

IDIAPers @ Causal News Corpus 2022: Efficient Causal Relation Identification Through a Prompt-based Few-shot Approach*

Sergio Burdisso^{*,1,2}, Juan Zuluaga-Gomez^{1,3}, Esaú Villatoro-Tello^{1,5}, Martin Fajcik^{1,4}
Muskaan Singh¹, Pavel Smrz⁴, Petr Motlicek¹

¹Idiap Research Institute, Martigny, Switzerland

²Universidad Nacional de San Luis (UNSL), San Luis, Argentina

³Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland

⁴Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Republic

⁵Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Unidad Cuajimalpa, Mexico City, Mexico

*corresponding author: sergio.burdisso@idiap.ch

Abstract

In this paper, we describe our participation in the subtask 1 of CASE-2022, Event Causality Identification with Casual News Corpus. We address the Causal Relation Identification (CRI) task by exploiting a set of simple yet complementary techniques for fine-tuning language models (LMs) on a small number of annotated examples (i.e., a *few-shot* configuration). We follow a prompt-based prediction approach for fine-tuning LMs in which the CRI task is treated as a masked language modeling problem (MLM). This approach allows LMs natively pre-trained on MLM problems to directly generate textual responses to CRI-specific prompts. We compare the performance of this method against ensemble techniques trained on the entire dataset. Our best-performing submission was trained only with 256 instances per class, a small portion of the entire dataset, and yet was able to obtain the second best precision (0.82), third best accuracy (0.82), and an F1-score (0.85) very close to what was reported by the winner team (0.86).

1 Introduction

Causal relation identification aims to predict whether or not there exists a cause-effect relation between a pair of events mentioned in a given text. For example, in the sentence “*Protests spread to 15 towns and resulted in the destruction of property*”, the automatic causal identification system must be able to realize that there is cause-effect relation between the events “*protest*” and “*destruction*”.

Hence, understanding causal relations within a text is an essential aspect of natural language processing (NLP) and understanding (NLU) (Ayyanar et al., 2019a; Li et al., 2021; Tan et al., 2022b). Once the causal information is identified within a

text, such knowledge becomes beneficial for many other downstream NLP tasks, e.g., Information Extraction, Question Answering, Text Summarization (Ayyanar et al., 2019a; Man et al., 2022). However, due to the ambiguity and diversity in written documents, causality identification is not easy and remains a challenging problem.

The Event Causality Identification with Causal News Corpus (CASE-2022) shared task addresses this problem on a recently created corpus named the Causal News Corpus (CNC) (Tan et al., 2022a). Contrary to previous existing causality corpora, the CNC dataset, manually annotated by experts, incorporates a broader set of causal linguistic constructions, i.e., not only limited to explicit constructions, resulting in a more challenging dataset.

In this paper, we describe our followed methodology for addressing the causal event classification shared task (subtask 1) during the CASE-2022 competition¹. Our primary method, based on a *few-shot* configuration, follows a prompt-based prediction approach for fine-tuning the language model. The intuitive idea of this approach is to allow the language model (LM) to directly auto-complete natural language prompts. Following this technique, we leverage the LM’s knowledge and let it decide the correct label of the input sequence. Additionally, we evaluate the performance of ensemble techniques trained using the entire dataset available. Our results demonstrate that our few-shot, prompt-based, fine-tuning approach can generalize well even when using as few as 256 samples per class for training, outperforming ensemble techniques trained with the entire dataset, as well as most of other teams’ submissions.

¹We refer the reader to our standalone publication (Fajcik et al., 2022) to know our results for subtask 2.




Figure 1: Augmented prompt-based classification for causality identification task. First, the input instance $x = \text{"Soldiers were hurt in the attacks"}$ is converted into three different input prompts by applying $f'_t(x)$ three times. Then, these three prompts are given to a RoBERTa model, and one logit vector is obtained for each. These vectors are then averaged, and the word with the highest score, "causal", is selected. Finally, this word is mapped to its corresponding class, and x is classified as positive. Note that, in this example, we have the following word-to-class label mapping $word(positive) = \text{"causal"}$ and $word(negative) = \text{"random"}$.

2 Related Work

Previous work on causal relation identification varies from knowledge-based to deep neural network approaches (Deep-NN). Knowledge-based systems rely on linguistic patterns extracted using an exhaustive exploration of the data, where lexico-semantic analysis lead to the identification of relevant structures and keywords that depict the presence of a causal relation in the text (Garcia, 1997; Khoo et al., 2000). Although interpretable, these methods require a lot of human power to generate relevant patterns and result in models that are not readily applicable in different domains.

