

# Open Domain Question Answering over Virtual Documents: A Unified Approach for Data and Text

Kaixin Ma<sup>♣†\*</sup>, Hao Cheng<sup>♣\*</sup>, Xiaodong Liu<sup>♣</sup>, Eric Nyberg<sup>♣</sup>, Jianfeng Gao<sup>♣</sup>

<sup>♣</sup> Carnegie Mellon University <sup>♣</sup> Microsoft Research

{kaixinm, ehn}@cs.cmu.edu {chehao, xiaodl, jfgao}@microsoft.com

## Abstract

Due to its potential for a universal interface over both data and text, data-to-text generation is becoming increasingly popular recently. However, few previous work has focused on its application to downstream tasks, *e.g.* using the converted data for grounding or reasoning. In this work, we aim to bridge this gap and use the data-to-text method as a means for encoding structured knowledge for knowledge-intensive applications, *i.e.* open-domain question answering (QA). Specifically, we propose a *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework for open-domain QA over data and text where verbalized tables from Wikipedia and triples from Wikidata are used as augmented knowledge sources. We show that our **Unified Data and Text QA**, UDT-QA, can effectively benefit from the expanded knowledge index, leading to large gains over text-only baselines. Notably, our approach sets the single-model state-of-the-art on Natural Questions. Furthermore, our analyses indicate that verbalized knowledge is preferred for answer reasoning for both adapted and hot-swap settings.

## 1 Introduction

Data-to-text generation involves verbalizing structured knowledge, *e.g.* tables and knowledge base (KB) graphs, into natural language with a broad range of applications such as dialog response generation (Moon et al., 2019) and multi-document summarization (Fan et al., 2019). Given its potential in providing a universal interface for data and text, it has become increasingly popular (Gardent et al., 2017; Parikh et al., 2020; Nan et al., 2021) with various methods developed recently (Wang et al., 2020; Ribeiro et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020b). In spite of that, most existing work has

focused on *intrinsic evaluations* exclusively, making its usefulness on downstream tasks largely unknown. Moreover, it remains unclear whether a single data-to-text model is able to verbalize heterogeneous structured data effectively. In this work, we aim to investigate the feasibility of using a unified data-to-text verbalizer as the means for enriching the knowledge source for open-domain QA.

Based on the typical *retriever-reader* framework (Min et al., 2019a) for open-domain QA, recent work (Oguz et al., 2020) has demonstrated that expanding the textual knowledge source with more structured tables and KBs is beneficial. However, most existing work either only considers limited size/type of data or adopts different knowledge retrieval methods for various sources (Oguz et al., 2020; Agarwal et al., 2021). Here, we propose a simple and unified *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework, UDT-QA, as an extension for open-domain QA over data and text.

To bridge the gap between existing data-to-text approaches and open-domain QA, we develop a novel data-to-text generation paradigm for our *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework. First, both tables and KB triples are converted into the same format such that a single data-to-text model can handle both cases. Moreover, we design a method consisting of data filtering and beam selection to maximize the faithful coverage of the input information. To remedy the lack of in-domain training data, we further propose an iterative training approach to augment the existing data-to-text training set with selected high quality outputs from the target domain. With this verbalizer, we convert all tables from Wikipedia and triples from Wikidata into virtual documents as the additional knowledge source for answering open-domain questions.

We first validate our data-to-text methods based on the existing intrinsic data-to-text metrics on DART (Nan et al., 2021) and additional data faith-

† Work done during an internship at Microsoft Research  
\* Equal contribution

ful promoting evaluation on the target open-domain QA data. Remarkably, our data-to-text generation approach can effectively improve the target-domain faithful metric without compromising the intrinsic metrics. To further validate the effectiveness of the proposed *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework, we carry out experiments on the open-domain QA task using a recent state-of-the-art (SOTA) retriever-reader pipeline, including DPR (Karpukhin et al., 2020) for dense retrieval and UnitedQA (Cheng et al., 2021) for answer reasoning over the retrieved context. Consistent with previous work, our results also suggest that additional knowledge source from data is beneficial for the open-domain QA task. Notably, we find that the verbalized knowledge is more favored by the reader compare to the raw format, especially when the structured data size is comparable to text, leading to more pronounced end-to-end improvements. Overall, UDT-QA shows large improvements over text-only baselines and performs competitively with recent more complicated methods on both Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and WebQuestions (WebQ) (Berant et al., 2013). In particular, our *verbalizer-retriever-reader* model achieves a new state-of-the-art performance on Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) under the single-model open book setting.

In summary, we make the following contributions in this work:

- We propose a simple and unified *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework, UDT-QA, for open-domain QA over data and text.
- We develop a novel data-to-text approach that enables building a large-scale collection of knowledge by verbalizing all tables from Wikipedia and triples from Wikidata.
- We demonstrate that our proposed method achieves remarkable improvements on both NQ and WebQ with additional knowledge from data, and sets the new single-model SOTA on NQ.

## 2 Overview of UDT-QA

In this section, we briefly present the overall pipeline of our *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework for open-domain QA over data and text. An overview of UDT-QA is shown in Figure 1.

The major difference between our approach and the popular *retriever-reader* based open domain

QA systems (Min et al., 2021, *inter alia*) is the use of a data-to-text verbalizer (§3) for converting structured data into natural language text, *i.e.* virtual documents. Here, we consider two types of structured knowledge (§4.2), tables and KB subgraphs. Once the structured knowledge is verbalized, a follow-up pipeline of a DPR-based retriever (Karpukhin et al., 2020) and a United-QA-E reader (Cheng et al., 2021) is used for answer inference. For a given question, the retriever fetches a list of relevant documents from a joint set of virtual documents and regular textual passages. Then, each pair of a given question and a support passage is independently encoded by the reader for predicting a possible answer string based on the entire retrieved set of support passages.

