

An unsupervised extractive summarization method based on multi-round computation

Dehao Tao*, Yingzhu Xiong*, Zhongliang Yang, Yongfeng Huang, Jin He, and Kevin Song

Abstract—Text summarization methods have attracted much attention all the time. In recent years, deep learning has been applied to text summarization, and it turned out to be pretty effective. Most of the current text summarization methods based on deep learning are supervised methods which need large-scale datasets. However, large-scale datasets are difficult to obtain in practical applications. In this paper, an unsupervised extractive text summarization method based on multi-round calculation is proposed. Based on the directed graph algorithm, we change the common method which calculates the sentence ranking at one time to multi-round calculation, and we dynamically optimize the relation of sentences after each round of calculation to reduce the redundancy of summarization. Experiments are carried out on four data sets, each separately containing Chinese, English, long and short texts. The experiment results show that our method has better performance than other unsupervised methods.

Index Terms—Text summarization, Unsupervised, multi-round calculation

I. INTRODUCTION

WITH the development of the Internet, massive text data are generated every day. People who want to access certain information can hardly find the proper text data efficiently. Automatic text summarization, aiming to generate a shorter version of the given text while keeping the most central contents, has attracted more and more attention.

Two main approaches have been proposed to solve this problem - extractive and abstractive. In extractive summarization, sentences are chosen from the original text and then concatenated to form the summary, while in abstractive summarization, though words and phrases from the original texts may be reused, the summary is basically rewritten and tries to retain the main contents [10]. Ideally, the abstractive methods can generate summarizations which are refined and in line with human habit. However, they also bring great challenge when we tried to keep the grammar of the summarizations correct. The extractive methods may not get us refined summarizations like the abstractive methods do, but they are comparatively easy to be implemented in practical applications, and the grammar of summarizations they generate is almost certainly

true since the sentences are written by humans. Due to the complexity of abstractive summarization, especially the complexity of ensuring the grammar, more scholars tend to use extractive methods to generate summarizations. Consequently, we will mainly focus on extractive summarization in this paper.

For extractive text summarization, scholars used to apply statistical methods, such as tf-idf [13], TextRank [9] to extract summaries [1], [8]. Traditional machine learning techniques have also been widely used for text summarization. They are trainable systems in which models try to capture human-engineered features, such as sentence position and length (Radev *et al.*, 2004), word frequency (Nenkova *et al.*, 2006), and action nouns (Filatova and Hatzivassiloglou, 2004). A shortcoming of these methods is that the human-engineered features may not be taken into consideration in single work, which means this kind of methods have boundaries somewhere.

Modern neural networks are used for text summarization since 2016. Cheng and Lapata [2] proposed a data-driven approach based on a neural network composed of a hierarchical document encoder and an attention-based extractor. Liu and Lapata [7] treated the summary task as a binary classification problem and fine-tuned their own model based on BERT [3] to achieve a state-of-the-art result. Zhong *et al* [15] used semantic matching to find the best summary in a set of candidate summaries, all composed of sentences chosen from the original text. However, those methods perform poorly without training data which are actually hard to access in many practical applications. Based on this situation, researchers hope to develop unsupervised text summarization methods relying less on training data, which can play a greater role in real-world applications.

Unsupervised methods which have no need for labeled data always attract researchers' attention. TextRank [9] is a very popular method which represents sentences of text as nodes of a graph, it scores the nodes using the graph-based ranking algorithm derived from PageRank [11]. Mallick and Das modified TextRank by considering term frequency and inverse sentence frequency [8]. To achieve better performance, deep learning is used. Zheng and Lapata introduced another TextRank-based algorithm called PACSUM [14]. Considering the fact that people tend to write summative sentences before explaining them, PACSUM introduces BERT [3] to encode sentences, and values the earlier sentences more than the later sentences. Among these unsupervised methods, sentences are always scored according to certain rules, and the sentences with highest scores are selected as summarization. A problem

The author Dehao Tao is with the Institute for Network Sciences and Cyberspace, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (e-mail:taodh19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn)

The author Yingzhu Xiong is with the Department of Computer Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA (e-mail: xiong73@wisc.edu)

The authors Zhongliang Yang and Yongfeng Huang are with the Department of Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (e-mail: yangzl15@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, yfhuang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn)(Corresponding author: Zhongliang Yang.)

