

MQAG: Multiple-choice Question Answering and Generation for Assessing Information Consistency in Summarization

Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, Mark J. F. Gales
 Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge
 pm574@cam.ac.uk, al826@cam.ac.uk, mjfg@eng.cam.ac.uk

Abstract

State-of-the-art summarization systems can generate highly fluent summaries. These summaries, however, may contain factual inconsistencies and/or information not present in the source. Hence, an important component of assessing the quality of summaries is to determine whether there is information consistency between the source and the summary. Existing approaches are typically based on lexical matching or representation-based methods. In this work, we introduce an alternative scheme based on standard information-theoretic measures in which the information present in the source and summary is directly compared. We propose a Multiple-choice Question Answering and Generation framework, MQAG, which approximates the information consistency by computing the expected KL-divergence between summary and source answer distributions over automatically generated multiple-choice questions. This approach exploits multiple-choice answer probabilities, as predicted answer distributions can be easily compared. We conduct experiments on four summary evaluation datasets: QAG-CNNNDM/XSum, XSum-Faithfulness, Podcast Assessment, and SummEval. Experiments show that MQAG (using models trained on RACE) outperforms existing evaluation methods on the majority of tasks.¹

1 Introduction

The objective of summary evaluation is to quantify the quality of summaries, either on a relative or an absolute scale. Accurate and reliable automatic summary evaluation systems are useful to researchers, as they provide an easy and cheap way to compare new summarization models to existing ones. Although current summarization systems have improved dramatically in the last decade, and are capable of generating highly fluent outputs

¹The code is available at <https://github.com/potsawee/mqag0>.




Figure 1: Multiple-choice Question Answering and Generation (MQAG) framework.

(Lewis et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020a; Brown et al., 2020), it has been shown that generated summaries are prone to exhibit factual errors or hallucinations (Kryscinski et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2021; Nan et al., 2021; Ji et al., 2022). Thus, information consistency between the summary and source is an important assessment criterion.

Existing methods that measure information consistency generally perform lexical matching, either directly in the form of ROUGE (Lin, 2004) and BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), or indirectly using more complex representations such as triple matching (Goodrich et al., 2019). Some recent approaches adopt question answering (QA) pipelines to detect factual inconsistencies (Wang et al., 2020; Durmus et al., 2020; Deutsch et al., 2021; Scialom et al., 2021). They are based on the assumption that if the source extracted answer is consistent with the summary extracted answer then summary and source are consistent. The answers are compared using either lexical matching (Wang et al., 2020; Durmus et al., 2020) or representation-based matching (Deutsch and Roth, 2022). These span-based QA approaches (referred to as SpanQAG) may have lexical biases present, and struggle with highly abstractive summaries or when dealing with

multiple answer spans.

In this work a measure of consistency between the source and summary is defined from an information-theoretic perspective. We propose a Multiple-choice Question Answering and Generation framework, MQAG, where instead of comparing answer spans, multiple-choice questions are generated and the resulting answer distributions from the source and summary compared. The main contributions of this paper are: (i) we provide an alternative way of assessing information consistency based on probability distributions instead of lexical or representation-based methods; (ii) we show that our approach achieves the best performance on three out of the four evaluation datasets.

2 Background and Related Work

This work focuses on determining if information in the summary is consistent with information in the source, and does not consider ‘factuality’ where valid external facts are acceptable (Maynez et al., 2020). Existing methods that have been applied to evaluate information consistency include:²

Text overlap scores. ROUGE and BLEU measure word overlap between two texts, while BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020b) and BLEURT (Sellam et al., 2020) compare texts in their representation space. These metrics measure *textual similarity*, so are not necessarily a good measure of consistency.

Knowledge representation. Goodrich et al. (2019) assess factual consistency by comparing relation triples from the source and the summary. The relation triples are in the format of Subject-Relation-Object and can be obtained using a model-free method such as OpenIE (Etzioni et al., 2008) or using a trained relation extraction model.

Textual Entailment. A textual entailment classifier trained on Multi-NLI (Williams et al., 2018) has been applied to assess summaries’ consistency with the source (Maynez et al., 2020). Similarly, simulated data, such as real or fake summaries created by pre-defined transformations, have been used to train classifiers to detect inconsistent summaries (Kryscinski et al., 2020; Bao et al., 2022).

