

Using Foundation Models to Detect Policy Violations with Minimal Supervision

Sid Mittal, Vineet Gupta, Frederick Liu, Mukund Sundararajan

Google LLC

{sidmittal,vineet,frederickliu,mukunds}@google.com

Abstract

Foundation models, *i.e.* large neural networks pre-trained on large text corpora, have revolutionized NLP. They can be instructed directly (*e.g.* (Brown et al., 2020))—this is called *hard prompting*—and they can be tuned using very little data (*e.g.* (Lester et al., 2021))—this technique is called *soft prompting*. We seek to leverage their capabilities to detect policy violations. Our contributions are:

- We identify a hard prompt that adapts chain-of-thought prompting to policy violation tasks. This prompt produces policy violation classifications, along with extractive explanations that justify the classification.
- We compose the hard-prompts with soft-prompt tuning to produce a classifier that attains high accuracy with very little supervision; the same classifier also produces explanations. Though the supervision only acts on the classifications, we find that the modified explanations remain consistent with the (tuned) model’s response.
- Along the way, we identify several unintuitive aspects of foundation models. For instance, adding an example from a specific class can actually reduce predictions of that class, and separately, the effects of tokenization on scoring etc.
- Based on our technical results, we identify a simple workflow for product teams to quickly develop effective policy violation detectors.

1 Introduction

Trigger warning: Sections 2.1 and the appendices contain examples of toxic comments.

1.1 Foundation Models, Prompting, Prompt Tuning

Natural language processing has been transformed by large language models (Peters et al., 2018; De-

vlin et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2022), pre-trained on large corpora; these are also called *foundation models*. Foundation models demonstrate excellent performance on a wide-variety of tasks including translation, answering questions involving factual knowledge, math problems, or common-sense reasoning (Chung et al., 2022).

Foundation models can be instructed to perform a task; this is called prompting (*e.g.* (Brown et al., 2020)). They can also be fine-tuned efficiently using very little data using an approach called soft-prompt tuning (*e.g.* (Lester et al., 2021; Li and Liang, 2021)), discussed further in Section 3.

1.2 Toxicity Detection

We seek to leverage foundation models to detect policy violations. We will use a toxicity detection task (tox, 2019) as a running-example; the task is to identify if a piece of text is insulting, identity-hating, or contains obscene references. These pieces of text could be comments about some content (news article or video), or discussions in a forum. Currently, this task is performed by a combination of humans and machines; humans label training data, which machines use for supervised classification.

Issuing rater instructions, collecting training data, and building models using supervised learning is a fairly labor intensive process. In contrast, prompting can be used for one-off tasks where the cost of collecting data is prohibitive, or to quickly modify instructions when guidelines change, or to test new instructions for human raters.

We expect foundation models to have some knowledge of toxicity because they are trained on portions of the web, news articles and even social media conversations (see Section 3 in (Chowdhery et al., 2022)). State-of-the-art results have been achieved on the toxicity task by other Transformer based language models such as BERT (Duchene

et al., 2023), but there is no prior benchmark that uses models as large as this work and with this little supervision.

1.3 Roadmap

See abstract for a description of our contributions.

Section 2 describes the design of our prompt, including how we adapt chain-of-thought reasoning, and produce extractive explanations. Section 3 describes how we do soft-prompt tuning. Section 4.1 justifies aspects of our prompt design using ablation studies. Section 4.2 discusses how performance varies as we change the tuning dataset size. Sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 indicate a useful mental abstraction of foundation models.

2 Prompt Design

A hard prompt consists of text instructions and optionally a few examples of the desired input/output. This is prepended to the inputs to the foundation model. We discuss the major ideas in the design of our hard prompt below.

2.1 The Hard Prompt

Our hard prompt consists of a Guideline describing the task, followed by a few examples, each consisting of a Comment, Answer, Explanation, Citation and Keywords. The structure of the prompt allows the model to switch between generative (for Explanation) and extractive modes (for Keywords and Citation). Here is part of our prompt. (The full prompt is in Appendix A.)

```
Toxic Policy:
A toxic comment is one which is likely to make the conversation
partner leave a discussion or give up on sharing their perspective.
A comment violates the Toxic Policy if the author:
(1) makes obscene references.
...
(4) humiliates their conversation partner
...
Question: Does the comment violate the Toxic Policy?
...
<Comment> @ okay king of the Wikipedia Nazis. </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment mentions 'king of the Wikipedia Nazis' so
it violates '(4) humiliates their conversation partner'.
</Explanation>
<Citations> (4) humiliates their conversation partner </Citations>
<Keywords> king of the Wikipedia Nazis </Keywords>
---
```

2.2 Extractive Explanations

Citations and Keywords are examples of extractive explanations applied to prompting. Extractive Explanations (DeYoung et al., 2019; Narang et al., 2020) are excerpts from the input text that are produced along with the model’s response; the excerpt justifies or explains the response. We produce two types of excerpts: ‘Keywords’ that are drawn from

the input text (Comment), and ‘Citations’ that are drawn from the Guideline.

