

Text Modular Networks: Learning to Decompose Tasks in the Language of Existing Models

Tushar Khot Daniel Khashabi Kyle Richardson
Peter Clark Ashish Sabharwal

Allen Institute for AI, Seattle, WA, U.S.A.

{tushark, danielk, kyler, peterc, ashishs}@allenai.org

Abstract

A common approach to solve complex tasks is by breaking them down into simple sub-problems that can then be solved by simpler modules. However, these approaches often need to be designed and trained specifically for each complex task. We propose a general approach, Text Modular Networks (TMNs), where the system learns to decompose any complex task into the *language of existing models*. Specifically, we focus on Question Answering (QA) and learn to decompose complex questions into sub-questions answerable by existing QA models. TMNs treat these models as blackboxes and learn their textual input-output behavior (i.e., their *language*) through their task datasets. Our next-question generator then learns to sequentially produce sub-questions that help answer a given complex question. These sub-questions are posed to different existing QA models and, together with their answers, provide a natural language explanation of the exact reasoning used by the model. We present the first system, incorporating a neural factoid QA model and a symbolic calculator, that uses decomposition for the DROP dataset, while also generalizing to the multi-hop HotpotQA dataset. Our system, MODULARQA, outperforms a cross-task baseline by 10-60 F1 points and performs comparable to task-specific systems, while also providing an easy-to-read explanation of its reasoning.

1 Introduction

A natural way to solve more complex tasks such as multi-hop reasoning (Yang et al., 2018; Khashabi et al., 2018a; Khot et al., 2020) and numerical reasoning (Dua et al., 2019) is by decomposing them into simpler problems that have already been solved, e.g., single-fact QA (Rajpurkar et al., 2016). Besides being able to reuse existing simpler models, this approach allows developing an




Figure 1: MODULARQA learns to ask sub-questions to existing simple QA models, including a symbolic calculator, to finally arrive at the answer to a given complex questions. Note that our approach did not rely on any decomposition annotations. The system learned to add “start to take a dip” in the question from the DROP dataset.

interpretable system that can explain its reasoning as a composition of these simpler sub-tasks, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Current decomposition approaches (Talmor and Berant, 2018; Min et al., 2019a) mainly focus on developing algorithms that target specific question patterns (e.g., decomposing by predicting split points). However, such approaches are difficult to extend to new question patterns and cannot guarantee that the generated sub-questions are actually solvable by existing models. For instance, consider the question from the DROP dataset in Figure 1. The second sub-question here requires the *introduction of a new phrase*, “start to take a dip”. This is beyond the scope of standard approaches that only rephrase question splits. Additionally, the final question needs to be posed to a *symbolic calculator*, which operates with a different ques-

tion language.

To address these issues, we propose a general framework called Text Modular Networks (TMNs) where the system learns to decompose complex questions (of any form) into sub-questions that are answerable by existing QA models or symbolic modules (henceforth referred to as *sub-models*).¹ The core of this framework is a *next-question generator* that sequentially produces the next sub-question as well as the appropriate sub-model that should be capable of answering this sub-question. This sequence of sub-questions and answer provides an interpretable explanation of the model’s *neuro-symbolic* reasoning, as illustrated in Figure 1.

A key insight behind our approach is that we can model the capabilities of existing sub-models by training a text-to-text model to generate the questions in the sub-model’s training dataset (e.g. SQuAD), given appropriate *cues*. In our case, we train a BART model (Lewis et al., 2019) to generate questions given the context, answer, and vocabulary hints as cues. We then use these sub-task question models to generate sub-questions (and the appropriate sub-models) that could lead to the intermediate answers for each complex question (e.g., “Raymond S.” and “American” in the HotpotQA example in Figure 1). The resulting sub-questions, by virtue of our training, are in the language (i.e., within-scope) of the corresponding sub-models.

These sub-question sequences can now be used to *train* the next-question generator to sequentially produce the next sub-question. TMNs use only this trained generator, along with existing QA models, to answer complex questions, without need for answer supervision during inference. Importantly, since TMNs learn model-specific decompositions automatically, they can easily integrate different QA sub-models as blackboxes, irrespective of whether they are neural or symbolic.

We use the TMN framework to develop a modular system, MODULARQA, that explains its reasoning and generalizes across DROP (Dua et al., 2019),² and HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018) using a neural factoid QA sub-model and a symbolic calculator. MODULARQA outperforms a baseline text-to-text model and even other modular net-

¹TMNs, in fact, treat sub-models as blackboxes, and can thus use *any* model or function as a module.

²We target 20% of DROP questions that need only numeric reasoning.

works that each target only one of these datasets.

Contributions. (1) A general framework called *Text Modular Networks* (TMNs) that decomposes complex questions into sub-questions answerable by existing models treated as blackboxes (neural or symbolic); (2) An implementation of this framework called MODULARQA³ that learns to decompose multi-hop and discrete reasoning questions; (3) The first question decomposition approach for DROP² that also generalizes to HotpotQA; and (4) An interpretable model that can explain its reasoning in terms of a sequence of simple questions and answers.

2 Related Work

The idea of decomposing complex behavior in terms of simpler parts is long-standing in the AI literature. Minsky (1988) famously characterized human intelligence as interactions between simpler parts or agents (forming what he called a *society of mind*). Many early QA systems were also designed as combination of distinct modules (Harabagiu et al., 2001; Moldovan et al., 2000). Traditionally, this idea has been used to compose outputs of *lower-level* language tasks to solve the higher-level NLU tasks (Harabagiu and Hickl, 2006; Lally et al., 2012; Khot et al., 2017; Khashabi et al., 2018b). A distinct feature of much of this prior work is the use of pre-determined symbolic representations. This includes, in addition, frameworks for mapping math word problems to a symbolic representation based on mathematical operations (Seo et al., 2015; Roy and Roth, 2018; Amini et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020), as well as mapping questions to pre-defined set of operations (Berant et al., 2013; Neelakantan et al., 2016), inter alia.

There have been different **modular network** architectures proposed to exploit compositionality (Rosenbaum et al., 2018; Kirsch et al., 2018). The closest models to our work are based on *neural module networks* (NMN) (Andreas et al., 2016). NMNs are end-to-end modeling frameworks that compose task-specific neural modules where each module performs a simple operation. Two formulations of NMNs have been proposed for complex QA tasks (1) Self-Assembling NMNs (Jiang and Bansal, 2019) for HotpotQA and (2) NMN for DROP (Gupta et al., 2020). Both

³<http://github.com/allenai/modularqa>

these approaches target exactly one dataset and need to learn the simple reasoning of the modules from the complex task. While these systems are also capable of producing explanations in terms of a semantic parse and the module attentions, they are harder to interpret than our simple text-based explanations.

Question decomposition has been pursued before for two different datasets: ComplexWebQuestions (Talmor and Berant, 2018) and HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018). Both the approaches (Talmor and Berant, 2018; Min et al., 2019b) focus on directly training a model to produce the decomposition, similar to work on semantic parsing to produce the latent logical forms (Berant et al., 2013). Along similar lines, Wolfson et al. (2020) collect question decompositions for these textual QA datasets, in addition to other semantic parsing datasets, with a *fixed* operation set. However, we argue that textual question-answering may not have a fixed vocabulary of valid operations – the “operations” are defined by the sub-models used to solve the simple questions. Hence, we propose Text Modular Networks as an alternate framework that learns to generate question decompositions in the language of these models. Additionally, these approaches (Talmor and Berant, 2018; Min et al., 2019b) exploit the *explicit decomposition* cues from the question to produce question splits – an approach not usable for DROP questions (as shown in Fig. 1).

Perez et al. (2020) also used a text-to-text model to generate simple sub-questions for HotpotQA. However, they used similar questions from a large corpus of simple questions as training data for this model without trying to exactly capture the reasoning steps. Consequently, their final system mainly used these generated decompositions to collect evidence.