Question Answering. QAGS (Wang et al., 2020) and FEQA (Durmus et al., 2020) were among the first to utilise a QA framework. Typically these approaches consist of a question generation model and a question answering model, where QAGS and

FEQA first generate questions based on the summary, and then measure consistency by comparing the source’s answer with the summary’s answer. As an extension, QuestEval (Scialom et al., 2021) also generates questions based on the source to assess the informativeness of a summary.

3 MQAG

Since current summarization systems generate highly fluent summaries, this work focuses on assessing whether summaries contain the same information to that of the source, or whether it is contradictory. One way to view information would be to consider the set of questions that are answerable given a certain passage. If a summary is consistent with the source, then one would expect the set of answerable questions by the summary to overlap with those of source, and yield similar answers. Though SpanQAG approaches are similarly motivated, existing span-based frameworks use text similarity measures, either in the form of lexical or representation space. In contrast, we attempt to measure information using multiple-choice questions, which allows for a more abstract understanding of information and enables convenient use of standard information-theoretic measures. Let x = source, y = summary, q = question, and \mathbf{o} = options associated with the question q . We define information consistency $\mathcal{IC}(x, y)$ as

$$\int_{q, \mathbf{o}} -\mathcal{KL}(P_a(\mathbf{o}|q, x), P_a(\mathbf{o}|q, y)) P_g(q, \mathbf{o}|y) d\mathbf{o} dq$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N -\mathcal{KL}(P_a(\mathbf{o}^{(i)}|q^{(i)}, x), P_a(\mathbf{o}^{(i)}|q^{(i)}, y)) \quad (1)$$

where $\{q^{(i)}, \mathbf{o}^{(i)}\}$ is sampled from $P_g(q, \mathbf{o}|y)$, the question-option generation model, $P_a(\mathbf{o}^{(i)}|q^{(i)}, x)$ and $P_a(\mathbf{o}^{(i)}|q^{(i)}, y)$ are the option distributions given the source and summary respectively, and the negative KL-divergence is used to measure distribution similarity. The approximation in eq. 1 will be referred to as the **MQAG-Sum** score. Alternatively, it is possible to generate questions and options, $\{q, \mathbf{o}\}$ using the source x instead of the summary y , $\{q^{(i)}, \mathbf{o}^{(i)}\}$ is sampled from $P_g(q, \mathbf{o}|x)$. We will refer to this variant as the **MQAG-Src** score. MQAG-Src is expected to measure the amount of source information present in the summary, i.e. the informativeness of the summary, since questions are now derived from the source.

²Supervised approaches, with systems trained on human evaluation annotations, are outside the scope of this work.

3.1 MQAG Framework Implementation

Question Generation. The multiple-choice questions are generated in two stages. First model g_1 generates the question q and answer a , then model g_2 generates the distractors $\mathbf{o}_{\setminus a}$ given q and a .

$$P_g(q, \mathbf{o}|y) = P_{g_2}(\mathbf{o}_{\setminus a}|q, a, y)P_{g_1}(q, a|y) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{o} = \{a, \mathbf{o}_{\setminus a}\}$. We set the number of options (answer and distractors) to four. Both g_1 and g_2 models are sequence-to-sequence models based on the T5-large architecture (Raffel et al., 2020) fine-tuned to RACE (Lai et al., 2017).

Question Answering. The answering stage contains one model a , which uses the Longformer architecture (Beltagy et al., 2020) with a multiple-choice setup similar to Yu et al. (2020). The input to the model is a concatenation of context, question and option. The question answering model a is also fine-tuned to RACE. See Appendix A for additional model details.

4 Experimental Setup

Baselines. We re-implement: (1) *ROUGE*. (2) *OpenIE-triple* score = $\frac{|T_x \cap T_y|}{|T_y|}$ where T_x and T_y are triples extracted from source/summary (Goodrich et al., 2019). (3) *BERTScore* (Zhang et al., 2020b) (4) *SpanQAG* is QAGS proposed in Wang et al. (2020). (5) *Entailment* is a BERT classifier fine-tuned to the MNLI data, which follows Maynez et al. (2020). We provide the details about the implementation of the baselines in Appendix A.1.