2.3 Grounded Reasoning Chains

The structure of our prompt bears resemblance to Chain-of-Thought Prompts (Wei et al., 2022), where models perform tasks in reasoning or mathematics by being prompted using triples of the form <Question, Reasoning, Answer>. In their case, reasoning is an argument or a derivation that helps the model arrive at the right answer.

In contrast, we partition our reasoning into three steps. Two grounded steps extract relevant keywords (e.g. ‘king of the Wikipedia Nazis’ in the example above) from the comment and the applicable citation (e.g. ‘humiliates their conversation partner’) from the guideline. The reasoning can be intuitively interpreted as: The Answer is Yes/No because the excerpt ‘Keywords’ violates the guideline bullet ‘Citation’. The third step is the ‘Explanation’ block, a natural language statement that articulates this argument. Our requirement to tune a soft-prompt also influences the prompt design — see Section 4.2.

2.4 XML Tags

Most other works structure their prompts by using section headings, i.e.,

```
Text: some text
Reasoning: some reasoning
Answer: some response
```

We found this to be fragile when there were long, multi-line comments. We found it effective to use XML-style markup to demarcate the blocks. This eliminates the fragility as we show in Section 4.1 — our models consistently generated the correct XML-like structure. In addition section headings led to tokenization problems (Section 4.5), which we avoid with XML and proper spacing.

3 Soft Prompt Tuning

3.1 What is soft prompt tuning?

Soft prompt tuning (Lester et al., 2021) trains a model on a few hundred or few thousand examples. However, unlike classic fine-tuning, the model’s parameters are frozen. Instead a few artificial tokens are prefixed to each input — the embeddings of these tokens are tuned via gradient descent. These prefixed tokens are called the ‘soft’ prompt. The advantage of this approach is that a single (expensive) foundation model can be used for a variety of tasks.

3.2 Training Dataset Size

We choose a small subset of training examples as a dataset for prompt tuning. This mimics how we intend to apply foundation models. If a lot of training data is available, we could instead use smaller models like BERT; BERT models are cheaper to operate, but need much more supervision. We therefore seek to apply foundation models when a lot of labeled data is not yet available and choose to work with datasets of size 50-5000.

3.3 Composing Prompt Tuning with Extractive Explanations

We assume that supervision is only available for the model’s prediction (toxic or not). No supervision is available for the extractive explanations, because it is harder to produce such supervision. However, we would like the tuned model to produce extractive explanations. We therefore include the hard prompt during tuning and inference.¹

There has been some prior work in combinations of soft and hard prompts, but none to best of our knowledge with a similar setting to ours: using a hard prompt to generate structured explanations, while tuning the soft prompt with supervision from a binary label. The prior works (Yu et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2021) start with a classification task, and use the hard prompts to make the task resemble the pretraining task. For instance, for a sentiment scoring task, the hard prompt appends the review with a template such as "It was X", where the output blank is scored for the probability of [great] or [terrible]. (Han et al., 2021) extends this to the multiclass setting using prior knowledge of each class. In contrast, the goal of the hard prompt in our case is to provide guidelines to describe the task and to control the format of the output.

4 Experiments

We perform experiments on the toxicity detection dataset from (tox, 2019). The binary classification task is to predict whether a piece of text is toxic or not, *i.e.* whether it contains abusive or hateful speech that causes the reader to disengage from a conversation.

The dataset contains around 2M examples. We use the provided splits for train and test. We also

¹One approach is to prompt tune the model without the hard prompt, and add the hard prompt at inference time to get the explanations. However this did not work — the resultant model did not produce any explanations; it just returned the ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ over and over again.

downsample the negative examples in order to create balanced splits for train, validation (pulling examples from train split), and test. We randomly sample to further create train samples of size 50, 100, 200, 500, 1k, 2k, and 5k in order to show scaling performance. Our test set is of size 5000. Our results varied only slightly with test set re-sampling.

