

Interactive Editing for Text Summarization

Yujia Xie Xun Wang Si-Qing Chen Wayne Xiong Pengcheng He

Microsoft

{yujiaxie, xunwang, sqchen, Wayne.Xiong, Pengcheng.H}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Summarizing lengthy documents is a common and essential task in our daily lives. Although recent advancements in neural summarization models can assist in crafting general-purpose summaries, human writers often have specific requirements that call for a more customized approach. To address this need, we introduce REVISE, an innovative framework designed to facilitate iterative editing and refinement of draft summaries by human writers. Within our framework, writers can effortlessly modify unsatisfactory segments at any location or length and provide optional starting phrases – our system will generate coherent alternatives that seamlessly integrate with the existing summary. At its core, REVISE incorporates a modified fill-in-the-middle model with the encoder-decoder architecture while developing novel evaluation metrics tailored for the summarization task. In essence, our framework empowers users to create high-quality, personalized summaries by effectively harnessing both human expertise and AI capabilities, ultimately transforming the summarization process into a truly collaborative and adaptive experience.

1 Introduction

Human intelligence has been significantly augmented by the rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI, Engelbart (1962); Lee et al. (2022)), particularly with the emergence of large language models (Devlin et al., 2018; Raffel et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023). AIs have shown great potential in various practical settings, helping users brainstorm ideas (e.g., Jasper, Copy.ai), paraphrase sentences (e.g., Wordtune, QuillBot), reformulate queries (Nogueira and Cho, 2017), autocomplete sentences (Chen et al., 2019), and write code (e.g., Copilot, TabNine). One specific area where AI can revolutionize our daily life is in the realm of document summarization, which



Figure 1: Illustration on how REVISE interacts with human writer.

is the focus of this paper.

In this work, we present REVISE– Refinement and Editing Via Iterative Summarization Enhancement, a novel framework that transforms the summarization process into an interactive experience for human writers. Instead of generating static summaries, our approach enables users to efficiently edit and improve draft summaries iteratively, tailoring them to their specific needs and preferences. This results in the creation of high-quality, customized summaries that cater to individual requirements and contexts, moving beyond the limitations of traditional, one-size-fits-all summarization models. Figure 1 shows an illustration.

Our framework primarily consists of two models: one providing the initial draft summary and the other supporting the writer in refining the summary through interactive suggestions. We build upon a pretrained encoder-decoder summarization model and enhance its ability to generate contextually relevant and coherent suggestions for human edits. Through extensive experimentation and evaluation, we demonstrate the superior performance of our proposed framework in terms of salience,

coherence, and adaptability to different situations.

The key innovation in REVISE lies in fostering a seamless collaboration between human writers and AI models, creating a truly interactive summarization experience. This interactive approach not only enables users to harness the power of AI to extract key information but also preserves the creativity and adaptability offered by human input. By empowering users to edit the summary iteratively until they are satisfied, our framework ensures the delivery of personalized, high-quality summaries tailored to diverse requirements.

We perform extensive human evaluations, suggesting the proposed framework can not only improve the efficiency of human editing, but also significantly enhance the summary quality.

2 Related Works

Interactive summarization. There are several works exploring the how to facilitate human summary writing in an iterative way. For example, Yan et al. (2011) generate new summaries after their users to click on sentences they want to know more about. In Avinesh and Meyer (2017) and Avinesh et al. (2018), users can indicate which bigrams of a candidate summary are relevant to their interests. The APRIL system (Gao et al., 2020) first let users to indicate preference between candidate summaries, and then train a summary-ranking model to select the next pair of candidate summaries. Bohn and Ling (2021) optimize document summaries for personal interest by collecting user feedback in the normal flow of reading, such as dwell time or gaze location. More recently, Shapira et al. (2021, 2022) allow users to interactively submit queries in order to expand on the information on a topic in the summary. In contrast, our framework is more versatile – users can either specify their intent by the prompts, or let the model provide a few alternatives.

Text generation – interactive editing. The task of human editing text interactively with AI is widely explored in other text generation tasks (Cheng et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2022), e.g., machine translation (Barrachina et al., 2009). Many works are *prefix-based*, i.e., new completions can only be generated left-to-right (González-Rubio et al., 2013; Peris and Casacuberta, 2018, 2019a,b). Few works (González-Rubio et al., 2016; Weng et al., 2019) allow edits at arbitrary positions. However, unlike REVISE, the edits can only be words or sentences.