Datasets. (1) *QAG*: Wang et al. (2020) annotated CNNDM (235 summaries) and XSum (239 summaries) sentence-by-sentence on whether hallucination occurs or not. For each summary, the faithfulness score is then obtained by averaging all sentence level scores. (2) *XSum-Faith*: Maynez et al. (2020) annotated 2500 XSum summaries on two metrics, Faithfulness (whether the information is faithful w.r.t. the source at the token-level) and Factuality (whether the summary sentence is factual w.r.t source and external knowledge). (3) *Podcast Assessment*: Manakul and Gales (2022) compiled 3580 podcast summaries on a 4-point scale considering a combination of consistency, informativeness, and fluency. (4) *SummEval*: Fabbri et al. (2021) assessed 1600 CNNDM summaries on four aspects: relevancy, consistency, coherency, fluency. This work uses the relevancy and consistency annotations in SummEval. Data statistics are provided in Appendix A.3.

5 Experimental Results

The baseline and MQAG results are shown in Table 1. The first observation is that **MQAG-Sum** outperforms SpanQAG on all tasks. This illustrates the benefits of directly comparing the answering distributions rather than spans.

On the Podcast data, both extractive and abstractive summaries need to be assessed. Lexical based evaluation methods will by default yield high scores for extractive summaries. This bias causes most assessment systems to have a negative correlation with human judgements. This effect is illustrated in Fig. 2 for the SpanQAG and MQAG-Sum systems, other system plots are shown in and Fig. 5 of the Appendix B.4. Only the MQAG-Sum and entailment methods avoid scoring extractive systems too highly, and hence avoid negative correlations (with MQAG-Sum outperforming Entailment for the abstractive summaries).




Figure 2: Scatter plot for system-level correlation on Podcast Assessment data. Blue = Abstractive systems, Orange = Extractive systems.

MQAG-Src, which assesses how much source information is contained within the summary by generating questions from the source, achieves lower PCCs than MQAG-Sum on all datasets. This finding aligns with our expectation, as the summaries (apart for those of Podcast) were graded by humans predominantly on the consistency aspect (which MQAG-Sum was designed to measure) rather than the quantity of source information present (which MQAG-Src measures). On Podcast, where human evaluation is a combination of consistency, informativeness, and fluency, we observe that the combination of MQAG-Sum and MQAG-Src (via Harmonic mean) yields the best performance (PCC=0.824). The results of the Harmonic mean (referred to as MQAG-F1) are shown in Table 5 in Appendix B.4. As it is more challenging to generate questions using the source (due to larger content space to be explored), MQAG-Src has a higher variance compared to MQAG-Sum.

	Method	QAG		XSum-Faith		Podcast	SummEval	
		CNNNDM	XSum	Faithful	Factual		Relevant	Consistent
Baseline	ROUGE-1	0.337	0.012	-0.050	0.008	0.326	0.323	0.458
	OpenIE-trp	0.381	0.131	0.019	-0.020	0.706	0.489	0.548
	BERTScore	<u>0.584</u>	0.008	0.185	0.154	0.718	0.724	0.645
	Entailment	0.159	0.169	<u>0.362</u>	<u>0.209</u>	0.228	0.245	0.619
	SpanQAG	0.437	0.200	0.101	0.080	0.464	0.430	0.812
MQAG	Sum	0.461	<u>0.283</u>	0.135	0.179	<u>0.761</u>	<u>0.772</u>	<u>0.942</u>
	Src	0.144	0.097	0.087	0.054	0.320	0.559	0.599

Table 1: Person Correlation Coefficient (PCC) between the scores of summary evaluation methods and human judgements. PCCs are computed at the system level on Podcast and SummEval datasets. Podcast results are computed on abstractive systems. The first section shows the results of re-implemented baselines. The second section shows the results of our proposed MQAG using $N=50$. We provide the standard deviations of MQAG and the system combination results in Tab. 5 in Appendix. Underlining denotes the best system on a particular testset.