We focus our experiments on 3 models: 62B FLAN-cont-PaLM, 540B FLAN-PaLM, and 540B FLAN-U-PaLM (Chung et al., 2022). In addition to being pretrained with prior world knowledge, the instruction tuning from FLAN allows these models to achieve superior few shot and zero shot performance on a variety of benchmarks.

4.1 Ablation Studies

In this section, we justify aspects of our hard prompt (Section 2.1) using ablation experiments. For all experiments in this section, we use 540B FLAN-U-PaLM model (Chung et al., 2022).

A few clarifications about the meaning of the rows in the Table 1. The ‘baseline’ is the few-shot prompt in Appendix A. All our ablations are performed on this version. ‘Prompt with no guideline’ consists only of the few-shot examples without the instructions/guideline that precede it. Since without the guidelines, it doesn’t make sense to have citations or explanations, we remove those as well. ‘Answer only’ removes the explanation, citations and keywords from the prompt, just producing a Yes/No answer. ‘No XML tags’ replaces XML tags with section headings as discussed in Section 2.4. ‘Zero shot’ is a prompt with only the guidelines, without any few shot examples. We see that our baseline outperforms the ablations in all cases for balanced accuracy. (Note that given the nature of the problem, positive accuracy is more important, all else being equal.)

4.2 Prompt tuning

We tuned a prompt consisting of 100 tokens, each with an embedding of dimension 8192 for the 62B model. Similarly, we tune a prompt of 40 tokens with an embedding dimension of 18432 for the 540B models. We trained these tokens with a basic Adam optimizer with clipped gradients. We chose a default learning rate and schedule for all our experiments, and did not tune hyperparameters further. We set sampling temperature to 0 and fixed the prompt initialization, to reduce randomness.

Experiment	Positive Acc	Negative Acc	Balanced Acc
Few-shot prompt (Section 2.1)	0.774	0.835	0.805
Prompt with no guideline	0.734	0.826	0.780
Answer-only	0.764	0.808	0.786
No XML Tags	0.727	0.861	0.794
Zero Shot	0.731	0.870	0.801

Table 1: Ablation studies of our proposed few-shot prompt. Positive and negative accuracies are the recalls on the positive and negative examples in the dataset respectively, also called sensitivity and specificity in the literature.

We experimented with different sizes of the dataset, to see how few examples we could get away with. We show the results of our experiments in Figures 1 and 2. We find that the AUC-ROC and accuracy with a dataset of size as small as 50 is significantly higher than with just the hard prompt; adding more examples only produces a gradual increase in accuracy. From the graph it appears that accuracy would increase with even larger datasets (larger than 5000 in size), but the goal of this work (as discussed in Section 3) is to explore the benefit of this technique when few training examples are available.




Figure 1: AUC for different training examples sizes, for three different models. 0 indicates no prompt tuning.

We also computed the AUC for soft prompt tuning without the few-shot prompt, and found it to be slightly lower — for the 62B model the AUC without the few-shot prompt is 0.938, whereas with the few-shot prompt it was 0.951 (with a training set of size 5000 examples). Thus, not only does the presence of the few-shot prompt during fine-tuning help produce extractive explanations (Keywords and Citations), it also increases performance slightly.

In Appendix D, we show several examples where the prediction of the few-shot prompt differed from the soft prompt. We note that whenever the soft-




Figure 2: Balanced accuracy for different training examples sizes, for three different models. 0 indicates no prompt tuning.

prompt changes the output, it also constructs a coherent explanation. Thus the explanations (and also citations and keywords) always match the prediction, so the tuned prompt continues to produce useful explanations.

Producing the answer section before the explanations, citations and keywords has a couple advantages. It allows for us to use supervision since the labels are the immediate next generation of the hard prompt. It also speeds up training because we only need to generate a single token output.

4.3 Few-shot examples are exemplars

In traditional ML, examples determine where the decision boundary is drawn, and the boundary is drawn to maximize margin between positive and negative examples. Typically, adding more examples of a certain class, increases the number of times that class is predicted. In contrast, with foundation models, the few examples that we supply, mimic ‘exemplars’, *i.e.* typical examples, as it would with humans. Adding examples from a class could reduce the number of times that class is predicted. For instance, if examples of violations are

all very severe, only true severe violations will be predicted as violations. A corollary to this is that if you add an example of a severe violation, the model would tend to predict fewer violations. This will cause the model to miss subtle cases nearer the boundary between the two classes.

As an experiment, we added an extreme comment from our training data: “Hey faggot, where is the citation for M Magazine? Plus, your gay comment has atrocious syntax.” Our original few-shot prompt identified 1441 of the 5000 examples as toxic, but the prompt augmented with the extreme example identified only 1166 examples as toxic, affirming our intuition that as the exemplars became more extreme, the model labeled only the more extreme examples toxic.