Our approach to train a model to produce the latent decomposition from weak/distant supervision bears resemblance to **semantic parsing** approaches (Berant et al., 2013; Krishnamurthy et al., 2017) that are trained to produce the latent logical forms that can be executed over tables. We, however, diverge from this line of work since our inferred decompositions are in free-form language and *not limited to any pre-specified set of operations*. Iyyer et al. (2017) also proposed solving complex QA tasks using a sequence of sub-questions, but the sub-questions were model-

agnostic and limited to QA over structured tables. Finally, various approaches (Chen et al., 2016; Buck et al., 2018; Nogueira and Cho, 2017; Wang et al., 2018) have also proposed reformulating questions for textual QA tasks. However these approaches mostly focus on rephrasing simple questions and not decomposing the question itself.

3 Text Modular Networks

TMNs are a family of architectures consisting of *modules* that communicate through *language* learned from these modules, to accomplish a certain goal (e.g., answering a question). Figure 2 illustrates this general idea in the context of answering a DROP question. The core of our system is a *next-question generator* \mathbb{G} , a component in charge of generating and distributing sub-tasks among *sub-models* \mathbb{A}_s . The system alternates between using next-question generator model to produce the next question (*NextGen*) and using the corresponding sub-model to answer this question. To state it formally, solving a complex question qc is an alternating process between the following two steps:

Generate the next question q_i for submodel t_i :
 $\langle t_i, q_i \rangle = \mathbb{D}(qc, q_1, a_1, \dots, q_{i-1}, a_{i-1})$
Find answer a_i by posing q_i to submodel t_i :
 $a_i = \mathbb{A}_{t_i}(q_i, p)$

where q_i is the i^{th} generated sub-question and a_i is the answer produced by a sub-model t_i based on a given context paragraph p . This simple iterative process ends when q_{i+1} equals to a special end-of-sequence symbol (denoted throughout as $[\text{EOQ}]$) with the final output answer a_i .

3.1 Design Principles

The two key design principles that motivate this design of Text Modular Networks are:

Decomposability of task: Text Modular Networks are designed to decompose *complex* tasks that can be solved (or defined) using *existing* (and simpler) tasks. Such complex tasks are organically created by the natural progression of science. As simpler tasks get solved (e.g., factoid QA), more complex tasks are defined that require composition of solved tasks (e.g., multi-hop QA). Even if certain sub-tasks do not have existing datasets, collecting a dataset for such sub-tasks should be




Figure 2: A sample inference chain for a DROP question. Through text-to-text interactions between the next-question generator \mathbb{D} and existing QA models \mathbb{A} , we can clearly see the interactive reasoning process of our system.

easy and even necessary. Ensuring solvability of the sub-tasks is a necessary step towards solving the more complex task that builds on top of them.

Exploiting existing models. Our architecture aims to decompose complex tasks into simpler sub-tasks, enabling the reuse of existing models (or the use of easy-to-define functions). As we show in later sections, we solve questions in DROP and HotpotQA, two multi-step reasoning datasets, by decomposing them in terms of SQuAD (an existing simpler dataset) and a symbolic calculator. This paradigm is in contrast to recent efforts to build increasingly complex monolithic models trained on large datasets for each new complex task (Fang et al., 2019; Xiao et al., 2019; Ran et al., 2019). While similar text-based decomposition architectures have also been proposed before (Talmor and Berant, 2018; Min et al., 2019b), the main characteristic of TMNs is learning to produce these decompositions in the language of these models. This design attribute makes Text Modular Networks *extensible* since a designer can plug in any QA model, even a non-differentiable symbolic model, to extend the scope of the overall system.

3.2 Building a Text Modular Network

The key challenge in building a Text Modular Networks is developing the next-question generator model. Training this model requires a next-question prediction dataset where each example is a step in the iterative progression of sub-question generation. We illustrate this with two examples:

Example 1:

Input

qc: How many years did it take for the services sector to rebound?

Output

$\langle t_1, q_1 \rangle = \langle \text{SQuAD}, \text{In what year did the service sector rebound?} \rangle$

Example 2:

Input

qc: How many years did it take for the services sector to rebound?

q1: In what year did the services sector rebound?

a1: 2003

Output

$\langle t_2, q_2 \rangle = \langle \text{SQuAD}, \text{“When did the services sector start to take a dip?”} \rangle$

While it may be possible to do this by collecting task-specific datasets or designing a task-specific next-question generator (Min et al., 2019b; Talmor and Berant, 2018), our goal is to build a framework that can be easily extended to new complex QA tasks as well as to new sub-tasks. To achieve this, we present a *general* framework to *generate the next-question training dataset* with the following two properties:

Decomposition in the language of sub-models.

To effectively communicate with each sub-model, the next-question generator has to generate sub-tasks in the *language* of each sub-model (i.e., decomposing the complex tasks as chunks that are understandable by each model). This means that our training dataset (and thereby the next-question generator) should use questions that an existing sub-model can handle without having to manually specify them for each sub-model (Sec. 3.2.1).

Minimal supervision of decompositions:

Just as we need to model the sub-tasks, the next-question generator also needs to model the rea-

p : ...The sector decreased by 7.8 percent in 2002, before rebounding in 2003 with a 1.6 percent growth rate... a : 2002
 $\mathbb{G}_S(p, a)$: *When did the services sector start to take a dip?*

Figure 3: Sample questions generated by our conditional question generator models. Given the context and answer, our SQuAD-based \mathbb{G} model is able to generate a valid factoid question answerable by a SQuAD QA model. Similarly a symbolic generator can be used to produce a question answerable by a calculator.

soning needed in the complex task. We argue that for many problems there are practical ways to weakly supervise the reasoning chain *without* the need for manual and exhaustive annotation of the full decomposition. As we show in Sec. 3.2.2, it is possible to extract a set of *hints* (embodied in the questions and context paragraphs) to semi-automatically construct the training data for next-question generator that captures the reasoning needed for the complex task.

3.2.1 Modeling QA Sub-Models

We identify minimal supervision hints, e.g. intermediate answers, to weakly specify each reasoning step (described shortly) for a complex QA task. These hints are then used to generate the sub-questions q_i in the “language” of existing sub-models at each step. To ensure these questions are answerable by existing sub-models, we train a text-to-text model on the sub-model’s original task to generate a plausible q_i conditioned on these hints, e.g., a BART model trained to generate the question given the answer. We can view this utility as characterizing the question language of the sub-model. For example, such a model trained on the SQuAD dataset would produce factoid questions – the space of questions answerable by a model trained on this dataset.

While an unconditional question generation model can also capture the space of questions, it can generate a large number of possibly valid questions, making it hard to effectively train or use such a model. Instead, we scope the problem down to conditional generation of questions given hints z . For example, we could use the context p and answer a as input conditions to train a question generator model $\mathbb{G} : z \rightarrow q$ where $z = \langle p, a \rangle$. Figure 3 shows an example question from such a generator \mathbb{G}_S trained on SQuAD dataset.

Para, p : ... The sector decreased by 7.8 percent in 2002, before rebounding in 2003 with a 1.6 percent growth rate ...
Question, q_c : How many years did it take for the services sector to rebound? **Answer** a : 1
Hints \rightarrow **Sub-Questions**
 $a_1=2003 \rightarrow q_1 = \mathbb{G}_S(p, a_1)$: *In what year did the services sector rebound?*
 $a_2=2002 \rightarrow q_2 = \mathbb{G}_S(p, a_2)$: *When did the services sector start to take a dip?*
 $a_3=1 \rightarrow q_3 = \mathbb{G}_C(p, a_3)$: *diff(2003, 2002)*
 $\blacksquare \rightarrow q_4 = [EOQ]$

Figure 4: An example decomposition generated for a DROP example using hints and sub-question generators \mathbb{G} . These intermediate answers can be obtained by finding two dates/numbers and an operation that produces the final answer.