Statistical machine learning (ML) approaches require less human effort at the moment to find relevant classification patterns. Traditionally, using different NLP tools, it is possible to compute various features for a given collection and apply any ML pipeline to train a causality relation classifier, e.g., (Rutherford and Xue, 2014; Hidey and McKeown, 2016). However, one main disadvantage of these techniques is the language dependency and error propagation of the NLP tools.

Finally, recent approaches based on Deep-NN have become popular, given their powerful representation learning ability. Typical approaches include convolutional neural networks (Ayyanar et al., 2019b), long short-term memory networks (Li et al., 2021), and methods based on pre-trained transformer-based LMs such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), where following a standard fine-tuning approach makes possible the detection of

causality relations (Tan et al., 2022b; Khetan et al., 2022; Fajcik et al., 2020). Normally, these methods involve high computational costs and large amounts of labeled data. However, in this work, we show that pre-trained LMs can still be effective even when fine-tuned with very few instances.

3 Methodology

3.1 Prompt-Based Approach

In the "pre-train, prompt, and predict" paradigm, unlike the standard "pre-train and fine-tune" paradigm, instead of adapting pre-trained LMs to downstream tasks via objective engineering, downstream tasks are reformulated to look more like those solved during the LM pre-training phase (Liu et al., 2021). More precisely, prompt-based prediction treats the downstream task as a masked language modeling problem, where the model directly generates a textual response (referred to as a *label word*) to a given prompt defined by a task-specific *template* (Gao et al., 2020). For instance, when identifying the sentiment of a movie review like "I love this movie." we may continue with "Overall, it was a [MASK] movie." and ask the LM to fill the mask with a sentiment-bearing word. In this example, the original input text x ("I love this movie.") is modified using the *template* " $[x]$ Overall, it was a [MASK] movie." into a textual string prompt x' in which the mask will be filled with a *label word*. Some examples of *label words* for this example could be "fantastic" or "boring".

In the case of classification tasks, in addition to

defining a set of possible *label words*, it is necessary to define a mapping between each one and the actual output labels. For instance, if labels + and - refer to positive and negative sentiment, respectively, “fantastic” in previous example could be mapped to output label +, and “boring” to -.

Formally, let \mathcal{L} be a pre-trained language model, $f_t(x)$ a function that converts the input x into a prompt by instantiating template t which contains one [MASK] token, $mask$. Let $word : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ be a mapping from the task label space, \mathcal{Y} , to the *label words* set, \mathcal{W} . Then, the classification task is converted to a *masked language modeling* (MLM) task in which the probability of predicting class $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is modeled as:

$$p(y|x) = p(mask = word(y)|f_t(x)) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}_{word(y)} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{mask})}{\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{word(y')} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{mask})}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{h}_{mask} is the hidden vector of [MASK] and \mathbf{w}_v denotes the vector encoding word v . Note that when fine-tuning \mathcal{L} to minimize the cross-entropy loss, the pre-trained weights \mathbf{w}_v are re-used, and there’s no need to introduce any new parameters. On the contrary, with standard fine-tuning a task-specific head, $\text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_o \mathbf{h}_{[CLS]})$, has to be added, with new task-specific learnable parameters $\mathbf{W}_o \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times d}$, which increases the gap between pre-training and fine-tuning.

Hereafter we will refer to the “causal” and “non-causal” classes as “positive” (+) and “negative” (-) respectively. In addition, and following previous work by Gao et al. (2020), we append one answered prompt for each class to the input prompt as *demonstrations*.² More precisely, let $\mathcal{Y} = \{+, -\}$ be the set of labels for the binary causality identification task, let $t \leftarrow v$ be the template t in which its [MASK] token has been filled with word v , and $w^y = word(y)$ the *word label* for class $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, then we redefine $f_t(x)$ in Equation 1 as $f'_t(x)$ defined as:

$$f'_t(x) = f_t(x) \parallel f_{t \leftarrow w^+}(x^+) \parallel f_{t \leftarrow w^-}(x^-), \quad (2)$$

where \parallel is the string concatenation operator, and x^y is an instance of class y randomly sampled from the training set. Figure 1, depicts an example of three different input prompts are shown by applying $f'_t(x)$ three times to the input instance x .

²These *demonstrations* (Gao et al., 2020) are used to demonstrate the LM, in-context, how it should provide the answer to the input prompt.