6 Ablation Studies

Model Choices. We investigate the impact of model choices by swapping to less capable models, e.g. T5-large \rightarrow T5-base for generation, and Longformer(4096) \rightarrow Roberta(512) for answering. The full results are shown in Table 3. Using a smaller generation model does not result in a lower performance. This could be because T5-base has higher perplexity, which could yield more diverse questions. When using Roberta, with a shorter input length, the performance on SummEval (the input length is mostly shorter than 512) remains almost the same. However, as the input length is longer in QAG-XSum/Podcast, we observe a drop in PCC.

Number of Questions (N). We analyse the impact of N , the number of generated questions per summary (see Figure 3 for details). We observe a large improvement as N increases from 1 to 20, and then less significant performance gains as N increases to 50. Though the performance curve has not completely plateaued at $N=50$, since the computational cost of MQAG scales linearly with N , 50 questions seem to be a reasonable compromise between computational efficiency and performance. An interesting next step would be to investigate if the same/similar performance can be achieved with as low N as possible, e.g. by generating a smaller but more diverse set of questions and options.

System Combination. We investigate whether MQAG is complementary to alternate approaches, see Table 5 for detailed results. On QAG-CNNNDM and XSum-Factual (where some baselines outperform MQAG) we find that doing a system combination with MQAG further boosts performance and

that MQAG is complementary. On other datasets that MQAG is already the best system, we also show system combination again improves performance and sets new state-of-the-art results.

Comparing the two distributions. Distributions can be poorly calibrated due to overconfidence in training or domain shift, e.g. RACE \rightarrow summarization task. As an initial result, we show in Appendix B.3 that: First, the accuracy drops from around 80% on RACE to around 60% (or below) on summarization datasets. Second, we observe a performance gain by applying temperature annealing as shown in Fig. 4. In addition, we observe that some questions can be answered irrespective of context (as observed by Pang et al. (2022)), and if the answering system does not leverage context, this would fail to measure consistency. These findings suggest possible directions to improve the current MQAG: 1) calibration, 2) uncertainty and unanswerability of the answer distribution (Raina and Gales, 2022), and 3) selection of questions and options.

7 Conclusion

This work demonstrates the potential of a novel scheme for assessing information consistency between source and summary based on the distance between multiple-choice answer distributions. The current realization of the framework exploits current multiple-choice question generation and answering systems. It is expected that as these systems improve, for example the diversity of questions generated and selection of options. The framework may also allow insight into the balance of human assessment of summaries and the balance of faithfulness and information content.

Limitations

Our approach is designed to assess the information content, so it may not work well with other aspects of summary evaluation such as fluency or coherency. Our analysis is based on the QG and QA systems trained on the RACE dataset, which is collected from English examinations in China. Hence, the questions and options generated could be biased towards the style of the examinations.

Acknowledgments

This paper reports on research supported by the ALTA institute (Cambridge University Press & Assessment) and Cambridge International & St John's College Scholarship.

References

- Forrest Bao, Ge Luo, Hebi Li, Minghui Qiu, Yinfei Yang, Youbiao He, and Cen Chen. 2022. [SueNes: A weakly supervised approach to evaluating single-document summarization via negative sampling](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2450–2458, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Daniel Deutsch, Tania Bedrax-Weiss, and Dan Roth. 2021. [Towards question-answering as an automatic metric for evaluating the content quality of a summary](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:774–789.
- Daniel Deutsch and Dan Roth. 2022. [Benchmarking answer verification methods for question answering-based summarization evaluation metrics](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 3759–3765, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Esin Durmus, He He, and Mona Diab. 2020. [FEQA: A question answering evaluation framework for faithfulness assessment in abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5055–5070, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Oren Etzioni, Michele Banko, Stephen Soderland, and Daniel S Weld. 2008. Open information extraction from the web. *Communications of the ACM*, 51(12):68–74.
- Alexander R Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409.
- Ben Goodrich, Vinay Rao, Peter J. Liu, and Mohammad Saleh. 2019. [Assessing the factual accuracy of generated text](#). In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '19*, page 166–175, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Hoon Heo. 2021. Factsumm: Factual consistency scorer for abstractive summarization. <https://github.com/Huffon/factsumm>.
- Yi-Chong Huang, Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2021. The factual inconsistency problem in abstractive text summarization: A survey. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.14839.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2022. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2202.03629.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. [Neural text summarization: A critical evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 540–551, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. [Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In

- Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9332–9346, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guokun Lai, Qizhe Xie, Hanxiao Liu, Yiming Yang, and Eduard Hovy. 2017. **RACE: Large-scale ReAding comprehension dataset from examinations**. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 785–794, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. **BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. **ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries**. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Potsawee Manakul and Mark JF Gales. 2022. **Podcast Summary Assessment: A resource for evaluating summary assessment methods**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13265*.
- Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. 2020. **On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1906–1919, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Feng Nan, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Henghui Zhu, Patrick Ng, Kathleen McKeown, Ramesh Nallapati, Dejjiao Zhang, Zhiguo Wang, Andrew O. Arnold, and Bing Xiang. 2021. **Improving factual consistency of abstractive summarization via question answering**. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6881–6894, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Alicia Parrish, Nitish Joshi, Nikita Nangia, Jason Phang, Angelica Chen, Vishakh Padmakumar, Johnny Ma, Jana Thompson, He He, and Samuel Bowman. 2022. **QuALITY: Question answering with long input texts, yes!** In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5336–5358, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. **Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation**. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. **Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer**. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*.
- Vatsal Raina and Mark Gales. 2022. **Answer uncertainty and unanswerability in multiple-choice machine reading comprehension**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 1020–1034, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Scialom, Paul-Alexis Dray, Sylvain Lamprier, Benjamin Piwowarski, Jacopo Staiano, Alex Wang, and Patrick Gallinari. 2021. **QuestEval: Summarization asks for fact-based evaluation**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6594–6604, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur Parikh. 2020. **BLEURT: Learning robust metrics for text generation**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7881–7892, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Wang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Mike Lewis. 2020. **Asking and answering questions to evaluate the factual consistency of summaries**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5008–5020, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. **A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weihao Yu, Zihang Jiang, Yanfei Dong, and Jiashi Feng. 2020. **Reclor: A reading comprehension dataset requiring logical reasoning**. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. 2020a. **Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization**. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020b. **Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with BERT**. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A More Details on Experimental Setup

A.1 Baselines

ROUGE(x, y) is based on the rouge-score Python package. Note that ROUGE is used to compare the summary against the source. We implement the **Entailment** system by fine-tuning BERT (bert-large-uncased) (Devlin et al., 2019) to MNLI data (Williams et al., 2018). Given the context, the Entailment model is to classify the hypothesis into one of the three classes (entail/neutral/contradict). When applied to a summarization dataset, the context is the source document and the hypothesis is the summary. The probability of being the entail class is used as the prediction of the Entailment system. **OpenIE-triple**, **BERTScore**, and **SpanQAG** are based on the FactSumm implementation (Heo, 2021) with the following models: Name-Entity-Recognition (NER), Question Generation (QG), Question Answering (QA). The trained weights are from HuggingFace as follows: NER=flair/ner-english-ontonotes-fast; QG=mrm8488/t5-base-finetuned-question-generation-ap; QA=deepset/roberta-base-squad2; BERTScore=microsoft/deberta-base-mnli.

A.2 Training QG and QA systems

We train both question generation (QG) models and question answering (QA) on the RACE training set, and we do early stopping when the performance on the RACE validation set does not improve. The train/validation/test split of RACE is 87866/4887/4934. We use batch size 8 for QG models (T5) and 2 for QA model (Longformer). The learning rate is set to $1e-6$, and we use the Adam optimizer. We perform training using one NVIDIA A100-80GB GPU. Training the QG model (T5-large) takes around 8 hours, and training the QA model (Longformer-4096) takes up to 2 days. Running MQAG inference (QG=T5-large, QA=Longformer-4096) on one NVIDIA P100 GPU takes around 3 seconds per question.

A.3 Data Statistics

The RACE corpus (train+validation+test) has 97687 examples. The average length of the contexts is 317.8, and the average length of the questions is 11.0. The statistics of summary evaluation datasets are provided in Table 2.