3.2.2 Generating Training Data

We next describe how to use the sub-task question models to produce potential question-answer chains for a complex question. To generate using the sub-task question model, we need to define the input hints z at each step. Such hints can often be extracted from multi-hop datasets (as we show in Sec. 5) and are easier to annotate than model-specific decompositions. For example, in our running DROP example, while we do not have annotations for the exact decomposition, we can use cues in the question and the paragraph to derive hints (such as the answers for each sub-question). This is akin to approaches that generate *weak-supervision* for semantic parsers (Liang et al., 2013; Berant et al., 2013), math QA systems (Roy and Roth, 2017) and textual NMNs (Gupta et al., 2020; Jiang and Bansal, 2019).

For example, under the definition of $z = \langle p, a \rangle$, we would need to provide the context and answer for each reasoning step. In our example question, we can derive the intermediate answers by finding the two dates whose difference leads to the final answer.⁴ As shown in Fig. 4, this kind of simple weak-supervision in combination with our sub-task question models can be used to produce the sequence of sub-questions needed to train our next-question generator.

At the end, we can now easily derive the training data needed for our next-question generator. For each question q_i generated using the sub-task

⁴Other systems on DROP and HotpotQA have used similar ideas for auxiliary supervision (Jiang and Bansal, 2019; Gupta et al., 2020; Andor et al., 2019).

Operation	QA Model, \mathbb{A}_C	Question Generator, \mathbb{G}_C
$\text{diff}(X, Y, [Z])$	Return absolute difference between X and Y. If $Z \in \{\text{days, months, years}\}$ is specified, find the difference in Z units.	Generate questions with all possible date/number pairs as X,Y. If $Z \in \{\text{days, months, years}\}$ is mentioned in the question, add Z
$\text{not}(X)$	Return $100 - X$	Generate questions for every number ≤ 100 as X.
$\text{if_then}(X > Y, Z, W)$	If X is greater than Y, return Z else return W (X, Y can be numbers or dates)	Generate questions with all possible date/number pairs as X and Y. Use pair of entities in the question as Z and W.
$\text{if_then}(X \neq Y, Z, W)$	If X is not the same as Y, return Z else return W.	Generate questions with previous answers as X, Y. Z and W are set to “no” and “yes” respectively.

Table 1: Set of operations handled by the symbolic calculator model \mathbb{A}_C and the corresponding approach to generate such questions in \mathbb{G}_C .

question model \mathbb{G}_{t_i} , we can create a training examples for our next-question generator:

Input: $qc, q_1, a_1, \dots, q_{i-1}, a_{i-1}$

Output: $\langle t_i, q_i \rangle$

Note that the cues are *only needed for creating this training data* for the next-question generator \mathbb{D} . Hence they do not need to be carefully designed to have complete coverage or be noise-free. The model will learn to generalize over this noise and other linguistic variations.

4 MODULARQA System

We next describe a specific instantiation of the Text Modular Network: MODULARQA— a new QA system that works across HotpotQA and DROP. We focus here on the key pieces of this system that are independent of the end-task. We present details about our two end-tasks and the associated extraction of hints in the next section. More specific details of the system and model hyperparameters are provided in the Appendix A.

4.1 QA Sub-Models, \mathbb{A}

We use two QA models that are sufficient to cover a large space of questions in these two datasets:

- SQuAD model, \mathbb{A}_S : A RoBERTa-Large model trained on the entire SQuAD 2.0 dataset including the no-answer questions.
- Math calculator model, \mathbb{A}_C : A symbolic Python program that can perform key operations needed for DROP and HotpotQA (see Table 1).

4.2 Sub-task Question Models

We define two sub-task question models corresponding to each of our QA sub-models. We

train these conditional generators using the context, answer and an estimated question vocabulary v as hints, i.e. $z = \langle p, a, v \rangle$. Note that as the hints get more specific, the space of potential questions gets smaller, making it less likely to produce noisy training decompositions. However, it can be harder to obtain extremely specific hints for questions in your end-task, e.g., the exact words of the decomposed questions would be hard to obtain unless one knew the gold decomposition. We found the answer and estimated question vocabulary to be a reasonable signal for reducing the noise without being hard to obtain automatically.

4.2.1 SQuAD QA Model, \mathbb{G}_S

We train a BART-Large model on the answerable subset of SQuAD 2.0 to build our sub-task question model for SQuAD. We use the gold paragraph and answer from the dataset as the input context and answer. For the estimated question vocabulary, we select essential words⁵ from the gold questions (referred as the function Φ from hereon) with additional irrelevant words sampled from other questions.⁶

To train the text-to-text $BART_S$ model, we use a simple concatenation of the passage, vocabulary and answer (with markers such as “H:” and “A:” to indicate each field) as the input sequence and the question as the output sequence. While a constrained-decoding approach (Hokamp and Liu, 2017; Hu et al., 2019a) could be used here to further promote the use of the vocabulary hints, this simple approach was effective and more generally applicable to other hints in our use-case. E.g.,

⁵We select non-stopwords that are nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs

⁶More details in Appendix A

Complex Q	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
<i>qc: How many years did it take the services sector to rebound after the 2002 decrease?</i>	a_1 : 2002 v_1 : $\Phi(qc)$ p_1 : p	a_2 : 2003 v_2 : $\Phi(qc)$ p_2 : p	a_3 : 1 v_3 : ["diff", "2002", "2003"]
	q_1 : <i>When did the services sector take a decrease?</i> t_1 : \mathcal{S}	q_2 : <i>When did the services sector rebound?</i> t_2 : \mathcal{S}	q_3 : <i>diff(2002, 2003)</i> t_3 : \mathcal{C}
<i>qc: Little Big Girl was a Simpsons episode directed by the animator and artist of what nationality?</i>	a_1 : Raymond S Persi v_1 : $\Phi(qc)$ p_1 : d_1	a_2 : American v_2 : $\Phi(qc)$ + "Raymond S Persi" p_2 : d_2	
	q_1 : <i>Who directed "Little Big Girl"?</i> t_1 : \mathcal{S}	q_2 : <i>What nationality was Raymond S?</i> t_2 : \mathcal{S}	

Table 2: Sample hints and the resulting generated questions for DROP and HotpotQA examples. The function Φ selects non-stopword words from the input question.

Input = ... *Berners-Lee is the director of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), ... H: WWW; director; Berners; invented; Lee A: the World Wide Web Consortium Q:*

Output = *What was Berners-Lee a director of?*

To use this model, we use nucleus sampling to generate k questions and filter out unanswerable or incorrectly answered questions, i.e., given $q \sim \text{BART}_{\mathcal{S}}(p, a, v)$,

$$\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(p, a, v) = \{q \mid \text{overlaps}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{S}}(p, q), a)\}$$

4.2.2 Math Calculator, $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}$

Given the symbolic nature of this solver, rather than training a neural generator, we just generate all possible numeric questions given the context. Similar to the $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{S}}$ model, we first generate potential questions (see Table 1) and then select the ones that lead to the expected answer using $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$.

$$\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}(p, a, \Phi) = \{q \mid \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(p, q) = a\}$$

4.3 Training Next-Question Generator

Table 2 shows example complex questions and the hints derived for these questions. Given these input hints,⁷ and our sub-task question models, we can identify the next-question for each step and the appropriate sub-model (based on the sub-task question model that produced this question). Note that since we sample these questions for each step, every complex question can lead to many such question chains. To improve the quality of the training data, we also filter out potentially noisy decompositions.⁸

⁷for simplicity, we don't show the input context here

⁸E.g., if an answer is unused or the vocabulary is too different. See Appendix A.3 for more details.