The authors Jin He and Kevin Song are with VMware Inc., Beijing, China(e-mail: Hejin@vmware.com, Skevin@vmware.com)

* The two authors contributed equally

is, these methods always score the sentences with same rules, leading to a result that the selected sentences tend to contain the similar contents – in other words, the summary they generate tend to concentrate on one topic of the article, ignoring the other information.

A most intuitive principle when we do manual text summarization is: the summary should contain the main (but not all) contents of the article. In this article, we start from the principle of manual abstracts, combined with the current situation of extractive summarization, and sum up the guiding rules for our work. Based on these guiding rules, we changed the calculation mode of previous method, tried to dynamically optimize the relationship among abstract sentences in multiple rounds of calculation, aiming to take more contents of articles into our summaries.

II. REDUNDANCY REDUCTION

In this chapter, we will introduce the important guiding rules of extractive summaries that we summed up, and describe in detail the process of deriving the guiding rules from the principles of manual summarization and the actual situation of extractive summarization methods. Next, we will introduce the improvement we have made to the existing summary method under the guidance of this principle.

A. Guiding Rule

We believe the correct theoretical guidance can help us work faster and better, thus we tried to sum up a guiding rule before we start our work.

The most intuitive principle when we do manual text summarization is: firstly, the summary should contain the main (but not all) contents of the article; secondly, on the basis of the first, the number of words in the summary should be as few as possible. Such principles should be appropriately modified to “include the main contents and extract as few sentences as possible” when used in the extractive summarization method. However, the reality is that there is currently no extractive summarization algorithm that automatically determines the number of extracted sentences based on the text. This is not included in this article, but belongs to the next step of our plan. The usual practice is that the users set the number of extracted sentences. In other words, the number of extracted sentences is decided before the methods run. We do the same in this paper.

Under the condition that the number of sentences is set by users, we have to modify the first principle to “include more main contents when the number of sentences is fixed”. The second principle can also be explained as: reduce the repetition of the main contents, and pay attention to the choice of the secondary contents. Considering this, we sum up our guiding rule as “include main contents and pay attention to the choice of the secondary contents when the number of sentences is fixed”.

The key point is to determine what is the “main contents” and what is the “secondary contents” in the original text. We judge whether the sentence is the “main contents” or “secondary contents” based on the importance of the sentence. In

other words, we score the sentences and rank them according to the scores. This is also a common practice.

From the perspective of the guiding rule, the existing methods usually tried to extract the main contents through some set rules and they paid little attention to the secondary contents, which means there tends to be more redundancy in the summary.

To better follow the guiding rule, we modified the method of only one round calculation of sentence centrality to multi round, considered the relationship of current extracting sentence to previous extracted sentences, aiming to reduce the summary redundancy to achieve the “include main contents and pay attention to the choice of the secondary contents” goal.

B. Sentence importance calculation for the first round

As extractive summarization methods go, sentences are chosen from original text. To do that, we have to score all sentences. A common used way is to calculate similarities between every pair of sentences, and then add up the similarities corresponding to each sentence. The sums of similarities of each sentence, also called the centrality, are ranked then to decide which sentences to be chosen.

The first step is to calculate the similarities of each pair of sentences in the text. There are existing methods to calculate similarities. To combine the advantages of traditional and modern practices, We integrate the deep learning and TextRank methods. We employ a neural representation model BERT [3] as our encoder, number the sentences in order and convert them into vectors. Then, we calculate the inner product between each vector i and j as their similarity $S_{i,j}$ because we empirically found that inner product performs better than cos similarities. The next step is to create the adjacency matrix with the sentences being nodes and their similarities being the weight of the edge. Here, we assume that similarities which are too small are noise and should not be considered into computation. Thus we set a threshold TH defined in (2), where S_{min} and S_{max} represent the minimal and maximal similarity among all sentence pairs, and we reset all the similarities which are smaller than TH into 0 by (3). The similarity matrix is completed now, and the last step is to score and select the sentences.