**Retrieval** We use the DPR (Karpukhin et al., 2020) system for retrieval over data and text. The DPR retriever is a bi-encoder model consists of a question encoder and a context encoder. Following the previous work (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Oguz et al., 2020), we use the uncased BERT-base (Devlin et al., 2019) model as the encoder, where the [CLS] token representation is used as the document/question vector. During training, positive and negative pairs of (question, context) are used to update the model. For inference, the entire document index is encoded with context encoder and the encoded question vector is used to retrieve the top documents with highest dot-product scores.

**Reading** We use the United-QA-E (Cheng et al., 2021), an extractive reader based on ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020) for answer inference. Here, a pair of a given question and a support passage is jointly encoded into neural text representations. These representations are then used to define scores or probabilities of possible answer begin and end positions, which are in turn used to define probabilities over possible answer spans. Finally, the answer string probabilities are based on the aggregation over all possible answer spans from the entire set of support passages.

## 3 Verbalizer: Data-to-text Generation

Here, we formally describe the data-to-text model developed in this paper, including input format (§3.1), and adaptation approach for open-domain QA (§3.2).




Figure 1: An overview of UDT-QA based on the *verbalizer-retriever-reader* pipeline.

### 3.1 Input Format

Given a structured data input  $D$ , the data-to-text generator  $G$  aims to generate a natural language passage  $P$  that faithfully describes the information present in  $D$ . In the literature, the structured data input can be in the form of a set of triples (Nan et al., 2021), a few highlighted cells from a table (Parikh et al., 2020) or a full table (Chen et al., 2020a). Correspondingly,  $P$  could be a simple surface-form verbalization of  $D$  (e.g. when  $D$  is a triple set) or a high-level summarization in case of a full table or a large KB graph. Since we consider (noisy) tables/KB sub-graphs of arbitrary size in this paper, directly feeding the entire input into the generator is not feasible, likely incurring significant computation challenges. Moreover, it is also desirable to maximize the information coverage of  $P$  so that most relevant information in  $D$  can be leveraged by the downstream QA retriever and reader. Based on this, we verbalize both tables and KB graphs at a fine-grained level.

In this work, we verbalize tables row by row and use each table row as the input to  $G$ , where each row is a set of cells  $r = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^k$ , and  $k$  is the number of cells in the corresponding row. Most relevant to our setting, recent work (Nan et al., 2021) represents each cell in a triple. To form such triples, they manually annotate the tree ontology of column headers and then create triples using table title, headers, cell value and header relations, e.g. (`[TABLECONTEXT]`, `[title]`, LeBron James), (LeBron James, League, NBA) where LeBron James is the parent cell. Although such fine-grained ordering of triples may help guide the generator, applying the trained generator to a target domain with no ontology

annotation (our case), there is a training-inference mismatch likely resulting in degradation. To overcome this, we propose to convert the triple set to pairs, e.g. (`[title]`, LeBron James), (League, NBA). We found such conversion had little impact on the intrinsic evaluation (§5.1). After all rows are verbalized, we assemble the text outputs back to form the verbalized table.

For KB, we follow previous work (Agarwal et al., 2021) and break the KB into small sub-graphs based on subject entity. Here, each sub-graph contains one central entity and its neighbors. Although this conversion would inevitably create undesirable artifacts (e.g. hurdles for multi-hop reasoning across sub-graphs), this preprocessing allows us to unify the input representations for both table and KB graphs, making it possible for a single verbalizer to convert structured knowledge into text format. Specifically, we convert all KB sub-graphs into the same format as table cell sets above, where the subject entity is treated as the title and all the edges are represented using pairs in the form of (`relation`, `object`). Then we verbalize each sub-graph with the generator  $G$ . Examples of input and output for table row and KB subgraph are shown in Figure 1.

### 3.2 Improved Data-to-Text Model Training

A known problem in data-to-text generation is that the model tends to hallucinate or neglect information in the input (Wang et al., 2020; Agarwal et al., 2021). Faithfulness and information coverage is especially important when we apply the verbalized output to knowledge-intensive downstream tasks like open-domain QA. To address this, we propose to subsample training data  $T$  such that the instances

are filtered out if they are likely to steer model towards missing information. In particular, we compute Rouge-1 (Lin, 2004) score between the input and target of training instances and filter out those whose score is below a certain threshold. We denote the filtered version as  $T-F$ . Although filtered examples are mostly valid, we hypothesize that their target sentences may contain verbalization of partial input information or high level summarization, which may bias the model towards unwanted behavior.

Another challenge we face is that most data-to-text training examples have succinct structured inputs. In other words, the cells in the structured input are usually single words or short phrases with corresponding short target sentences as well. In our case, a number of tables contain large cells with dozens of words. Models trained with existing data likely have a hard time verbalizing such inputs faithfully. To alleviate this domain-mismatch issue, we propose an iterative training set-up. In the first iteration, we train a generator on  $T-F$ . Then we apply the generator to our data. We then find high quality verbalized outputs based on the Rouge-1 score between the input and output, and sample instances with score higher than a threshold for the next-round training. We sample instances up to the same size of  $T-F$ , and denote this set as  $ID-T$ . Finally, we mix the  $ID-T$  with  $T-F$  and train a second generator for verbalization.

