Learning to Revise References for Faithful Summarization

Griffin Adams1* Han-Chin Shing1,2 Qing Sun2
Christopher Winestock2 Kathleen McKeown1,2 Noémie Elhadad1
{griffin.adams, noemie.elhadad}@columbia.edu
{hanchins, qinsun, winestock, mckeownk}@amazon.com
1Columbia University, New York, NY 2Amazon AWS AI, Seattle, WA

Abstract
In many real-world scenarios with naturally occurring datasets, reference summaries are noisy and contain information that cannot be inferred from the source text. On large news corpora, removing low quality samples has been shown to reduce model hallucinations. Yet, this method is largely untested for smaller, noisier corpora. To improve reference quality while retaining all data, we propose a new approach: to revise—not remove—unsupported reference content. Without ground-truth supervision, we construct synthetic unsupported alternatives to supported sentences and use contrastive learning to discourage/encourage (un)faithful revisions. At inference, we vary style codes to over-generate revisions of unsupported reference sentences and select a final revision which balances faithfulness and abstraction. We extract a small corpus from a noisy source—the Electronic Health Record (EHR)—for the task of summarizing a hospital admission from multiple notes. Training models on original, filtered, and revised references, we find (1) learning from revised references reduces the hallucination rate substantially more than filtering (18.4% vs 3.8%), (2) learning from abstractive (vs extractive) revisions improves coherence, relevance, and faithfulness, (3) beyond redress of noisy data, the revision task has standalone value for the task: as a pre-training objective and as a post-hoc editor1.

1 Introduction
The tendency of models to generate summaries which are unfaithful to the input is well-established (Cao et al., 2018; Kryscinski et al., 2020; Maynez et al., 2020). Efforts to address it have focused on smarter models (Sharma et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2021; Huang et al., 2020), more suitable metrics (Eyal et al., 2019; Durmus et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Goyal and Durrett, 2020a), content-plan editing (Narayan et al., 2021), and post-hoc interventions: ranking (Falke et al., 2019a; Zhao et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021) and editing (Cao et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2021).

Less attention is paid to the role of the data on which the models are trained. This is problematic for two reasons: (1) many corpora are naturally occurring—not created for training models—and, as such, are noisy (Kryscinski et al., 2019) and without “inherent quality guarantees” (Bommasani and Cardie, 2020); (2) noisy data is detrimental to training faithful models (Dušek et al., 2019). A common approach to deal with training noise is filtering: to identify and ignore low quality text at the reference (Kang and Hashimoto, 2020; Matsumaru et al., 2020; Nan et al., 2021a; Narayan et al., 2021) or span level (Goyal and Durrett, 2021). Different quality metrics are used: missing entities (Nan et al., 2021a; Narayan et al., 2021), entail-
We synthetically generate it. At a high-level, we experiment with the publicly available MIMIC-III dataset (Johnson et al., 2016). As in Adams et al. (2020; Dong et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2021). We also generate synthetic data to improve faithfulness, yet involve re-ranking (Falke et al., 2019b) or learning to correct errors from synthetic datasets (Cao et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021b). Post-hoc interventions focus on question answering (Chen et al., 2018; Deutsch et al., 2021; Choubey et al., 2021), entailment (Pasunuru and Bansal, 2018; Deutsch et al., 2021; Choubey et al., 2021), and reinforcement learning (Zhang et al., 2020b; Huang et al., 2020). Automatic evaluation focuses on question answering (Chen et al., 2018; Durmus et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Scialom et al., 2019; Deutsch et al., 2021; Choubey et al., 2021), entailment (Pasunuru and Bansal, 2018; Goyal and Durrett, 2020b), and models trained on synthetic errors (Pagnoni et al., 2021), the truthfulness of hallucinations (Maynez et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2021), etc. Modeling solutions focus on optimizing factuality metrics with contrastive learning (Cao and Wang, 2021), counterfactual estimation (Xie et al., 2021), and reinforcement learning (Zhang et al., 2020b; Huang et al., 2020). Automatic evaluation focuses on question answering (Chen et al., 2018; Durmus et al., 2020; Ladhak et al., 2021), we treat the Brief Hospital Course (BHC) section of the discharge summary as a reference summary and all notes prior to discharge as source. Faithfulness is critical in this domain yet 40% of reference entities have no source antecedent.

The main contributions of this work are: (1) Proposing a new method to address variable reference quality: reference revision, which, as a data pre-processing step, is model agnostic and complementary to other faithfulness methods; (2) Showing that learning to ground references can improve faithfulness in three ways: via cleaner training data, post-hoc correction of errors, and as a standalone pre-training objective; and (3) Open-sourcing software to generate, evaluate, and edit hospital-course summaries, as well as releasing pre-trained models for corruption, revision, and summarization on HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2020) and plans to allow for pre-processed data to be downloaded from PhysioNet (Goldberger et al., 2000 (June 13)².

Related Work

Faithfulness. The tendency of abstractive systems to produce unfaithful summaries is an active area of research. A substantial body of work characterizes the problem, including its prevalence (Cao et al., 2018), fine-grained distribution of system errors (Pagnoni et al., 2021), the truthfulness of hallucinations (Maynez et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2021), etc. Modeling solutions focus on optimizing factuality metrics with contrastive learning (Cao and Wang, 2021), counterfactual estimation (Xie et al., 2021), and reinforcement learning (Zhang et al., 2020b; Huang et al., 2020). Automatic evaluation focuses on question answering (Chen et al., 2018; Durmus et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Scialom et al., 2019; Deutsch et al., 2021; Choubey et al., 2021), entailment (Pasunuru and Bansal, 2018; Goyal and Durrett, 2020b), and models trained on synthetic errors (Kryscinski et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020; Goyal and Durrett, 2021; Cao and Wang, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021b). Post-hoc interventions involve re-ranking (Falke et al., 2019b) or learning to correct errors from synthetic datasets (Cao et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2021). We also generate synthetic data to improve faithfulness, yet our use case is different in that we: (1) seek to mimic real data (clinician-authored), rather than

²To our knowledge, no generative transformers for clinical text are publicly available to the research community. We hope access to pre-trained models and clean datasets will encourage more research into long-form clinical summarization.
model outputs; (2) use the synthetic data on both
the encoder and decoder: as input for revision and
as negative examples of poor revisions.