As mentioned above, the most popular TextRank scores the sentences by calculating the centrality of each sentence and then choose the top sentences as summary. Considering positional relationship between sentences, PACSUM assigns different weights (similarities) to forward and backward edges when calculating centrality of sentences. Thus, the two nodes linked by one edge can get different similarities from this edge when calculating scores because of the different forward and backward weights. This method performed well.

At a high level, the gained performance for PACSUM comparing to TextRank owes to the consideration for sentence order. Considering the guiding rule, a more detailed analysis is that PACSUM’s approach did better than TextRank in “include the main contents”: By assigning different forward and backward weights, the scores from similar words (or

semantics) are concentrated in the sentences at the front, while similar sentences approaching the end of the articles will have lower scores. Thus the highest score sentences tend to be less repetitive, which means the summary includes more main contents. We reserve this practice of PACSUM.

Finally, we use the importance scores of sentences im to represent the importance of sentences, which are computed by (4). The im_i means the importance of sentence i , β_1 and β_2 are two hyper-parameters.

$$S_{i,j} = vector_i \cdot vector_j \quad (1)$$

$$TH = S_{min} + a \cdot (S_{max} - S_{min}) \quad (2)$$

$$S_{i,j} = \begin{cases} S_{i,j} & \text{if } S_{i,j} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$im_i = \beta_1 \cdot \sum_{j < i} S_{i,j} + \beta_2 \cdot \sum_{i < j} S_{i,j} \quad (4)$$

C. Multi-round calculation and dynamic optimization

As we have analysed PACSUM above, to some extent it does include more main contents. However, it's not what PACSUM means to do. Under the guidance of the rule we summed up, we try to include main contents and pay attention to the choice of the secondary contents consciously.

Most extractive summarization methods will calculate the importance score (or other similar scores) and then obtain the summary at one time according to the score ranking. This approach does not fully consider the relationship between the summary sentences. To reduce the repetition and include more main contents in summary, the relationship between the chosen sentences must be taken into consideration. Thus we adopt multiple rounds of calculations instead of single round. We select one sentence for each round, and adjust the strategy for the next round selection based on the selected sentence. We believe that this method can optimize the relationship between summary sentences and more fully explore the features of articles, which further reduce the redundancy information and achieve the goal of "to include more main contents".

The specific algorithm goes as follows: In the first round of calculation, we obtain the adjacency matrix, and retain the PACSUM approach to assign additional weights β_1 and β_2 to the forward and backward edges, calculate the importance score of each sentence, and select the sentence i with the highest score as a summary sentence. After the sentence i is selected, we recompute all the related similarities as $SS_{i,j}$ by (5), and add sentence i into set sum . Then the next round of calculations will be performed in the remained sentences and we can still get importance im of remained sentences by (4). The only difference is that we recompute im as (6) rather than (4). For an article with n sentences, the practice of multiple rounds of calculation actually only brings about the addition of n -square, and n is usually less than 100, so the time complexity brought by multiple rounds of calculation can be Negligible (especially relative to embedding).

$$SS_{i,k} = SS_{k,i} = \begin{cases} \alpha_1 \cdot S_{i,k} & \text{if } i < k \\ \alpha_2 \cdot S_{i,k} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$im_i = \beta_1 \cdot \sum_{j < i \& j \notin sum} S_{i,j} + \beta_2 \cdot \sum_{i < j \& j \notin sum} S_{i,j} + \sum_{j \in sum} SS_{i,j} \quad (6)$$

III. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets

In order to evaluate our algorithm more comprehensively, we made experiments on four different datasets, CNN/DailyMail [4], NYT [12], TTNews [5] and CLTS [6]. Both the Chinese and English datasets are composed of relatively shorter articles datasets and relatively longer articles datasets. Among them, the Chinese and English data sets each include a data set with relatively short text and a data set with relatively long text. CNN/DailyMail is a commonly used news summarization dataset containing short text. New York Times (NYT) contains longer text than CNN/DailyMail. TTNews is a Chinese dataset with content from Taiwanese news media. CLTS is a newly released dataset, which contains relatively long Chinese texts.