Following recent data-to-text methods (Nan et al., 2021), we use the pretrained T5-Large (Rafael et al., 2020) model as our generator. Given paired training examples consisting of a structured data input and a target sentence, we finetune the T5 model to maximize the log-likelihood of generating the corresponding target sentences. Here, we follow the same experimental setup as (Ribeiro et al., 2020).

## 4 Experiment Setup

In this section, we describe the data used for experiments and the basic setup.

### 4.1 Datasets

In this paper, we use DART (Nan et al., 2021) to train our verbalizer (data-to-text) and two open-domain QA datasets, NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and WebQ (Berant et al., 2013), to train and evaluate our pipeline, with the same split as in (Lee et al., 2019). Below we provide a brief description

of each dataset and refer readers to their paper for details.

**DART:** It is a data-to-text dataset containing pairs of (triple-set, sentences) collected from WebNLG, E2E and crowdsourcing based on tables found in WikiSQL and WikiTableQuestions.

**Natural Questions:** The dataset contains questions mined from Google search queries and the answers are annotated in Wikipedia articles by crowd workers. Similar to (Karpukhin et al., 2020), we construct the training data where the positive passages are gold passages and negative passages are mined using BM25.

**WebQuestions:** As a KB QA dataset, it consists of questions from Google Suggest API and the answers are annotated as entities in Freebase. We use the same training data as (Karpukhin et al., 2020) where the positive passages are the highest ranked BM25 passage that contains the answer. The rest of passages that do not contain the answer are treated as negatives.

**Knowledge-answerable Questions:** We additionally collect table-answerable questions from NQ and KB-answerable questions from WebQ in order to evaluate our verbalizer and augment the retriever training data. Specifically, we find questions in the original NQ training set that can be answered by a table. For each question, we search through tables contained in its associated HTML pages to locate exact answer matches. In total, we collected 14,164 triple of (question, answer, gold table) from NQ train and dev sets as  $NQ-table-Q$ . On WebQ, we find questions that can be answered by KB by expanding from question entities and search for their 1-hop neighbors. If an answer entity is matched, we keep this sub-graph of the source question entity. In total, we collected 2,397 triples of (question, answer, sub-graph) from WebQ train and dev set as  $WebQ-KB-Q$ .

### 4.2 Structured Knowledge Sources

In addition to regular textual Wikipedia passages, we consider two types of structured knowledge, tables from Wikipedia and KB graphs from Wikidata. For regular English Wikipedia passages, we follow the same setup as described in (Karpukhin et al., 2020). Here, we focus on the pre-processing of the two structured knowledge sources.

**Tables:** We collect tables from all English Wikipedia HTMLs following OTT-QA (Chen et al., 2021b). For (Chen et al., 2021b), they only kept

Training Set	# Examples	Intrinsic Eval					Extrinsic Eval
		BLEU	METEOR	TER	MoverScore	BERTScore	Answer Coverage
DART (Nan et al., 2021)	62,659	50.66	0.40	0.43	0.54	0.95	-
DART ours	62,628	51.05	0.40	0.43	0.54	0.95	95.4
DART ours filtered	55,115	51.04	0.41	0.43	0.54	0.95	96.0
DART ours filtered + ID-T	110,230	50.59	0.41	0.44	0.54	0.95	98.4

Table 1: Intrinsic and extrinsic evaluations of verbalization approaches on tables using DART test and NQ-table-Q (§4.1), respectively. All metrics are higher the better.

KELM (Agarwal et al., 2021)	Ours
97.8	99.6

Table 2: Extrinsic evaluation (Answer Coverage) of our verbalizer in comparison to a recent method on KB graphs using WebQ-KB-Q (§4.1).

tables in good format, *i.e.* tables with no empty cell, multi-column or multi-row, and they constrained the tables to have at most 20 rows or columns. Instead, we removed such constraints and kept everything with the `<table>` tag, which results in a much larger and noisier set of tables. We denote this realistic set of tables as `OTT-tables`.

However, previous work (Oguz et al., 2020) only considers tables from HTML pages provided by the original NQ dataset. In addition to the size difference, `OTT-tables` are crawled from a more recent Wikipedia dump than the NQ version. In order to study the impact of expanded knowledge source, we also collect tables from 300K+ HTML pages provided by the original NQ dataset using the same process and follow the heuristic suggested by (Herzig et al., 2021) to de-duplicate tables. We denote this set of tables as `NQ-tables`. To avoid overlap, we remove the tables from `OTT-tables` whose page title are in `NQ-tables` set. Finally, we remove all cells of tables in both set that contain more than 80 words as they might be hard for verbalizer to handle. Fortunately, most of these cases are plot summaries of TV show episodes and we did not find negative impact after removing them. In total, we have a `All-tables` set consisting of 2.2M tables from `OTT-tables` and 210K tables from `NQ-tables`.

**KB Graphs:** Although FreeBase has been a popular KB for research (WebQ is based on FreeBase), it is no longer maintained. Therefore, we consider using the English Wikidata (Vrandečić and Krötzsch, 2014), the successor of Freebase, as our KB due to its broad coverage and high quality of knowl-

edge. In order to be comparable with recent work (Agarwal et al., 2021), we directly use their partitioned KB graphs from WikiData in our experiments which is denoted as `WD-graphs`.

