

# Composing Answer from Multi-spans for Reading Comprehension

Zhuosheng Zhang<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Yiqing Zhang<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Hai Zhao<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Xi Zhou<sup>4</sup>, Xiang Zhou<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

<sup>2</sup>Key Laboratory of Shanghai Education Commission for Intelligent Interaction and Cognitive Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

<sup>3</sup>MoE Key Lab of Artificial Intelligence, AI Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

<sup>4</sup>CloudWalk Technology, Shanghai, China

{zhangzs, zhangyiqing}@sjtu.edu.cn, zhaohai@cs.sjtu.edu.cn,  
{zhouxixi, zhouxixiang}@cloudwalk.cn

## Abstract

This paper presents a novel method to generate answers for non-extraction machine reading comprehension (MRC) tasks whose answers cannot be simply extracted as one span from the given passages. Using a pointer network-style extractive decoder for such type of MRC may result in unsatisfactory performance when the ground-truth answers are given by human annotators or highly re-paraphrased from parts of the passages. On the other hand, using generative decoder cannot well guarantee the resulted answers with well-formed syntax and semantics when encountering long sentences. Therefore, to alleviate the obvious drawbacks of both sides, we propose an answer making-up method from extracted multi-spans that are learned by our model as highly confident  $n$ -gram candidates in the given passage. That is, the returned answers are composed of discontinuous multi-spans but not just one consecutive span in the given passages anymore. The proposed method is simple but effective: empirical experiments on MS MARCO show that the proposed method has a better performance on accurately generating long answers, and substantially outperforms two competitive typical one-span and Seq2Seq baseline decoders.

## 1 Introduction

The task of Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) is to generate or extract an answer for a question according to given passages (Hermann et al. 2015; Chen 2018; Liu et al. 2019; Zhang, Zhao, and Wang 2020). MRC tasks essentially differ from each other according to the form of their required answers. We have two general categories of MRC tasks, extraction and non-extraction, which are thus respectively solved by extractive and generative decoders in MRC models.

So far, the extraction-style MRC tasks along with their datasets and leaderboards have been well-developed (Hermann et al. 2015; Hill et al. 2015; Rajpurkar et al. 2016; Hu et al. 2019; Rajpurkar, Jia, and Liang 2018; Trischler et al. 2017). As the answer for this type is shown as a span

appearing in the given passage, sometimes, such an MRC task is called span-style. Usually, to solve such type of MRC problem, the model needs to predict the positions of the answer in the given passages. Recently, there comes a series of MRC tasks whose answers cannot be directly extracted from the given passages (He et al. 2018; Kociský et al. 2018; Nguyen et al. 2016). For example, MS MARCO (Nguyen et al. 2016) requires the MRC models to generate an answer for the question according to the given redundant passages. Answering its questions requires understanding and summarizing the salient information entailed in the passages.

Answers in extraction or span-style MRC tasks (Rajpurkar et al. 2016; Rajpurkar, Jia, and Liang 2018; Trischler et al. 2017; Joshi et al. 2017; Dunn et al. 2017) are located somewhere of its given passage; therefore, pointer network as a typical extractive decoder (Vinyals, Fortunato, and Jaitly 2015; Hu et al. 2019; Pang et al. 2019) for such an answer position prediction has been widely employed. As the point network offers an effective and straightforward MRC modeling way, it may even support non-extraction MRC tasks (Nguyen et al. 2016; Choi et al. 2018; Reddy, Chen, and Manning 2019). The rationale is that the exacted spans from the passage can guarantee its expression with well-formed syntax and semantics to a certain extent, this type of decoders still most fit those MRC tasks whose answers are in continuous one-span form. However, real-world answers usually distribute as discontinuous parts of the passage, using pointer network or its derivative solutions will have to face incomplete answer or redundant words. Therefore, only extracting one span from passages as the answer is inconvenient and insufficient for more and more MRC tasks, which motivates researchers to turn to generative decoders when facing complicated non-extraction MRC tasks. Generative decoders like Seq2Seq generate answer word by word, in which the words may not have to appear in the given passage. However, generative decoders often perform poorly as the generated answer may be too long to maintain well-formed syntax and semantics.