The impact of training noise on faithfulness is
less studied. The most common proposal is to
identify low quality samples—with entailment (Mat-
sumaru et al., 2020; Goyal and Durrett, 2021) or
entity overlap (Nan et al., 2021a; Narayan et al.,
2021)—and drop them. These filtering methods
tend to improve faithfulness yet can degrade in-
formativeness because models are trained on less
data. Kang and Hashimoto (2020) address the data
hunger issue by first training on all data before
implementing Loss Truncation—ignoring high log
loss datapoints. This is effective on a relatively
clean Gigaword corpus yet untested on noisier cor-
pora in which hallucination behavior from the unfil-
tered data may be difficult to forget. Our proposed
method also takes advantage of all available data
while seeking to redress the underlying issue.

Clinical Summarization. Faithfulness is less
studied for clinical summarization because most
proposed methods are extractive (Moen et al., 2014;
Pivovarov and Elhadad, 2015; Moen et al., 2016;
Liu et al., 2018; Alsentzer and Kim, 2018). Ab-
stractive approaches tend to focus on finer temporal
granularities, e.g., synthesizing a single radiology
report (Zhang et al., 2018, 2020b; MacAvaney et al.,
2019; Sotudeh Gharebagh et al., 2020; Zhang et al.,
2020c; Karn et al., 2022) and doctor-patient con-
versations (Krishna et al., 2020; Joshi et al., 2020;
Chintagunta et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021a).

Most similar, Shing et al. (2021) survey extract-
then-abstract approaches to section-specific dis-
charge summarization on MIMIC-III. They mea-
sure factuality with entity overlap and remove poorly supported references. We also consider
linked entities as a key unit of clinical text anal-
ysis. When analyzing a proprietary EHR-derived,
hospital-course summarization corpus, Adams et al.
(2021) indicate that references are silver-standard,
which we confirm on the public MIMIC-III dataset.

2 Data

The publicly available MIMIC-III dataset contains
de-identified clinical records from patients admit-
ted to Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (John-
son et al., 2016). Hospital-admission summariza-
tion is a challenging task: in at most a paragraph,
a summary must discuss what happened to the pa-
tient during the admission, why it happened, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Visit</td>
<td>Mentions</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention</td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Type</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Entity-level breakdown by entity type in
source and reference (Ref.). Supported is the intersec-
tion of reference and source entities. The average entity
novelty fraction is high $40\% = \frac{20 - 30}{50}$.

Entity Analysis. Similar to previous work
(Shing et al., 2021; Nan et al., 2021a), we character-
ize (un)supported content at the entity level. Amazon Comprehend Medical is used to extract entities
of the following semantic types: diagnoses (using
the ICD-10 classification), medications (RxNorm),
procedures, treatments, and tests. Given the fre-
quent use of short-hand (e.g., acronyms (Joshi
et al., 2006; Adams et al., 2020) and synonyms
(e.g., brand name vs generic drugs), merging en-
tities by token overlap is insufficient. Rather, we
merge entities based on a combination of ontolog-
ical (RxNorm/ICD-10 codes) and lexical overlap
(embedding and exact match) (see Appendix A).

Table 2 shows the number of concept mentions
per admission, as well as the breakdown by entity

3Please refer to Grusky et al. (2018) for details on extrac-
tive analysis, including formulas for density and coverage.
type across note references, and the intersection (supported reference entities). The BHC is entity-dense: 86% of sentences have at least one entity, and 56% two or more. On average, 40% of reference entities do not have an antecedent. This missing rate varies by type: 22% for procedure, 30% for diagnosis, 48% for test, 56% for medication, and 63% for treatment. The skew makes sense given that medications and treatments may be found in structured data, yet the level of incompleteness remains very high across the board. Please see Appendix B for more analysis.

3 Building Source-Reference Alignments

We link each reference sentence to a subset of source sentences: (1) to identify poorly supported sentences (candidates for revision), and (2) prior work finds that reference sentences tend to reflect content from very few source sentences (Lebanoff et al., 2019b). Lebanoff et al. (2019b) greedily select sentences with high ROUGE overlap (Lin, 2004) and minimize redundancy by removing covered tokens after each step. We follow this approach but replace ROUGE with embedding similarity (BERTScore precision (Zhang et al., 2020a)) because our corpus contains high levels of intrinsic abstraction (abbreviations, misspellings, etc.), as well as abstraction caused by hallucinated content. This BERT-based alignment does not guarantee that all reference entities are covered, so we add a fallback step to ensure that all entities which can be covered are covered. Please refer to Appendix C for more intuition, motivation, and an example.

Classifying References. We treat reference sentences with 0 entity hallucinations and a BERTScore precision with respect to its aligned source evidence of $\geq 0.75$ as well-supported. The remaining are categorized as poorly supported. These values were set to optimize F1 on a held out set. 417,318 (41%) reference sentences qualify as well-supported. The remaining 595,300 (59%) are deemed not perfectly supported: 47% fail both thresholds (280,839), 38% have hallucination(s) with a high BERTScore (225,423), and 15% have no hallucinations but a low BERTScore (88,189). Figure 2 reveals that BERTScore and entity overlap are incomplete, yet complementary, metrics for assessing semantic coverage. The first example has both entity hallucinations and poor embedding-based scores. The second is semantically similar yet missing a critical concept (complications) which cannot be inferred from the context. The third has full entity coverage (IUFD is a term for stillbirth) yet BERTScore is low because there is no mention of social work. The final reference sentence is covered by both metrics and is treated, for the purposes of this paper, as gold-standard.

4 Learning to Revise Unsupported Text

The ultimate goal is to re-write unsupported references such that they are supported, i.e., inerferable from the source notes. To learn this revision task without a gold standard ground-truth, we take each supported reference sentence, inject noise to create unsupported, yet realistic alternatives (Section 4.1), and then use this mix of real and synthetic data to create a supervised set of positive and negative revisions for contrastive learning (Section 4.2).