B. Deployment details

We used the BERT as encoder, but did not innovate on BERT fine-tuning. In order to see the effect of our algorithm more intuitively and eliminate the influence of finetuning, we employed the same bert model downloaded from Internet on all the methods we tested, including baselines and our own work.

We tuned hyper-parameters on the validation set of the three datasets except the TTNews which contains only train set and test set. We tuned hyper-parameters with a small amount of samples first to roughly know the best value range, and then we used the whole validation set to get the best hyper-parameters. We used the best hyper-parameters to evaluate the methods on the test set to see how well they performs. When evaluating on the Chinese datasets, since ROUGE does not support Chinese text, we convert the Chinese sentence into Unicode format, and then use these transformed sentences as input to call ROUGE for experimental evaluation.

As mentioned above, the number of extracted sentences is decided before the methods run, and we set the number of extracted sentences to 3 which is a common choice for most methods. We also tried numbers 2,4 and 5, and we found 3 is a better choice for most methods since it performed better.

C. Result analysis

In addition to evaluating our method, we also tested three other unsupervised summarization methods for comparison. Lead3 is a very simple method. It directly selects the first three sentences of the article as the summary. Although this method is simple, it works very well in some cases, especially on the CNN/DailyMail data set. TextRank is a classic summarization method, and it has a great influence on PACSUM




Fig. 1: Multi-round calculation and dynamic optimization

Method	NYT			CNN/DailyMail		
	R-1	R-2	R-L	R-1	R-2	R-L
Lead3	35.3	17.2	31.8	40.2	17.6	36.5
TextRank(tf-idf)	33.2	13.1	29.0	33.2	11.8	29.6
TextRank(BERT)	30.9	10.9	27.2	30.7	10.6	27.7
PACSUM(BERT)	40.5	20.9	36.6	40.3	17.7	36.6
Ours(BERT)	41.3	21.7	37.4	40.6	17.7	36.9

TABLE I: ROUGE Results on NYT and CNN/DailyMail

Method	CLTS			TTNews		
	R-1	R-2	R-L	R-1	R-2	R-L
TextRank(BERT)	37.8	18.9	37.6	34.9	17.2	34.6
PACSUM(BERT)	41.7	23.4	41.5	38.8	20.2	38.5
Ours (BERT)	42.2	23.4	41.9	39.2	20.3	38.9

TABLE II: ROUGE Results on CLTS and TTNews

and our work. Also, to tell if it's BERT which improves the performance of our algorithm indeed, we tested two versions of TextRank: TextRank based on tf-idf and TextRank based on BERT. Here in TextRank, tf-idf and BERT are used to represent the sentences and to compute the similarities of sentences. The PACSUM method is currently the best unsupervised text summarization method, and our work aims to improve it.

As can be seen from the table 1, the lead3 method is indeed very effective on the CNN/DailyMail data set, and it's better than TextRank both on NYT and CNN/DailyMail. PACSUM performs better than Lead3 and TextRank significantly. Our method performs better than PACSUM especially on NYT, and we believe that it's because of the long texts on NYT where the dynamic optimization can play a bigger role. To our surprise, TextRank(tf-idf) performs better than TextRank(BERT). However, it exactly shows that it's not all BERT which makes our algorithm performs well. As table 2 shows, on CLTS and TTNews, our method still performs best than other methods, including the previous state-of-the-art unsupervised method PACSUM. These experiments show that our method is effective on both Chinese and English datasets, on both long text or short text datasets, and it is generally better than the previous method.

