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Abstract

For summarization, human preference is critical to tame outputs of the summarizer in favor of human interests, as ground-truth summaries are scarce and ambiguous. Practical settings require dynamic exchanges between human and AI agent wherein feedback is provided in an online manner, a few at a time. In this paper, we introduce a new framework to train summarization models with preference feedback interactively. By properly leveraging offline data and a novel reward model, we improve the performance regarding ROUGE scores and sample-efficiency. Our experiments on three various datasets confirm the benefit of the proposed framework in active, few-shot and online settings of preference learning.

1 Introduction

The advent of AI has changed business practices, though the human involvement is still important. The human roles in interaction with AI-powered machines have been evolving under the concept of human-in-the-loop (HITL) (Zanzotto, 2019). HITL allows human to actively participate in supervising AI systems by approving, rejecting, or re-labeling current outputs, and providing expert-guided advices to the system. It will also act as the unique source of external knowledge from human. By observing the outputs of AI systems, human can hand-pick some potential outcomes and then feedback to the models for better performance.

In NLP, document summarization is considered as a subjective task (Stiennon et al., 2020). They argued that it would be hard to quantify what makes a “good summary” without human judgment input. Collecting human feedback and evaluating the crafted summaries from documents for building the training datasets is time-consuming (Wu et al., 2021) and labor-expensive. It is true particularly where the domain knowledge is required. Moreover, Uc-Cetina et al. (2021) argued the importance of the user’s intentions for modeling Natural Language Understanding with high performance. The authors considered that the nature of the user’s intentions was diverse and uncertain, while that nature was sequential and context-specific.

Given these attributions, we are more interested in deploying an interactive HITL-based text summarization framework, which continuously collect the user-feedback to consequently improve model prediction robustness. Here, the user’s intention is implicitly acknowledged as a factor influencing the extraction of important sentences from the source documents. Upon this formulation, the AI model will be trained with human-produced summaries and adapted as more human-feedback is fed in.

Previous studies used human feedback to rank the label of object (Wirth et al., 2017), which employed reinforcement learning to minimize the user’s effort to provide feedback for training a ranker. However, these approaches rank the entire the solution space including relevant and irrelevant pairs, which is a waste of computing power. To tackle this shortcoming, Siddhant and Lipton (2018) employed Bayesian Optimization, which substitutes the standard uncertainty-based acquisition functions in active learning. However, they still consume a lot of computing power for a larger number of iterations, and are vulnerable to the curse of dimensionality of input data. Recently, researchers proposed to learn a reward model simulating human preference (Ziegler et al., 2019). The reward model is then used to translate real-time human feedback to reward score to fine-tune the model under RL training. The method is designed for online learning of language models and requires numerous interactions to achieve good performance. However, how to achieve sample-efficiency is still an open question.

In this paper, we propose a novel interactive preference learning for the summarization task. We fine-tune pretrained extractive summarization
models with reinforcement learning using a reward model that enforces distance-based order of preferences. The reward model is trained to master differentiating two summaries regarding topic, length, and quality (human preference). To enable sample-efficiency, we propose to utilize offline data, which was previously used to pretrain the model. We show that naively using the offline data is harmful for preference learning. Instead, we introduce two mechanisms to selectively sample offline data in favor of human feedback learning. Our sampling strategies focus on low-rewarded samples or documents similar to fine-tuning data. We demonstrate that our method can be used in various settings: active, few-shot and online learning. Tested on three summarization datasets, our method consistently achieves significantly better results than competitive baselines in each setting. In summary, our contribution is three-fold:

- We propose a new RL-based preference learning system for the summarization task using a novel reward model.
- We propose sampling mechanisms to efficiently leverage offline data for preference learning of extractive summarization.
- We conduct extensive empirical studies on three summarization datasets, showing that our proposed method outperforms competitive baselines in various settings such as active, online, and few-shot learning scenarios.

2 Related work

2.1 Summarization with RL

Direct reward The most direct way to have a reward function in reinforcement learning for summarization is to match the candidate summary to the reference (gold) summary (Narayan et al., 2018; Paulus et al., 2017). Put in the HITL setting, humans are required to provide the gold summary for training the machine, which is prohibitively expensive and can be ambiguous. Thus, we focus on rewards constructed from preference feedback, in which humans only need to indicate the better summary between two candidate summaries.