4.1 Generating Synthetic Hallucinations

Desiderata. Based on Figure 2, we observe that unsupported sentences (1) look normal (unfaithful only in the context of available data) (2) contain many hallucinated entities, (3) exhibit a wide range of semantic divergence from the aligned source
Several days into hospital course, patient developed delirium and agitation. Most likely secondary to long hospital course and multiple psychotropic medications as well as history of EtOH abuse.

Several days into hospital course, patient developed delirium and agitation likely secondary to long hospital course and multiple psychotropic medications as well as history of EtOH abuse.

Several days into hospital course, patient developed delirium and agitation likely secondary to long hospital course and multiple psychotropic medications as well as history of EtOH abuse.

context, and (4) in spite of clear differences, are typically similar to aligned context. To illustrate (3), we note that the second sentence could be revised by simply removing the bigram “without complications”, yet the first and third sentences require more substantial re-writing to remove unfaithful content and remain informative and coherent.

Suitability of existing approaches. The simplest way to construct, and control for, hallucinations is to perform entity swaps (Kryscinski et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021b; Chen et al., 2021). Yet, this can produce disfluent text which is easily detectable (Goyal and Durrett, 2021). In contrast, generating from a PLM produces fluent (Zhou et al., 2021), more diverse text (Cao and Wang, 2021), yet without as much control over hallucinations. A third strand exploits the connection between predictive entropy and hallucinations (Xiao and Wang, 2021) to select synthetic hallucinations from low confidence beams (Goyal and Durrett, 2020a). This low-confidence method makes more sense for simulating model errors than our use case: unsupported human-authored text. Given desiderata (d), we seek to combine entity swaps (d1) into a generative framework (d2, d3) and incorporate a set of topical entities to appear plausible and avoid excessive semantic drift (d4).

Our Approach. Based on our criteria and related work, we propose a new hybrid method: reference distractor entity set swapping (ReDRESS). As shown in Figure 3, we exchange entities between a distractor entity set—entities extracted from related sentences in the corpus (Step 1)—and an input sentence, and pass both to a denoising model for reconstruction of the original input (Step 2). To give the model flexibility to re-write and re-organize, we corrupt the input in two other ways: span deletion and word order shuffling (included in Step 2). During training, the model learns to reconstruct the original sentence by reversing the entity swaps between the corrupted input and the distractor set and adding to/reordering as necessary (Step 3). During inference, to encourage hallucinations, removed entities (delirium, agitation, psychotropic meds) are not inserted into the distractor set, so the model selects plausible alternatives (delirium tremens, CIWA scale, anxiety) to include in a coherent, topical output (bottom right in Step 4).

Controlling Hallucinations. We provide the number of entity swaps (separately sampled for add and remove) as “swap” codes, prefixed to the encoder (Step 3). During inference, we add-1 to each code to instruct the model to implement an additional entity swap (Step 4). The input consists of three <sep>-delimited components: (1) entity control codes (2) distractor set (interspersed with entities removed from the original input sentence only during training), and (3) corrupted sentence.

At a high-level, ReDRESS implements entity swaps in a generative framework to ensure fluency and naturalness. See Appendix D for more details, including intrinsic evaluation and diverse outputs.
Figure 4: Synthetic positive and negative sets for revision training. The encoder input is the concatenation of the input (first box) and source context (second box), while the (un)faithful revision target is the third. Entities from inputs and targets are colored as unsupported relative to the provided context. Sampled ReDRESS is a randomly sampled synthetic hallucination, while Unsupported ReDRESS is the one most unsupported by Adjusted Context. Figure 10 (Appendix E), visualizes how this data is obtained from ReDRESS and within-example misalignments.

4.2 Removing Synthetic Hallucinations

**Notation.** Let \( r \) represent a reference sentence with aligned source sentences \( S \). \( \hat{r}_c \) is a corrupted version of \( r \) generated by ReDRESS with random seed \( c \). Given \( C \) diverse outputs, each generated from its own sampled set of corruptions, \( \hat{r}_u \) is the most unsupported (lowest BERTScore precision).

**Training.** The input to the reviser model (reviser) is the concatenation of a noisy input and aligned source context, while the output is a (un)faithful revision. We rely on ReDRESS to generate noisy inputs and unfaithful outputs. ReDRESS hallucinations require moderate levels of revision to reconstruct the original supported input. This makes sense for most of the observed unsupported sentences. Yet, sometimes, a sentence is almost entirely unsupported and must be more or less scrapped for a synthesis of its aligned context. As such, we also retrieve a random reference sentence \( (r^*, S^*) \), and its aligned source \( (S^*) \), from the same example, to simulate this more drastic scenario. Using the notation above, as tuples of format (input, context, target), the positive set is: \((\hat{r}_u, S, r) \) and \((r^*, S, r) \). The negative set is: \((\hat{r}_u, S, \hat{r}_c \in C)\) and \((r, S^*, r) \), where \( \hat{r}_c \in C \) is a randomly selected corruption. In other words, for the positive set, we learn to generate a supported reference \( r \) from its aligned context \( (S) \) and either a ReDRESS output \( (\hat{r}_u) \) or another reference sentence \( (r^*) \) as the synthetic, unsupported input. For the negatives, we discard the model from generating (1) a synthetic hallucination \( (\hat{r}_c \in C) \), and (2) itself if unsupported. Figure 4 shows positive and training sets for an example from the training data.

As in ConSeq (Nan et al., 2021b), we optimize the likelihood of positives \((Z^+)\) and unlikelihood \((Z^-)\): (Welleck et al., 2020)

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_\text{contrast} &= \mathbb{E}_Z \log(p(r_{\text{out}}|c, \hat{r}_c, S)) - \\
& \quad \mathbb{E}_Z \log(1 - p(r_{\text{out}}|c, r_{\text{in}}, S))
\end{align*}
\]

\( r_{\text{in}} \) stands for the noisy reference input and \( r_{\text{out}} \) the revision target. \( c \) refers to the style codes specific to each revision. Additionally, we add context-guided entity masking infilling as an auxiliary objective \( (\mathcal{L}_\text{mask}) \) to ground generation on concepts from the source context. Specifically, we replace each entity span in \( r \) with a \(<\text{mask}>\) token. Because \( r \) is supported, the masked entity can always be found in \( S \). The combined training objective is the sum of the two: \( \mathcal{L}_\text{revise} = \mathcal{L}_\text{mask} + \mathcal{L}_\text{contrast} \).