## 5 Experiments: Data-to-Text Verbalization

In this section, we evaluate our data-to-text verbalizer with both intrinsic and extrinsic evaluations. Since intrinsic metrics are probably less correlated with the model downstream performance, we focus on using an extrinsic metric for selecting models and include intrinsic metrics as sanity check for generation quality. During inference, we use beam search with a beam size 10 for decoding and saved all outputs. In order to retain as much input information as possible, a re-ranking stage is carried out over the outputs based on the Rouge-1 score. The highest ranked prediction is then used as the final output. We find this re-ranking step to be very effective for improving performance on extrinsic evaluation.

### 5.1 Intrinsic Evaluation

Since our model is developed mainly based on DART, we first conduct the intrinsic evaluation on the DART test set to understand the impact of our improved data-to-text training method, *i.e.* data filtering and iterative training. Following (Nan et al., 2021), we use the official evaluation metrics including BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), TER, MoverScore (Zhao et al., 2019) and BERTScore (Zhang\* et al., 2020).

In addition to the model trained with the original DART setup (Nan et al., 2021), we include three variations of our verbalizer for comparison: 1) DART ours, a model trained with our conversion from triples to pairs (§3.1), 2) DART ours filtered, a model train with data filtering of our conversion (§3.2), 3) DART ours filtered + ID-T,

a model trained with data filtering and iterative training (§3.2) using additional predicted data from `NQ-tables` (§4.2).

Table 1 summarizes different data-to-text models on DART test. As we can see (row 1 vs row 2 of Table 1), the resulting model trained with our data conversion performs on par with the model using the original format. More interestingly, filtering short samples has almost no impact on the verbalizer performance on DART. Lastly, iterative training with additional target domain data only hurt very mildly on BLEU and achieve similar performances on other metrics. Overall, the verbalizer based on our proposed data conversion and improved training methods is still very effective on the original DART test set.

## 5.2 Extrinsic Evaluation

Since we’re interested in applying verbalized knowledge for open-domain QA, the QA model is more likely to predict the correct answer only if the answer still exists after the verbalization. Therefore, we also evaluate each generator using a metric more related with the downstream task performance: **answer coverage**. Specifically, we compute the answer coverage as the percentage of examples that the answer present in the raw structured knowledge is still preserved in the corresponding verbalized output.

First, we compute the answer coverage of different generators discussed in the previous section on `NQ-table-Q` where tables known to contain question-triggering information. The scores are reported in the last column of Table 1. Due to more lengthy tables in `NQ-table-Q`, data filtering is pretty effective in improving the answer coverage as expected. Moreover, model trained with our iterative training demonstrates substantial improvements in answer coverage. It indicates that our approach is highly effective for converting tables into text. Later, we use this best generator to verbalize `All-tables`.

Lastly, we directly apply our best generator (DART ours filtered + ID-T) for verbalizing KB graphs. To evaluate the performance, we compare our generator with the recently developed method KELM-verbalizer (Agarwal et al., 2021) using answer coverage on the set `WebQ-KB-Q` where KB sub-graphs are known to contain question-triggering entities. As shown in Table 2, although never tuned for KB graph inputs, our model out-

Source	Raw	Verbalized
Text	21M	-
OTT-tables	4.0M	6.3M
NQ-tables	446K	572K
WD-graphs	5.7M	5.8M

Table 3: Statistics of Knowledge Index

performs the KELM-verbalizer by a large margin. This suggests that our data-to-text approach is highly effective for both tables and KB graphs.

## 6 Experiments: Open-domain QA over Data and Text

In this section, we present our main experiments on open-domain QA over Data and Text.

### 6.1 Knowledge Source for Retrieval

For regular Wikipedia text, we use the same index as (Karpukhin et al., 2020) that contains 21M passages where each passage contains about 100 words. In addition, we consider two settings for open-domain QA over data and text. For NQ, we augment the text index with all tables from the `All-tables` set (§4.2). In addition to verbalized tables, similar to (Oguz et al., 2020), we also consider the raw representations with a simple linearization of tables. For WebQ, we consider combining text with KB graphs from `WD-graphs`. Different from (Oguz et al., 2020) where a separate entity-linking based retriever is used for KB, we experiment with the same linearization of raw KB graphs along with our verbalized KB graphs. Therefore, in our case, both text and data (tables and KB graphs) can be essentially handled by a unified retriever-reader pipeline. The summary statistics of our knowledge index are shown in Table 3.

### 6.2 Main Results

We create additional retriever training data from `NQ-Table-Q` and `WebQ-KB-Q` in a similar fashion as text-only setting, so that DPR can better handle additional knowledge. We also adopted the iterative training set-up for retrieval training as it has been found helpful from previous work (Oguz et al., 2020). More training details can be found in appendix A.

To evaluate the effectiveness of our *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework for open-domain QA over data and text, we first include recent state-of-the-art open-domain QA models using text as

Model	Structured Knowledge	NQ	WebQ
DPR(Karpukhin et al., 2020)	N	41.5	35.2
UnitedQA(Cheng et al., 2021)	N	51.8	48.0
KEALM(Agarwal et al., 2021)	Y	41.5	43.9
UnitK-QA(Oguz et al., 2020)	Y	54.1	<b>57.8</b>
UDT-QA w/ Raw Data (Ours)	Y	54.7	51.4
UDT-QA w/ Verbalized Data (Ours)	Y	<b>55.2</b>	52.0

Table 4: End-to-end open-domain QA evaluation of UDT-QA in comparison to recent state-of-the-art models on the test sets of NQ and WebQ. Exact match score is reported. The best model is in **bold**.

the only knowledge source, *i.e.* DPR (Karpukhin et al., 2020) and UnitedQA (Cheng et al., 2021). In addition, we also compare our UniQA with recent models using additional structured knowledge, *i.e.* KEALM (Agarwal et al., 2021) and UnitK-QA (Oguz et al., 2020). The results of open-domain QA are shown in Table 4. Following the literature, we report the exact match (EM) score as the main metric.