We train a BART-Large model on this generated training data to produce the next question (and QA system) given the complex question and previous question-answer pairs. For example, for the first question decomposition in Table 2, the model is trained on:

Input = *QC: How many years did it take the services sector to rebound after the 2002 decrease?*

QI: *(squad) When did the services sector take a decrease? A: 2002 QI: (squad) When did the services sector rebound? A: 2003 QS:*

Output = *(math) diff(2002, 2003)*

4.4 Inference

For inference, we now only rely on the next-question generator and QA sub-models. Given a set of modules (in our case one \mathbb{D} and different \mathbb{A}_t), we describe inference as finding the best path through a directed graph where each vertex is one of the modules being called and the edges are the outputs of these modules. Each edge has an associated target module e.g. the output sub-question of the next-question generator also provides the QA sub-model that can answer the sub-question. We sample multiple sub-questions from the next-question generator using nucleus sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020), each forming a different edge in our graph. We select the top- k answers from the QA sub-models, again each forming a new edge with the next-question generator as the target module.⁹ An inference chain is any sequence of edges $u = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ from a unique start node (next-question generator with the input complex question) to a unique end node (sink node for any edge labelled [EOQ])

⁹ k is set to 1 in our experiments.




Figure 5: A sample inference chain scored by our approach for a negation DROP question. For each n_0 question generated in the first step, we will explore n_1 questions in the second step (and so on). We use our scoring function w to select the optimal inference chain+answer (and prune incomplete low-scoring chains).

Under this formulation, the inference problem therefore can be stated as a single-source shortest-path problem (Cormen et al., 2009):

$$P^* = \arg \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \sum_{e_j \in P} w(e_j) \right\},$$

where the goal is to find the minimal cost path P^* (corresponding to an inference chain) parameterized by some weighting function w (see illustration in Figure 5). To approximate the full space of possible paths \mathcal{P} , we perform a best-first search (Dijkstra et al., 1959). We define a monotonic scoring function w that scores each sub-question edge based on vocabulary overlap with the input question.¹⁰ At the end, we also score the final chain (i.e. $w(e_n)$) using a RoBERTa model trained on randomly sampled chains (see App. A.5).

We note that while our particular choice of w is simple and empirically motivated by our particular choice of datasets,¹¹ many such weighting functions could be used here, including functions based on additional learned components (e.g., using the neural shortest path approach of Richardson et al. (2018) or other graph-based structure prediction techniques (Deutsch et al., 2019)).

5 Experimental Setup

We train and evaluate our system on two different QA datasets: DROP and HotpotQA. DROP dataset contains questions that need discrete numeric reasoning over a single paragraph. HotpotQA dataset is a dataset of multi-hop questions that need facts from two paragraphs to answer each question. While these are very different

¹⁰Same function used to remove noisy decompositions as described in Appendix A.3

¹¹Experiments using model output scores (e.g., generator and QA scores) to weigh the edges in the graph led to sub-optimal results.

datasets, by decomposing them into a sequence of simple QA sub-tasks, we are able to develop a single QA system that works across both of them. We will first present the dataset-specific details of collecting the decomposition programs followed by our results.

5.1 DROP Dataset

We focus on three classes of questions that are within the scope of our QA system: difference, comparison, and negation.¹²

Difference (How many days before X did Y happen?): We identify such questions based on the presence of terms indicating a difference operations e.g. “days before”. We consider all possible number and date pairs close to the mention of X and Y as the intermediate answers. If the difference between the number pair matches the final answer, we assume them to be the intermediate answer. For hints, we use the key terms from the question for the first two questions, and use the two intermediate answers for the last question (and any unit if mentioned).

Comparison (Which event happened before: X or Y?): We identify such questions based on the presence of two compared entities e.g. “...: X or Y”. we do not know the exact answer, but it often involves a numeric comparison. So we assume that the intermediate answers should be the numbers or dates close to the mention of the entities in the question.¹³ Since there can be multiple dates/numbers that satisfy this criterion, we generate one set of hints for each potential pair of numbers/dates.

¹²Rest of the questions require a QA model that can return multiple answers. See discussion in Sec. 7.3.

¹³Similar idea has been used to train NMNs for DROP (Gupta et al., 2020).

Negation (What percent is not X?): We identify such questions based on the phrasing "not X" and the presence of a number $= 100 - a$ in the context (which forms the intermediate entity). For hints, we use the key terms from the question for the first question, and use the intermediate answer as the hint for the last question.

For further details, please refer to Appendix C. Note that such approaches to identify within-scope questions and using heuristics to identify potential reasoning steps are commonly used to better guide models for such complex tasks (Gupta et al., 2020). In our case, 14.4K training DROP questions are answerable with our system, which forms 18.7% of the complete dataset.¹⁴ We similarly select 2973 Dev questions (from 9536 questions in the Dev set) that are further split to produce 601 Dev and 2371 Test questions.

5.2 HotpotQA Dataset

We consider both bridge and comparison questions from the HotpotQA dataset in the Distractor setting, where the input context has 10 Wikipedia documents including the two documents needed to answer the question. Since we rely on existing systems for QA, we only use 17% of the training dataset (15661 questions categorized as "hard" by the authors) to train our decomposition model. Since the test set is blind, we split the 7405 Dev questions (entire Dev set) into 1481 Dev and 5924 Test questions.

There are generally two forms of reasoning needed for HotpotQA:

For bridge questions (e.g., Where was 44th President born?), the model often needs to find an entity in one of the relevant document d_1 that links to the second Wikipedia document, d_2 containing the answer. For such questions, we assume that the title entity of the second paragraph, e_2 is the intermediate answer.¹⁵ In this case, we set $z_1 = \langle p_1 = d_1, a_1 = e_1, v_1 = \eta(qc) \rangle$ for the first question. The second question would use this intermediate entity and so we add it to the vocabulary, i.e., $z_2 = \langle p_2 = d_2, a_2 = a, v_2 = \eta(qc) + e_1 \rangle$. The function η extracts the key terms from the

¹⁴Previous modular systems (Gupta et al., 2020) have targeted smaller subsets to develop models with interpretable reasoning

¹⁵Similar approaches have been used to produce reasoning chains for multi-hop datasets (Chen et al., 2019; Kundu et al., 2019; Xiao et al., 2019)

question relevant to the input context.¹⁶ If the final answer is present in both the paragraphs, we assume it to be a conjunction question (e.g. who acted as X and directed Y?). For such questions, each sub-question would have the same answer i.e. $a_1 = a_2 = a$.

For comparison questions (e.g., who is older: X or Y?), we handle them exactly same as we did for DROP. For each potential pair of names/dates, we create one potential set of hints where $v_i = \langle d_i, e_i, \eta(qc) \rangle$.

Further details are deferred to Appendix C.

6 Results

We evaluate MODULARQA against a cross-dataset baseline architecture and, for completeness, also against modular systems targeting individual datasets. When possible, we train the compared model on our dataset, otherwise we use the published model trained on its corresponding dataset (indicated throughout with †). We show that our general approach is comparable to these targeted approaches in terms of its quality, with more explainable text-based reasoning.

Table 3 summarizes our quantitative results,¹⁷ compared to both a cross-dataset baseline (Section 6.1) and dataset-targeted architectures (Section 6.2). Table 4 illustrates MODULARQA’s ability to explain its reasoning via sub-questions (Section 6.3).

6.1 Cross-Dataset Architectures

MODULARQA is a general system that works across both DROP and HotpotQA datasets. Since there does not exist any similar system that works across discrete reasoning (needed by DROP) and multi-document span-prediction (needed by HotpotQA) tasks, we use a language-generation model that can naturally handle both these tasks. We train *a single model* for DROP and HotpotQA for both these systems for a fair comparison.

Specifically, we train a BART-Large model on these two datasets to generate the answer given the passage and the question. For DROP, we directly train model to produce the answer (can be a span or a number). For HotpotQA, the input context with multiple documents is too long for such

¹⁶We remove terms that do not appear in the corresponding context (e.g. d_2) but do appear in the other context (e.g. d_1).

¹⁷We report F1 scores here. For completeness, exact match (EM) scores may be found in Table 6 in Appendix B.