To alleviate the drawbacks of both types of decoders, in this paper, we propose a novel solution to the non-extraction MRC tasks by making up answers from extracted spans. Excluding the working mode of the generative decoder, we first extract several shorter spans in the given passage. It is expected that more well-formed syntax and semantics in short

\*Corresponding author. This paper was partially supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China (No. 2017YFB0304100), Key Projects of National Natural Science Foundation of China (U1836222 and 61733011), Huawei-SJTU long term AI project, Cutting-edge Machine reading comprehension and language model.

spans can be kept, and the problems of redundant words can be alleviated. Later, by composing multiple discontinuous spans into the final answer, the missing parts can also be relieved.

In detail, our model learns to score every word in the given passage for how much they are likely in the expected answer, then calculates the score of a candidate span from the words' scores. The candidate spans are generated in two different ways. One is using a fixed-length sliding window in terms of  $n$ -gram forms, the other limits the candidate spans as syntactic constituents. All the possible candidate spans will be picked to compose the final answer in their original order in the passage. Experiments on MS MARCO (Nguyen et al. 2016) dataset show that the proposed method substantially outperforms two competitive typical one-span and Seq2Seq baseline decoders, and has a better performance on accurately generating long answers.

## 2 Related Work

With the development of deep learning, the research of machine reading comprehension (MRC) has made great progress. At the same time, various types of reading comprehension tasks require suitable targeted solutions.

### 2.1 MRC Tasks

MRC Tasks mostly differ from each other by their answering forms. According to the answer forms, MRC tasks can be roughly categorized into two types, extraction and non-extraction.<sup>1</sup>

Extraction or MRC span-style tasks like SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al. 2016) are required to select a short span from the given passage as the answer to the given question. Furthermore, some harder MRC tasks appeared. SQuAD2 (Rajpurkar, Jia, and Liang 2018) asks models to judge whether the question is answerable according to the given passage, and hotpotQA (Yang et al. 2018) needs the model to find and reason over multiple supporting documents.

Non-extraction style MRC tasks like Dureader (He et al. 2018) and MS MARCO (Nguyen et al. 2016) are required to generate an answer according to the given context and question. It releases the convenient constraint that the answer is a span in the given passage(s), which makes it harder to get the final answer. These tasks provide several passages for a question, and the given passages do not necessarily contain all the clues to answer the question, which increases the difficulty. However, for these non-extraction tasks, the answers can still be obtained through the direct though incomplete clues from the given passage, which may be handled by generative models. Thus these tasks are called generative style MRC sometimes.

In addition, there also exist non-generative style MRC tasks. The cloze-style MRC like CNN/ Daily Mail (Hermann

<sup>1</sup>There is a latest progress involving reasoning, e.g., WikiHop (Welbl, Stenetorp, and Riedel 2018) and HotpotQA (Yang et al. 2018) provide several passages and ask models to do multi-hop reasoning in the given passages. However, in this work, we focus on handling the writing form of the answer rather than extra model ability.

et al. 2015) is to predict a masked word in a given passage.<sup>2</sup> Further, the span extraction task (Rajpurkar et al. 2016; Rajpurkar, Jia, and Liang 2018; Trischler et al. 2017; Joshi et al. 2017; Dunn et al. 2017) requires to predict the answer span from the given passage. The multi-choice style MRC like RACE (Lai et al. 2017) requires models to choose a correct answer from a set of answer candidate options.

In this paper, we focus on the generative style MRC, which, though it belongs to the type of non-extraction, still keeps strong enough answer clues inside the given passage.

### 2.2 Different Decoders of MRC

An MRC system commonly consists of an encoder and a decoder (Zhang, Zhao, and Wang 2020). The former adopts contextualized language models (CLMs), and the latter should be carefully selected according to the answer form of the task type, which is our major focus in this paper.

For extraction MRC, pointer network (Vinyals, Fortunato, and Jaitly 2015) is widely used, it works by indicating the start and end positions of the answer in the given passage. For generative MRC, we have a diverse selection of its decoder. Although the answer is not bound to appear in the passage(s), the pointer network can still be used to extract a possible span to some extent (Wang et al. 2018). On the other hand, researchers also seek help from generative models such as Seq2Seq (Sutskever, Vinyals, and Le 2014) and Pointer-Generator Networks (See, Liu, and Manning 2017), which help generate answers directly. Tan et al. (2018) developed an extraction-then-synthesis framework to synthesize answers from extraction results, which used a pointer network to extract span from a passage, and then adopted a Seq2Seq model (Sutskever, Vinyals, and Le 2014) to generate answers. (Nishida et al. 2019) proposed to generate answers with Pointer-Generator Networks (See, Liu, and Manning 2017), which adopted a copy mechanism (He et al. 2017) to selectively choose an important entity directly from the passage or a word from the vocabulary in each prediction step. The generative decoders might suffer from the worse generation quality when the generative answer becomes too long.

