## Extractive Headline Generation Based on Learning to Rank on Community Question Answering

Tatsuru Higurashi<sup>\*1</sup> Hayato Kobayashi<sup>\*1</sup> \*<sup>2</sup> Takeshi Masuyama<sup>\*1</sup> Kazuma Murao<sup>\*1</sup>

\*<sup>1</sup>Yahoo Japan Corporation \*<sup>2</sup> RIKEN AIP



Copyright (C) 2019 Yahoo Japan Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

Motivation and Approach

Proposed method

• Experiment and Results

Motivation and Approach

Proposed method

• Experiment and Results

### **Community Question Answering Service**

#### Question



### Push Notification in CQA

 Push Notification obtain quick answers Directly linked to the quality of CQA

④ √ ⑨ 93% □

#### **く**すべてのカテゴリ Q&A 解決済み □子育ての悩み ~

■ Y!mobile 🗢

#### **Contents of Posted Question**

はじめまして、よろしくお願いします、30 代の男性です。 アドバイスお願いします。 隣の家が飼っている犬が朝から晩まで 吼え続けます。

近所の人たちも飼い主に注意を促して いるのですが、改善が見られませ



Push Notification of Question

今

#### **Snippet Extraction Makes Headline Informative**



### Contributions

1. Show empirical evidence that snippet headlines are more effective than prefix headlines

2. Propose extractive headline generation method based on learning to rank

3. Create Japanese dataset including headline candidates with "headline-ness" scores by crowdsourcing

### **Advantages of Snippet Headlines**

• Effective



A/B testing on Yahoo! Chiebukuro push notifications of smartphones

#### Practical

## **Snippet headlines never include generative errors**

- Commercial services

   (Yahoo! Chiebukuro) cannot
   accept generative errors
- Abstractive methods cannot completely avoid generative errors

#### **Related Work of Headline Generation and CQA**

- Neural Headline Generation:
  - [Takase+ '16][Chopra+ '16][Kiyono+ '17][Zhou+ '17][Raffael+ '17]
- Sentence Compression:
  - [Woodsend+ '10][Alfonseca+ '13][Colmenares+ '15]
- Extractive Summarization:
  - [Kobayashi+ '15][Yogatama+ '15][Cheng&Lapata '16][Nallapati+ '17]
- CQA Data:
  - [Bhasker+ '13] [Ishigaki+ '17][Surdenau+ '08][Celikyilmaz '09]

Our research is first attempt to address extractive headline generation for CQA service with substring of question based on learning to rank

Motivation and Approach

Proposed Method

• Experiment and Results

### **Overview of Our Proposed Method**



Nice to meet you, thank you in advance. I'm a man in my thirties. Advice please. A dog kept in the next house barks from morning to night...

#### Ranked Headline

...A dog kept in the next house barks from morning to night...



#### **Candidate Generation**



- Make sentence which starts from beginning of each sentences of question.
- Cut subsequent sentences if it has over 20 Japanese characters.
- Put ellipsis at front and end of substring.

#### Candidate Ranking

- Pairwise Learning to Rank
  - L2-regularized L2-loss linear rankSVM

$$\begin{split} \min_{\omega} \quad \frac{1}{2} \omega^{\mathsf{T}} \omega + \mathcal{C} \sum_{(i,j) \in P} \ell \left( \omega^{\mathsf{T}} \, \widetilde{x_i} \, - \omega^{\mathsf{T}} \, \widetilde{x_j} \right) & (\ell(d) = \max(0, 1 - d)^2) \\ P = \left\{ (i,j) \middle| q_i = q_j, y_i > y_j, (x_i, y_i, q_i) \in D, (x_j, y_j, q_j) \in D \right\} \\ \hline \mathbf{x}: Candidate \ headline \\ \mathbf{y}: Vote \ score \\ \mathbf{q}: Question \end{split}$$

24

[Lee 2014] Lee, Ching-Pei and Lin, Chih-Jen: Large-scale Linear Ranksvm. Neural Computation, 26(4)

### **Data Creation: Crowdsourcing**

#### **Instruction for workers**

Select the best option from the list so that users can guess the content of the question and distinguish it from other ones.