As we can see, compared with text-only models, models with additional structured knowledge achieve significant improvements. This indicates that both KB graphs and tables contain complementary knowledge which is either absent in the text source or harder to be reasoned over. For NQ, our model with either raw or verbalized tables substantially outperform the current SOTA system (Oguz et al., 2021). Given that we consider a larger collection of tables, it indicates that enlarging the table source is beneficial for NQ. As for WebQ, though our model achieves competitive performance, it is still lacking. We attribute this to two possible reasons. For the current SOTA Unit-KQA, a separate entity-linking based retriever is used for KBs (Oguz et al., 2021) which might lead to higher retrieval recall. In addition, since WebQ is fully based on FreeBase, we hypothesize that the use of WikiData only is likely to suffer from information loss. Nevertheless, our verbalizer-based models achieve better performances than the corresponding raw format models on both datasets, indicating that the proposed verbalizer is highly effective for tables and KB graphs.

## 7 Analysis

In this section, we present further experimental analyses over the impact of knowledge index size, the use of additional structured knowledge in a hot-

Source	Format	R20	R100	EM
text	-	81.3	87.3	51.8
+NQ-tables	raw	86.0	91.2	54.8
+NQ-tables	V	86.2	91.0	54.2
+All-tables	raw	86.9	<b>91.9</b>	54.7
+All-tables	V	<b>87.0</b>	91.7	<b>55.2</b>
text	-	73.2	81.4	48.0
+WD-graphs-WebQ	raw	<b>80.2</b>	<b>85.8</b>	51.5
+WD-graphs-WebQ	V	79.7	85.3	<b>52.6</b>
+WD-graphs	raw	78.8	85.1	51.4
+WD-graphs	V	78.5	85.5	52.0

Table 5: Impact of knowledge index size over separately trained retriever-reader models (Top for NQ and bottom for WebQ). All metrics are computed on the corresponding test set.

swap setting, and comparison to an recent KB-only data-to-text approach in an end-to-end fashion.

**How does the size of knowledge index affect retriever and reader performance?** More knowledge is likely to have better coverage of supporting evidences for input questions. On the other hand, larger index size also increases the complexity of retrieval making it harder for the later reader answer reasoning. To better understand the impact of the increased knowledge index size, we conduct experiments with a restricted setting where only relevant set of knowledge to the corresponding dataset (a priori) is used for retrieval. Similar to (Oguz et al., 2020), we experiment with the combined knowledge index of text and NQ-tables for NQ. As for WebQ, we subsample documents from WD-graphs that contain any of the question entity in either training or test set to build a WD-graphs-WebQ, and experiment with using text + WD-graphs-WebQ. In order to adapt to those changes, we also redo the data preparation for creating additional retriever training data. In ad-

Knowledge	Format	R20	R100	EM
Text-only		81.3	87.3	51.8
+NQ-tables	raw	83.9	90.3	51.7
+NQ-tables	V	84.3	90.4	52.5
+All-tables	raw	84.0	<b>90.6</b>	51.7
+All-tables	V	<b>84.5</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>52.7</b>

Table 6: Hotswap Evaluation of (linearized) raw vs our verbalized knowledge using a text-only retriever-reader model on NQ test.

dition to the end-to-end metric EM, we also report the two retrieval recalls, R20 and R100, evaluating the retriever in term of the accuracy of gold passages in the top-20 and top-100 documents, respectively. The results are reported in table 5.

For NQ, in spite of being more challenging, we see that using `All-tables` yield substantial improvement in both recall and answer exact match compare to using `NQ-tables`. We think that our additional retriever training data built from tables and iterative training set-up can effectively help retriever to distinguish useful knowledge from irrelevant ones, thus benefiting from larger knowledge index. Also, the larger raw form index is likely to bring in more noise resulting in degradation in terms of reader performance (`+All-tables vs+NQ-tables`), while our verbalized knowledge is more friendly for answer reasoning leading to a notable QA improvement. Different from NQ, we observe that on WebQ the restricted setting with `WD-graphs-WebQ` actually achieves better results. We hypothesis that this is likely due to the scale of WebQ dataset. Since WebQ training data is about 20x smaller than that of NQ, the retriever may not be properly trained to handle large-scale knowledge index. We leave the verification of this hypothesis for future work.

**Does a text-only retriever-reader model benefit more from verbalized knowledge compare to raw format?** Since both retriever and reader are based on pretrained language models, we hypothesize that they would probably benefit more from the verbalized knowledge due to its similar linguistic style as text. From Table 5, we can see that the retriever performance is usually on par or slight better with raw knowledge. Interestingly, the reader benefits more from verbalized knowledge such that the best results for both NQ and WebQ are achieved with it. We think this is due to how retriever and

Knowledge	R20	R100	EM
KELM	78.2	85.3	51.5
WD-graphs (Ours)	<b>78.5</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>52.0</b>

Table 7: Comparison of verbalized knowledge from our verbalizer and KELM for retriever and reader on WebQ test.

reader process documents. For the retriever, since it encode the entire documents into a vector, it is insensitive to the fine-grained details of the documents, i.e. linguistics style. On the other hand, the reader models the interaction of question and documents on a more fine-grained level. Consequently, it would likely prefer verbalized knowledge which exhibit more similarity with textual corpus.