We have also analysed the reason why our method outperforms others. Just like we talked above, we optimize the relationship between chosen sentences after every round of

calculation. In fact, we are trying to differ the next sentence to be chosen from the selected sentence in datasets like NYT, and trying to choose similar sentences in datasets like CNN/DailyMail, depending on the features of articles. We achieve this by different values of hyper-parameters α_1 and α_2 .

In addition, theoretically, since the framework of PACSUM is still used in a single round of calculation, PACSUM is actually a subset of our algorithm. If we don't optimize the similarity matrix after every round of calculation, then our algorithm degrades into PACSUM. This means that the optimal result of our algorithm will at least be consistent with the optimal result of PACSUM, and by tuning the hyper-parameters, our algorithm can naturally perform better than PACSUM.

IV. CONCLUSION

We summed up a guiding rule deriving from the most intuitive principles when we do manual text summarization. According to this rule, we rethink the existing methods and proposed a new unsupervised extractive summarization method, with the novel idea of multiple rounds of calculation and dynamic optimization which are meant to reduce the repetition and include more main contents in summary. We made experiments to evaluate our proposed method, and the results show that it performs better than the previous state-of-the-art unsupervised method PACSUM. From theoretical analysis, we showed that our algorithm can degrade into PACSUM under certain condition. It can be seen that the optimal result of our algorithm will at least be consistent with the optimal result of PACSUM.

There are still lots of things to be done. We still cannot differentiate the main contents from the secondary contents efficiently. And automatically determining the number of extracted sentences based on the text should be considered soon.

REFERENCES

- [1] Barrios, F., López, F., Argerich, L., Wachenchauser, R.: Variations of the similarity function of textrank for automated summarization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.03606 (2016)
- [2] Cheng, J., Lapata, M.: Neural summarization by extracting sentences and words. arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07252 (2016)
- [3] Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 (2018)

- [4] Hermann, K.M., Kocisky, T., Grefenstette, E., Espeholt, L., Kay, W., Suleyman, M., Blunsom, P.: Teaching machines to read and comprehend. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **28**, 1693–1701 (2015)
- [5] Hua, L., Wan, X., Li, L.: Overview of the nlpcc 2017 shared task: Single document summarization. In: *National CCF Conference on Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*. pp. 942–947. Springer (2017)
- [6] Liu, X., Zhang, C., Chen, X., Cao, Y., Li, J.: Clts: A new chinese long text summarization dataset. In: *CCF International Conference on Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*. pp. 531–542. Springer (2020)
- [7] Liu, Y., Lapata, M.: Text summarization with pretrained encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08345* (2019)
- [8] Mallick, C., Das, A.K., Dutta, M., Das, A.K., Sarkar, A.: Graph-based text summarization using modified textrank. In: *Soft computing in data analytics*, pp. 137–146. Springer (2019)
- [9] Mihalcea, R., Tarau, P.: Textrank: Bringing order into text. In: *Proceedings of the 2004 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. pp. 404–411 (2004)
- [10] Nenkova, A., McKeown, K.: *Automatic summarization*. Now Publishers Inc (2011)
- [11] Page, L., Brin, S., Motwani, R., Winograd, T.: The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. *Tech. rep.*, Stanford InfoLab (1999)
- [12] Sandhaus, E.: The new york times annotated corpus. *Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia* **6**(12), e26752 (2008)
- [13] Shi, C.y., Xu, C.j., Yang, X.J.: Study of tfidf algorithm. *Journal of Computer Applications* **29**(6), 167–170 (2009)
- [14] Zheng, H., Lapata, M.: Sentence centrality revisited for unsupervised summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03508* (2019)
- [15] Zhong, M., Liu, P., Chen, Y., Wang, D., Qiu, X., Huang, X.: Extractive summarization as text matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08795* (2020)