Text infilling. There are two approaches for imbuing

models with infilling capabilities: first, through new architectures like SpanBERT (Joshi et al., 2020) and XLNet (Yang et al., 2019). To list a few examples, XLNet modifies the attention mask in a standard transformer to enable token generation in any user-specified order, while Insertion Transformer (Stern et al., 2019), KERMIT (Chan et al., 2019), and InDIGO (Gu et al., 2019) allow the model to predict a location for the next token before predicting the token. Similarly, Blank Language models (Shen et al., 2020) generate text by iteratively selecting a blank and replacing it with a token (and optionally more blanks).

Alternatively, Zhu et al. (2019), Donahue et al. (2020), GLM (Du et al., 2022), CM3 (Aghajanyan et al., 2022), InCoder (Fried et al., 2022), and Bavarian et al. (2022) utilize left-to-right autoregressive modeling by moving the infill regions to the end of context, with regions separated by sentinels. Notably, Bavarian et al. (2022) show the computational efficiency and superior performance of training in this way at scale. Our work extends Bavarian et al. (2022) to encoder-decoder models, and demonstrates the feasibility of its usage in summarization.

Text infilling can also be performed using a GAN-based method (Fedus et al., 2018), where REINFORCE is needed, or through gradient search (Liu et al., 2019).

3 Method

The key component of our framework is a Fill-In-the-Middle (FIM) model, which can provide alternatives to the human specified unsatisfactory part. Specifically, the input of the model is a source document sequence, a prefix sequence containing the summary before the deleted part and an optionally human start, a suffix sequence containing the summary after the deleted part. The goal of the model is to fill in a sequence that not only contains the key information of document, but also connect coherently with the prefix and the suffix. Following the advanced neural models for abstractive summarization (Zhang et al., 2020; He et al., 2022), we adopt an encoder-decoder model architecture.

3.1 Training for FIM

We start from a standard summarization training data $\mathcal{D} = \{d_i, t_i\}_{i=1}^N$, where d_i is the i -th document, t_i is the corresponding summary, and they are both sequences of tokens. During training, we



Figure 2: Illustration on how the FIM model is trained.

randomly divide the summary t_i into three parts: the prefix p_i , the middle m_i , and the suffix s_i . Then, we concatenate the prefix, the suffix, and the document, together with their sentinel tokens, as the input for the encoder,

$$[\text{PRE}] \circ p_i \circ [\text{SUF}] \circ s_i \circ [\text{CLS}] \circ d_i,$$

where \circ is the concatenation of tokens. We input the middle together with its sentinel tokens into the decoder,

$$[\text{BOS}] \circ m_i \circ [\text{EOS}].$$

Here, we follow Bavarian et al. (2022) and adopt an $[\text{EOS}]$ token to signal a successful concatenation of the middle and the suffix. The model is then trained with a standard cross-entropy loss for sequence-to-sequence models.

3.2 Training for the Corner Cases

Human edits can appear anywhere – not only the middle, but also in the beginning and the end. In our preliminary experiments, we find that if the model is only trained for the data in the middle, it cannot handle the edits in the beginning and the end of the summaries. Especially, if the edits are in the end, the generation usually cannot reach $[\text{EOS}]$ token, i.e., the generation cannot end.

Therefore, we sample a proportion γ of data for the edits in the beginning and the end. Specifically, we randomly split the summary t_i into the prefix p_i and the suffix s_i . On the one hand, to train the generation in the end, we input the concatenation of the prefix and the document into the encoder,

$$[\text{PRE}] \circ p_i \circ [\text{CLS}] \circ d_i,$$

and the suffix for the decoder,

$$[\text{BOS}] \circ s_i \circ [\text{EOS}].$$

On the other hand, we exchange the position of p_i and s_i to train the generation in the beginning.