To verify that verbalized knowledge is more amenable, we carry out a hot-swap experiment here. Specifically, we directly using a DPR model trained on NQ text-only data for additionally indexing both `NQ-tables` and `All-tables`. Then, the retrieval is performed on the augmented knowledge index for an input question, and a text-only United-QA-E reader trained on NQ is applied for answer inference afterwards. The results are summarized in Table 6. Similar to the previous fully fine-tuned settings, we see that additional knowledge still provide substantial improvements for text-only retriever using either raw or verbalized knowledge. However, the improvement in recall is not reflected in later reader performance for the raw format, whereas the hot-swap answer inference performance is notably improved with verbalized knowledge. This observation further validates our hypothesis that verbalized knowledge is more beneficial than raw format, especially for reader.

**How does the proposed verbalizer compare to previous work?** Lastly, we compare our verbalizer with the recently proposed data-to-text generator for converting KB graphs only, KELM (Agarwal et al., 2021). Here, we evaluate using our verbalized `WD-graphs` and the KELM corpus (Agarwal et al., 2021) as additional knowledge for open-domain QA on WebQ. In particular, we follow the same procedure to train and evaluate our retriever and reader except that we swap the `WD-graphs` with KELM corpus in data construction and retrieval. Both retriever and reader performances are reported in Table 7. Note that the KELM generator is customized for converting KB graphs only and trained with a much-larger dataset (about 8M

training instances), whereas our verbalizer is applicable to both tables and KB graphs with a smaller training data (only 110K instances). As we can see, the model with KELM knowledge only slightly improve over the raw knowledge based model from Table 3. Nevertheless, consistent with its better extrinsic performance (§5.2), our verbalizer again outperforms the KELM generator in both retrieval and reading, which provide further support for the effectiveness of our approach.

## 8 Related Work

**Open-domain QA** Open-domain QA requires a system to answer questions based on evidence retrieved from a large corpus such as Wikipedia (Voorhees, 2000; Chen et al., 2017). Recent progress has been made towards improving evidence retrieval through both sparse vector models like TF-IDF or BM25 (Chen et al., 2017; Min et al., 2019a), and dense vector models based on BERT (Lee et al., 2019; Karpukhin et al., 2020; Guu et al., 2020; Qu et al., 2021). Generally, the dense representations complement the sparse vector methods for passage retrieval as they can potentially give high similarity to semantically related text pairs, even without exact lexical overlap. Unlike most work focusing on a pipeline model, Lee et al. (2019) propose a pre-training objective for jointly training both the retrieval encoder and reader. It is further extended by Guu et al. (2020) with a dynamic update of the passage index during the training. Instead, in this work, we focus on incorporating more structured knowledge sources for open-domain QA.

**Open-domain QA with Data and Text** As the knowledge required to answer the questions may not be available in textual corpus, previous studies have sought to incorporate knowledge from difference sources such as tables and knowledge bases. (Min et al., 2019b) used Wikidata to expand seed passages found by the retriever and enhance encoded passage representations in the reader. (Li et al., 2021) proposed a hybrid framework that takes both text and tables as inputs to produce answers and SQL queries. (Chen et al., 2021b) proposed OTT-QA dataset containing questions that require joint reasoning over both tables and text, where the tables and text come from entire Wikipedia. There is also a line of work that studies model architectures for tables specifically or joint encoding of tables and text (Yin et al., 2020;

Herzig et al., 2020; Zayats et al., 2021; Glass et al., 2021). However, their focus is not on open-domain QA tasks. Most similar to our work is (Oguz et al., 2020), where they used both tables and Wikidata knowledge graph along with Wikipedia text to build retriever index. However, their tables are only mined from original NQ HTML files, hence it is still a constrained setting. In comparison we used tables from full Wikipedia which is a much larger set. Additionally, they only experimented with simply flattening the table whereas we explored strategies to represent both tables and knowledge base in verbalized format.

**Data-to-Text** Generating text from structured data has been a popular task in NLP. Many dataset have been proposed for this task such as Wikibio (Lebret et al., 2016), Rotowire (Wiseman et al., 2017), WebNLG (Gardent et al., 2017) and E2E (Novikova et al., 2017), where each dataset focuses on a particular domain. More recently, large-scale datasets that contains open-domain examples have been proposed including DART (Nan et al., 2021), TOTTO (Parikh et al., 2020), WikiTableT (Chen et al., 2021a) and GenWiki (Jin et al., 2020). On the modeling side, finetuning the pretrained models typically achieves promising performance (Ribeiro et al., 2020). (Wang et al., 2020) proposed customized loss functions to reduce model hallucination during generation. (Hoyle et al., 2021) proposed multi-task learning objectives to improve model’s robustness towards input variations. (Chen et al., 2020b) introduced a generalized format and a pretrained model that can generate text from both table rows and knowledge graphs. Most previous work on data-to-text generation have only conducted internal evaluation, using typical generation metrics such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE (Lin, 2004), hence the data-to-text is considered the target task. In this paper, we argue that different training strategies and evaluation metrics should be adopted when applying data-to-text models to downstream tasks, i.e. open-domain QA. Closed to our work is (Agarwal et al., 2021), where they verbalized the entire Wikidata to natural language using a finetuned T5 model (Raffel et al., 2020). They also applied the verbalized knowledge base to increase the un-parameterized knowledge of the downstream QA model. However, they only incorporated KB as the structured knowledge source and they did not study the verbalizer’s impact on the QA performance.

