parsing with stack-transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10669*.
- Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Shu Cai, Madalina Georgescu, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Kevin Knight, Philipp Koehn, Martha Palmer, and Nathan Schneider. 2013. Abstract meaning representation for sembanking. In *Proceedings of the 7th linguistic annotation workshop and interoperability with discourse*, pages 178–186.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 41–48.
- Michele Bevilacqua, Rexhina Blloshmi, and Roberto Navigli. 2021. One spring to rule them both: Symmetric amr semantic parsing and generation without a complex pipeline. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Deng Cai and Wai Lam. 2019. Core semantic first: A top-down approach for amr parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3799–3809.
- Deng Cai and Wai Lam. 2020. Amr parsing via graph-sequence iterative inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05572*.
- Shu Cai and Kevin Knight. 2013. Smatch: an evaluation metric for semantic feature structures. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 748–752.
- Marco Damonte, Shay B Cohen, and Giorgio Satta. 2016. An incremental parser for abstract meaning representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.06111*.
- DongLai Ge, Junhui Li, Muhua Zhu, and Shoushan Li. 2019. Modeling source syntax and semantics for neural amr parsing. In *IJCAI*, pages 4975–4981.
- Junliang Guo, Xu Tan, Linli Xu, Tao Qin, Enhong Chen, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. Fine-tuning by curriculum learning for non-autoregressive neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7839–7846.
- Hardy Hardy and Andreas Vlachos. 2018. Guided neural language generation for abstractive summarization using abstract meaning representation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 768–773.
- Young-Suk Lee, Ramón Fernandez Astudillo, Tahira Naseem, Revanth Gangi Reddy, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2020. Pushing the limits of amr parsing with self-learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 3208–3214.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*.
- Kexin Liao, Logan Lebanoff, and Fei Liu. 2018. Abstract meaning representation for multi-document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1178–1190.
- Cao Liu, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, Jun Zhao, et al. 2018. Curriculum learning for natural answer generation. In *IJCAI*, pages 4223–4229.
- Liyuan Liu, Haoming Jiang, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Jiawei Han. 2019. On the variance of the adaptive learning rate and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03265*.
- Chunchuan Lyu and Ivan Titov. 2018. Amr parsing as graph prediction with latent alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.05286*.
- Arindam Mitra and Chitta Baral. 2016. Addressing a question answering challenge by combining statistical methods with inductive rule learning and reasoning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 30.
- Tahira Naseem, Abhishek Shah, Hui Wan, Radu Florian, Salim Roukos, and Miguel Ballesteros. 2019. Rewarding smatch: Transition-based amr parsing with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13370*.
- Emmanouil Antonios Platanios, Otilia Stretcu, Graham Neubig, Barnabas Poczos, and Tom M Mitchell. 2019. Competence-based curriculum learning for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.09848*.
- Sudha Rao, Daniel Marcu, Kevin Knight, and Hal Daumé III. 2017. Biomedical event extraction using abstract meaning representation. In *BioNLP 2017*, pages 126–135.
- Mrinmaya Sachan and Eric Xing. 2016. Machine comprehension using rich semantic representations. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 486–492.
- Yixuan Su, Deng Cai, Qingyu Zhou, Zibo Lin, Simon Baker, Yunbo Cao, Shuming Shi, Nigel Collier, and Yan Wang. 2020. Dialogue response selection with hierarchical curriculum learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14756*.

- Yanshan Wang, Sijia Liu, Majid Rastegar-Mojarad, Liwei Wang, Feichen Shen, Fei Liu, and Hongfang Liu. 2017. Dependency and amr embeddings for drug-drug interaction extraction from biomedical literature. In *Proceedings of the 8th acm international conference on bioinformatics, computational biology, and health informatics*, pages 36–43.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2019. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.
- Benfeng Xu, Licheng Zhang, Zhendong Mao, Quan Wang, Hongtao Xie, and Yongdong Zhang. 2020a. Curriculum learning for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6095–6104, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dongqin Xu, Junhui Li, Muhua Zhu, Min Zhang, and Guodong Zhou. 2020b. Improving amr parsing with sequence-to-sequence pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2501–2511.
- Sheng Zhang, Xutai Ma, Kevin Duh, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019a. Amr parsing as sequence-to-graph transduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08704*.
- Sheng Zhang, Xutai Ma, Kevin Duh, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019b. Broad-coverage semantic parsing as transduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02607*.
- Zixuan Zhang and Heng Ji. 2021. Abstract meaning representation guided graph encoding and decoding for joint information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 39–49.
- Jiawei Zhou, Tahira Naseem, Ramón Fernandez Astudillo, and Radu Florian. 2021. Amr parsing with action-pointer transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14674*.