4 Experiments

4.1 Settings

We use the CNN / Daily Mail (CNNDM) dataset (See et al., 2017) for training and evaluation. We adopt the pretrained Z-Code++ (He et al., 2022) as the backbone encoder-decoder model. The proportion γ of the training for the corner cases is 0.5. We train the model for 10 epochs with learning rate 7×10^{-6} .

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate the FIM model for three aspects:

1. Is the generation salient in the document?
2. Does the generation connect coherently with the rest of the summary?
3. Can the model handle any possible positions?

We propose to use three evaluation metrics for these three aspects, respectively.

ROUGE score. We split the test set summaries of CNNDM into prefixes, middles, and suffixes. We feed the golden prefixes and suffixes to the model, and compute the ROUGE scores (Lin, 2004) between the generated texts and the golden middles. In this way, we measure whether the generated texts captures the important information as the golden summaries do.

GPT Likelihood. Large pretrained language models can be used to evaluate the coherence of text (Yuan et al., 2021). Here, we adopt GPT-3.5 (Brown et al., 2020). Specifically, given a sequence of tokens $x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(j)}, x^{(j+1)}, \dots, x^{(N)})$, we evaluate whether $(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(j)})$ are locally coherently connect with $(x^{(j+1)}, \dots, x^{(N)})$ by computing the log-likelihood of generating

Model	R-FIM	R-begin	R-end	ℓ_1	ℓ_2	R-all
Proposed	51.79/30.30	49.51/28.87	37.36/20.31	-3.14	-2.97	43.32/20.96
Context in decoder	45.72/25.62	44.25/24.72	36.32/19.41	-3.14	-3.84	43.37/20.94
No corner case training	51.86/30.24	46.67/27.11	26.97/12.67	-4.01	-3.04	10.67/2.42
Base model	47.79/27.20	46.01/25.98	34.46/18.13	-4.32	-3.19	41.92/19.36

Table 1: Different variants of the FIM model. Here, for R-FIM, R-begin, R-end, and R-all, the first number is ROUGE-1, the second number is ROUGE-2.

$x^{(j+1)}, x^{(j+2)}, \dots$, given the previous tokens,

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell_H((x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(j)}), (x^{(j+1)}, \dots, x^{(N)})) \\ &= \log p(x^{(j+1)}, \dots, x^{(j+H)} | x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(j)}) \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^H \log p_{\text{GPT}}(x^{(j+h)} | x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(j+h-1)}) \end{aligned}$$

where $p_{\text{GPT}}(a^{(k)} | a^{(1)}, \dots, a^{(k-1)})$ is the probability that next token is $a^{(k)}$ given previous token sequence $a^{(1)}, \dots, a^{(k-1)}$, and the probability is provided by GPT model. Here, we adopt the likelihood on a fixed-length sequence $x^{(j+1)}, \dots, x^{(j+H)}$ instead of the complete sequence $x^{(j+1)}, \dots, x^{(N)}$ to alleviate the length effect.

For summarization, we consider the connectivity of the prefix-middle and the middle-suffix,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1 &= \ell_H(p_i, m_i), \\ \ell_2 &= \ell_H(p_i \circ m_i, s_i), \end{aligned}$$

where p_i, m_i, s_i is from the split test set summary in the above section.

ROUGE score for corner cases. Following the training recipe in Section 3.2, we split the test set summaries into the prefix and the suffix, ask the model to generate the prefix or the suffix accordingly, and compute the corresponding ROUGE scores.

Model	R-FIM	R-begin	R-end	R-all
Base model	47.79/27.20	46.01/25.98	34.46/18.13	41.92/19.36
- DA	46.52/25.97	44.99/25.19	34.04/17.52	35.44/15.53
- DA - RTD	46.22/25.80	45.15/25.22	33.40/17.02	39.90/18.21

Table 2: Different pretraining setting.

4.3 Empirical Results

Different design choices for text infilling. We include three different variants of the proposed model in Table 1. Our proposed training method can achieve the best performance in terms of salience and coherence. In Table 2 we also show how the design choices in the pretraining stage affect the performance.




Figure 3: Illustration on the human editing process with interaction. The annotators will be prompted with multiple suggestions of summary completions, and they choose one from them.

Comparing to standard summarization model.