**Controlling the Extractiveness.** Sentence extraction is perfectly faithful, yet undesirable given reference abstractiveness and note-specific writing style (Adams et al., 2021). To explore this faithful-abstractive tradeoff (Ladhak et al., 2020), we introduce two encoder- prefix style codes which control the target lexical overlap between the output and, separately, the noisy input and the context. Input extract codes control the fraction of words to retain from the input, while source extract codes control extractiveness. Major revisions involve lower input codes and higher source codes.

**Building Revised References.** We apply the trained reviser model to each unsupported reference sentence, and its aligned source context. To generate a diverse set of candidates with different levels of source grounding, we vary the source extract code. The input extract code is fixed relative to the lexical overlap between the noisy input and the source context. We then rank candidates and select a final revision. The revised reference sentences replace the original unsupported ones and...
the new training data is a mix of original and revised sentences. As a data pre-processing step, it is agnostic to model choice and training objective.

5 Experimental Setup

We design experiments around our central hypothesis: in a setting (long form hospital-course summarization) in which high-quality reference data is limited, reference revision is the best data-centric intervention to improve model faithfulness. As such, we restrict the set of comparison methods to model-agnostic methods which explicitly address data quality. Other approaches, such as optimizing factuality metrics (Zhang et al., 2020b), incorporating facts into modeling (Zhu et al., 2021), decoding-based constraints (Zhao et al., 2020), or post-hoc editing (Dong et al., 2020) are complementary to our method, not competing. Based on our literature review, we consider two classes of baselines: those which filter low quality data (Kang and Hashimoto, 2020; Narayan et al., 2021; Matsumaru et al., 2020; Nan et al., 2021a; Goyal and Durrett, 2021), and those which control for it (Filippova, 2020).

Reference Revision Strategies. We experiment with two different functions to re-score over-generated candidate revisions: Less Abstractive selects the one with the highest BERTScore precision, while More Abstractive adds a penalty, based on the extractive fragment density (Grusky et al., 2018), to encourage more abstraction. We also consider a baseline revision approach: Fully Extractive, which replaces each unsupported reference sentence with the source sentence with the highest BERTScore overlap. Even though our dataset is highly abstractive, this is necessary to justify the complexity of abstractive revision.

Baselines. (1) Filtered. We experiment with three heuristics for low quality: references where no Admission Note is available in the source documents (No Admission) (Shing et al., 2021), references where a significant portion of the content is unsupported by the source notes (< 0.75 token coverage or entity hallucination rate of > 10%) (Unsupported), and Halluc. Ents, which masks the training loss over spans of hallucinated reference entities. Halluc. Ents is inspired by Goyal and Durrett (2021) who use a factuality model to ignore negatively entailed dependency arcs. Given the poor performance of other filtering strategies, we did not implement entailment-based filtering (Matsumaru et al., 2020). We also implement Loss Truncation (Kang and Hashimoto, 2020), which involves training for a fixed number of steps on the full training data before skipping high log loss examples. We grid-searched for the optimal number of warmup steps (2k) and the fraction of examples to drop (0.6) during truncation. (2) Control Hallucination. We implement the method in Filippova (2020): group training data into quality buckets based on token coverage, and control for hallucinations with encoder-prefix style codes.

Training Details. We fine-tune ReDRESS from bart-base on a large set of sentences from MIMIC-III discharge summaries. The reviser is fine-tuned from ReDRESS pre-training. We fine-tune downstream summarization models from BART (Lewis et al., 2020) and the encoder-decoder Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020). We train all models for 10k steps or until convergence on the validation set. Some methods use revised or filtered training data yet all use the same 1,195 validation examples and evaluation test set (1,190). Please refer to Appendix F for hyperparameters.

Metrics. To measure source faithfulness, we use hallucination rate (HR), BERTScore (BS), and fraction of summary sentences predicted as entailed by SciFive (Phan et al., 2021) fine-tuned on MedNLI (Romanov and Shivade, 2018). To capture coverage, we record faithful-adjusted recall (FaR): the fraction of non-hallucinated reference entities included in a model output (Shing et al., 2021). As in Koto et al. (2020); Adams et al. (2021), we approximate coherence with the average next-sentence prediction (NSP) probability between adjacent sentences (we rely on an in-domain model, ClinicalBERT (Aldsentz et al., 2019)).

6 Results

Analyzing Revised Training Data. Table 3 describes statistics from original, filtered, and revised
Table 3: Training datasets obtained from the revision strategies according to size (number of references), average number of tokens and entities in the references, and entity-level overlap with sources (average precision and recall).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Version</th>
<th>Quality Strategy</th>
<th># Training Examples</th>
<th>Avg. # Tokens</th>
<th>Avg. # Entities</th>
<th>Entity-Level Source Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Precision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>45k</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtered</td>
<td>No Admission</td>
<td>5.7k</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>6.0k</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised (Ours)</td>
<td>Fully Extractive</td>
<td>45k</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Abstractive</td>
<td>45k</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Abstractive</td>
<td>45k</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Summarization quality metrics across reference quality mitigation strategies (original, filtered, control, revised) and summarization models (BART and Longformer Encoder-Decoder (LED)). Numbers discussed below.

Table 4: Summarization quality metrics across reference quality mitigation strategies (original, filtered, control, revised) and summarization models (BART and Longformer Encoder-Decoder (LED)). Numbers discussed below.

versions of the training data. As expected, the Filtered datasets (5.7k/6.0k) are smaller than the Original and Revised sets (45k), indicating the high number of noisy references. The Filtered references are more faithful than Original, as reflected by entity-level source precision (e.g., 91.5/95.7 vs 60.4). In comparison, the abstractively revised references are more concise than Original and Filtered at the token (e.g., 300/272 vs 370 and 420/381) and entity level (e.g., 29/26 vs 50 and 64/55), yet contain a larger fraction of the entities present in the source (36.8/35.0 versus 26.8 and 32.7/28.9). While the fully extractive references have perfect average precision (by construction), the abstractive revisions are close, 97.6/96.8 and contain almost twice as many relevant entities (36.8/35.0 vs 19.6).