Different from previous work that mainly focused on introducing generative mechanisms, in this work, we instead propose a novel non-generative decoder to fully exploit the results from the extractive decoder. The answer in our model is obtained from multiple spans through a composing way. For the technical decoder design, our method adopts a syntactic parse tree, which is different from any existing extractive decoder. As the example shown in Figure 1. Our method is well applicable for advanced MRC tasks, whose questions are supposed to be not merely answered by a single span extraction, in general. These questions often require reasoning, information integration, and coreference resolution over the passage. The answers are often composed of discontinuous multi-spans.

<sup>2</sup>Strictly speaking, the cloze style MRC is a special type, as the masked word may be given either appearing in the passage or a list of candidate options.




Figure 1: Overview of our model.

### 3 Method

#### 3.1 Input and Encoder

The MRC task can be formalized as the scenario that given a passage  $P$  and question  $Q$ , the model should return an answer  $A$ . Most MRC models are generally composed of two core modules, a front-end as encoder which takes passage and question as input to form effective representation, and a backend as decoder which takes a task-specific process to determine the forms of answers. Recent MRC systems often share a similar option by adopting pre-trained CLMs (such as BERT) as the encoder but still differs from the decoder part. Following the general model design, the overview of our model is illustrated in Figure 1.

Different from existing pointer network modeling, in which only two boundary words for one span in the passage need to learn and predict, our model is to compose the answer from multiple (discontinuous) spans. Thus, we first need to label the answer spans in the text of passage according to the gold answer. The labeling is done word by word through simulating the computation of Levenshtein Distance between the answer and the passage, during which each matched word in the passage is labeled as 1, and the rest as 0. We obtain a gold label vector  $S_G$  for the passage to be learned by our model. The predicted answer will also be composed by simply concatenating all the predicted spans in their original order in the passage.

For a sequence of tokens  $T \in \mathbb{R}^{|T| \times d}$ , we adopt an encoder to obtain the contextualized representation,

$$C = \text{Encoder}(T), C \in \mathbb{R}^{|T| \times h}, \quad (1)$$

where  $h$  is the hidden size,  $d$  is word embedding size, and  $|\cdot|$  indicates the sequence length.

Following the common setting of CLMs for MRC, our encoder input  $T$  is the concatenation of question  $Q$  and passage  $P$ , and therefore the output of the encoder  $C$  is with a shape of  $(|Q| + |P|) \times h$ .

#### 3.2 Decoder

The decoder part of our model is simple enough that consists of one sigmoid layer<sup>3</sup> which maps the contextualized representation  $C$  into word score  $S_w \in \mathbb{R}^{|P|+|Q|}$ . Our decoder is hereafter called multi-span decoder to easily distinguish from the pointer network decoder, which only extracts one span as the answer.

After the decoder predicts the scores for every word in the passage, we can straightforwardly take all words whose scores  $S_w$  are larger than a predefined threshold  $\Theta$  as the predicted answer spans for composing the final answer. In other words, the threshold is set to decide the number of spans to use in the final answer. However, our early empirical results show that such a simplified process may result in either too many redundant words or too few words for constructing a complete answer no matter how carefully we tune the threshold  $\Theta$ . We attribute such a negative result to the ignorance of answer spans by this word-level decoding strategy. Thus, we adopt a multi-word (span) based decoding strategy instead.

**$n$ -gram Spans** We generally consider all  $n$ -gram spans for all  $n \leq n_{max}$  in the passage as the candidate answer spans, only if the span score  $s_{n\text{-gram}} > \Theta$ . To apply a penalty to too long  $n$ -gram spans, we let the span score is computed by

$$s_{n\text{-gram}} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \log(S_{w_i}) \right) / n, \quad (2)$$

where  $S_{w_i}$  is the score of word  $w_i$  in the  $n$ -gram. We set a ratio threshold denoted as  $\alpha$ , which indicates the maximal length ratio with respect to the sentence length. For example,  $\alpha=0.2$  means all phrases which are longer than 1/5 of the respective sentence length will be discarded for answer

<sup>3</sup>Pointer network usually adopts an MLP with the last layer as softmax. However, our preliminary experimental results show that softmax layer may result in too small scores (i.e., score vanishing) for our multi-span scoring, the adopted sigmoid function will alleviate such a difficulty.