The last column of Table 1 shows the results when we do not provide summary context for generation, i.e., we ask the model to generate a complete summary. In comparison, in He et al. (2022), a vanilla finetuned summarization model can achieve a ROUGE-2 of 22.2. Our corner case training can significantly improve the generation quality.

4.4 Human Evaluation

To validate our proposed pipeline can effectively help human writer to make edits, we conduct a contrast experiment on whether using REVIVE can improve editing efficiency. Specifically, we collect 120 document in three domains¹ – news, conversations, and blogs, and ask human annotators to edit the draft summaries until they are satisfied with the summary. The draft summaries are generated by the standard summarization model. We compare the editing processes with and without interaction.

Figure 3 shows an illustration of the editing process with interaction. In practice, we prompt the annotators with 3 suggestions. We adopt the top-3 beams of beam search decoding method as suggestions, to enforce the suggestions are at least one-token different.

The experiment consists of two stages. In the first stage, we perform a contrast experiment, to collect annotations with or without interaction. In the

¹We release the data together with the evaluation results at <https://github.com/microsoft/Interactive-Summarization>.

	Avg. Time	Avg. Rating	Accept / Accept w Edits / Reject	Hallucination Rate
Draft Summary	–	3.99 ± 1.62	5.7% 45.0% 48.3%	0.12
Human w/o interaction	903.0	4.61 ± 1.73	30.8% 37.5% 31.7%	0.04
Human w interaction	645.5	5.52 ± 0.84	43.3% 52.5% 4.2%	0.03

Table 3: Average editing time and annotation quality. The ratings are the general quality of the summary, with 1 meaning worst and 7 meaning best.

second stage, we evaluate the annotations collected from the first stage, to see whether the annotation quality and efficiency are improved. The experiment takes 3 annotators, where each annotator will

1. annotate 40 documents with interaction,
2. annotate 40 documents without interaction,
3. evaluate the summaries of 40 documents, where each document has 3 summaries, i.e., the draft summary and the human annotated summary with and without interaction.

The 40 documents in each of the above tasks are different for each annotator. In this way, we enforce the annotation time and evaluation results are unbiased, as the annotators will never see the same document across different tasks.

Table 3 shows REVISE can significantly save editing time and improve annotation quality. In practice, annotators trigger 2.2 suggestions for each document on average. Due to model inference latency and network latency, the suggestions will take 4.1s on average, which is also included in the annotation time reported in Table 3.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we propose REVISE, offering an interactive and iterative approach for human writers to efficiently edit and refine summaries tailored to their specific needs. We adopt a fill-in-the-middle model for the encoder-decoder architecture underlies the framework, empowering it to generate coherent and contextually relevant suggestions for human edits, validated by a set of novel evaluation metrics. We perform extensive human evaluation, suggesting the proposed framework can improve both the editing efficiency and summary quality. We hope REVISE can herald a new era in the summarization experience, with potentially transformative implications for practical applications and inspiring further research in interactive AI systems.

References

- Armen Aghajanyan, Bernie Huang, Candace Ross, Vladimir Karpukhin, Hu Xu, Naman Goyal, Dmytro Okhonko, Mandar Joshi, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, et al. 2022. Cm3: A causal masked multi-modal model of the internet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07520*.
- PVS Avinesh, Carsten Binnig, Benjamin Hättasch, Christian M Meyer, and Orkan Özyurt. 2018. Sherlock: A system for interactive summarization of large text collections. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 11(12):1902–1905.
- PVS Avinesh and Christian M Meyer. 2017. Joint optimization of user-desired content in multi-document summaries by learning from user feedback. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1353–1363.
- Sergio Barrachina, Oliver Bender, Francisco Casacuberta, Jorge Civera, Elsa Cubel, Shahram Khadivi, Antonio Lagarda, Hermann Ney, Jesús Tomás, Enrique Vidal, et al. 2009. Statistical approaches to computer-assisted translation. *Computational Linguistics*, 35(1):3–28.
- Mohammad Bavarian, Heewoo Jun, Nikolas Tezak, John Schulman, Christine McLeavey, Jerry Tworek, and Mark Chen. 2022. Efficient training of language models to fill in the middle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14255*.
- Tanner Bohn and Charles X Ling. 2021. Hone as you read: A practical type of interactive summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.02923*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- William Chan, Nikita Kitaev, Kelvin Guu, Mitchell Stern, and Jakob Uszkoreit. 2019. Kermit: Generative insertion-based modeling for sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01604*.
- Mia Xu Chen, Benjamin N Lee, Gagan Bansal, Yuan Cao, Shuyuan Zhang, Justin Lu, Jackie Tsay, Yinan Wang, Andrew M Dai, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2019. Gmail smart compose: Real-time assisted writing. In

- Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 2287–2295.
- Ruijia Cheng, Alison Smith-Renner, Ke Zhang, Joel R Tetreault, and Alejandro Jaimes. 2022. Mapping the design space of human-ai interaction in text summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14863*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Chris Donahue, Mina Lee, and Percy Liang. 2020. Enabling language models to fill in the blanks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.05339*.
- Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335.
- Douglas C Engelbart. 1962. Augmenting human intellect: A conceptual framework. *Menlo Park, CA*, page 21.
- William Fedus, Ian Goodfellow, and Andrew M Dai. 2018. Maskgan: better text generation via filling in the... *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07736*.
- Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2022. InCoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05999*.
- Yang Gao, Christian M Meyer, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. Preference-based interactive multi-document summarisation. *Information Retrieval Journal*, 23(6):555–585.
- Jesús González-Rubio, Daniel Ortiz-Martínez, José-Miguel Benedí, and Francisco Casacuberta. 2013. Interactive machine translation using hierarchical translation models. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 244–254.
- Jesús González-Rubio, Daniel Ortiz-Martínez, Francisco Casacuberta, and José-Miguel Benedí. 2016. Beyond prefix-based interactive translation prediction. In *Proceedings of The 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 198–207.
- Jiatao Gu, Qi Liu, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Insertion-based decoding with automatically inferred generation order. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:661–676.
- Pengcheng He, Baolin Peng, Liyang Lu, Song Wang, Jie Mei, Yang Liu, Ruochen Xu, Hany Hassan Awadalla, Yu Shi, Chenguang Zhu, et al. 2022. Z-code++: A pre-trained language model optimized for abstractive summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.09770*.
- Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Yinhan Liu, Daniel S Weld, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. 2020. Spanbert: Improving pre-training by representing and predicting spans. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:64–77.
- Mina Lee, Megha Srivastava, Amelia Hardy, John Thickstun, Esin Durmus, Ashwin Paranjape, Ines Gerard-Ursin, Xiang Lisa Li, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, et al. 2022. Evaluating human-language model interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09746*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Dayiheng Liu, Jie Fu, Pengfei Liu, and Jiancheng Lv. 2019. Tigs: An inference algorithm for text infilling with gradient search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10752*.
- Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2017. Task-oriented query reformulation with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04572*.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774.
- Álvaro Peris and Francisco Casacuberta. 2018. Active learning for interactive neural machine translation of data streams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.11243*.
- Álvaro Peris and Francisco Casacuberta. 2019a. Interactive-predictive neural multimodal systems. In *Iberian Conference on Pattern Recognition and Image Analysis*, pages 16–28. Springer.
- Alvaro Peris and Francisco Casacuberta. 2019b. Online learning for effort reduction in interactive neural machine translation. *Computer Speech & Language*, 58:98–126.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, Peter J Liu, et al. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(140):1–67.
- Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. [Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1073–1083, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ori Shapira, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Mohit Bansal, Ido Dagan, and Yael Amsterdamer. 2022. Interactive query-assisted summarization via deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2551–2568.

- Ori Shapira, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Hadar Ronen, Mohit Bansal, Yael Amerdamer, and Ido Dagan. 2021. Extending multi-document summarization evaluation to the interactive setting. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 657–677.
- Tianxiao Shen, Victor Quach, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2020. Blank language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03079*.
- Mitchell Stern, William Chan, Jamie Kiros, and Jakob Uszkoreit. 2019. Insertion transformer: Flexible sequence generation via insertion operations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5976–5985. PMLR.
- Rongxiang Weng, Hao Zhou, Shujian Huang, Lei Li, Yifan Xia, and Jiajun Chen. 2019. Correct-and-memorize: Learning to translate from interactive revisions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03468*.
- Rui Yan, Jian-Yun Nie, and Xiaoming Li. 2011. Summarize what you are interested in: An optimization framework for interactive personalized summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2011 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1342–1351.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. Bartscore: Evaluating generated text as text generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27263–27277.
- Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. 2020. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR.
- Wanrong Zhu, Zhiting Hu, and Eric Xing. 2019. Text infilling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00158*.