4.4 Correlation between scores and ratings

A decoder only language model, such as the one we used, operates as follows:

1. Parse the input text as a sequence of tokens, which are predefined character strings (determined at the time of training the model).
2. Compute a probability distribution over all possible next tokens.
3. Output the most probable next token.
4. Append the output token to the input, go back to step (2).

Due to the nature of our prompt, the first token the model outputs is either “Yes” or “No” — the probabilities of these two tokens sum to almost 1. We can use the probability of “Yes” as a score for an example — if the score is above 0.5, the model outputs “Yes”, otherwise the model would output “No”. The score can also be used as an estimate of the certainty of the model — if the score is far from 0.5, the model is more certain. We studied the correlation between the score and the average (across raters) rating of an example, and found the correlation to be quite high (see Table 2). We could use this observation to only route less certain examples to human raters, saving human effort.

4.5 Sensitivity to Tokenization

In the previous section, we observed that the sum of the ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ probabilities is nearly 1.0. However, if we remove the spaces around XML tags, this is no longer true. So if we change “<Answer>_Yes_<Answer>” to “<Answer>Yes<Answer>”, the model additionally

considers the tokens “Yes<” or “No<” as possible responses, among others. Thus we can no longer consider the score for “Yes” as the uncertainty associated with the example. Consequently, the correlation between the score and average ratings disappears (Table 2).

4.6 Keyword matching vs. Language Understanding

In Appendix C, we study a random sample of 10 comments that were labelled toxic but were determined to be non-toxic by our model. 6 out of 10 Comments should have been labeled non-toxic. This demonstrates an application of foundation models to identify mislabeled examples. The examples shown are labeled toxic as they contain words that often occur in toxic contexts (e.g. idiot, Hitler, lazy), but in this case they are clearly not directed at any individual or group. The foundation models seem to detect the nuance of natural language better than raters in these examples.

The examples in Appendix D show an interesting side-effect of prompt tuning. The predictions of the soft-prompt match the rater responses better. However, sometimes the language nuances that the model was able to pick up with the few-shot prompt are over-ridden by the training process. There is no free lunch!

4.7 Some More Examples

In Appendix B, we list a few example outputs of the model with the few-shot prompt. We show several outputs, some correct, some wrong, some toxic, some not.

Some of these examples show the model’s ability to deal with nuances of language. The model was correctly able to recognize that ‘muck-head’ is an obscure insult and ‘shocked you can spell’ is a subtle way to humiliate someone. In contrast, ‘hit the nail on the head’ is not an expression of violence. It also recognized that ‘darn “Christina” holidays’ really meant Christian holidays, hence is attacking religion.

Example 9 shows a case where the model is able to predict multiple reasons to regard a comment as toxic.

The remaining examples show some errors made by the model. It is sometimes more eager to declare a comment toxic, taking offence at phrases like “what is wrong with this generation”. It occasionally misses idioms and slang, assuming that “beat me, sue you, retire” is a threat of violence.




Figure 3: An example workflow for a policy rating task

Experiment	Pearson Corr.	Spearman Rank Corr.	Kendall’s τ
Few-shot prompt (baseline)	0.6404	0.6531	0.4839
Few-shot prompt with fewer spaces	-0.0867	-0.1224	-0.0879
Few-shot with tuning (5K examples)	0.8142	0.8261	0.6474

Table 2: Correlation between the score and the average (across raters) rating for our experiments.

Occasionally it gets the answer right for the wrong reason, as in example 10 — the sarcastic phrase was “Did you really need me to explain that to you?”, but it chose another phrase that was not referring to the participants in the conversation.

5 Workflows

As we have shown, foundation models can attain excellent performance with very little supervision (see Figures 2 and 1. This enables a new workflow that relies on fewer labeled examples (rater supervision), and enables a product team to implement new policies with greater velocity. We illustrate this in Figure 3.

In the first step, we use a description of a policy along with a handful of labeled examples as a few-shot prompt, and then run this on some data and manually inspect the result, tweaking the prompt till it performs adequately. This step is more art than science, but the discussions in Sections 2.1 can serve as a guide.

The next task is creating a training set for soft-prompt tuning. We either take a few dozen random examples and label them. We can use the technique in Appendix E to inspect and fix labels. We then train a soft-prompt with this data (see Section 3. We again evaluate this on a test sample, and modify

the hard prompt, or expand the training set.