**Sentence:** *The Volcano forecast for Apr 12 is 52 degrees and Patchy light rain.*

n-gram spans

parameter: n-gram size = 5

candidate spans:

'The Volcano forecast for Apr',  
 'Volcano forecast for Apr 12',  
 'forecast for Apr 12 is',  
 'for Apr 12 is 52',  
 'Apr 12 is 52 degrees',  
 '12 is 52 degrees and',  
 'is 52 degrees and Patchy',  
 '52 degrees and Patchy light',  
 'degrees and Patchy light rain'.

syntactic spans

parameter:  $\alpha = 0.6$

candidate spans:

'The Volcano forecast',  
 'The Volcano forecast for Apr 12',  
 'for Apr 12',  
 'Apr 12',  
 '52 degrees',  
 'Patchy light rain',  
 '52 degrees and Patchy light rain'.




Figure 2: An example of candidate spans picked with  $n$ -gram and syntactic spans.

Question	<i>How much does a pint of blood weight in lbs?</i>
One-span	<i>How much does one pint of water weigh? 1 US pint of water is 473 gm. 1 Imperial pint is 568 gm. In pounds, a US pint Span-style will weigh 1.044 pounds 8 US pints (1 US gallon) = about 8.35 pounds A pint (16 fluid ounce s) does not exactly equal</i>
Generative	<i>one pint water 1.044 pounds weight.</i>
Multi-span (Our method)	<i>How much does one pint of water weigh? 1 US pint of water is 473 gm. 1 Imperial pint is 568 gm. In pounds, a US pint Span-style will weigh 1.044 pounds 8 US pints (1 US gallon) = about 8.35 pounds A pint (16 fluid ounce s) does not exactly equal</i>
Gold answer	<i>A pint of blood will weigh 1.044 pounds.</i>

Table 1: An example of one-span/generative decoder and our multi-span decoder. Picked or generated answer spans are marked in red in the passage.

	Train	Dev	Test
Full	808,731	101,093	101,092
Answerable	475,049	25,578	29,999

Table 2: Statistics of two versions of MS MARCO datasets.

construction. Note that the long  $n$ -gram penalty is also affected by the way how to select the targeted  $n$ -gram. In our current design, an  $n$ -gram will be measured by the score as a whole and then chosen, instead of token by token.<sup>4</sup>

Though scoring span-level instead of word-level has alleviated the fragmentation problem for composing answer, it still has an obvious shortcoming as not every picked  $n$ -grams may be a meaningful phrase in human language, sometimes an unreasonable  $n$ -gram may be chosen as a part of answer only because most of the words in it have high enough scores. Such a shortcoming will become even worse when the  $n$ -gram size becomes large.

**Syntactic Spans** To limit the  $n$ -gram spans for scoring

<sup>4</sup>For the nested overlapping  $n$ -gram case, we calculate each  $n$ -gram span score individually; the one with a higher score will be chosen.

with linguistic meaning, we introduce a syntactic constituent parse tree to pick reasonable spans from passages.

Using a pre-trained parser may give a constituent parse tree for each input sentence. Then, each subtree in the parse tree can determine a phrase or constituent in the sentence, whose length may vary from 1 to the sentence length. The syntactic spans are also score by Eq. (2).

Figure 2 shows the example of  $n$ -gram spans picked by two strategies.

### 3.3 Training

Our model's training target is the gold labeling score vector  $S_G \in \mathbb{R}^{|P| \times 1}$  according to our re-labeling the passage by matching the gold answer. We adopt a square loss between  $S_G$  and the predicted score vector  $S_W$  as  $Loss = \|S_G - S_W\|_2^2$ .

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Dataset

Our experiments are conducted on MS MARCO (Nguyen et al. 2016),<sup>5</sup> which contains 1,010,916 questions sampled

<sup>5</sup><http://www.msmarco.org/>

from Bing’s search query logs and 82,669 completely human rewritten generated answers. Ten passages are provided for answering a question, and not every passage contains clues for answering the question. There are also non-answerable questions in the dataset, which means all the given passages do not contain any helpful clue to answer the question.