Impact of Revisions on Summarization. Table 4 confirms that filtering improves faithfulness (Filtered - Unsupported lowers the HR from 38.9/36.8 to 22.9/18.4 and improves entailment from 43.6/48.4 to 59.6/61.6 for BART/Longformer), yet degrades coverage (47.7/48.2 vs 47.2/46.9 FaR) and coherence (86.9/85.6 vs 79.9/79.0). Masking hallucinated entities from log loss training (Filtered - Halluc. Ents) only slightly improves faithfulness, which underscores the difficulty in assigning token-level credit to pervasively noisy references. Loss Truncation leads to worse performance except on entailment (51.6/51.7), which can likely be attributed to: 1) learning from fewer examples (from truncation); 2) hallucination patterns learned from the full data warmup are not unlearned during truncation; and 3) log loss might not capture faithfulness as well as more direct measures, i.e., entity overlap.

In comparison, all revision approaches yield dramatic improvements across faithfulness metrics (e.g., for the Longformer fine-tuned on Less Abstractive revisions, 3.8/94.6.3/83.7 vs 36.8/82.3/48.4). These precision-oriented faithfulness gains do not come at the expense of coverage (as defined by FaR), which actually jumps from 47.7/48.2 to 56.3/54.0 for BART/Longformer. Abstractive revision (Less and More) outperforms Fully Extractive on coverage and coherence (e.g.,
54.0/57.1 vs 52.4, and 66.1/76.6 vs 59.2, respectively, for Longformer). Surprisingly, despite Fully Extractive revision being perfectly faithful, Less Abstractive revision leads to more faithful models (e.g., 3.8/83.7 vs 5.4/78.6 for Longformer HR and entailment, respectively), which further suggests the need to re-write, not replace, unsupported content. The More Abstractive models achieve the highest coverage (56.3/57.1) while being competitive on faithfulness (even achieving lower HR than Fully Extractive–7.4 vs 9.1—with BART).

Table 4 reveals a curious, inverse relationship between faithfulness (HR, entailment, BS) and coherence (NSP) across all models and quality strategies. We hypothesize that (1) models trained on data with very high levels of extrinsic hallucinations essentially operate as unconditional language models, capable of producing the most fluent discourse; (2) our revision strategy introduces a faithfulness-coherence tradeoff: to increase faithfulness, we change the meaning of a sentence in isolation without considering its previous context. With regards to (2), we note important caveats: (a) ClinicalBERT’s NSP score is self-supervised (not trained on human judgments), so any subtle, spurious deviation from observed inter-sentential patterns is likely to be penalized; (b) coherence is lowest for the Fully Extractive baseline, so the decrease is actually mitigated by learning from model-generated (abstractive) text; (c) Adams et al. (2021) note that “cohesion is sub-optimal for evaluating hospital-course discourse because clinical summaries naturally exhibit frequent, abrupt topic shifts”\(^9\).

Reviser as a Post-Hoc Editor. As a natural extension, we experiment with using the revision model to correct system outputs. In particular, we take the summaries output by the Longformer model trained on the original references, align each sentence to the source context, and then feed the predictions and contexts to the reviser model. It would be easy for the reviser to increase faithfulness by copying the context verbatim. Yet, we are more interested to see whether or not the reviser increases effective faithfulness (Ladhak et al., 2021), i.e., controlling for extractiveness. To cover the spectrum, for each predicted sentence, we over-generate revision candidates with different targeted levels of extraction (by varying the source extract style code defined in Section 4)\(^{10}\). Then, we bin sentences by extractiveness (coverage) and record faithfulness (fraction of sentences predicted as entailed) within each bin. For reviser corrections, we include separate plots for Corrected, which includes each over-generated candidate, and Re-Rank Corrected, which selects the top correction by entailment prediction (breaking ties according to the most abstractive). Figure 5 demonstrates that reviser-corrected summaries are much more effectively faithful at all levels of abstraction, although, naturally, the gap shrinks as all outputs become highly extractive and mostly entailed. The ability to re-rank and select from diverse candidates (by varying extraneous style codes) makes a huge difference, as evidenced by the large gap between Corrected and Re-Rank Corrected. Finally, we find that there is a much weaker correlation between coverage and entailment post-correction. In particular, the Pearson correlation falls from 53.0 with Original to 12.5 with Re-Rank Corrected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviser Training Objective (Each Ablation is Separate)</th>
<th>BERTScore ↑</th>
<th>Entail. ↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full (last row of Table 4)</td>
<td>92.1 / 73.0 / 81.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o RedRESS hallucinations</td>
<td>90.8 / 72.4 / 80.4</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Random other alignments</td>
<td>90.9 / 72.8 / 80.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o All Negatives (no contrast)</td>
<td>90.9 / 72.8 / 80.7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Separately removing key components of the reviser training objective (from Equation 1) hurts the downstream performance of Longformer summaries.

Ablation Analysis. Which parts of the proposed revision pipeline are necessary to improve downstream summary performance? We construct different revised versions of the training data—each using the More Abstractive re-scoring function—from ablated versions of the reviser objective. Separately,

---

\(^9\)A human evaluation of system summaries is in progress, which will help assess the efficacy of each automatic metric.