After some iterations, we are ready to deploy the prompt. If the score produced by the model is extreme, *i.e.* the model is more certain, then we can accept the result. (As Section 4.4 shows, the scores are correlated with rater uncertainty.) Otherwise the example is sent off for human evaluation, and these examples can then be added to the soft-prompt training set for future iterations.

6 Limitations

- We have only evaluated the method for English language text.
- We have not tested on adversarial behavior, *i.e.*, someone trying to defeat the classifier willfully.
- The large language models that we use are not yet available widely.
- Publicly available foundation models do not yet offer prompt tuning interfaces.

References

2019. [Jigsaw unintended bias in toxicity classification.](#)

- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#).
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pilla, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. [Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways](#).
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2022. [Scaling instruction-finetuned language models](#).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. [BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805.
- Jay DeYoung, Sarthak Jain, Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Eric Lehman, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Byron C. Wallace. 2019. [Eraser: A benchmark to evaluate rationalized nlp models](#).
- Corentin Duchene, Henri Jamet, Pierre Guillaume, and Reda Dehak. 2023. [A benchmark for toxic comment classification on civil comments dataset](#).
- Xu Han, Weilin Zhao, Ning Ding, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2021. [Ptr: Prompt tuning with rules for text classification](#).
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. [The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. [Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation](#).
- Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2021. [Gpt understands, too](#).
- Sharan Narang, Colin Raffel, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Noah Fiedel, and Karishma Malkan. 2020. [Wt5?! training text-to-text models to explain their predictions](#). *CoRR*, abs/2004.14546.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [Deep contextualized word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. [Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2201.11903.
- Ping Yu, Wei Wang, Chunyuan Li, Ruiyi Zhang, Zhanpeng Jin, and Changyou Chen. 2022. [Stt: Soft template tuning for few-shot adaptation](#).

A Few-shot Prompt

Toxic Policy:

A toxic comment is one which is likely to make the conversation partner leave a discussion or give up on sharing their perspective. A comment violates the Toxic Policy if:

- (1) the author makes obscene references.
- (2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner.
- (3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference.
- (4) the author humiliates their conversation partner.

However there are exceptions. A comment does not violate the Toxic Policy if it is:
(a) criticizing or debating or disagreeing with the edits someone made constructively.

Question: Does the comment violate the Toxic Policy?

<Comment> My addition to talk page is not a personal attack. If it was, he would certainly know of the attack. I simply placed a request for discussion as to why continually harasses and defames other wikipedia users. </Comment>

<Answer> No </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment does not violate the Toxic Policy. </Explanation>

<Citations> </Citations>

<Keywords> </Keywords>

<Comment> You can't fucking block me for 3 months for fucking personal attacks or harassment! You fucking stupid hellhole, you better motherfucking let me vandalize Wikipedia again FRICKEN NOW! </Comment>

<Answer> Yes </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment mentions 'fucking block me', 'fucking personal attacks' so violates '(1) the author makes obscene references'. It also mentions 'You fucking stupid hellhole' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'. </Explanation>

<Citations> (1) the author makes obscene references, (4) the author humiliates their conversation partner </Citations>

<Keywords> fucking block me | fucking personal attacks | You fucking stupid hellhole </Keywords>

<Comment> @ okay king of the Wikipedia Nazis. </Comment>

<Answer> Yes </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment mentions 'king of the Wikipedia Nazis' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'. </Explanation>

<Citations> (4) the author humiliates their conversation partner </Citations>

<Keywords> king of the Wikipedia Nazis </Keywords>

<Comment> important you and your family shall burn! you have been warned, if you do troll mikes talk page i will slaughter you in your sleep. bye... </Comment>

<Answer> Yes </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment says 'i will slaughter you' so violates '(2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner'. </Explanation>

<Citations> (2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner </Citations>

<Keywords> i will slaughter you </Keywords>

<Comment> Please do not vandalize pages, as you did with this edit to Moriah. If you continue to do so, you will be blocked from editing. (talk) </Comment>

<Answer> No </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment is '(a) criticizing or debating or disagreeing with the edits someone made constructively'. </Explanation>

<Citations> (a) criticizing or debating or disagreeing with the edits someone made constructively </Citations>
<Keywords> </Keywords>

<Comment> ... </Comment>

B Example outputs produced by the model

The following are some examples of the outputs produced by the model:

1. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> The incentive to lie is that Wikileaks has most likely been under Russian thumbs for years already before the events of the 2016 election. Have they published ANYTHING that would seriously embarrass the Kremlin in the last five years? No. They're co-opted by the Russians. </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment mentions 'Russian thumbs' so it violates '(1) the author makes obscene references'. </Explanation>
<Citations> (1) the author makes obscene references </Citations>
<Keywords> Russian thumbs </Keywords>

2. Toxic

<Comment> so muck-head, your telling us they will leave this if we tax them fairly?... You have to be dreaming or misinformed. </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation>The comment mentions 'muck-head' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'.</Explanation>
<Citations> (4) the author humiliates their conversation partner </Citations>
<Keywords> muck-head </Keywords>

3. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> While I am shocked you can spell "magisterium". </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment mentions 'shocked you can spell' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'. </Explanation>
<Citations> (4) the author humiliates their conversation partner </Citations>
<Keywords> shocked you can spell </Keywords>

4. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> geez how come we have these types of accidents. what is wrong with today's generation. back in my days (early 60s) many of our moms drove but no infant or toddler got runned over by their own mother, and we had bigger cars back then. I'm having a hard time figuring out how this happened, and this is not the first time this type of accident happened in our island. what is going on with these parents nowadays. wake up and start caring where your child is before you go. this is just ridiculous. </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment mentions 'what is wrong with today's generation' so

it violates '(3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference'. </Explanation>
<Citations> (3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference </Citations>
<Keywords> what is wrong with today's generation | what is going on with these parents nowadays | wake up and start caring where your child is before you go | this is just ridiculous </Keywords>

5. Human Rating: Toxic

<Comment> Is there no hoop too silly, too ridiculous for university administrators to jump through? </Comment>
<Answer> No </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment does not violate the Toxic Policy. </Explanation>
<Citations> </Citations>
<Keywords> </Keywords>

6. Human Rating: Toxic

<Comment> There is no place in our school system for the recognition of those darn "Christina" holidays. </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment denigrates an individual or group based on their religion so it violates '(3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference'. </Explanation>
<Citations> (3) denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference </Citations>
<Keywords> darn "Christina" holidays </Keywords>

7. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> Maybe the police are at fault, not United. Anyway beat me, sue you, retire. </Comment>
<Answer> Yes </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment mentions 'beat me, sue you, retire' so it violates '(2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner'. </Explanation>
<Citations> (2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner </Citations>
<Keywords> beat me, sue you, retire </Keywords>

8. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> The serious content here is the social conservative agenda. There is no plausible plan to deal with girdlock. No carbon tax but also no alternative for combatting climate change. We shouldn't flippantly dismiss this serious content; rather we should acknowledge that it isn't good polciy. </Comment>
<Answer> No </Answer>
<Explanation> The comment is '(a) criticizing or debating or disagreeing with the edits someone made constructively'. </Explanation>
<Citations>(a) criticizing or debating or disagreeing with the edits someone made constructively</Citations>
<Keywords> </Keywords>

9. Toxic

<Comment> Where are the guys with three names when they are REALLY needed? This guy is a natural born mistake. I would call him a complete idiot but I am not sure he is complete yet. We can only hope for a cardiac event or a stray bus. </Comment>

<Answer> Yes </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment mentions 'This guy is a natural born mistake' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'. It also mentions 'I would call him a complete idiot' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'. It also mentions 'We can only hope for a cardiac event or a stray bus' so it violates '(2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner'. </Explanation>

<Citations> (4) the author humiliates their conversation partner,(2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner </Citations>

<Keywords> This guy is a natural born mistake | I would call him a complete idiot | We can only hope for a cardiac event or a stray bus</Keywords>

10. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> Then he comes off as being prejudiced against Moslems. Did you really need me to explain that to you? </Comment>

<Answer> Yes </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment mentions 'prejudiced against Moslems' so it violates '(3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference'. </Explanation>

<Citations> (3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference </Citations>

<Keywords> prejudiced against Moslems </Keywords>

11. Human Rating: Non-toxic

<Comment> Thank you for this great column. When I said much of the same stuff in the comment section I was attacked and had several comments blocked as "uncivil" when they were not. Things that certain other commenters wrote were vile and nasty with swearing but they were ruled "civil". Go figure. </Comment>

<Answer> No </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment does not violate the Toxic Policy. </Explanation>

<Citations> </Citations>

<Keywords> </Keywords>

12. Human Rating: Toxic

<Comment> Hit the head on the nail. </Comment>

<Answer> No </Answer>

<Explanation> The comment does not violate the Toxic Policy. </Explanation>

<Citations> </Citations>

<Keywords> </Keywords>

C False negatives produced by the model

The following is a sample of the comments that had a label "Toxic" but were determined to be non-toxic by our model. We chose the first ten such examples, to avoid cherry-picking.