To let the evaluation over our proposed method have a specific focus, we extract an answerable subset of MS MARCO for our main evaluation, which includes all answerable questions and question-related passages. Thus for most experiments in this paper, the passage ranker as another extra factor is not necessary then to avoid additional influential factors. In addition, we split the official development set into two parts to be our development (25,578 question-passage pairs) and test (29,999 question-passage pairs) sets for evaluating our model. Table 2 shows the statistics of the new training, development, and test sets together with the full MS MARCO dataset.<sup>6</sup>

## 4.2 Experiment Settings

Following the common practice on MRC modeling, we use the pre-trained BERT model as our encoder with the original BERT’s vocabulary and word embedding (Devlin et al. 2019). We basically follow the default settings of BERT for fine-tuning.<sup>7</sup> The learning rate is set to  $5 \times 10^{-5}$ , and the hidden size is 512. The optimizer is the AdamW. Limited by our computational resources, for all the experiments, we use the BERT-base model, which contains a 12-layers Transformer. We fine-tune 3 epochs on 2 NVIDIA Tesla P40s with batch size 48. We follow the self-attentive parser (Kitaev and Klein 2018) for giving syntactic constituency parse trees of sentences.<sup>8</sup> NLTK sentence tokenization tool is used to split the given passage into several sentences.<sup>9</sup>

The average number of candidate spans of each question is 18. In contrast, the average number of ground-truth answers is 16. We find that they are quite close, which also indicates that the  $n$ -gram spans well match the gold answers in length.

Following MS MARCO convention, the evaluating metrics include BLEU1-4 and ROUGE-L. The official evaluation script provided by MS MARCO is used for our evaluation.

## 4.3 Experiment Results

**One-span and generative vs. multi-span** We take two types of baseline decoders for our comparison. (1) One-span decoder. As MS MARCO’s ground-truth answers may not appear as a single span in the given-passages, we enumerate

<sup>6</sup>There is a slight difference with the original statistics, because some MS MARCO questions may have two or more supportive passages as answering evidence, but we only take one passage according to our needs.

<sup>7</sup>The code of our method is available at [Anonymous](https://github.com/anonymous).

<sup>8</sup>To investigate the influence of parsing quality, we downgraded the parsing results. Our model results are quite modest unless facing disastrous parsing errors (> 80%). The model can often benefit from satisfactory parsers in most languages.

<sup>9</sup><http://www.nltk.org>.

Model	BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-3	BLEU-4	ROUGE-L
Seq2Seq	12.0	11.0	8.5	6.0	15.1
BART	38.3	36.0	34.5	33.7	49.1
one-span	46.4	43.8	42.3	41.3	51.2
$n$ -gram <sub>2,0.5</sub>	57.7	53.3	50.5	48.4	61.2
$n$ -gram <sub>4,0.5</sub>	53.4	48.9	46.2	44.1	59.1
syn <sub>1.0,0.5</sub>	<b>57.7</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>62.0</b>

Table 3: The result of our model on test set. The subscript of  $n$ -gram indicates the parameters  $n_{max}-\Theta$ , and the subscript of  $syn$  denotes the parameters  $\alpha-\Theta$ , respectively.

all possible spans with the highest ROUGE-L score computed with the ground-truth answer as the training target and use pointer network to predict it. The same BERT-base model is used as an encoder, and a two-layer MLP is used to predict the answer’s start and end positions. (2) Generative decoder. We also use the same BERT-base model as the encoder, and the Seq2Seq decoder described in Sutskever, Vinyals, and Le (2014) is used to generate the answers. For training, the source text is the concatenation of passage and question, and the target text is ground-truth answers. Besides the LSTM-based backbone for the Seq2Seq model, we also compare the results using the more stronger model BART (Lewis et al. 2020), which is a pre-trained Transformer-based denoising autoencoder. An example of comparing the effectiveness of one-span, generative decoder, and our multi-span decoder is shown in Table 1.

As shown in Table 3, our multi-span decoders in terms of proper span settings perform better than one-span decoder and much better than generative (Seq2Seq) decoder on all the evaluating metrics.

For our  $n$ -gram span decoders, they generally give better results than one-span decoder for both types of scores, let alone the generative decoder. In the meantime, the syntactic span decoder for the given settings performs better than the one-span or  $n$ -gram span decoders here in terms of both metrics, BLEU and ROUGE-L, which shows the superiority of selecting  $n$ -gram for answer composing according to the syntactic parse tree.