	Reasoning Explanation	Cross-Dataset Generalization	Model Reuse	DROP F1				HotpotQA F1		
				All	Diff	Comp	Neg	All	Br	Cmp
MODULARQA	✓	✓	✓	87.9	85.2	81.0	96.6	61.8	64.9	49.2
BART	✗	✓	✗	28.0	7.7	77.5	12.8	49.0	52.8	33.7
NMN-D†	✓	✗	✗	79.1*	–	–	–	–	–	–
NumNet+V2	✗	✗	✗	90.3	83.0	93.7	96.7	–	–	–
SNMN†	✓	✗	✗	–	–	–	–	63.1	63.7	60.1
Quark	✗	✗	✗	–	–	–	–	75.5	78.1	64.9

Table 3: Main results, using F1 score (see Appendix B for EM scores). TOP: Comparison to dataset-agnostic models. MODULARQA outperforms the BART baseline on both HotpotQA (bridge and comparison questions) and DROP datasets. BOTTOM: Comparison to dataset-specific architectures. † indicates we used the model trained on its target set. Compared to other modular and explainable systems (NMN-D and SNMN), MODULARQA is a *single* system that demonstrates similar performance while being applicable to multiple datasets. Compared to *targeted* blackbox systems (NumNet and Quark), MODULARQA lags behind but remains the only system that produces an explanation and generalizes to two datasets.

models, so we train the model independently on each document to produce the answer (if present in the document) or “N/A” (if not). This is an extension of an existing BERT-based model for HotpotQA (Min et al., 2019a). During inference, we collect all the non-“N/A” answers across documents and select the most common answer span.

The top section of Table 3 summarizes cross-dataset results. We see that on the DROP dataset, the BART baseline is completely unable to learn the numeric reasoning needed for these question classes. While BART has some success with comparison questions, MODULARQA is able to handle all three classes well, with a close to 100% score on the 2-hop negation questions. The table also shows that BART, while being competitive on HotpotQA, is substantially outperformed by MODULARQA on both bridge and comparison questions.¹⁸

6.2 Dataset-Targeted Approaches

Although our emphasis is on cross-dataset models, for completeness, we also compare MODULARQA with two DROP-specific models: (1) NumNet+V2 (Ran et al., 2019), a state-of-the-art model built on top of RoBERTa for discrete reasoning, and (2) a Neural Module Network model (Gupta et al., 2020) specifically designed for a subset of DROP (referred to as NMN-D). NMN-D used techniques similar to MODU-

¹⁸A DROP model such as NumNet could be applied to HotpotQA by converting it into a single-document reading comprehension task. We leave this for future work, noting that such a system still wouldn’t produce explanations and would have to learn to reason from scratch.

LARQA to train its modules and provide auxiliary supervision for its target subset. Since the difference and negation questions are not within NMN-D’s target set, we evaluate it only on comparison questions.

As shown in the bottom section of Table 3, MODULARQA achieves performance comparable to the state-of-the-art model, NumNet+V2, on DROP, while at the same time exhibiting three unique strengths that no other compared model possesses: being able to produce explanations, generalizing across different datasets, and re-using existing QA models.

Since the other modular system, NMN-D, focuses on a different subset of DROP than MODULARQA, we report its score (79.1) only on the 496 test questions it shares with MODULARQA, denoted by * in the table. When evaluated also on this same subset, MODULARQA achieves an F1 score of 92.5 (not shown in the table), revealing a gap of 13 F1 points. In addition, MODULARQA produces textual explanations while being able to re-use existing QA systems.

We also compare MODULARQA with two HotpotQA-specific systems: (1) Quark (Groeneweld et al., 2020), which additionally uses supporting fact annotations to first select relevant sentences and then trains a BERT-based QA system directly on it; and (2) an NMN model (Jiang and Bansal, 2019) specifically designed for HotpotQA (referred to as SNMN) with each module trained from scratch on the HotpotQA task.

As shown again in the bottom section of Table 3, MODULARQA performs comparably to the

Example 1: **How many days passed between the Sendling Christmas Day Massacre and the Battle of Aidenbach?**
 » Q: *When was the Battle of Aidenbach?* A: 8 January 1706 Q: *When was the Sendling Christmas Massacre?* A: 25 December 1705 Q: *diff(8 January 1706, 25 December 1705, days)* A: **14**

Example 2: **Which ancestral group is smaller: Irish or Italian?**
 » Q: *How many of the group were Irish?* A: 12.2 Q: *How many Italian were there in the group?* A: 6.1 Q: *if_then(12.2 < 6.1, Irish, Italian)* A: **Italian**

Example 3: **How many percent of the national population does not live in Bangkok?**
 » Q: *What percent of the national population lives in Bangkok?* A: 12.6 Q: *not(12.6)* A: **87.4**

HotpotQA

Example 4: **12 Years a Slave starred what British actor born 10 July 1977)**
 » Q: *Who stars in 12 Years a Slave?* A: Chiwetel Ejiofor Q: *Who is the British actor born 10 July 1977?* A: **Chiwetel Umeadi Ejiofor**

Example 5: **How many children’s books has the writer of the sitcom Maid Marian and her Merry Men written ?**
 » Q: *What writer was on Maid Marian and her Merry Men?* A: Tony Robinson Q: *How many children’s books has Tony Robinson written?* A: **sixteen**

Example 6: **Did Holland’s Magazine and Moondance both begin in 1996?**
 » Q: *When did Holland’s Magazine begin?* A: 1876 Q: *When did Moondance begin?* A: 1996 Q: *if_then(1876!= 1996, no, yes)* A: **no**

Table 4: Sample Reasoning Explanations generated by MODULARQA for DROP and HotpotQA questions. The name of the sub-models can be inferred from the sub-questions and are excluded for simplicity. These explanations provide valuable insight into the reasoning used by MODULARQA for each question. As shown here, MODULARQA is able to learn the appropriate decompositions for these questions without any manually designed rules (e.g., “smaller” $\Rightarrow x < y$).

modular SNMN model even though the latter is trained on the complete HotpotQA dataset. While the Quark system does outperform both modular approaches, it is known that such end-to-end models often exploit artifacts present in the HotpotQA dataset to achieve high scores with just single-hop reasoning (Min et al., 2019a).

While we present the above comparisons with dataset-targeted models for completeness, it is important to note that our focus is on cross-dataset models that are able to produce an interpretable representation of the multi-hop reasoning procedure used to arrive at the answer (instead of only generating the answer or marking supporting facts in the given context).

6.3 Model Intepretability

We analyzed MODULARQA’s explanation on 40 Dev questions (20 from each dataset) to verify its interpretability. Of these questions, MODULARQA answered 28 questions correctly (avg. acc. of 70%). Among the cases answered correctly, MODULARQA used a valid reasoning chain to arrive at the answer in as many as 93% of the cases. This highlights the strong ability of our model to produce human understandable explanations of its reasoning.

Additionally, the use of a neural generator (as opposed to heuristics) to produce these questions results in *grammatical* questions in almost all of these cases (barring two). Among the error cases

where MODULARQA produced an incorrect answer, 33% of the questions were out-of-scope for it (e.g., required reasoning over multiple spans), while 25% of the questions in fact lead to correct reasoning chain but an incorrect answer, often due to the failure of a QA sub-model.

Table 4 shows sample question decompositions generated by MODULARQA. We exclude the context and sub-models for simplicity. We can see that the model is able to take oddly phrased questions to create clean questions (example 4), handle yes/no questions (example 6), recognize the unit of comparison (example 1) and map the phrase “smaller” to the appropriate direction of comparison without any manual rules (example 2).

In contrast, the DecompRC (Min et al., 2019b) system decomposes the fifth example into:

- Q1: which writer of the sitcom maid marian and her merry men*
Q2: how many children’s books has [answer] written ?

While these sub-questions may result in the correct answer, the question phrasing is not grammatical due to the splitting-based nature of the decomposition. Moreover, DecompRC sometimes passes certain questions directly passed to the QA system without any decomposition (e.g., it does not decompose Example 4). Not surprisingly, due to the nature of these questions, naïvely replacing our next-question generator in MODULARQA

with the output of DecompRC results in a huge drop in performance.