\(^{10}\)The source extract code is an effective control mechanism: its Pearson correlation with output extractiveness is 61.7.
Table 6: Assessing the usefulness of the ReDRESS & reviser models as pre-training objectives. We separately fine-tune models from bart-base, ReDRESS and reviser checkpoints on Filtered - No Admission training data. w/o Entity Swap baseline is an ablated version of the full ReDRESS objective in which corruptions are limited to span in-filling and word re-ordering (Figure 3 without the pre-pended distractor set). Numbers discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretrain Weights</th>
<th>Hallucination Rate (HR) ↓</th>
<th>BERTScore P / R / F1 (BS) ↑</th>
<th>Entail. ↑</th>
<th>Faithful-Adj. Recall (FaR) ↑</th>
<th>Coherence (NSP) ↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bart-base</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Entity Swapping</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReDRESS</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviser</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

we remove ReDRESS hallucinations (top sequence in both Positive and Negative from Figure 4), randomly sampled other alignments (bottom sequence in both Positive and Negative from Figure 4), and all negative examples (right portion of Figure 4 and the second half of Equation 1). Table 5 reveals that both sources of synthetic revision training data (ReDRESS and randomly sampled other alignments) contribute to downstream performance (BS F1/Entailment of 80.4/72.1 and 80.7/73.8, individually, vs 81.3/76.3 combined). This elides with Cao and Wang (2021) who also demonstrate "the importance of covering diverse types of errors in negative samples". Finally, eliminating unlikelihood training of synthetic negatives reduces summary BS F1/Entailment from 81.3/76.3 to 80.7/72.4.

ReDRESS/Revision as Pre-Training Objectives.

Beyond data cleaning, do our proposed methods to generate hallucinations (ReDRESS), and then edit them out (reviser), hold intrinsic value for the task as pre-training objectives? One can argue that both models are trained on faithfulness objectives: based on context, ReDRESS learns to add/remove/integrate entities, and the reviser to edit out synthetic hallucinations. Table 6 shows that fine-tuning from ReDRESS and reviser—both trained from checkpoints of bart-base—improves all evaluation metrics vis-a-vis bart-base (except slight entailment decrease from ReDRESS (56.0 to 55.2) and coherence drop from reviser (80.8 to 80.3)). w/o Entity Swapping is a denoising baseline in which corruptions are limited to span deletion and word re-ordering. Adding entity swaps into pre-training (ReDRESS), then, causes HR to drop (26.9 to 22.3) and NSP/FaR to rise (81.1/42.1 to 83.3/44.7).

7 Limitations

Systematic errors in synthetically revised data, undetected by automatic metrics and human judgment, may be passed on to downstream models. Our sentence-level revision strategy does not consider the impact of changing one sentence on the reference as a whole (i.e., coherence, redundancy, etc.). Future work should incorporate summary-level guidance into sentence-level revisions.

8 Conclusion

We propose a new approach to mitigating the downstream impact of noisy references on summarization models. We learn a model to improve the coverage of existing references from a large clinical corpus of EHR notes, and re-train models on revised references. Results show that reference revision is a more effective intervention for improving faithfulness than quality filtering. Also, the revision task encodes certain properties which make it a promising direction for pre-training faithful models and post-hoc editing of unfaithful outputs.

9 Ethical Considerations

Deidentification. Our summarization corpus is extracted from a publicly available database of real-world, de-identified clinical records: MIMIC-III v1.4 (Johnson et al., 2016). Even though it is HIPAA-compliant, we make sure no Protected Health Information (PHI) is shared with the public.

Intended Use & Failure Modes. The goal of this paper is to make progress toward automatic summarization of a patient’s hospital admission. Deploy such a system in a real-world clinical setting has its own set of ethical and procedural concerns. Robustness, Fairness, and Trust is vital to any NLP system, especially one deployed in a hospital setting where lives are at risk. As with many NLP datasets, our MIMIC-III dataset likely contains biases, which may be perpetuated by its use. It is important to analyze the underlying population to identify demographic, social, and economic discrepancies vis-a-vis the broader population of interest. Model-generated errors could be harmful to
patient safety and even negatively affect outcomes. There are lessons to be learned from existing clinical decision support tools (Pivovarov et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2020). Furthermore, there is a moral hazard from deploying clinical systems, in which clinicians start to over-rely on a system at the expense of their own judgment (Goddard et al., 2012). EHRs are also living systems and deploying a summarization system within it necessitates evolving with the EHR and the underlying population.

References


Meng Cao, Yue Dong, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. 2021. Inspecting the factuality of hallucinated entities in abstractive summarization. ArXiv preprint, abs/2109.09784.


Ziqiang Cao, Furu Wei, Wenjie Li, and Sujian Li. 2018. Faithful to the original: Fact aware neural abstractive summarization. In Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), the 30th innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAIA-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018, pages 4784–4791. AAAI Press.


Prafulla Kumar Choube, Jesse Vig, Wenhao Liu, and Nazneen Fatema Rajani. 2021. Mofe: Mix-


Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pages 3246–3256, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.


Yijia Zhang, Qingyu Chen, Zhihao Yang, Hongfei Lin, and Zhiyong Lu. 2019. Biowordvec;&nbsp;improving biomedical word embeddings with subword information and mesh. Scientific Data, 6(1).


Yuhao Zhang, Derek Merck, Emily Tsai, Christopher D. Manning, and Curtis Langlotz. 2020c. Optimizing the factual correctness of a summary: A
A Merging Entities

For each pair of entity mentions in the source text and reference, we compute a code overlap score. Let entity $e_x$ have codes $c_x$ and tokens $t_x$ and $e_y$ have codes $c_y$ and tokens $t_y$, the pairwise code overlap score is:

$$
CodeOverlap(e_x, e_y) = \frac{|c_x \cap c_y|}{|c_x| + |c_y|}
$$

Then, we compute embedding cosine similarity between mention tokens with BioWordVec (Zhang et al., 2019), filtering out stopwords and punctuation. Let

$$
EmbedOverlap(e_x, e_y) = \text{cosine}(E(t_x), E(t_y))
$$

Finally, we compute the TF-IDF overlap ($TF-IDF(t_x, t_y)$) to compensate for occasional noise in embedding space. We define the aggregate score as the average of embed, code, and TF-IDF overlaps. For entity types with no available codes (treatments, procedures, and tests), we only examine mention overlap. Based on validation on a manually labeled held-out set, we classify $e_x$ and $e_y$ as synonyms iff any of the following thresholds are met: $CodeOverlap(e_x, e_y) \geq 0.4$. $EmbedOverlap(e_x, e_y) \geq 0.75$, or $AggOverlap(e_x, e_y) \geq 0.4$.