Preference reward As stated in the introduction, the preference from human is much more accessible and consistent. In this approach, the frameworks (Gao et al., 2018; Stiennon et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2021) consist of two main steps:

1) Preference learning that gives a score, which mimics human evaluation, to a summary of a document. 2) Reinforcement learning based on the reward model. These works have not examined the summarization problem in an interactive training scheme, which will be addressed in this paper.

2.2 Preference learning in NLP

Preference learning aims at obtaining the ranking (i.e. total ordering) of objects from pairwise preferences, in which the linear Bradley-Terry (BT) model (Bradley and Terry, 1952) is one of the most studied methods. Later, the APRIL framework (Gao et al., 2018) shows that it can reduce the number of required comparisons by using active selection with uncertainty sampling (Avinesh and Meyer, 2017). On the other hand, the OpenAI framework (Stiennon et al., 2020) uses a neural structure to predict the score given a document and its summary. Its advantage is the learning with direct human evaluation (score for each summary) or human preference (comparison between 2 summaries). However, the input space is the product of two documents, so it needs much more human feedbacks to achieve good performance. In contrast, our proposed reward model treats the input as only one document, and thus is simpler and has fewer parameters to learn. That is more suitable for the interactive learning context where the number of data is limited.

Reinforcement learning is a popular and effective approach to utilize human preferences. The APRIL framework (Gao et al., 2018) trains a summarizer by using a pretrained preference model. The work of Ziegler et al. (2019) employs preference-based RL to fine-tune a deep language model on sentiment classification and document summarization tasks. They only rely on online data during finetuning. We instead make use of offline data to accelerate the learning process.

3 Background

3.1 The backbone model

We use BERTSUM (Liu and Lapata, 2019) as the backbone for extractive summarization. Given a document with a set of sentences, the model uses BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) for learning hidden vectors of sentences by using the modified [CLS] token of each sentence. The vectors are fed into an inter-sentence layer using Transformer for learning the inter-relationship among sentences. Important
sentences are extracted by using a sigmoid function to estimate the importance of the sentences.

3.2 Finetuning with reinforcement learning

**Proximal policy optimization** (PPO) To finetune the backbone with interactive feedback, we treat the summarization process as a sequential decision-making process so that we can employ RL (Stiennon et al., 2020; Ziegler et al., 2019). The RL agent traverses all sentences in the original document, and at each time step, it classifies the current sentence $s_i$ into two labels: important ($y_i = 1$) and unimportant ($y_i = 0$). We consider the backbone model trained with supervised learning as the initial policy. The policy is then optimized using PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) as our RL method. The objective for training PPO is:

$$J_{PPO}(\theta) = E[\min(ra(\theta) \hat{A}_{\theta_{old}}(s_i, y_i), \
s\text{clip}(ra(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}_{\theta_{old}}(s_i, y_i))]$$

where $\theta$ is the policy’s parameters, $\hat{A}_{\theta_{old}}(s_i, y_i)$ is the advantage calculated at the old parameters $\theta_{old}$ before each updated policy iteration, using any advantage estimation algorithm to transform the rewards (Schulman et al., 2015), and $ra(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_i|s_i)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(y_i|s_i)}$ is the probability ratio of the policy $\pi_\theta$. PPO uses the objective to avoid big changes between new and old policies.

**Reward schemes** Besides the final reward that evaluates the quality of the whole summary, we follow Pasunuru and Bansal (2018); Li et al. (2019) to use an additional reward to constrain policy update. Let $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ denote the supervised trained backbone model and $\pi_{\theta}$ is the one that we optimize with RL. The reward at the time step $i$ is:

$$r_i = -\beta_{KL} \log \left[ \frac{\pi_\theta(y_i|s_i, D)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(y_i|s_i, D)} \right] + 1(i = n) \times r^M$$

where $\beta_{KL}$ is the KL coefficient, $n$ is the final time step corresponding to the total number of sentences in document $D$. For the intermediate time step $i$ ($i < n$), the reward is the negative KL divergence between the output distribution of the backbone model and the current policy. For the final time step $i$ ($i = n$), when the model obtains the complete summary $S$, the reward model takes the summary and the original document to produce the final reward $r^M$ (see Section 5).