A Human Annotation Guideline

Here we include the complete instructions for human annotators, which include experiment details such as evaluation portal snapshots.

A.1 Goal

This experiment is to validate the effectiveness of the interactive summarization pipeline. Specifically, this pipeline is to facilitate the summary annotation process. It not only provides the annotators with a draft summary, but also interactively provides suggested completions to the annotators while they are editing the summary. This collected data will be used to further improve the annotation pipelines.

A.2 Experiment Design and Instruction

The experiment consists of two stages. In the first stage, we perform a contrast experiment, to collect annotations with or without interaction. In the second stage, we evaluate the annotations collected from the first stage, to see whether the annotation quality and efficiency are improved. The experiment needs 3 annotators, where each annotator will

1. annotate 40 documents with interaction,
2. annotate 40 documents without interaction,
3. evaluate the summaries of 40 documents, where each document has 3 summaries.

A.2.1 Stage 1: Contrast experiment with or without interaction

The experiment consists of two groups, i.e., the experimental group (with interaction) and the control group (without interaction), and there are 120 examples in each group. Since there are 3 annotators working on the experiment, each annotator will label 80 examples in total, where 40 belong to the experimental group and 40 belong to the control group. For each example, the annotator is given a source document, a draft summary, and possibly some interactive suggestions, and we will record

1. the annotated summary,
2. the annotation time.

Since the annotation time is also critical to this experiment, we would like the annotators not to be distracted when doing annotation.

A.2.1.1 Experimental Group

Portal description. Figure 4 shows a snapshot of the annotation portal. The portal contains a few components:

1. Source document: This is the document to be annotated.
2. Draft Summary: To ease the annotation, we provide a draft summary as the start point of annotation. The draft summary may or may not be a good candidate summary. The annotator is asked to edit the draft summary until it satisfy the conditions described in the next section “Guidelines on What is a Good Summary Annotation”.
3. Suggested summary – Choice 1/2/3: While the annotator is editing the summary, we provide three alternative suggestions interactively. Note that sometimes when the possible alternatives are limited, the suggestions can be the same.
4. Choose one you like for further editing: If the annotator would like to adopt one of the suggestions, they can indicate so using this radio. After making a selection, the adopted suggestion will appear in the draft summary box for further editing.
5. Save and Next button: Save current annotation and navigate to the next example.