The BREAK dataset (Wolfson et al., 2020), on the other hand, provides the following high-level logical form for the first example:

Q1: return when was the Sendling Christmas day Massacre
Q2: return when was the Battle of Aidenbach
Q3: return days between #1 and #2
Q4: return number of #3

While this meaning representation is more readable, it can introduce additional steps not needed to solve this task. Again, due to the difference in language, we can not use the BREAK dataset (or a model trained on it) as-is with MODULARQA either.

Importantly, however, our approach does not preclude exploiting these decompositions as *cues*, that is, as z for each decomposition step. Combining these question-based decompositions with our generation framework is left for future work.

6.4 Dataset-Specific Parameters

Our approach has the advantage that a *single model* can be applied to both DROP and HotpotQA datasets. Here we explore the impact of training models specific to each dataset.

	DROP	HotpotQA
	EM F1	EM F1
BART		
Per-Dataset	24.2 25.4	39.1 51.8
Single Model	26.7 28.0	37.9 49.0
MODULARQA		
Per-Dataset	84.7 86.2	49.5 63.2
Single Model	86.0 87.5	48.5 61.8

Table 5: A single MODULARQA system can work across both the tasks as well as dataset-specific model trained on each dataset.

As shown in Table 5, MODULARQA with a single set of parameters is comparable to the specific models trained on each individual dataset. Even in this setting, the BART model is unable to learn the discrete reasoning needed by the DROP dataset, showing that our subset of DROP is not trivially solvable by a generative model.

7 Discussion

There are many natural applications of Text Modular Networks to other complex tasks. We next

discuss challenges that might arise when using TMNs in these applications and potential mitigation strategies.

7.1 Non-differentiable Reasoning

Unlike NMNs, our final system communicates between any sub-task function through text. While this enables us to easily combine symbolic functions with neural models, it also makes our system non-differentiable. As a result, our next-question generator or the QA sub-models cannot be directly fine-tuned on the end task using standard gradient-based methods, but reinforcement learning (Williams, 1992) remains promising.

7.2 Better Models for Faster Search

Inference in the MODULARQA system involves sampling multiple possible sub-questions at each step and finding the optimal chain. Generating these questions and answering each question in the chain can result in slow inference (about 10 seconds per question). Further fine-tuning the next-question generator on the end-task may reduce the number of questions that need to be sampled (or one could simply perform greedy search).

7.3 Handling multiple spans

While in theory one should be able to implement TMNs to cover all types of questions, there are some question types currently not covered by our sub-models in MODULARQA. For example, there are many DROP questions that need a list of spans to be extracted and then counted (“How many touchdowns were scored by X in 2nd quarter?”). Due to the lack of any dataset tackling this simple problem, models were not designed to handle this simple task until recently (Hu et al., 2019b; Segal et al., 2019).

Multiple spans are also challenging to extract as the intermediate answers for our sub-task question models. For example, if the answer to the previous question was "3", any set of 3 spans would qualify as valid intermediate answers. We believe these intermediate annotations are still easier to obtain than the decomposition itself. Such intermediate annotations have been collected for DROP recently and have been shown to improve the accuracy of other models as well (Dua et al., 2020).

7.4 Boolean Questions

Compared to these multi-span questions, the space of intermediate answers is really small for Boolean

questions. However, the space of questions even when given the answer is very large. For example, consider q_c ="Are both X and Y musicians?" and the final answer a =no. We know that the answer to one of the sub-questions in the decomposition should be "no" for the final answer to be "no" (by conjunction). However, if we were to generate any relevant Boolean sub-question with "no" as the answer, there is an impractically large space of such questions (even when constrained to the vocabulary: "X", "Y", "musicians"). As a result, most of the generated sub-questions can be very different from the ideal decomposition, e.g., we may generate the sub-question "Do musicians work for X?" that does not help answer the original question.

Similar issues have been observed in semantic parsing where additional weak supervision was needed to handle Boolean questions (Dasigi et al., 2019). One promising way forward is to exploit the similarity between the two sub-questions in the ideal decomposition ("Is X a musician?" and "Is Y a musician?") to guide our sub-question generation.

8 Conclusion

We introduced *Text Modular Networks*, which provide a general-purpose framework that casts complex tasks as *textual* interaction between existing, simpler QA modules. Based upon this conceptual framework, we build MODULARQA, an instantiation of TMNs that can perform multi-hop and discrete numeric reasoning. Empirically, we demonstrate that MODULARQA is significantly stronger than a dataset-agnostic system, while being on-par with other modular dataset-specific approaches. Importantly, MODULARQA provides easy-to-interpret explanations of its reasoning. It is the first system that decomposes DROP questions into textual sub-questions and can be simultaneously applied to both DROP and HotpotQA. We leave several angles, such as covering more question types and more effective learning, as future work.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Aristo team at AI2 for helpful input, Dirk Groeneveld for providing the output of the Quark system for evaluation, and Jonathan Berant, Matt Gardner, and Hanna Hajishirzi for invaluable feedback on initial drafts of this paper.

References

- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Mathqa: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. In *NAACL*, pages 2357–2367.
- Daniel Andor, Luheng He, Kenton Lee, and Emily Pitler. 2019. Giving BERT a calculator: Finding operations and arguments with reading comprehension. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- Jacob Andreas, Marcus Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, and Dan Klein. 2016. Learning to compose neural networks for question answering. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 1545–1554.
- Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. 2013. Semantic Parsing on Freebase from Question-Answer Pairs. In *EMNLP*, pages 1533–1544.
- C. Buck, Jannis Bulian, Massimiliano Ciaramita, Andrea Gesmundo, Neil Houlsby, W. Gajewski, and Wei Wang. 2018. Ask the right questions: Active question reformulation with reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1705.07830.
- Bo Chen, Le Sun, Xianpei Han, and Bo An. 2016. Sentence Rewriting for Semantic Parsing. *Proceedings of ACL*.
- Jifan Chen, Shih-ting Lin, and Greg Durrett. 2019. Multi-hop question answering via reasoning chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02610*.
- Xinyun Chen, Chen Liang, Adams Wei Yu, Denny Zhou, Dawn Song, and Quoc V. Le. 2020. Neural symbolic reader: Scalable integration of distributed and symbolic representations for reading comprehension. In *ICLR*.
- Thomas H Cormen, Charles E Leiserson, Ronald L Rivest, and Clifford Stein. 2009. *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT press.
- Pradeep Dasigi, Matt Gardner, Shikhar Murty, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Eduard Hovy. 2019. Iterative search for weakly supervised semantic parsing. In *NAACL*.
- Daniel Deutsch, Shyam Upadhyay, and Dan Roth. 2019. A General-Purpose Algorithm for Constrained Sequential Inference. In *CoNLL*, pages 482–492.
- Edsger W Dijkstra et al. 1959. A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. *Numerische mathematik*, 1(1):269–271.
- Dheeru Dua, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2020. Benefits of intermediate annotations in reading comprehension. In *ACL*.

- Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. Drop: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. In *NAACL*, pages 2368–2378.
- Yuwei Fang, Siqi Sun, Zhe Gan, Rohit Pillai, Shuohang Wang, and Jing jing Liu. 2019. Hierarchical graph network for multi-hop question answering. *ArXiv*, abs/1911.03631.
- Dirk Groeneveld, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, et al. 2020. A simple yet strong pipeline for hotpotqa. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.06753*.
- Nitish Gupta, Kevin Lin, Dan Roth, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2020. Neural module networks for reasoning over text. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Sanda Harabagiu and Andrew Hickl. 2006. Methods for using textual entailment in open-domain question answering. In *ACL*, pages 905–912.
- Sanda M. Harabagiu, Dan I. Moldovan, Marius Pasca, Mihai Surdeanu, Rada Mihalcea, Roxana Girju, Vasile Rus, V. Finley Lacatusu, Paul Morarescu, and Razvan C. Bunescu. 2001. Answering complex, list and context questions with lcc’s question-answering server. In *TREC*.
- Chris Hokamp and Qun Liu. 2017. Lexically Constrained Decoding for Sequence Generation using Grid Beam Search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.07138*.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *ICLR*.
- J Edward Hu, Huda Khayrallah, Ryan Culkin, Patrick Xia, Tongfei Chen, Matt Post, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019a. Improved Lexically Constrained Decoding for Translation and Monolingual Rewriting. In *NAACL*.
- Minghao Hu, Yuxing Peng, Zhen Huang, and Dongsheng Li. 2019b. A multi-type multi-span network for reading comprehension that requires discrete reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/1908.05514.
- Mohit Iyyer, Wen-tau Yih, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2017. Search-based neural structured learning for sequential question answering. In *ACL*.
- Yichen Jiang and Mohit Bansal. 2019. Self-assembling modular networks for interpretable multi-hop reasoning. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, pages 4464–4474.
- Daniel Khashabi, Snigdha Chaturvedi, Michael Roth, Shyam Upadhyay, and Dan Roth. 2018a. Looking beyond the surface: A challenge set for reading comprehension over multiple sentences. In *NAACL*, pages 252–262.
- Daniel Khashabi, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Dan Roth. 2018b. Question answering as global reasoning over semantic abstractions. In *AAAI*.
- Tushar Khot, Peter Clark, Michal Guerquin, Paul Edward Jansen, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2020. QASC: A dataset for question answering via sentence composition. In *AAAI*.
- Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Peter Clark. 2017. Answering complex questions using open information extraction. In *ACL*, pages 311–316.
- Louis Kirsch, Julius Kunze, and David Barber. 2018. Modular networks: Learning to decompose neural computation. In *NeurIPS*.
- Jayant Krishnamurthy, Pradeep Dasigi, and Matt Gardner. 2017. Neural semantic parsing with type constraints for semi-structured tables. In *EMNLP*.
- Souvik Kundu, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2019. Exploiting explicit paths for multi-hop reading comprehension. In *ACL*.
- Adam Lally, John M Prager, Michael C McCord, Branimir K Boguraev, Siddharth Patwardhan, James Fan, Paul Fodor, and Jennifer Chu-Carroll. 2012. Question analysis: How Watson reads a clue. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 56(3.4):2–1.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*.
- Percy Liang, Michael I Jordan, and Dan Klein. 2013. Learning dependency-based compositional semantics. *Computational Linguistics*, 39(2):389–446.
- Sewon Min, Eric Wallace, Sameer Singh, Matt Gardner, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019a. Compositional questions do not necessitate multi-hop reasoning. In *ACL*.
- Sewon Min, Victor Zhong, Luke S. Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019b. Multi-hop reading comprehension through question decomposition and rescoring. In *ACL*.
- Marvin Minsky. 1988. *Society of mind*. Simon and Schuster.
- Dan I. Moldovan, Sanda M. Harabagiu, Marius Pasca, Rada Mihalcea, Roxana Girju, Richard Goodrum, and Vasile Rus. 2000. The structure and performance of an open-domain question answering system. In *ACL*.
- Arvind Neelakantan, Quoc V Le, Martin Abadi, Andrew McCallum, and Dario Amodei. 2016. Learning a natural language interface with neural programmer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.08945*.

- Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2017. Task-oriented query reformulation with reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1704.04572.
- Ethan Perez, Patrick Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Kyunghyun Cho, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Unsupervised question decomposition for question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09758*.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *EMNLP*.
- Qiu Ran, Yankai Lin, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2019. Numnet: Machine reading comprehension with numerical reasoning. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, pages 2474–2484.
- Kyle Richardson, Jonathan Berant, and Jonas Kuhn. 2018. Polyglot Semantic Parsing in APIs. *Proceedings of NAACL*.
- Clemens Rosenbaum, Tim Klinger, and Matthew Riemer. 2018. Routing networks: Adaptive selection of non-linear functions for multi-task learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Subhro Roy and Dan Roth. 2017. Unit dependency graph and its application to arithmetic word problem solving. In *AAAI*.
- Subhro Roy and Dan Roth. 2018. Mapping to declarative knowledge for word problem solving. *TACL*, 6:159–172.
- Elad Segal, Avia Efrat, M. Shoham, Amir Globerson, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. A simple and effective model for answering multi-span questions. *arXiv: Computation and Language*.
- Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, Oren Etzioni, and Clint Malcolm. 2015. Solving geometry problems: Combining text and diagram interpretation. In *EMNLP*, pages 1466–1476.
- Alon Talmor and Jonathan Berant. 2018. The web as a knowledge-base for answering complex questions. In *NAACL*, pages 641–651.
- Shuohang Wang, Mo Yu, Xiaoxiao Guo, Z. Wang, Tim Klinger, Wei Zhang, S. Chang, G. Tesauero, Bowen Zhou, and Jing Jiang. 2018. R3: Reinforced ranker-reader for open-domain question answering. In *AAAI*.
- Ronald J Williams. 1992. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3-4):229–256.
- Tomer Wolfson, Mor Geva, Ankit Gupta, Matt Gardner, Yoav Goldberg, Daniel Deutch, and Jonathan Berant. 2020. Break it down: A question understanding benchmark. *TACL*, 8:183–198.
- Yunxuan Xiao, Yanru Qu, Lin Qiu, Hao Zhou, Lei Li, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. 2019. Dynamically fused graph network for multi-hop reasoning. In *ACL*.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *EMNLP*.

A Model Settings

Each BART model is trained with the same set of hyper-parameters – batch size of 64, learning rate of $5e-6$, triangular learning rate scheduler with a warmup of 500 steps, and training over 5 epochs. Each RoBERTa model is trained with the same set of hyper-parameters but a smaller batch size of 16. We selected these parameters based on early experiments and did not perform any hyper-parameter tuning thereafter. All the baseline models are trained with their default hyper-parameters provided by the authors.

We always used nucleus sampling to sample sequences from the BART models. To sample the sub-question using the SQuAD sub-question generator, we sampled 5 questions for each step with $p=0.95$ and max question length of 40. To sample the question decompositions during inference, we additionally set $k=10$ to reduce the noise in these questions.

A.1 Training SQuAD Question Generator

We use the SQuAD 2.0 answerable questions to generate the training data for our SQuAD question generator. We use the nouns, verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs (pos tags=[NOUN, VERB, NUM, PROPN, ADJ, RB]) from the question to define the vocabulary hints (after filtering stop words). To simulate the noisy vocabulary, we also add distractor terms with similar pos tags from other questions from the same paragraph. We sample $j \in [2, \dots, 7]$ distractor terms for each question and add them to the vocabulary hints.

A.2 Generating sub-questions

For every step in the reasoning process, we generate 5 questions using nucleus sampling. We select the questions that the corresponding sub-model is able to answer correctly. For each sub-question, we generate 5 questions in the next step (and so on). At the end, we select all the successful question chains (i.e each sub-question was answered by the sub-model to produce the expected answer at each step).

A.3 Selecting Question Decompositions

It is possible that some of these sub-questions, while valid answerable questions, introduce other words mentioned in the paragraph. However, these may not be valid decompositions of the original question. E.g., for the complex question:

"When was the 44th US President born?", the sub-question may state "Who was the 44th President from Hawaii?". While this a valid question with the expected intermediate answer, it introduces irrelevant words that would not be possible for the next-question generator to learn.

To filter out such potentially noisy decompositions, we compute three statistics based on non-stopword overlap. We compute the proportion of new words introduced in a decomposition $u = \{\dots, q_i, a_i, \dots\}$ that were not in the input question or any of the previous answers i.e.

$$\theta(u) = \frac{|\cup_i \{w \in q_i | \neg(w \in qc \text{ or } \exists j < i w \in a_j)\}|}{|\{w \in qc\}|}$$

We also compute the number of words from the input question not covered by the decomposition as μ

$$\mu(u) = \frac{|\{w \in qc | \neg(\exists i w \in q_i)\}|}{|\{w \in qc\}|}$$

We also compute the number of answers ν which were not used in any subsequent question i.e. the sub-question associated with this answer is irrelevant

$$\nu(u) = |\{a_i | \exists w \in a_i, j > i \text{ s.t. } w \in q_j\}|$$

We only select the decompositions where $\theta < 0.3$, $\mu < 0.3$, $\theta + \mu < 0.4$ and $\nu = 0$. To prevent a single question from dominating the training data, we select upto 50 decompositions for any input question. These hyper-parameters were selected early in the development and not fine-tuned for each dataset.