- The cops should have 15 patrol officers on that stretch of road every day. They could make a mint off all the idiots who speed and pass illegally. This comment is not really directed at a particular individual or group.
- Killing someone, particularly oneself, with a knife is much more difficult than with a gun. Golly! Never thought of that!. This could be considered toxic (sarcasm).
- Legally, the verdict was correct. I still believe XXXX did what he was accused of. In a situation where there is a power imbalance (does't have to be sexual assault) the victim is screwed. It is wrong for YYYY to tell victims it has to be this way. The legal system is skewed. The principal of reasonable doubt is noble but the reality is that victims are at an UNFAIR disadvantage. Telling them to suck it up is wrong.. This does not seem toxic.
- Well said. People drive because it's cheap and easy and they are lazy (myself included sometimes). That doesn't mean we should shoot ourselves in the foot and create a sprawling garbage city like most of the US.. Not directed at any individual.
- Hypocrisy is a feature of politicians. This is not directed at any user.
- You keep on believing that. Boulder.... 25 square miles of Utopian controlled bliss surrounded by reality! Personal responsibility and the free market be damned so good luck with that nanny state mentality.. This is likely toxic.
- It may be easy to define some "hate groups" depending on what they do and what they say. But what if someone like Hitler defines a "hate group" as being "Jews" and seeks to exterminate them? And don't claim that "Oh, that is ridiculous. That would never happen in the United States." Well, it happened in Germany.....and for many years the Germans, most of Europe, and the US turned a blind eye.....because it wasn't happening to them.. The comment is not directed at any user.
- Kicking a hard-working, plucky team who came this close to the finals? Why would the Globe and Mail even publish such nasty drivel?. This is not directed at any user.
- That's silly. This comment could be considered toxic.
- Let us reflect on these words from Joeseph Goebbels: "We enter parliament in order to supply ourselves, in the arsenal of democracy, with its own weapons. If democracy is so stupid as to give us free tickets and salaries for this bear's work, that is its affair. We do not come as friends, nor even as neutrals. We come as enemies. As the wolf bursts into the flock, so we come.". This comment might be considered toxic, depending on the context.

D Examples where the soft prompt changed the prediction of the few-shot prompt

- The cops should have 15 patrol officers on that stretch of road every day. They could make a mint off all the idiots who speed and pass illegally.
Human Rating: Toxic.
Few-shot: No.
Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'idiots' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'.

- Bullshit. When two friends and I were coming to Alaska we were crossing at Vancouver. They took us one at a time into a little room and asked what the penalty for possession of marijuana was where we were from. We were from Oregon and at the time it was a 100 dollar fine for an ounce or under. He then asked if we ever smoked any. I said I had a couple of "drags" at a party once years before. My friends lied and said no, never. I was refused entry and they were not. This happened a lot, so this guy is full of it.
 Human Rating: Toxic.
 Few-shot: No.
 Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'Bullshit' so it violates '(1) the author makes obscene references'.
- At least we don't have to discuss how badly the person deserved to die based on his helmet status or how fast Lance Armstrong can ride a bike.
 Human Rating: Non-toxic.
 Few-shot: No.
 Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'die' so violates '(2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner'.
- These people you mention were courageous people indeed. But they didn't die for love, nor even for principles. They died for dogmas. That makes them fools. (Not my words but the words of David Bowie, no less, regarding the martyrdom of St Thomas More.)
 Human Rating: Toxic.
 Few-shot: No.
 Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'die' so violates '(2) the author threatens violence against their conversation partner'.
- Well look on the bright side sunshine, at least I left his crazy mother out of it.
 Human Rating: Toxic.
 Few-shot: No.
 Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'crazy mother' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'.
- There is no place in our school system for the recognition of those darn "Christina" holidays.
 Human Rating: Toxic.
 Few-shot: Yes. The comment denigrates an individual or group based on their religion so it violates '(3) the author denigrates an individual or group based on their race, gender, religion or sexual preference'. Keywords: darn "Christina" holidays.
 Soft-prompt: No.
- Hopefully these two criminals are convicted and a judgment or restitution takes away their assets, PFD, and Imig Audio and Video. Those Imig's are shady to say the least... Man up and show up in court!
 Human Rating: Toxic.
 Few-shot: No.
 Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'criminals' so it violates '(1) the author makes obscene references'.
- no one believes your sick stupidity, oil is increasing in demand around the world and has been responsible for our great standards of living and technology,, you go live in a cave with a bike if you like but we will stick with great fossil

fuels

Human Rating: Toxic.