**Different  $n_{max}$  and  $\Theta$  for  $n$ -gram span decoding** Figure 3 lists  $n$ -gram span decoding results on dev set for different threshold  $n$ -gram sizes  $n_{max}$  and  $\Theta$ . When we fix the threshold  $\Theta$ , the results show that  $n_{max}=2$  gives peak performance in both BLEU scores and ROUGE-L. The change of  $n$ -gram size limit has a great influence on BLEU scores. However, ROUGE-L is relatively stable when  $n$ -gram size is larger than 2. We attribute the results to that setting  $n_{max}$  to 2 lets our multi-span decoder mostly match true phrases in the real language whose lengths are mostly around 2.

When we fix  $n_{max}$  as 2, different values of  $\Theta$  show contrary impacts over BLEU scores and ROUGE-L by comparing the  $\Theta$  values between 0.5 and 0.7. The former gives the highest ROUGE-L, while the latter provides the most top BLEU scores.<sup>10</sup> Such results show that tuning  $\Theta$  may help

<sup>10</sup>Note that the BLEU score more focuses on precision, and




Figure 3: The performance of  $n$ -gram span decoder with different  $\Theta$  and  $n$ -gram sizes  $n_{max}$ .




Figure 4: The performance of syntactic span decoder with different  $\Theta$  and  $\alpha$ .

us balance the scores between BLEU and ROUGE-L.

**Different  $\Theta$  for syntactic span decoding** Figure 4 (a) illustrates syntactic span decoding results on dev set for different threshold  $\Theta$ . As we can see, all BLEU scores are sensitive to the  $\Theta$  value. For example, BLEU-1 drops over 0.1 when  $\Theta$  changes from 0.7 to 0.8. However, ROUGE-L changes less drastically with different  $\Theta$ . The ROUGE-L and BLEU scores reach the peaks when the  $\Theta$  value is 0.5 and 0.7, respectively.

**Maximum length ratio of syntactic spans** The ratio threshold  $\alpha$  controls the maximal span (phrase) length for the syntactic span decoder. We use the product of the  $\alpha$  and sentence length to restrict the range of spans so that the maximal length can change flexibly for different sized sentences. Usually, longer sentences may include longer phrases, and a higher maximal length will help pick up these useful long phrases.

The performance with different  $\alpha$  on dev set is showed in Figure 4 (b). When the value of  $\alpha$  increases, we see that BLEU-1 and BLEU-2 scores slightly decline and BLEU-3,

ROUGE-L cares more about the recall, a higher BLEU might lead to a decay of ROUGE-L, i.e., a best BLEU model may not give the best ROUGE-L.

	$n$ -gram span	syntactic span
Speed	13998.68	4.17
Ratio	3356.9	1.0

Table 4: Decoding speed of two multi-span decoders. The number of speed means the amount of question-passage pairs processed per second.

BLEU-4 and ROUGE-L increase. As BLEU-4 and BLEU-3 scores are more valuable metrics for measuring on longer  $n$ -grams, such results indicate that syntactic span decoder generally gives better performance with larger  $\alpha$ .

**Decoding speed of  $n$ -gram and syntactic spans** Table 4 compares decoding speed of  $n$ -gram and syntactic spans. Decoding speed is calculated by the amount of question-passage pairs that decoder can process per second. As syntactic span decoder needs a preprocessing of syntactic parsing,<sup>11</sup> which seriously slows down its speed. By contrast,  $n$ -gram span decoder thus runs thousands of times faster.

<sup>11</sup>Our adopted syntactic parser is especially less efficient though with high accuracy.






Figure 5: Results on different types of answers and statistic of percentage of span answers and generative answers.

**Performance on one-span and generative answers.** Empirical statistics on non-extraction MRC datasets show that there are still ground-truth answers that entirely appear as one span in the given passage, which is thus called one-span answers, and the others are called generative answers. We compare the performance on one-span and generative answers in the test set with the syntactic span decoder in Figure 5. As we can see, 25.6% answers are one-span and all evaluating scores on them are much higher than those on generative ones. Meanwhile, these results show that our multi-span decoder may well handle one-span answers even though it is originally designed for the general multi-span cases.

**Performance of different length answers.** We give syntactic span decoder’s scores for different sized answers on the test set in Figure 6. The result curves demonstrate that the longer the answer is, the better our decoder performs. Especially, our syntactic span decoder gives the highest scores in both BLEU and ROUGE-L for answer length 21-25 and nearly the highest scores for all answers, which are longer than 25. As long answers are more possibly composed of multiple short spans, for which our model is right designed, it may explain such the-longer-the-better. On the other hand, our decoder performs poorly for answer length 0-5. We examine such short answer cases and find that most of them are ones like ‘YES’ and ‘NO’, which do not usually occur in the given passage and thus cannot be composed by our decoder.