	Randomly Sorted Headline Candidate	score
1	Neighbors have given the owner cautions against	2
	This area has only private houses, not rented	0
3	How can I effectively manage this problem?	1
	However, I will go crazy if I have to keep enduring	0
5	A dog kept in the next house barks from morning	6
6	Nice to meet you, thank you in advance, I'm a	0
7	Advice please. A dog kept in the next house	/ 1
	Number of votes by	

Number of votes by

10 workers per question

### **Crowdsourcing Results**

- Ratio of questions whose prefix headlines were most voted candidates was 61.8%
  - = Room for improvement for prefix headline was up to **38.2%**.

#### **Our Goal**

- Improve uninformative headlines of 38.2%
- Remaining 61.8% unchanged

Motivation and Approach

Proposed Method

• Experiment and Results

#### Features for Ranking Model

- Features
  - Bag-of-Words: 30,820 dimension sparse vector based on tf-idf
  - Embedding: 100 dimension dense vector based on doc2vec
  - Position: 10 dimension binary vector representing candidate position

### **Compared Methods**

#### • Simple Baselines

- *Prefix:* Select first candidate
- *DictDel:* Delete uninformative sentence with rule (Used in A/B testing)
- Random: Select randomly

#### Unsupervised Baselines

- *ImpTfidf:* Select most important candidate with highest tf-idf value
- *SimTfidf:* Select most similar candidate to original question with cosine similarity
- LexRank: Select candidate with highest score based on LexRank (Erkan&Radev 2004)

#### Supervised Baselines

- SVM: Select candidate with highest confidence learned as classification task
- SVR: Select candidate with highest predicted votes learned as regression task

#### **Evaluation Metrics**

#### Average Votes

- Measures how appropriate candidates selected by each method
- Determines the overall performance of each method
- Corresponds to DCG@1

Average votes =  $\frac{\text{Sum of votes for the best candidates for all questions}}{\text{No. of questions}}$ .

#### Change Rate

- Measures how much each method changed the default prefix headline
- Determines the impact of application to actual CQA service.

Change rate =  $\frac{\text{No. of questions where the best candidate is not the prefix headline}}{\text{No. of all questions}}$ 

### **Results: Quantitative Analysis**

Method	Avarage Votes		Change Rate	
Ideal		5.56		38.2
MLRank(ours)		4.28		9.9
Prefix	2	4.19		0
DictDel	3	4.23	4	2.2
Random		1.39		85.9
ImpTfidf		1.68	5	81.1
SimTfidf		2.27		79.3
LexRank		2.27		55.7
SVM		4.09		16.7
SVR		3.00		52.5

① *MLRank(ours)* performed the best among all methods.

② *Prefix*(First sentence) can be a good summary.

③ *DictDel*(Rule-Based) was more useful than Prefix.

④ Change rate of *DictDel* was small, which means small impact on service.

(5) Change rates of unsupervised methods were high, but the overall performances were low

### **Results: Qualitative Analysis**

• Examples of prefix headline and snippet headline

(F)	
Prefix Headline	Snippet Headline
<b>カテ違いならゴメンナサイ</b> 。今、財布が破…	…今、財布が破 <b>れてツライ状況です。新し…</b>
I am sorry if the category is wrong.	Now, my wallet is torn, and I'm
Now, my wallet is torn…	having a hard time. A new one
27歳女です。環境的になかなか新しい出…	…環境的になかなか新しい出会いがなく…
<b>I am a 27-year-old woman.</b> Owing to my environment, there is little chance of new	Owing to my environment, there is little chance of new encounters with men

Uninformative expressions are successfully excluded, and informative experssions are added

Motivation and Approach

Proposed Method

• Experiment and Results

### Conclusion

## Addressed a snippet headline generation task for push notifications of CQA

- Showed empirical evidence that snippet headlines are more effective than prefix headlines 2.4 times in average answer rate
- Proposed extractive headline generation method based on learning to rank
- Created dataset including headline candidates with "headline-ness" scores by crowdsourcing

#### **Future Work**

- Investigate effectiveness in practical situations on web service.
- Make the dataset publicly available.

# Thank you



Copyright (C) 2019 Yahoo Japan Corporation. All Rights Reserved