B Analyzing Unsupported References

B.1 Identifying Correlates

We collect a wide-range of visit-level statistics and compute the Pearson correlation coefficient with respect to the hallucination rate, defined as the fraction of entities in the reference text not present in the available source documentation. Unsurprisingly, lexical overlap (unigram coverage) is highly correlated (88%) with the hallucination rate. Examples with well-supported references contain more source notes and distinct note types. The MIMIC-III notes do not cover time a patient spent outside the ICU. Interestingly enough, however, the number of days spent outside the ICU has zero direct correlation with the hallucination rate.

B.2 Distribution of Hallucinations

We examine the example and sentence-level distribution of hallucinations before considering a revision strategy. Figure 6 reveals a degree of uniformity in the example-level hallucination rate and, to a lesser extent, sentence-level\footnote{Sentence-level hallucination rates are shown only for multi-entity sentences to get a sense of the non-binary distribution. 14% of reference sentences contain zero entities, and 30% have one. Single entity sentences have a hallucination rate of 41%.}. The figure indicates that the faithfulness issue is not concentrated to just a few very low coverage examples, or sentences. As such, example-level quality filtering is noisy since there is no clear coverage boundary and relatively few references contain zero entity hallucinations ($< 2k$). These two basic plots inform two key design choices: \textbf{(1.)} to address quality at the sentence-level rather than the reference; \textbf{(2.)} to enforce diversity of faithfulness in synthetic hallucinations.
C. Alignment Algorithm

Figure 7 provides an example alignment with improvement filtering and an extra extraction step to ensure full entity coverage.

C.1 Notation

Let \( \langle S_1, R_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle S_N, R_N \rangle \) represent the corpus, consisting of source-reference pairs for \( N \) unique patient ICU admissions. Let \( S_n = \langle s_1^n, \ldots, s_{|s_n|}^n \rangle \) represent the sentences extracted from the source input for the \( n \)th example and, likewise, \( R_n = \langle r_1^n, \ldots, r_{|r_n|}^n \rangle \) the reference sentences. Similarly, \( s_i^j = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_{|s_i^j|} \rangle \) is the tokenized sequence for the \( i \)th source sentence from the \( n \)th example, and \( r_j^n = \langle \hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{|r_j^n|} \rangle \) the tokenization of the \( j \)th reference sentence.

Given very long inputs, we link each reference sentence \( r_j^n \) (\( n \in N, j \in R_n \)), to a small subset (\( \leq 5 \)) of source sentences corresponding to the same example. Due to the abstractness of the data (acronym usage, shorthand, etc.), as well as redundancy from copy-and-paste (Hirschtick, 2006), we align sentences using a new approach which combines BERTScore and subword-level coverage, rather than the conventional approach of lexical overlap with ROUGE (Lebanoff et al., 2019a; Liu and Lapata, 2019). Given a candidate alignment pair: a reference sentence \( r_j^n \) with \( K \) tokens and a source sentence \( s_i^k \in S_n \) with \( L \) tokens, for each reference token \( \hat{x}_k \), we find its closest match in \( s_i^k \):

\[
align(\hat{x}_k, s_i^k) = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \cos(h(\hat{x}_k), h(x_\ell))
\]

where \( h(x) \) represents the contextualized BERT embedding\(^{12}\). Based on these greedy alignments, we extract sentences for \( T \) steps. At \( t = 0 \), we initialize an importance vector \( w \) of length \( K \), to all ones. Then, at each timestep, we select \( s^* \in S_n \) which maximizes the importance-weighted BERTScore:

\[
s^* = \arg\max_{s^* \in S_n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k \cdot \text{align}(\hat{x}_k, s^*) \right) / \sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k
\]

After each timestep, we keep track of the best alignment score for each reference token via the importance vector. In particular, we update each token’s importance by the inverse of its best coverage score: \( w_{t+1, 1} = \min(w_{t, 1}, 1 - \text{align}(\hat{x}_1, s^*)) \) (formula shown for first element). Similarly to Maximal Marginal Relevance (MMR) (Carbonell and Goldstein, 1998), the importance vector de-prioritizes well-covered tokens for future extractions. We also remove \( s^* \) from \( S_n \) to ensure it is only extracted once. After retrieving the top \( K \)

\(^{12}\)The mean-pool of the last four layers of ClinicalBERT.
using this procedure, we only use sentences for the final alignment set for which the average coverage improvement $\geq 0.01$ or the max $\geq 0.05$, where improvement is defined as the reference token-level increase in coverage of the latest extraction over the previous max from prior extractions: $\max(0, w^t - \langle \text{align}(\hat{x}_1, s^t), ..., \text{align}(\hat{x}_K, s^t) \rangle)$.

Infrequently, the medical concepts extracted from the aligned sentences do not cover all the concepts in the reference sentence. In this case, for each missing concept, we filter for the subset of source sentences containing that concept, and add the sentence with the highest pairwise similarity of contextualized concept embeddings—the mean of hidden states corresponding to the entity span.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Param</th>
<th>Sample Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ent Add</td>
<td>$# \text{Ent}$</td>
<td>$\text{int}(\beta(1, \frac{1}{2} - 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent Remove</td>
<td>$# \text{Ent}$</td>
<td>$\text{int}(\beta(1, \frac{1}{2} - 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span Remove</td>
<td>$# \text{Tokens}$</td>
<td>$\text{int}(\beta(1, \frac{1}{2} - 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Shuffle</td>
<td>Order ($P$)</td>
<td>$\beta(1,1)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: $|e|$ stands for the number of entities in the sentence, $|s_{frag}|$ represents the number of tokens after entity swapping and $J, K$ tunable hyper-parameters. For our experiments, we set $J = K = 0.5$ so that half of the entities are added/removed in expectation.

**D ReDRESS Details**

**Sampling Noise Levels.** Table 7 reveals the separate beta distributions for which we sample the number of entities to add, the number of entities to remove, the number of tokens to remove, and how intensely to shuffle the word order. We shuffle the corrupted tokens by adding Gaussian noise to the original order: $P \ast \text{idx} + N(0,1)$. $P$ is a tunable hyper-parameter on the interval $(0, 1)$ which is designed to regulate shuffle orderliness. We set $P = 0.5$ for experimentation.