#### 4.4 Results on Full MS MARCO Dataset

Table 5 shows our results from our syntactic decoder with the best settings on the full MS MARCO Q&A task’s dev set compared with the published state-of-the-art system (Nishida et al. 2019).<sup>12</sup> As the complete MS MARCO Q&A task provides several passages for one question, which needs an extra passage selection or ranking module, we simply re-implement the Passage Ranker described in Nishida et al. (2019). Then our model gives the answer according to the highest-score passage. If the highest-scored passage does not receive a score exceeding a predefined threshold, the question will be directly targeted as non-answerable.

<sup>12</sup>Following the leaderboard of MS MARCO, only BLEU-1 and ROUGE-L are used for official evaluation.




Figure 6: Syntactic span decoders on different sized answers.

Model	BLEU-1	ROUGE-L
BiDAF (Seo et al. 2017)	23.96	10.64
Published SOTA (Nishida et al. 2019)	42.37	<b>50.93</b>
Ours	<b>44.53</b>	44.32

Table 5: Comparison on the full MS MARCO Q&A task.

The scores on the full dataset is from our strong enough multi-span decoder and a relatively weak passage ranker.<sup>13</sup> Although the evaluation on the full dataset is not only significantly determined by answer generator as our focus in this paper, but also by passage selection strategy and encoder, our model equipped with a baseline encoder and simplified implementations still yields comparable BLEU-1 scores as the state-of-the-art model with both highly optimized encoder and passage selection methods. The benefit has to come from our multi-span decoder, especially for better handling of long answers according to our analysis above.

## 5 Conclusion

For generative machine reading comprehension, previous work struggled in choosing a one-span extractive decoder or loose Seq2Seq decoder. Therefore in this work, we propose a novel multi-span decoding method to compromise such a dilemma by inspired that even generative answers can be composed of discontinuous multiple spans in the given passages. In detail, our proposed model determines candidate spans in the passage, and then all the candidate spans are connected together with their appearance order in the original passage to compose the final answer. Experiment results show that our model outperforms mainstream one-span/generative decoders on the MS MARCO benchmark. Especially, our models have a better performance on accurately generating long answers.

<sup>13</sup>The passage selection module and encoder from the SOTA model have shown hard to re-implement which leads to a relatively lower score on the full dataset.