Interactive Summarization Annotation Portal

Source document

In any developing country (and I believe Korea is 'developing' and really only started on the road to a real economy with the onset of real elections in 1994) there can be trials and tribulations for those who lead (politicians, heads of business) and follow (workers, students). Don't get me wrong, Korea has made gigantic strides in the last 50 years (thanks mainly to the iron-grip of their president/dictator from 1961 to 1979, Park Chung Hee) and in the last 10 years (when Korea really started to open up to Western influences)—but things are still in a state of flux here. Business practices have changed (although they retain much of the old flavour), politics...well, politics seems to still be the same..., relationships between people has changed (albeit only a little, Koreans still follow Confucius tenets and defer to age, men and the learned) and even language has changed (as the internet and chatting has lead to the truncation of many words). With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. The lady in the BMW below may have done both. She is likely enjoying the ride in her Z4, but (according to urlLink this newspaper article she is also a victim of over-pricing—something that BMW, I assume, does not mind as they can have a higher profit. (One other part of this may be that BMW has certain 'import duties' over and above the government ones that need to be paid in order to sell their cars here, such is another inefficiency.) urlLink The BMW Z4...a pricey car in this town. But what about those who cannot afford a luxury car, a flat in Kangnam (the priciest district in Seoul) and an expense account at the local watering hole? Or worse, those who had it all and then lost it? What happens to them? Well, for some, the answer is suicide (hence my mention of urlLink BASE jumping (Buildings, Antennae, Spans and Earth) in the title. Since there are few guns in Korea (heck, many policemen do a urlLink Barney Fife and don't even walk around with a loaded gun, the bullets are in their pocket!) the next best thing is jumping. While inline skating one day near the river I saw police taking 2 jumpers from the water—ug,that was not cool. Sorry for the imagery. One thing that irks me about Korea sometimes is the lack of discretion in some matters (one faux pas I probably just committed above). We know that reporting suicide can lead to more suicides, but they continue to report suicides as they happen. Some of the stories are truly heart-wrenching and I (yes, even I) weep a bit when I hear some of them—this is not something you get desensitized to. If you're of strong mind take a look at this article on recent urlLink suicides. Of course, it's not just in Korea. In the urlLink U.S. military suicide is the #2 killer (I'm not sure if friendly fire or actual action are #1, you start to wonder sometimes). The interesting thing I found from reading all of this (not that it makes me an expert by any means) is that Korea, although it may have the 4th highest suicide rate in the 29 OECD countries, it was waaaaay down the list globally (Korea always wants to be #1 compared to the top nations, which is why they probably used this statistic). Countries in Eastern Europe (although some of these 'suicides' may be underworld related), Scandinavia, and even the US and Canada, Hong Kong and Japan had higher rates than Korea did in 1994. (From Table 1 in urlLink this paper/abstract in true Korean fashion, the rates here went from 6.8 per 100,000 in 1998 to 16.5 in 2000 and 18.1 in 2002...man, does everything here have a urlLink logarithmic curve to it? Some also turn to urlLink murder, such as happened 10 years ago and lately again (and I'm sure there were other cases in-between), but that's another story. Perhaps this is just another part of living in a place where the past is meeting the future head on.

Draft Summary

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 1



Suggested Summary -- Choice 2



Suggested Summary -- Choice 3



Choose one you like for further editing

Choice 1

Choice 2

Choice 3

Previous

Save and Next

Please modify the summary.

Figure 4: A snapshot of annotation portal for the experiment group.

6. Previous: Navigate to the previous example. The edits in the current example will be lost. If the annotator navigates back to a previous example, make edits and save the annotation again, the later annotation will be adopted.

Instruction on the usage of the suggestions. The generation of the suggested summary is triggered by the ENTER key on the keyboard. The system will compare the old summary and the current summary and determine which part should be replaced.

As an illustrative example, if you are not satisfied with part of the summary, e.g., the highlighted part below, you can delete the highlighted part, hit the enter key, and it will trigger the system to generate

Draft Summary

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. **With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or** be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

suggestions, as shown below. In this example, the generated suggestion is not good – it has the same

Draft Summary

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. | be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 1

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. **With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or** be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

content as the original one. To let the system know what you would like to insert instead, you can type the start you like, e.g., By typing “Business practice” into the summary box following up by two spaces, all

Draft Summary

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice |be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 1

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed (although they retain much of the old flavour) With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 2

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed, politics has changed, relationships between people has changed. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 3

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

suggestions will continue from “Business practice”. If you prefer the second choice, select “Choice 2”, and then the second suggestion will appear in the summary box for you to make further edits.

Draft Summary

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed, politics has changed, relationships between people has changed. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 1

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed (although they retain much of the old flavour) With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 2

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed, politics has changed, relationships between people has changed. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Suggested Summary -- Choice 3

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. Business practice has changed. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Choose one you like for further editing

Choice 1
 Choice 2
 Choice 3

A.2.1.2 Control Group

Figure 5 shows a snapshot of the annotation portal.

The purpose of source document box, draft summary box, previous button, and save & next button is similar to the experimental group. The only difference is that in control group we do not provide interactive suggestions.

A.2.1.3 More Guidelines on How to Make a Good Summary Annotation

A good summary is a concise, fluent, and coherent text that can capture the main points of the original document/transcript accurately without any grammar errors, unrelated contents or hallucinations. Here are more detailed guidelines:

1. Although a draft summary is provided, we would suggest reading through the document first to make a summary without being biased by the draft summary. The draft summary may or may not be trustworthy – it may miss the point completely or include nonexistent information.
2. Keep perspective. If the document is of first-person perspective, use first-person perspective in the summary, too. Same applies to the third-person perspective.
3. Summaries should cover important information in a concise way. It should avoid redundancy or unimportant information and should not be too verbose.
4. Summaries should be self-contained and understandable by another readers without looking at the document. It should be fluent and coherent itself, like a very short passage.
5. Summaries should not be too generic. For example, “This document talks about the economics of the developing countries.” is not as informative as “In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations.”