## 9 Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrated that a unified *verbalizer-retriever-reader* framework, UDT-QA, for open-domain QA over data and text. We proposed a novel data-to-text paradigm that can largely improve the verbalization effectiveness for downstream knowledge-intensive applications, *i.e.* open-domain QA, when attaining good intrinsic performances. By leveraging the verbalized knowledge, we achieved a new state-of-the-art result for NaturalQuestions. Remarkably, we showed that simply augmenting the document index with the verbalized knowledge is able to improve the performance without retraining the model.

In addition to our method, there are many recently proposed approaches for open-domain QA that are orthogonal. For example, language models specifically optimized for dense retrieval (Gao and Callan, 2021), pretraining on large-scale QA data (Oğuz et al., 2021) and hybrid system that consists of retriever, reranker, extractive reader and generative reader (Fajcik et al., 2021). Incorporating those methods may further improve the performance for open-domain QA, and we leave that exploration for future work.

## References

- Oshin Agarwal, Heming Ge, Siamak Shakeri, and Rami Al-Rfou. 2021. [Knowledge graph based synthetic corpus generation for knowledge-enhanced language model pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3554–3565, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. [METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments](#). In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, pages 65–72, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. 2013. [Semantic parsing on Freebase from question-answer pairs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1533–1544, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. [Reading Wikipedia to answer open-domain questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1870–1879. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mingda Chen, Sam Wiseman, and Kevin Gimpel. 2021a. [WikiTableT: A large-scale data-to-text dataset for generating Wikipedia article sections](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 193–209, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenhu Chen, Ming wei Chang, Eva Schlinger, William Wang, and William Cohen. 2021b. [Open question answering over tables and text](#). *Proceedings of ICLR 2021*.
- Wenhu Chen, Jianshu Chen, Yu Su, Zhiyu Chen, and William Yang Wang. 2020a. [Logical natural language generation from open-domain tables](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7929–7942, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenhu Chen, Yu Su, Xifeng Yan, and William Yang Wang. 2020b. [KGPT: Knowledge-grounded pre-training for data-to-text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8635–8648, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hao Cheng, Yelong Shen, Xiaodong Liu, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. 2021. [Unit-edQA: A hybrid approach for open domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3080–3090, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [ELECTRA: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Martin Fajcik, Martin Docekal, Karel Ondrej, and Pavel Smrz. 2021. [R2-d2: A modular baseline for open-domain question answering](#).
- Angela Fan, Claire Gardent, Chloé Braud, and Antoine Bordes. 2019. [Using local knowledge graph](#)

- construction to scale Seq2Seq models to multi-document inputs. 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 4186–4196, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Luyu Gao and Jamie Callan. 2021. [Unsupervised corpus aware language model pre-training for dense passage retrieval](#).
- Claire Gardent, Anastasia Shimorina, Shashi Narayan, and Laura Perez-Beltrachini. 2017. [The WebNLG challenge: Generating text from RDF data](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 124–133, Santiago de Compostela, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Glass, Mustafa Canim, Alfio Gliozzo, Saneem Chemmengath, Vishwajeet Kumar, Rishav Chakravarti, Avi Sil, Feifei Pan, Samarth Bhargava, and Nicolas Rodolfo Fauceglia. 2021. [Capturing row and column semantics in transformer based question answering over tables](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1212–1224, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Papat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. [Retrieval augmented language model pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR.
- Jonathan Herzig, Thomas Müller, Syrine Krichene, and Julian Eisenschlos. 2021. [Open domain question answering over tables via dense retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 512–519, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan Herzig, Pawel Krzysztof Nowak, Thomas Müller, Francesco Piccinno, and Julian Eisenschlos. 2020. [TaPas: Weakly supervised table parsing via pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4320–4333, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Miserlis Hoyle, Ana Marasović, and Noah A. Smith. 2021. [Promoting graph awareness in linearized graph-to-text generation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 944–956, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhijing Jin, Qipeng Guo, Xipeng Qiu, and Zheng Zhang. 2020. [GenWiki: A dataset of 1.3 million content-sharing text and graphs for unsupervised graph-to-text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2398–2409, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Rémi Lebret, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2016. [Neural text generation from structured data with application to the biography domain](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1203–1213, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6086–6096. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Hanbo Li, Patrick Ng, Peng Xu, Henghui Zhu, Zhiguo Wang, and Bing Xiang. 2021. [Dual reader-parser on hybrid textual and tabular evidence for open domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4078–4088, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Jordan Boyd-Graber, Chris Alberti, Danqi Chen, Eunsol Choi, Michael Collins, Kelvin Guu, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Kenton Lee, Jennimaria Palomaki, Colin Raffel, Adam Roberts, Tom Kwiatkowski, Patrick Lewis, Yuxiang Wu, Heinrich Küttler, Linqing Liu, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, Sebastian Riedel, Sohee Yang, Minjoon Seo, Gautier Izacard, Fabio Petroni, Lucas Hosseini, Nicola De Cao, Edouard Grave, Ikuya Yamada, Sonse Shimaoka, Masatoshi Suzuki,