Dataset	#examples	Length	
		Source	Summary
QAG-CNNNDM	235	355.8	54.4
QAG-XSum	239	403.7	19.7
XSum-Faith	2500	442.1	20.5
Podcast	$\dagger 20 \times 179$	5950	88.3
SummEval	$\dagger 16 \times 100$	404.0	63.7

Table 2: Length statistics (#words) based on the NLTK tokenizer. \dagger #systems \times documents.

B Additional Results

B.1 Model Choices

For generation models, we measure cross entropy losses on RACE-testset:

- T5-base (223M): $g_1 = 1.612$, $g_2 = 1.875$
- T5-large (738M): $g_1 = 1.478$, $g_2 = 1.741$

where g_1 denotes question+answer generation, and g_2 denotes distractor generation. For answering models, we measure accuracy on RACE-testset:

- Roberta (355M): Accuracy = 84.84
- Longformer (435M): Accuracy = 81.67

Model	Pearson Corr.			
		Generation	Answering	SumE QAG-X Podc
T5-base	Roberta	0.949	0.242	0.471
T5-base	Longformer	0.949	0.293	0.647
T5-large	Roberta	0.930	0.211	0.350
T5-large	Longformer	0.930	0.229	0.772

Table 3: Ablation on model choices in MQAG using $N=20$. SumE = SummEval (Consistency aspect), QAG-X = QAG-XSum, Podc = Podcast Assessment.

B.2 Number of Generated Questions

We investigate the impact of N . Based on 50 generated questions, we perform bootstrapping using 1000 iterations for each value of N from 1 to 50. We show the mean and the confidence interval (i.e. standard deviation) in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Pearson correlations of MQAG-Sum with varying number of questions via bootstrapping.

B.3 Domain Shift and Calibration

Here, we investigate whether it is necessary to calibrate the probability distribution of the options $P_a(o|q, *)$. Because the answering model is trained on RACE, we expect some domain mismatch. In Tab. 4, we report its accuracy on RACE-testset (in-domain) and the target summary evaluation datasets (out-of-domain) in this paper. We try applying temperature annealing in Eq. 3.

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_a = \text{softmax}(\log(\mathbf{p}_a)/T) \quad (3)$$

When $T < 1.0$, the distribution over the options is *sharper* (i.e. $\mathcal{N}_o \downarrow$) and vice versa for $T > 1.0$. In Tab. 4, it suggests that the answering model is over-confident (Accuracy < Confidence). However, when calibrating the model via temperature annealing with $T > 1.0$, we do not observe an improvement. In fact, on Podcast dataset, by forcing the model to be more confident ($T < 1.0$ and $\mathcal{N}_o \downarrow$), we observe an improvement: for MQAG-Sum with temperature $T = 0.1$, PCC-(Ext&Abs) increases from 0.039 to 0.694, and PCC-(AbsOnly) increases from 0.761 to 0.795 – See Fig. 4.

Dataset	Acc.	Conf.	\mathcal{N}_o
RACE-test	81.67	84.81	1.603
QAG-C	60.05	72.24	2.092
QAG-X	62.03	69.67	2.181
X-Faith	55.13	64.64	2.410
Podcast	51.83	62.63	2.547
SummEval	58.79	72.06	2.100

Table 4: Performance of the answering model based on the Longformer architecture trained on RACE. Accuracy on summarization datasets is based on the answers generated by the generation model. Confidence score is the average probability of the predicted option. \mathcal{N}_o is the effective number of options, which ranges from 1 to max. number of options, e.g. 4: $\mathcal{N}_o = 2^{\mathcal{H}_2(\mathbf{p})}$ where $\mathcal{H}_2(\cdot)$ is entropy and \mathbf{p} is the probability distribution over the options.




Figure 4: Effect of temperature annealing on MQAG-Sum on Podcast Assessment data.

B.4 Extended MQAG Results




Figure 5: Scatter plot for System-level Correlation on Podcast Assessment data in addition to Fig. 2. Blue = Abstractive models, Orange = Extractive models.