**Pre-Training Data.** We pre-train on a large unlabeled sentence corpus: all sentences extracted from MIMIC-III discharge summaries, excluding notes related to patients in the summary test set. To minimize EHR-related noise, we filter out sentences without any clinical concepts and those found in non-narrative sections related to structured data, demographics, and/or administration (billing codes, dates, times, signatures, lab values).

**Dense Sentence Retrieval.** We build an inventory of all sentences from MIMIC-III discharge summaries, and embed sentences with BioSentVec (Chen et al., 2019) for dense retrieval via efficient L2 nearest neighbors search with Faiss (Johnson et al., 2017). For each sentence, we query its 250 closest sentences in the index and then collect an unordered set of unique entity mentions, up to a maximum of 25 for each entity type, e.g., Diagnoses. We retrieve related entities through sentence search, rather than direct similarity (i.e., via ontologies), because we are interested in generating topic-grounded hallucinations, whereby concept and concept type diversity is encouraged. To use the ReDRESS framework to generate synthetic data for semantic invariant transformation, i.e., paraphrasing, data augmentation (for imbalanced NER datasets), ontology-driven entity expansion might be helpful.

**Intrinsic Evaluation of ReDRESS.** ReDRESS combines entity swapping and span-infilling—so we compare it approaches that do one or the other. For pure entity swaps: (1.) **Swap Random** randomly removes entities and replaces them with a random one of the same type from the training data. Given the long tail of rare entities, we sample the replacement entity by its empirical frequency in the corpus. (2.) **Swap Related** follows an identical procedure with the exception that replacement entities are sampled from the related distractor set. **Span Fill** is a version of ReDRESS model without entity swaps (and no pre-pended distractor set). Corruption is limited to span removal and word order shuffling. Each baseline/ablation follows the same approach: over-generate five candidate hallucinations by re-sampling noise levels.

Based on Table 8, the unified ReDRESS model—**Span Infill + Entity Swap**—achieves diverse hallucinations while maintaining clinical plausibility and topical consistency. Interestingly, the pre-pended distractor set greatly improves the coherence of the outputs (**Span Fill** vs. **Span Fill + Ent Swap**) because the distractor set is topically consistent. Entity swaps alone produce incorrect sentences. Correctness is defined as one minus the fraction of tokens predicted as fake by BioELECTRA (Kanakarajan et al., 2021; Clark et al., 2020). BioELECTRA is trained from scratch on replaced-token prediction (similar to GANs), making it a reasonable unsupervised proxy to assess domain-specific plausibility. The corpus-level hallucination rate is 40% which we are nearly able to achieve (38%) with ReDRESS while maintaining plausibility and topicality. The first ablation (w/o Entity Swap) re-
Table 8: Intrinsic evaluation of ReDRESS model (Span Infill + Entity Swap) on supported reference sentences. For an upper bound, the original sentences have coherence of 75.8 and correctness of 87.2. We define diversity as one minus the pairwise unigram coverage score (Grusky et al., 2018) between two synthetic hallucination samples for the same input. Greater error diversity has been shown to be useful for synthetic data generation in other summarization work (Cao and Wang, 2021). Each ablation (w/o) is performed independently of the others.

Figure 8: ReDRESS model outputs. Green represents non-hallucinated entities, red not present in input sentence, and red also not present in any of the source notes. The orange box shows BERTScore F1 vis-a-vis original. Due to the topical nature of the distractor set, all hallucinations except terminal ileitis exist elsewhere in the source notes.

Figure 9: Correlation of sampled noise levels to control codes.

is only affected by the fact that, during inference, we prevent the model from retrieving the removed entities, by not inserting them into the distractor set (as is done during training). If we let the model perform the original entity swaps (w/o Entity Hiding Inference Trick), we see that correctness is not affected (86.3 vs 86.2). We also can see that the Add-1 inference trick is working as expected. Removing it (w/o Add-1 Inference Trick) leads to 10% lower hallucination rate (38 vs 28) without compromising coherence or correctness. In other words, we instruct the model to implement an additional entity swap and it appears to be doing so. Figure 8 demonstrates the diversity from the standpoint of metrics (BERTScore) and meaning.

In Figure 9, we examine the impact correlation of control codes on the evaluation metrics. Sampling more noise (entity swaps and span deletions) leads to more hallucinations (% novel entities) and semantic shit (BERTScore) without sacrificing coherence and clinical plausibility. In fact, span removal seems to help coherence and plausibility, perhaps because it gives the model more tokens to work with for integrating a different set of entities. Entity addition does not have a strong correlation with the hallucination rate which indicates that the model is good at picking out which entities have been improperly added. Due to the inference en-
tity hiding trick, however, entity removal is the noise parameter most strongly correlated with both hallucination % and BERTScore.

E Revision Model Details

The reviser training objective is visually shown in Figure 10.

F Summary Training Details

For training, we use two abstractive models: BART (Lewis et al., 2020) and the encoder-decoder Longformer (LED) (Beltagy et al., 2020) - a scaled up version of Bart to handle longer sequences via windowed local self-attention and a constant global attention. We fine-tune pretrained checkpoints (facebook/bart-base and allenai/led-base-16384 from the HuggingFace transformers library (Wolf et al., 2020)) for a maximum of 10,000 training steps, a maximum learning rate of $2e-5$ with a linear warmup of 200 steps, followed by linear decay to 0, and a batch size of 16. For Longformer, we use a maximum input length of 10,000. The maximum encoder length is 16,384 yet we could only fit 10,000 tokens onto a single 16GB V100 GPU. For Bart, we use the maximum input length of 1,024. To handle longer input sequences, we rely on oracle filtering by taking the sentences with the largest average of ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L F1 vis-a-vis the original reference. For models trained on revised data, oracle extraction is computed based on revised references during training yet the original during testing. This puts it a slight disadvantage to the other models which do not have this train-test mismatch. Yet, this mismatch only strengthens the empirical hypothesis considering the performance gains we see. During generation, we set beam search to 4, use trigram blocking, and set the maximum output length to 1,024.