## References

- Chen, D. 2018. *Neural Reading Comprehension and Beyond*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Choi, E.; He, H.; Iyyer, M.; Yatskar, M.; Yih, W.-t.; Choi, Y.; Liang, P.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2018. QuAC: Question Answering in Context. In *EMNLP*, 2174–2184.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT 2019*, 4171–4186.
- Dunn, M.; Sagun, L.; Higgins, M.; Guney, V. U.; Cirik, V.; and Cho, K. 2017. SearchQA: A new Q&A dataset augmented with context from a search engine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05179*.
- He, S.; Liu, C.; Liu, K.; and Zhao, J. 2017. Generating Natural Answers by Incorporating Copying and Retrieving Mechanisms in Sequence-to-Sequence Learning. In *ACL 2017*, 199–208.
- He, W.; Liu, K.; Liu, J.; Lyu, Y.; Zhao, S.; Xiao, X.; Liu, Y.; Wang, Y.; Wu, H.; She, Q.; Liu, X.; Wu, T.; and Wang, H. 2018. DuReader: a Chinese Machine Reading Comprehension Dataset from Real-world Applications. In *ACL 2018*, 37–46.
- Hermann, K. M.; Kociský, T.; Grefenstette, E.; Espeholt, L.; Kay, W.; Suleyman, M.; and Blunsom, P. 2015. Teaching Machines to Read and Comprehend. In *NIPS 2015*, 1693–1701.
- Hill, F.; Bordes, A.; Chopra, S.; and Weston, J. 2015. The Goldilocks Principle: Reading Children’s Books with Explicit Memory Representations. *CoRR* abs/1511.02301.
- Hu, M.; Wei, F.; Peng, Y.; Huang, Z.; Yang, N.; and Li, D. 2019. Read + Verify: Machine Reading Comprehension with Unanswerable Questions. In *AAAI 2019*, 6529–6537.
- Joshi, M.; Choi, E.; Weld, D. S.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2017. TriviaQA: A Large Scale Distantly Supervised Challenge Dataset for Reading Comprehension. In *ACL*, 1601–1611.
- Kitaev, N.; and Klein, D. 2018. Constituency Parsing with a Self-Attentive Encoder. In *ACL 2018*, 2676–2686.
- Kociský, T.; Schwarz, J.; Blunsom, P.; Dyer, C.; Hermann, K. M.; Melis, G.; and Grefenstette, E. 2018. The NarrativeQA Reading Comprehension Challenge. *TACL 2018* vol. 6: 317–328.
- Lai, G.; Xie, Q.; Liu, H.; Yang, Y.; and Hovy, E. H. 2017. RACE: Large-scale ReAding Comprehension Dataset From Examinations. In *EMNLP 2017*, 785–794.
- Lewis, M.; Liu, Y.; Goyal, N.; Ghazvininejad, M.; Mohamed, A.; Levy, O.; Stoyanov, V.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2020. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In *ACL*, 7871–7880.
- Liu, S.; Zhang, X.; Zhang, S.; Wang, H.; and Zhang, W. 2019. Neural machine reading comprehension: Methods and trends. *Applied Sciences* 9(18): 3698.
- Nguyen, T.; Rosenberg, M.; Song, X.; Gao, J.; Tiwary, S.; Majumder, R.; and Deng, L. 2016. MS MARCO: A Human Generated Machine Reading Comprehension Dataset. In *NIPS 2016*, Vol–1773.
- Nishida, K.; Saito, I.; Nishida, K.; Shinoda, K.; Otsuka, A.; Asano, H.; and Tomita, J. 2019. Multi-style Generative Reading Comprehension. In *ACL 2019*, 2273–2284.
- Pang, L.; Lan, Y.; Guo, J.; Xu, J.; Su, L.; and Cheng, X. 2019. HAS-QA: Hierarchical Answer Spans Model for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *AAAI 2019*, 6875–6882.
- Rajpurkar, P.; Jia, R.; and Liang, P. 2018. Know What You Don’t Know: Unanswerable Questions for SQuAD. In *ACL 2018*, 784–789.
- Rajpurkar, P.; Zhang, J.; Lopyrev, K.; and Liang, P. 2016. SQuAD: 100, 000+ Questions for Machine Comprehension of Text. In *EMNLP 2016*, 2383–2392.
- Reddy, S.; Chen, D.; and Manning, C. D. 2019. CoQA: A Conversational Question Answering Challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7: 249–266.
- See, A.; Liu, P. J.; and Manning, C. D. 2017. Get To The Point: Summarization with Pointer-Generator Networks. In *ACL 2017*, 1073–1083.
- Seo, M. J.; Kembhavi, A.; Farhadi, A.; and Hajishirzi, H. 2017. Bidirectional Attention Flow for Machine Comprehension. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017*.
- Sutskever, I.; Vinyals, O.; and Le, Q. V. 2014. Sequence to Sequence Learning with Neural Networks. In *NIPS 2014*, 3104–3112.
- Tan, C.; Wei, F.; Yang, N.; Du, B.; Lv, W.; and Zhou, M. 2018. S-Net: From Answer Extraction to Answer Synthesis for Machine Reading Comprehension. In *AAAI*, 5940–5947.
- Trischler, A.; Wang, T.; Yuan, X.; Harris, J.; Sordani, A.; Bachman, P.; and Suleman, K. 2017. NewsQA: A Machine Comprehension Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, 191–200.
- Vinyals, O.; Fortunato, M.; and Jaitly, N. 2015. Pointer Networks. In *NIPS 2015*, 2692–2700.
- Wang, Y.; Liu, K.; Liu, J.; He, W.; Lyu, Y.; Wu, H.; Li, S.; and Wang, H. 2018. Multi-Passage Machine Reading Comprehension with Cross-Passage Answer Verification. In *ACL 2018*, 1918–1927.
- Welbl, J.; Stenetorp, P.; and Riedel, S. 2018. Constructing Datasets for Multi-hop Reading Comprehension Across Documents. *TACL* 6: 287–302.
- Yang, Z.; Qi, P.; Zhang, S.; Bengio, Y.; Cohen, W. W.; Salakhutdinov, R.; and Manning, C. D. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering. In *EMNLP 2018*, 2369–2380.
- Zhang, Z.; Zhao, H.; and Wang, R. 2020. Machine Reading Comprehension: The Role of Contextualized Language Models and Beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06249*.