Classification process: the process is illustrated in Figure 1. First, the input instance x is converted into d different input prompts by applying $f'_t(x)$, d times. Then, each input prompt is given to the LM to obtain d logit vectors holding the word scores for the mask in each prompt. A simple ensemble scheme is then applied by averaging all d logit vectors, and the *word label* with the highest score is selected, which is finally mapped to its corresponding class y using mapping $word(y)$.

Training and model selection: for developing our prompt-based models, we performed a simplified version of the process described in previous work by Gao et al. (2020). Namely, we carried out the following seven steps: **(1)** We created a new training set by only extracting k instances per class from the original one and using all remaining $2925 - 2 \times k$ instances as a large evaluation set; **(2)** In order to choose a word-to-class label mapping $word(y)$, first, we manually set the template to $t = “[x] It was [MASK]”$ and then trained and evaluated the performance of different hand-crafted *word label* options. After this stage, words “causal” and “random” were selected for positive and negative classes respectively; **(3)** In order to add *demonstrations* to a given input x (see Equation 1), we uniformly sampled x^- and x^+ from the top-50% most similar instances in the training set³. To do so, we pre-computed the sentence embeddings of training instances using a pre-trained SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) model, and cosine distance was used as a similarity metric; **(4)** Using our *word labels*, the next step was to generate candidate templates automatically using T5. First, each training instance x of class y was converted to “[x] <P>word(y)<S>” where <P> and <S> are T5 mask tokens, and used a 100 wide beam search to decode multiple template candidates by filling <P> and <S> tokens; **(5)** Next step was sorting all 100 final candidate templates by F1 score on the development set. However, since this is a time-consuming step, we extracted 256 positive and negative instances from our $2925 - 2 \times k$ development set and used it for the evaluation; **(6)** We selected the top-10 best-performing templates for training and evaluating them using the complete development set; **(7)** Finally, we used the official dev set as our test set for evaluating and selecting the best model for submission⁴.

³We tested different percentages, however 50% was the best-performing one.

⁴We also checked that its F1 score on our custom dev set

Submission	Precision		Recall		Accuracy		F1-Score	
	<i>dev</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>dev</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>dev</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>dev</i>	<i>test</i>
Ensemble-10m	88.46	82.78	90.45	84.66	88.26	81.35	89.44	83.70
Prompt-256	85.49	82.80	92.70	87.50	87.30	82.64	88.95	85.08
Prompt-356e	82.72	80.41	88.76	88.64	83.60	81.35	85.63	84.32
Prompt-1000	84.56	81.08	91.57	85.22	86.07	80.39	87.87	83.10
Ensemble-8p	86.10	81.15	90.44	88.07	86.69	81.67	88.22	84.47

Table 1: Official obtained results from the selected methods in dev and test partitions.

The above process was repeated varying the number k of training instances, with $k = 256, 356, 512,$ and 1000 ; the number d of input prompts to ensemble during classification stage, with d from 1 to 9; and using RoBERTa (large and base), and DeBERTa V3 (base) as pre-trained LMs⁵.

3.2 Ensemble-based Approach

We also performed several ensembles of different fine-tuned LMs to increase the generalization and compensate for the overfitting of the models. We followed the approach described in Fajcik et al. (2019), called *TOP-N* fusion. In this formulation, we first define a *set* of M pre-trained LMs, varying only the training seed. *TOP-N* fusion starts by choosing one uniformly random model from the *set*, which is added to the ensemble. Next, it randomly shuffles the rest of the models and tries adding them into the ensemble once, as long as the F1 score improves. Each time a model is added to the ensemble, its performance gets measured. The model would stay in the ensemble only and only if it improved the overall performance. This aims at an iterative optimization of the ensemble’s F1 score by averaging the output probabilities. As the selection process is stochastic, we repeat the process $N=10000$ times. We construct a new ensemble for each iteration, independently of the previous ones. Finally, we select the best performing ensemble for submission. Further details are given in Appendix B (Figure 2).

4 Results & Discussion

Next, we describe each one of our submissions:

was also among the first ones (if not first).

⁵All models were fine-tuned for a maximum of 1000 steps using AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) optimizer ($\beta_1=0.9, \beta_2=0.999, \epsilon=1e-8$) with a learning rate of $\gamma=1e-5$ with no weight decay ($\lambda=0$). Models were evaluated every 100 steps and check-pointed when new best F1 scores were obtained.

Ensemble-10m: ensemble model described in subsection 3.2 with 10 final models obtained from a set of 150 initial ones (50 fine-tuned *bert-base-cased*, *roberta-base*, and *deberta-v3-base* models).