A.4 Inference Parameters

We sample n_i questions in the i^{th} question decomposition step. To ensure sufficient exploration of the search space, we initially sample a larger number of questions but scale them down every step for efficiency. Due to the pipeline nature of our system, it is difficult for our model to recover from any missed question early in the search. We set the number of sampled questions as $n_i = N * r^i$ where $N=10$ and $r = \frac{1}{2}$. For the QA models, we select only the most likely answer.

To score each generated question, we again rely on the same word-overlap statistic used to filter decompositions. We only use the θ metric that captures the number of new words introduced in

	E	G	R	DROP				HotpotQA		
				All	Diff	Comp	Neg	All	Bridge	Comp.
				EM F1	F1	F1	F1	EM F1	EM F1	EM F1
MODULARQA	✓	✓	✓	86.6 87.9	85.2	81.0	96.6	48.5 61.8	50.7 64.9	39.8 49.2
BART	×	✓	×	26.7 28.0	7.7	77.5	12.8	38.0 49.0	40.4 52.9	28.0 33.7
NMN-D†	✓	×	×	71.0 79.1*	–	–	–	–	–	–
NumNet+V2	×	×	×	89.2 90.3	83.0	93.7	96.7	–	–	–
SNMN†	✓	×	×	–	–	–	–	50.0 63.1	48.8 63.8	54.8 60.1
Quark	×	×	×	–	–	–	–	61.7 75.5	62.5 78.1	58.3 64.9

Table 6: Expanded version of the quantitative part of Table 3, reporting both F1 and EM scores in each case. The first three columns, as before, denote qualitative capabilities of each model: whether it can **E**xplain its reasoning, **G**eneralize well to multiple datasets, or **R**e-use existing QA models.

a question chain. The other two metrics are non-monotonic i.e they could go down depending on future questions and answers in the chain. At the end, we use a chain scorer (described next) to score each decomposition chain. While we use the θ metric to guide the search, we primarily rely on the chain score δ to select the right answer. As a result, the final score for a chain u is a weighted combination of these two metrics with higher emphasis on δ

$$\text{score}(u) = \theta(u) + \lambda\delta(u)$$

where $\lambda=10$. δ can only be computed for a complete decomposition and is set to zero for the intermediate steps. Note that higher this score, the worse the chain i.e. we need to find the chain with the lowest score.

A.5 Chain Scorer

To train the scorer, we first collect positive and negative chains by running inference with just the θ metric. For every complete chain, we compute the F1 score of the final answer with the gold answer. If the F1 score exceeds a threshold (0.2 in our case), we assume this chain to be a positive example. We collect such positive and negative chain examples from the training set and then train a RoBERTa model to classify these chains. We use the RoBERTa model’s predicted probability for the negative class as the score δ .

B Additional Results

Table 6 expands upon the quantitative results in Table 3 and reports both F1 and EM (exact match) scores in each setting considered.

C Hints for Complex QA Tasks

To apply Text Modular Networks to any complex QA dataset, we need to be able to extract the hints needed by the sub-task question model. As mentioned earlier, these need not have full coverage or have 100% precision.

C.1 HotpotQA

The questions qc in HotpotQA have two supporting facts: d_1 and d_2 . Additionally they are also partitioned into two classes: Bridge and Comparison questions.

C.1.1 Bridge Questions

There are two forms of bridge questions in HotpotQA:

Composition questions : These questions need to first find an intermediate entity e_1 that is referred by a sub-question in HotpotQA. This intermediate entity points to the final answer through the second sub-question. Generally this intermediate entity is the title entity of the document containing the answer. Say d_2 is the document containing the answer and d_1 is the other document. If we are able to find a span that matches the title of d_2 in d_1 and the answer only appears in d_2 , we assume it to be a composition question. We set e_1 to the span that matches the title of d_2 in d_1 .

For the question vocabulary, we could use the terms from the entire question for both steps. Also the second sub-question will use the answer of the first sub-question, so we add it to the vocabulary too. However, we can reduce some noise by removing the terms that are exclusively appear in the other document. The final hints for this question

are:

$$p_1 = d_1; a_1 = e_1; v_1 = \zeta(qc, d_1, d_2)$$

$$p_2 = d_2; a_2 = a; v_2 = \zeta(qc, d_2, d_1) + e_1$$

where $\zeta(q, d_1, d_2)$ indicates the terms in q that appear in d_2 but not in d_1 .

Conjunction questions : These class of questions do not have any intermediate entity but have two sub-questions with the same answer e.g. “Who is a politician and an actor?”. If the answer appears in both supporting paragraphs, we assume that it is a conjunction question. The hints for such questions are simple:

$$p_1 = d_1; a_1 = a; v_1 = \zeta(qc, d_1, d_2)$$

$$p_2 = d_2; a_2 = a; v_2 = \zeta(qc, d_2, d_1)$$

C.2 Comparison Questions

These questions compare certain attribute between two entities/events mentioned in the question. E.g., “Who is younger: X or Y?”. We identify the two entities e_1 and e_2 in such questions and find dates/numbers that are mentioned in documents. For every n_1, n_2 number/date mentioned in the document d_1 and d_2 respectively, we create the following hints:

$$p_1 = d_1; a_1 = n_1; v_1 = \zeta(qc, d_1, d_2)$$

$$p_2 = d_2; a_2 = n_2; v_2 = \zeta(qc, d_2, d_1)$$

$$p_3 = \phi; a_3 = a; v_3 = [\text{if_then}, n_1, n_2, e_1, e_2]$$

The final set of hints would be used by the calculator generator to create the questions: $\text{if_then}(n_1 > n_2, e_1, e_2)$ and $\text{if_then}(n_1 < n_2, e_1, e_2)$.

C.3 DROP

For the questions in DROP, we first identify the class of question that it may belong to and then generate the appropriate hints. Note that one question can belong to multiple classes and we would generate multiple sets of hints in such cases. The questions qc in DROP have only one associated context p .

C.3.1 Difference Questions

We identify these questions based on the presented of terms indicating a difference such as “before”, “after”, “win by”, etc. Also we check for two dates or numbers in the context such that their difference (in all units) can lead to the final answer. If

these conditions are satisfied, for every pair n_1, n_2 where the difference (in units u) can lead to the final answer, we generate the hints:

$$p_1 = p; a_1 = n_1; v_1 = \Phi(qc)$$

$$p_2 = p; a_2 = n_2; v_2 = \Phi(qc)$$

$$p_3 = \phi; a_3 = a; v_3 = [\text{diff}, n_1, n_2, u]$$

C.3.2 Comparison questions

We identify these questions based on the presented of the pattern: “ques: e_1 or e_2 ”. We handle them in exactly the same way as HotpotQA. Since DROP contexts can have more dates and numbers, we select numbers and dates that are close to the entity mentioned (Gupta et al., 2020).

$$p_1 = p; a_1 = n_1; v_1 = \Phi(\text{ques}) + e_1$$

$$p_2 = p; a_2 = n_2; v_2 = \Phi(\text{ques}) + e_2$$

$$p_3 = \phi; a_3 = a; v_3 = [\text{if_then}, n_1, n_2, e_1, e_2]$$

C.3.3 Negation questions

We identify these questions purely based on the presence of “.* not .*”. For such questions, we only need to find one number n_1 such that the $a = 100 - n_1$. The hints are pretty straightforward too:

$$p_1 = p; a_1 = n_1; v_1 = \Phi(qc)$$

$$p_2 = \phi; a_2 = a; v_2 = [\text{not}, n_1]$$