Method	QAG		XSum-Faith		Podcast	SummEval		
	CNNDM	XSum	Faithful	Factual		Relevant	Consistent	
Previous Work	ROUGE-1	0.287	0.132	0.197	0.125	-	-	-
	BERTScore	0.276	0.025	0.190	0.116	-	-	-
	Entailment	-	-	0.431	0.264	0.212	-	-
	SpanQAG	0.545	0.175	0.044	0.027	0.666	-	-
Re-produced	ROUGE-1	0.337	0.012	-0.050	0.008	0.326	0.323	0.458
	OpenIE-trp	0.381	0.131	0.019	-0.020	0.706	0.489	0.548
	BERTScore	<u>0.584</u>	0.008	0.185	0.154	0.718	0.724	0.645
	Entailment	0.159	0.169	<u>0.362</u>	<u>0.209</u>	0.228	0.245	0.619
	SpanQAG	0.437	0.200	0.101	0.080	0.464	0.430	0.812
MQAG	Sum	0.461 \pm 0.025	<u>0.283</u> \pm 0.029	0.135 \pm 0.008	0.179 \pm 0.010	0.761 \pm 0.045	<u>0.772</u> \pm 0.018	0.942 \pm 0.009
	Src	0.144 \pm 0.033	0.097 \pm 0.035	0.087 \pm 0.012	0.054 \pm 0.010	0.320 \pm 0.109	0.559 \pm 0.038	0.599 \pm 0.043
	F1	0.482 \pm 0.025	0.266 \pm 0.032	0.156 \pm 0.009	0.199 \pm 0.011	<u>0.824</u> \pm 0.047	0.764 \pm 0.018	0.898 \pm 0.012
System Combination								
Baseline	BERTSc \oplus Entail	0.494	0.123	0.391	0.259	0.509	0.655	0.854
	BERTSc \oplus SpanQ	0.600	0.142	0.204	0.166	0.664	0.684	0.863
	Entail \oplus SpanQ	0.406	0.270	0.321	0.200	0.435	0.348	0.738
MQ-Sum	\oplus BERTScore	0.602	0.194	0.217	0.226	0.804	0.789	0.837
	\oplus Entailment	0.424	0.289	0.331	0.259	0.559	0.588	0.902
	\oplus SpanQAG	0.538	0.323	0.163	0.178	0.773	0.638	0.932
MQ-F1	\oplus BERTScore	0.601	0.184	0.248	0.257	0.892	0.777	0.806
	\oplus Entailment	0.436	0.281	0.337	0.265	0.712	0.582	0.875
	\oplus SpanQAG	0.551	0.308	0.176	0.190	0.830	0.634	0.908

Table 5: Summary evaluation results in addition to Table 1. The previous work section borrows the results as follows: QAG-C/X from Wang et al. (2020), X-Faith/Fact from Maynez et al. (2020), Podcast from Manakul and Gales (2022). MQAG-F1 is the Harmonic mean of the predictions from MQAG-Sum and MQAG-Src. System combination results are obtained by combining the normalized predictions of two systems. The confidence intervals of the MQAG results are standard deviations obtained via bootstrapping. Underlining denotes the best single system on a particular testset, and we bold the best system combination (or single system).

Source: A G4S security van has been robbed outside a branch of royal bank of Scotland in Glasgow city centre. Police said three armed men took a five-figure sum from the vehicle in the city’s Sauchiehall street on Monday at about 21:45. A spokesman said no-one had been injured although two security guards aged 47 and 49 were left badly shaken. The area around the bank, which is near the Buchanan galleries shopping centre, has been cordoned off by police. Police said the security guards had been making their delivery when they were approached by the three armed men, who threatened them and demanded they hand over a box of money. It is understood the cash taken was in the region of £50,000. Following the robbery, the three men got into a white seat Leon car, which sped off along west Nile street towards the cowcaddens area. [...]

Summary: Two security guards have been threatened during a robbery at a bank in **Edinburgh**.

Generated question (using summary): The robbery happened in _ .

Generated options (using summary): (1) Edinburgh (2) a bank (3) a shop (4) a small town.

Prob. over options given Source: 0.077, 0.895, 0.018, 0.010

Prob. over options given Summary: 0.687, 0.295, 0.000, 0.018

Table 6: Example from QAG-XSum (documentID=1). Factual inconsistency in the summary is highlighted in red.