Prompt-256: prompt-based *roberta-large* model with $k=256$ training instances per class, $d=3$ input prompts to ensemble during classification stage; and template $t = "[\times] This is not [MASK]"$.

Prompt-1000: The same previous model but with $t = "[\times] There were no [MASK] ities in this"$, $k=1000$, and $d=1$.

Ensemble-8p: ensemble model described in subsection 3.2 with 8 final models obtained from the top-50 best performing prompt-based models as the initial set.

Prompt-356e: three prompt-base models trained with $k=356$ instances. The first two models have the same template as *Prompt-1000* but with $d=2$ and 3, respectively. The third one uses the template $t = "[\times] The incident is not [MASK]"$ with $d=1$.⁶ Finally, a simple majority voting ensemble among these three models generates the output.

4.1 Results

Table 1 shows the official results, both in dev and test partitions, for our five submissions. As expected, the ensemble of several LMs (Ensemble-10m) was able to obtain outstanding performance across several metrics during the validation phase (i.e., dev partition⁷). However, the performance dropped significantly in the test partition (F1=89.44 \rightarrow F1=83.70). On the contrary, our prompt-based approach trained on 256 instances per class (Prompt-256) could generalize better on the test partition. Such submission obtained 2nd place in terms of precision (82.80%), 3rd in accuracy (82.64%), and 5th in F1 (85.08%) —it’s worth mentioning

⁶Note that these prompts, as well as previous ones, were automatically generated as described in subsection 3.1.

⁷We further performed a 5-cvf experiment on six different architectures, see the results on Table 2 in Appendix A.

that the F1 reported by the 1st and 2nd places during the competition was 86%. However, the main advantage of our method is that it does not require large amounts of labeled data for training, i.e., a computationally less expensive approach, that can be easily adapted to different domains.

5 Conclusions

This paper describes our participation in the CASE-2022 subtask 1. Our proposed approach uses a few-shot configuration in which a prompt-based model is fine-tuned using *only 256 instances* per class and yet was able to obtain remarkable results among all 16 participant teams. An exhaustive comparison against traditional fine-tuning techniques and more ensemble approaches indicates that our proposed method can better generalize the posed task.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by CRITERIA, an EU project, funded under the Horizon 2020 programme, grant agreement no. 101021866. Esaú Villatoro-Tello, was supported partially by Idiap, SNI CONACyT, and UAM-Cuajimalpa Mexico.

References

- Raja Ayyanar, George Koomullil, and Hariharan Ramasangu. 2019a. Causal relation classification using convolutional neural networks and grammar tags. In *2019 IEEE 16th India Council International Conference (INDICON)*, pages 1–3. IEEE.
- Raja Ayyanar, George Koomullil, and Hariharan Ramasangu. 2019b. [Causal relation classification using convolutional neural networks and grammar tags](#). In *2019 IEEE 16th India Council International Conference (INDICON)*, pages 1–3.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Martin Fajcik, Josef Jon, Martin Docekal, and Pavel Smrz. 2020. [BUT-FIT at SemEval-2020 task 5: Automatic detection of counterfactual statements with deep pre-trained language representation models](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 437–444, Barcelona (online). International Committee for Computational Linguistics.
- Martin Fajcik, Muskaan Singh, Juan Zuluaga-Gomez, Esaú Villatoro-Tello, Sergio Burdisso, Petr Motlicek, and Pavel Smrz. 2022. [Idiapers @ causal news corpus 2022: Extracting cause-effect-signal triplets via pre-trained autoregressive language model](#). In *The 5th Workshop on Challenges and Applications of Automated Extraction of Sociopolitical Events from Text (CASE @ EMNLP 2022)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Martin Fajcik, Pavel Smrz, and Lukas Burget. 2019. [But-fit at semeval-2019 task 7: Determining the rumour stance with pre-trained deep bidirectional transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 1097–1104.
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2020. [Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*.
- Daniela Garcia. 1997. [Coatis, an nlp system to locate expressions of actions connected by causality links](#). In *Knowledge Acquisition, Modeling and Management*, pages 347–352, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021a. [Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09543*.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021b. [Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. 2016. [Gaussian error linear units \(gelus\)](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*.
- Christopher Hidey and Kathy McKeown. 2016. [Identifying causal relations using parallel Wikipedia articles](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1424–1433, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vivek Khetan, Roshni Ramnani, Mayuresh Anand, Subhashis Sengupta, and Andrew E. Fano. 2022. [Causal bert: Language models for causality detection between events expressed in text](#). In *Intelligent Computing*, pages 965–980, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Christopher S. G. Khoo, Syin Chan, and Yun Niu. 2000. [Extracting causal knowledge from a medical database using graphical patterns](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 336–343, Hong Kong. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer.