4 Interactive learning with Online RL

4.1 Problem formulation

In our problem, a backbone summarizer and a reward model are pretrained with offline data. We aim to update the models to adapt with a stream of online data using reinforcement learning. Given a document $D$ from the online data, the backbone (Section 3.1) extracts two summaries for an oracle (i.e., a human) to provide preference feedback. Each time the backbone receives feedback in one interaction. The feedback is translated to a reward via a reward model, which is later used to finetune the backbone using RL (Section 3.2), thereby improving the summary quality for future interactions. The reward model can be also finetuned with the online data and oracle’s feedback (Section 5).

This interactive mechanism is applicable to three scenarios: active, online, and few-shot learning (Section 4.2). Offline data can be employed during online fine-tuning to speed up the learning process. The common objective of all scenarios is to maximize the summarization quality while minimizing the number of interactions. We depict the overview of our framework in Figure 1.

4.2 Interaction plots

**Active learning** Given a pool of unlabeled samples, the agent queries the most informative samples at each iteration to create summaries. Then the agent asks the oracle to select which summary is better for the queried documents. The agent learns from the feedback of the oracle subsequently. This setting has been studied by Gao et al. (2018).

**Online learning** Different from active learning, each unlabeled instance is typically drawn one at a time from the data stream, continuously being sent to the system. The agent passively processes the data and is not allowed to choose the document. Ziegler et al. (2019) is the early work that promotes
We construct a reward model to generate rewards when the training and testing distributions are similar (Devlin et al., 2018), and then compute their similarity using the Cosine distance. To achieve sample efficiency in terms of the number of interactions between the backbone and the oracle, we argue that it is critical to leverage prior data used in the pretraining phase. We experience that the naive usage of prior data using random sampling is inefficient. Hence, we propose two novel offline-data sampling methods: low-reward and document-similarity. We describe all sampling mechanisms as follows.

**Random sampling (Random)** We randomly select $k$ offline documents and combine them with online data to fine-tune the backbone model.

**Low-reward sampling (LRS)** Intuitively, good summaries should be given a higher reward by the reward model. Samples that have extracted summaries with low rewards have not been well-learned by the summarizer. As a result, we select top $k$ documents having the lowest rewards from the reward model.

**Document-similarity sampling (DSS)** Conventionally, the backbone outputs good summaries when the training and testing distributions are similar. Therefore, we sample offline documents that share similar semantics with online documents. To do that, we encode the documents by using BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), and then compute their similarity using the Cosine distance. $k$ offline documents have the lowest distance to the online counterparts are selected for online training.

### 4.3 Efficient interaction from offline data

To achieve sample efficiency in terms of the number of interactions between the backbone and the oracle, we argue that it is critical to leverage prior data used in the pretraining phase. We experience that the naive usage of prior data using random sampling is inefficient. Hence, we propose two novel offline-data sampling methods: low-reward and document-similarity. We describe all sampling mechanisms as follows.

**Random sampling (Random)** We randomly select $k$ offline documents and combine them with online data to fine-tune the backbone model.

**Low-reward sampling (LRS)** Intuitively, good summaries should be given a higher reward by the reward model. Samples that have extracted summaries with low rewards have not been well-learned by the summarizer. As a result, we select top $k$ documents having the lowest rewards from the reward model.

**Document-similarity sampling (DSS)** Conventionally, the backbone outputs good summaries when the training and testing distributions are similar. Therefore, we sample offline documents that share similar semantics with online documents. To do that, we encode the documents by using BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), and then compute their similarity using the Cosine distance. $k$ offline documents have the lowest distance to the online counterparts are selected for online training.

### 5 Reward Model for Preference Learning

#### 5.1 Training procedure

We construct a reward model to generate rewards for finetuning the backbone model with RL. The reward model should simulate human preference, capable of assigning a higher reward to the preferred summary. For preference learning, we use the relative order between two summary candidates to train the reward model. The correct order is given by humans via their preference.

In traditional learning, the model has access to training documents of the dataset. Each document $D$ has a human (gold) summary $S_g$, which is assumed to be preferred to other candidate summaries (silver or machine-generated $S_m$). The training data is in the form of a triplet $(D, S_g, S_m)$ where $S_g \succ S_m$. We argue that this is insufficient to achieve a good reward model, and thus introduce three objectives as follows.