Summarization Annotation Portal

Source document

In any developing country (and I believe Korea is 'developing' and really only started on the road to a real economy with the onset of real elections in 1994) there can be trials and tribulations for those who lead (politicians, heads of business) and follow (workers, students). Don't get me wrong, Korea has made gigantic strides in the last 50 years (thanks mainly to the iron-grip of their president/dictator from 1961 to 1979, Park Chung Hee) and in the last 10 years (when Korea really started to open up to Western influences)—but things are still in a state of flux here. Business practices have changed (although they retain much of the old flavour), politics...well, politics seems to still be the same... relationships between people has changed (albeit only a little, Koreans still follow Confucius tenets and defer to age, men and the learned) and even language has changed (as the Internet and chatting has led to the truncation of many words). With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. The lady in the BMW below may have done both. She is likely enjoying the ride in her Z4, but (according to [urlLink this newspaper article](#) she is also a victim of over-pricing—something that BMW, I assume, does not mind as they can have a higher profit. (One other part of this may be that BMW has certain 'import duties' over and above the government ones that need to be paid in order to sell their cars here, such is another inefficiency.) [urlLink](#) The BMW Z4...a pricey car in this town. But what about those who cannot afford a luxury car, a flat in Kangnam (the priciest district in Seoul) and an expense account at the local watering hole? Or worse, those who had it all and then lost it? What happens to them? Well, for some, the answer is suicide (hence my mention of [urlLink BASE jumping](#) (Buildings, Antennae, Spans and Earth) in the title. Since there are few guns in Korea (heck, many policemen do a [urlLink Barney Fife](#) and don't even walk around with a loaded gun, the bullets are in their pocket!) the next best thing is jumping. While inline skating one day near the river I saw police taking 2 jumpers from the water—ugh, that was not cool. Sorry for the imagery. One thing that irks me about Korea sometimes is the lack of discretion in some matters (one faux pas I probably just committed above). We know that reporting suicide can lead to more suicides, but they continue to report suicides as they happen. Some of the stories are truly heart-wrenching and I (yes, even I) weep a bit when I hear some of them—this is not something you get desensitized to. If you're of strong mind take a look at this article on recent [urlLink suicides](#). Of course, it's not just in Korea. In the [urlLink U.S. military suicide](#) is the #2 killer (I'm not sure if friendly fire or actual action are #1, you start to wonder sometimes). The interesting thing I found from reading all of this (not that it makes me an expert by any means) is that Korea, although it may have the 4th highest suicide rate in the 29 OECD countries, it was waaaaay down the list globally (Korea always wants to be #1 compared to the top nations, which is why they probably used this statistic). Countries in Eastern Europe (although some of these 'suicides' may be underworld related), Scandinavia, and even the US and Canada, Hong Kong and Japan had higher rates than Korea did in 1994. (From Table 1 in [urlLink this paper/abstract](#) In true Korean fashion, the rates here went from 6.8 per 100,000 in 1998 to 16.5 in 2000 and 18.1 in 2002...man, does everything here have a [urlLink logarithmic curve](#) to it? Some also turn to [urlLink murder](#), such as happened 10 years ago and lately again (and I'm sure there were other cases in-between), but that's another story. Perhaps this is just another part of living in a place where the past is meeting the future head on.

Draft Summary

In a developing country, there are trials and tribulations. With these changes comes inefficiencies. One can capitalize on them or be a victim. For some, the answer is suicide.

Previous Save and Next

Please modify the summary.

Figure 5: A snapshot of annotation portal for the control group.

6. Summaries should not add or make up new information that is not supported by the document.

A.2.2 Stage 2: Evaluation on Collected Summaries

Each annotator will be assigned to 40 documents, each with 3 summaries. They will assign each summary a score on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = worst, 7 = best) and answer seven binary questions about potential issues in the summary.