2020. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880.
- Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, Abhishek Thakur, Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Julien Chaumond, Mariama Drame, Julien Plu, Lewis Tunstall, et al. 2021. Datasets: A community library for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 175–184.
- Zhaoning Li, Qi Li, Xiaotian Zou, and Jiangtao Ren. 2021. Causality extraction based on self-attentive bilstm-crf with transferred embeddings. *Neurocomputing*, 423:207–219.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hieu Man, Minh Nguyen, and Thien Nguyen. 2022. Event causality identification via generation of important context words. In *Proceedings of the 11th Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 323–330, Seattle, Washington. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentencebert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*.
- Attapol Rutherford and Nianwen Xue. 2014. Discovering implicit discourse relations through brown cluster pair representation and coreference patterns. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 645–654, Gothenburg, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Fiona Anting Tan, Ali Hürriyetöglü, Tommaso Caselli, Nelleke Oostdijk, Tadashi Nomoto, Hansi Hettiarachchi, Iqra Ameer, Onur Uca, Farhana Ferdousi Liza, and Tiancheng Hu. 2022a. The causal news corpus: Annotating causal relations in event sentences from news. In *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 2298–2310, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Fiona Anting Tan, Xinyu Zuo, and See-Kiong Ng. 2022b. Unicausal: Unified benchmark and model for causal text mining.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45.

A Baseline results

We performed standard cross-entropy fine-tuning on six different pre-trained LMs to produce baselines. We perform 5-fold cross-validation for each architecture following the partitions proposed in [Tan et al. \(2022a\)](#). Each system is fine-tuned on the sequence classification task to discriminate between casual and non-causal text input sequences. We report the mean and standard deviation (mean \pm std) on several metrics in [Table 2](#).

During experimentation, we use the same learning rate of $\gamma = 5e-5$ with a linear learning rate scheduler. Dropout is set to $dp = 0.1$ for the attention and hidden layers, while Gaussian Error Linear Units (GELU) is used as activation function ([Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2016](#)). We fine-tune each model with an effective batch size of 32 for 50 epochs with AdamW ([Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019](#)) optimizer ($\beta_1=0.9, \beta_2=0.999, \epsilon=1e-8$). The fine-tuned *deberta-v3-base* LM performed systematically better in all metrics. Thus, we made a submission by performing an ensemble using only this architecture (see [subsection 4.1](#)).

B Ensembling

We compose ensembles before submission to leaderboard in two manners. First, we define a *set* of models, which contains only baseline LMs fine-tuned on the sequence classification task (see [Table 2](#)). We fine-tune 50 LMs for each architecture, varying only the training seed. Second, we define a *set* of models containing only prompt-based LMs. We select the top models for leaderboard submission. This process is illustrated in [Figure 2](#).

Model	Precision	Recall	Accuracy	F1-score	Reference
bert-base-cased	83.52 ± 1.01	87.88 ± 3.08	79.68 ± 1.83	81.03 ± 1.20	(Devlin et al., 2019)
bart-base	84.21 ± 0.88	87.80 ± 2.26	80.99 ± 2.19	81.98 ± 0.95	(Lewis et al., 2020)
roberta-base	85.13 ± 1.11	87.86 ± 2.41	82.66 ± 2.35	83.21 ± 1.10	(Liu et al., 2019)
distilroberta-base	84.41 ± 1.20	88.05 ± 1.69	81.12 ± 2.09	82.22 ± 1.12	(Sanh et al., 2019)
deberta-base	82.67 ± 2.76	85.74 ± 2.72	80.32 ± 6.49	80.31 ± 3.44	(He et al., 2021b)
deberta-v3-base	85.87 ± 1.18	88.88 ± 1.74	83.18 ± 3.16	84.00 ± 1.18	(He et al., 2021a)

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation (mean ± std) of different metrics on the dev set using a 5-fold cross validation on the CNC dataset. We report results for six different architectures of pre-trained LMs.




Figure 2: Our proposed method to ensemble N fine-tuned LMs, based on Fajcik et al. (2019) approach. We fine-tune several LMs by modifying only the training seed. Our implementation uses the sequence classification task from HuggingFace toolkit (Wolf et al., 2020; Lhoest et al., 2021).