**The topic objective** Aiming to detect the document’s topic: $(D, S_g, S_h)$. We generate the training set of the topic objective as follows. For each document $D$ that has a gold summary $S_g$, we select a summary $S'_g$ from a different document $D'$ (randomly chosen) and expect that $S_g \succ S'_g$. If we miss the human summary, we could use machine-generated summaries instead $((D, S_m, S'_m))$ such that $S_m \succ S'_m$.

**The length objective** Aiming to detect the amount of summary information (i.e. the length of the summary). For each document $D$, we used a pretrained summary model to generate a long $(S_{ml})$ and a short $(S_{ms})$ summary to obtain the triplet $(D, S_{ml}, S_{ms})$. The correct order is $S_{ml} \succ S_{ms}$.

**The quality objective** Aiming to detect the general quality of the summary. For each document $D$, we generate a summary $S_m$ which has a similar length to the human summary and include the gold summary to compose the triplet for training $(D, S_g, S_m)$. We note that the data of this objective is similar to the traditional data used in Stiennon et al. (2020), which needs humans to provide a gold-silver summary or correct order between arbitrary summary candidates. On the contrary, the data of topic and length objectives can be created programmatically and thus save human effort.

#### 5.2 Respective-order mapping

For summarization, we argue that the reward model’s interpretation of ordering should be determined based on the distance between the summary and document representations. Therefore, we aim to learn a global representing mapping $\phi$ such that:

$$S_1 \succ S_2 \iff d(\phi(D), \phi(S_1)) < d(\phi(D), \phi(S_2))$$

where $d$ is the Euclidean distance, $\phi(D)$ is the representation of the document $D$ in the respective-
order mapping. Then, the reward for a summary $S$ is computed as follows.

$$r^M(D, S) = \frac{\text{score}(\phi(D), \phi(S)) - \text{score}_{\text{min}}}{\text{score}_{\text{max}} - \text{score}_{\text{min}}}$$

where $\text{score}(D, S) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(d(\phi(D), \phi(S)))}$ is the unnormalized score between $D$ and $S$; $\text{score}_{\text{min}}$, $\text{score}_{\text{max}}$ is the minimum and maximum score over all pairs of document-summary, respectively. We name our reward model as ROMSR (Respective-Order Mapping Score Reward).

5.3 Representation learning

To train $\phi$, first, we embed all documents that appear in triplet sets. To obtain important features of a document, we used the joint-embedding of a Transformer (capture a general meaning of the document) (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019; Devlin et al., 2018) and keyword feature vectors (capture important keywords in the document) (Sharma and Li, 2019). We denote this transformation as $f(D)$.

In fact, this feature vector $f(D)$ can be used to compare the similarity between two documents. However, it does not always satisfy the relative comparison from the triplets. Therefore, we learn a new embedding by using an autoencoder ($\text{decode}(\text{encode}(f(D)))$) that tries to follow all the triplet conditions. The embedded representation is our target mapping $\phi(D) = \text{encode}(f(D))$. The loss for the learning of the document representation $\mathcal{L}$ is the combination of the autoencoder reconstruction loss $\mathcal{L}_{AE}$ and the respective-order loss $\mathcal{L}_{RO}$ (the triplet loss).

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{AE} + \mathcal{L}_{RO}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{AE} = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}, S \in \mathcal{S}} \| f(D) - \text{decode}(\phi(D)) \|$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{RO} = \sum_{(D, S, S') \in T} \max(0, d(\phi(D), \phi(S)) - d(\phi(D), \phi(S')) + \alpha)$$

where $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S}$ is the set of original/summarized documents, $T$ is the union of all triplet sets, and $\alpha$ is the margin hyperparameter controlling the stretch in the representation space (Yu et al., 2018).

6 Experimental Setup

6.1 Datasets

We use three benchmark summarization datasets for our evaluation. BillSum comprises 22,218 US bill and human-written summary pairs collected from the US Government Publishing Office (Kornilova and Eidelman, 2019). The data is split into 18,949 training and 3,269 testing bills. Reddit TIFU is an English dataset collected from Reddit. It contains 12,000 posts divided into TIFU-long and TIFU-short (documents have less than 400 words) (Kodaira and Komachi, 2018). Livedoor contains Japanese articles crawled from the Livedoor News website. Each article consists of three sentences written by human editors (Kim et al., 2018).