Few-shot: No.

Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'sick stupidity' so it violates '(1) the author makes obscene references'.

- Its not rocket science people. Icky weather makes for not so cool driving conditions. Your not new to the world so common sense should tell you to SLOW IT DOWN! Nobody is invincible. If you want to drive like a idiot go find a secluded spot so you dont hurt others. Good gravy!

Human Rating: Toxic.

Few-shot: No.

Soft-prompt: Yes. The comment mentions 'idiot' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'.

- Take what I say out of context. You do that all the time. You are just here to troll and you mostly get away with it... Only 3 of your comments removed today? I wonder how that happened.

Human Rating: Toxic.

Few-shot: Yes. The comment mentions 'troll' so it violates '(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner'. Soft-prompt: No.

- Dumb.

Human Rating: Toxic.

Few-shot: No.

Soft-prompt: Dumb is a toxic comment. (1) the author makes obscene references,(4) the author humiliates their conversation partner

E Identifying mislabeled examples

We show top few examples when sorted by the magnitude of the difference between the average rating of an example and the score produced by the few shot prompt. This can be useful in identifying mislabeled examples. We show the labels given by the raters.

- I hope someone you love commits a crime that is legally classified as violent, although it really isn't. I want to be there to watch your loved ground screaming into teeny, tiny pieces.

Human Rating: Non-toxic.

- I would like to thank the snow god for kickin the a** of the frezin rain god! Peace V.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Dumb drivers

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Of course the comment you refer to is more funny than anything else, but basically it is some sort of underhand advertising. I think it is meant to illustrate that this comment section does not want to provide a forum for advertising especially not to witchdoctors and penis enlargers. I fully agree with that.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- you're getting goofy again Vic.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Great idea, Vicky. But be prepared - all of the usual trolls going to have a heyday with this series. You and your contributors will be absolute idiots for failing to foresee the dilemmas you found yourselves in. XXXX will almost certainly use these articles as source material for his rant series (that should be) titled Morons That Made A Mistake I Was Too Smart To Make. Most of us are too self conscious to share experiences were were lucky to walk away from. I would never admit that, uh, a friend of mine, once decided to try a new route back to a familiar campsite at dusk. A slight deviation about 300 yards from the destination resulted in hours of walking in circles in the rain. Oddly, my friend asserts that effective problem solving is compromised as exhaustion sets in and darkness steals depth perception and contrast. He eventually stumbled upon the place he began, then followed the familiar route back. Sure hope Mr. XXXX doesn't read this comment

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Are you referring to those educated in our over-funded public schools, by union card carrying educators? These low information voters? Yeah, thought so.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Millions of non Muslims work in the Arabian Gulf countries, including Saudi Arabia. About 40,000 Canadians work in the UAE. For decades. Like Carville said, it's the economy, stupid.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Here Allie, I've got a ladder for you. Now, you can come down to the level most of the human race resides at. BTW, I've also got a plate of humility and self empathy if you still hungry.

Human Rating: Non-toxic.

- "Haole" is a derogatory noun, because that is the typical context in which it is used. As far as being a "contraction" of ha and ole, your description is vague. There is, that I know of, no word on Hawaiian spelled 'ha'ole' which would include the consonant 'okina, which is not a contraction. The word 'haole' is a combination of 'ha' meaning "breath", and 'ole' which is "without". Therefore, the term for Caucasians is a word meaning without breath, which equates in context to "without aloha". For this reason Dave expounded on your mention of context with the fact that the context is commonly properly understood as "[f'in] haole" when used. The word "haole" is not akin to "black", it is akin to "nigger". Yes, I used it. But there's not really another way around this problem. Now go use it in SCLA.

Human Rating: Non-toxic.

- Are you sad because the earth is short one Daesh?

Human Rating: Non-toxic.

- The name was only ever an ironic icing to a shit-cake of gentrification. Changing the name doesn't change the fact that the restaurant aims to glorify one of the biggest and most destructive colonial forces in history, in one of Portland's historically black neighborhoods.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- Super dumb. A cow moose and a cow elk look nothing alike besides the fact that they're brown...and have fur.

Human Rating: Toxic.

- He's made more in a few years than you will make in your lifetime. Plus he's done more for his community than a tired white guy like you. (We all see thru the name)

Human Rating: Non-toxic.