- Shumpei Miyawaki, Shun Sato, Ryo Takahashi, Jun Suzuki, Martin Fajcik, Martin Docekal, Karel Ondrej, Pavel Smrz, Hao Cheng, Yelong Shen, Xiaodong Liu, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Jianfeng Gao, Barlas Oguz, Xilun Chen, Vladimir Karpukhin, Stan Peshterliev, Dmytro Okhonko, Michael Schlichtkrull, Sonal Gupta, Yashar Mehdad, and Wen tau Yih. 2021. [NeurIPS 2020 EfficientQA competition: Systems, analyses and lessons learned](#).
- Sewon Min, Danqi Chen, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019a. [A discrete hard EM approach for weakly supervised question answering](#). 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 2851–2864, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Danqi Chen, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019b. [Knowledge guided text retrieval and reading for open domain question answering](#).
- Seungwhan Moon, Pararth Shah, Anuj Kumar, and Rajen Subba. 2019. [OpenDialKG: Explainable conversational reasoning with attention-based walks over knowledge graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 845–854, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Linyong Nan, Dragomir Radev, Rui Zhang, Amrit Rau, Abhinand Sivaprasad, Chiachun Hsieh, Xiangru Tang, Aadit Vyas, Neha Verma, Pranav Krishna, Yangxiaokang Liu, Nadia Irwanto, Jessica Pan, Faiaz Rahman, Ahmad Zaidi, Mutethia Mutuma, Yasin Tarabar, Ankit Gupta, Tao Yu, Yi Chern Tan, Xi Victoria Lin, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Nazneen Fatema Rajani. 2021. [DART: Open-domain structured data record to text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 432–447, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jekaterina Novikova, Ondřej Dušek, and Verena Rieser. 2017. [The E2E dataset: New challenges for end-to-end generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 201–206, Saarbrücken, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Barlas Oguz, Xilun Chen, Vladimir Karpukhin, Stan Peshterliev, Dmytro Okhonko, Michael Schlichtkrull, Sonal Gupta, Yashar Mehdad, and Scott Yih. 2020. [Unik-qa: Unified representations of structured and unstructured knowledge for open-domain question answering](#).
- Barlas Oğuz, Kushal Lakhota, Anchit Gupta, Patrick Lewis, Vladimir Karpukhin, Aleksandra Piktus, Xilun Chen, Sebastian Riedel, Wen tau Yih, Sonal Gupta, and Yashar Mehdad. 2021. [Domain-matched pre-training tasks for dense retrieval](#).
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ankur Parikh, Xuezhi Wang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Manaal Faruqui, Bhuvan Dhingra, Diyi Yang, and Dipanjan Das. 2020. [ToTTo: A controlled table-to-text generation dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1173–1186, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yingqi Qu, Yuchen Ding, Jing Liu, Kai Liu, Ruiyang Ren, Wayne Xin Zhao, Daxiang Dong, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. [RocketQA: An optimized training approach to dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5835–5847, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Martin Schmitt, Hinrich Schütze, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Investigating pretrained language models for graph-to-text generation](#).
- Ellen Voorhees. 2000. [The TREC-8 question answering track report](#).
- Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. 2014. [Wiki-data: A free collaborative knowledgebase](#). *Commun. ACM*, 57(10):78–85.
- Zhenyi Wang, Xiaoyang Wang, Bang An, Dong Yu, and Changyou Chen. 2020. [Towards faithful neural table-to-text generation with content-matching constraints](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1072–1086, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sam Wiseman, Stuart Shieber, and Alexander Rush. 2017. [Challenges in data-to-document generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2253–2263, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Pengcheng Yin, Graham Neubig, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian Riedel. 2020. [TaBERT: Pretraining for joint understanding of textual and tabular data](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8413–8426, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Vicky Zayats, Kristina Toutanova, and Mari Ostendorf. 2021. [Representations for question answering from documents with tables and text](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2895–2906, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tianyi Zhang\*, Varsha Kishore\*, Felix Wu\*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Wei Zhao, Maxime Peyrard, Fei Liu, Yang Gao, Christian M. Meyer, and Steffen Eger. 2019. [MoverScore: Text generation evaluating with contextualized embeddings and earth mover distance](#). 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 563–578, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Retriever Training Details

To train the retriever to better handle knowledge from tables and KB, we create additional training data from `NQ-Table-Q` and `WebQ-KB-Q`. Given a (question, answer, gold table) from `NQ-Table-Q`, we create a positive passage by concatenating rows containing the answer. Then we randomly sample and concatenate other rows in the table if the passage has less than 100 words. To find negative passages for training, we build an index consists of all the tables and use BM25 to retrieve relevant tables. Ones that do not contain the answer are considered as negative tables. Then we sample rows from the table to build negative passages. For the raw tables, the process is the same except that we also concatenate headers in the beginning to build positive and negative passages. We combine NQ training data with this set to train DPR.

For `WebQ-KB-Q`, we use the verbalized gold sub-graphs as positive passages. For the raw format, this is replaced by flattening the gold sub-graph. Then we build an index with all documents in `WD-graphs` and the top ranked documents by BM25 that do not contain the answer are treated as negatives. Here the documents refer to concatenated triples set for raw setting and sentences produced by the generator in verbalized setting. Additionally, we search through answer entities and their neighbors in the graph to find documents that has word overlap with the question. Then we build training instances in a similar fashion.

As pointed by previous work (Oguz et al., 2020), mining harder negative passages using DPR and iterative training leads to better performance. We also adopted this approach in our experiments. After the first DPR is trained, we used it to retrieve passages from a joint index of `text+All-tables` or `text+WD-graphs`. Then the negative passages are paired with the positive passages from the first round to build new sets of training data. Then we train a second DPR using the `iteration1` data combined with the new training sets.