Our experiments use the training set to pretrain the backbone and reward models. Then, we randomly select 5000 samples from the original training data to create offline data. The online data is created from the original validation data. For active learning and online learning settings, we sample up to 320 documents from the online data. For fewshot learning, only 4 documents are randomly selected as online data. We aim to minimize the number of interactions to reach the highest performance on the whole online dataset.

6.2 Simulated interactions

Given one original document with two corresponding generated summaries and a standard metric ROUGE score, the oracle knows the ground-truth summary, and prefers the summary that has the higher ROUGE score w.r.t. the ground-truth. Theoretically, the ideal data for preference-based interactive learning is consistent preferences in which a higher-scored summary is always selected. However, we believe that perfect selection is impossible for real-world applications because human can occasionally misinterpret the intention when the presented candidates have similar qualities. Therefore, in this work, we consider noisy preferences with uniform probability $nc \in [0, 1]$, that randomly selects which summary is better.

6.3 Baselines

We construct a standard model (baseline) that just finetunes the backbone summarizer (see Section 3.1) with online data, coupled with our proposed reward model and PPO training. The combination of BERT and PPO is shown effective in the offline document summarization task (Nguyen et al., 2021). The baseline is similar to that of Ziegler et al. (2019), which uses human preferences and PPO to finetune language models. However, the latter uses a different reward model.
To show the efficacy of our reward model, we compare ours with the reward model of Ziegler et al. (2019) (OpenAI) and the uncertainty sampling reward model in APRIL (Gao et al., 2018) in the preference prediction task (see Section 7.1).

For few-shot and online learning, we compare our methods with the standard baseline. In active learning, we also compare our methods with APRIL. In all settings, we build a baseline that randomly samples from offline data to compare against our proposed sampling techniques: LRS and DSS. We note that all models share the same backbone and RL training. The baseline, Random, LRS, and DSS share the same reward model and only differ in the sampling techniques.

6.4 Evaluation metrics

The quality of summaries is measured using ROUGE-scores (Lin, 2004). We report ROUGE-1 as the representative ROUGE score. ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L are reported in the Appendix. We also report the number of interactions to show that our novel sampling techniques can significantly speed up the agent’s learning.

7 Results and Discussion

7.1 Reward model study

In the preference prediction task, the reward scores assigned to candidate summaries are used to determine the preferred summary. In general, the preferred summary is the one with a higher score. We select a subset of documents from the datasets to train the reward model. Each document can be used to construct three triples corresponding to the three objectives mentioned above. The number of pretraining/interactive training/testing documents is 1000/1000/1000 for Billsum and Livedoor, and 2000/2000/2000 for Reddit TIFU, respectively.

Figure 3 demonstrates that our reward model (ROMSR) significantly outperforms other methods when training on all three objectives. APRIL uses a linear regression model combined with a heuristics function that is tuned for the quality objective. This specific design limits the model to handle all three objectives. OpenAI’s results exhibit slow learning progress because it is a large neural network using joint features from a pair of texts, while our reward model learns to use respective-order on a feature space of a single document. Moreover, the reconstruction loss from the autoencoder helps the model to avoid overfitting to small training samples.

To verify the necessity of using 3 objectives for training the reward model, we compare two ver-
7.2 Fine-tuning backbone model using human preferences

This section shows our comprehensive experiments on three datasets and three scenarios to prove the effectiveness of our human-preference-guided learning with RL, and our LRS and DSS sampling.

**Active learning** We compare our sampling techniques with baselines including random offline sampling and methods without offline sampling such as the standard baseline and APRIL. Figure 2 shows that combining online data with randomly selected samples harms the agent during online fine-tuning. Meanwhile, selecting prior low-reward samples and similar documents boosts accuracy faster than not using offline data. After 64 interactions, ROUGE-1 reaches almost the highest. To validate the actual impact of ROMSR, we also test the reward model in the RL pipeline compared to the APRIL’s reward. Due to OpenAI reward is inferior to APRIL’s reward, we ignore OpenAI’s reward in this experiment. The results shown on Figure 2 depict that APRIL (orange) is inferior to our ROMSR (blue) in all datasets.

**Fewshot learning** Figure 4 describes the quality of the models: LRS, DSS, Random, and the standard baseline during interactions. The standard baseline without offline sampling cannot improve the summarization agent with few interactions and eventually worsen the agent. In contrast, LRS and DSS can significantly improve the model after 4 interactions. Naively using the offline data still harms the model, similar to active learning.

**Online learning** Due to computation limitation, we only examine this setting on the Reddit TIFU dataset. Also, prior experiments demonstrated that LRS and DSS are equally good sampling strategies. As DSS runs much faster than LRS, we choose DSS as our representative method in this experiment. We report the performance of DSS, Random and the standard baseline in Figure 5.

The results show that random sampling is again inferior to other methods in this online scenario. The standard baseline shows good performance, yet becomes unstable and drops performance later. Our DSS demonstrates fast and stable convergence, consistently achieving the highest ROUGE-1 score throughout interactions.

7.3 Ablation study and model analysis

**Impact of top-\(k\) selected offline documents** To investigate the effect of \(k\)-the number of sampled offline documents, we try different \(k\) values (\(k \in [1, 4]\)) on the RedditTIFU dataset, and the results are depicted in Figure 6a. \(k = 4\) is slightly better,
but $k = 1$ runs and converges faster. Hence, we use $k = 1$ in all experiments.

**Random sampling makes low rewards** We investigate the failure of random sampling. We keep track of the reward assigned to randomly selected offline documents across interactions. Figure 6b shows that, in general, DSS and LRS give better samples, indicated by higher assigned rewards, than random sampling does. DSS and LRS’s rewards are also much more consistent, showing less variance than random sampling. Thus, offline documents from random sampling provide little benefit and make the training unstable and unreliable.

We also analyze the distribution characteristics of selected offline documents in Figure 6c. The green line represents the distribution of similarity scores between online and random offline samples. The red one is the distribution of similarity scores between online and DSS samples. It is noticeable that the similarity score of DSS is in the range from 0.0 to 0.15, whereas this score of Random is up to 0.5. It is expected that sampling offline data will create a coherent training distribution for online learning, but Random skews the training distribution. As a result, Random harms the performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th>Run time</th>
<th>ROUGE-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Reddit TIFU dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2h20m</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2h50m</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The BillSum dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50m</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1h40m</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The running time of active learning with offline sampling.

**Running time** We assess the running time of our proposed method compared to the baseline on Reddit TIFU and BillSum in Table 1. The assessment is conducted on a single Tesla T4. On Reddit TIFU, our DSS takes nearly 3 hours (64 interactions) to reach almost the highest ROUGE-1 score of 28.6, while the baseline reaches only 26.0 of ROUGE-1 after 64 interactions. The baseline takes only 30 minutes faster than the DSS. In light of BillSum, the DSS is slower than the baseline, about 50 minutes for 96 interactions. However, the DSS is better than the baseline in terms of ROUGE-1. Despite that our proposed method takes more computing resources than the baseline, our approach requires much fewer interactions, saving human resources in the real HITL setting.

8 Conclusion

This work proposes a novel approach for learning reward functions in preference learning. By utilizing offline data with a reward model that focuses on the distance between the summary and the document, our method improves the ROUGE score by $2 - 5\%$ in comparison to the APRIL framework, while beating the random baseline by a large margin on three different datasets. Our experimental results also suggest that by applying low-reward sampling or document-similarity sampling, we can achieve efficiency in terms of both running time and the number of human interactions. Regarding limitations, our method is not tested with large online stream data, which may cause catastrophic forgetting. Future work will confirm our model’s effectiveness for abstractive summarization.
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A Hyper-parameters and Implementation details

Due to the limitation of resources, our backbone bases on BERT-base with 12 Transformer blocks with the hidden size is 768, and 110M parameters. We train our model with the learning rate of 1e-5. During online fine-tuning with RL, we set $k$ equals the number of online documents, where $k$ is the number of selected offline data. The noisy preference probability $nc$ is 0.1. For evaluation, we use ROUGE-score with parameters $-c\ 95\ -m\ -r\ 1000\ -n\ 2$.

B Additional Results

In Figure 8, we show ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L scores with the same setting as section 7.2. The results of few-shot and online learning setting is depicted in Figure 9 and 7 respectively.

![Figure 7: Online learning on RedditTIFU dataset: ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L score with the mean and std over 5 runs](image)
Figure 8: Active learning: ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L score with the mean and std over 5 runs

Figure 9: Fewshot learning: ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L score with the mean and std over 5 runs