

LaMSUM: A Novel Framework for Extractive Summarization of User Generated Content using LLMs

Garima Chhikara^{1,2}, Anurag Sharma³, V. Gurucharan⁴, Kripabandhu Ghosh³, Abhijnan Chakraborty⁵

¹Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India

²Delhi Technological University, India

³Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, India

⁴ Collaborative Dynamics, Texas, USA

⁵Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive performance across a wide range of NLP tasks, including summarization. Inherently LLMs produce abstractive summaries, and the task of achieving extractive summaries through LLMs still remains largely unexplored. To bridge this gap, in this work, we propose a novel framework LaMSUM to generate extractive summaries through LLMs for *large* user-generated text by leveraging voting algorithms. Our evaluation on three popular open-source LLMs (Llama 3, Mixtral and Gemini) reveal that the LaMSUM outperforms state-of-the-art extractive summarization methods. We further attempt to provide the rationale behind the output summary produced by LLMs. Overall, this is one of the early attempts to achieve extractive summarization for large user-generated text by utilizing LLMs, and likely to generate further interest in the community.

1 Introduction

Social media platforms like Facebook, X and Reddit offer a medium for individuals to express their opinions and views on various subjects, leading to a diverse array of perspectives shared through social debates, critiques, and reviews (Zhang et al., 2024b; Chhikara et al., 2023; Dash et al., 2019; Bražinskas et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2016). With a vast amount of crowdsourced data being generated online, there is a requirement for a summarization algorithm that can provide a precise and concise summary, eliminating the need for users to sift through numerous posts or reviews. Based on the output, summarization algorithms can be categorized as ‘extractive’ and ‘abstractive’. In extractive summarization, the aim is to select a subset such that it is representative of the original text (Xu et al., 2020; Liu and Lapata, 2019; Zhong et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2022, 2023a). On the other hand, in abstractive, the goal is to generate natural language

summaries that capture the essence of the original text (Lewis et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

In recent years, Large Language Models (LLMs) have exhibited high performance for various tasks, including summarization (Ouyang et al., 2022; Brown et al., 2020). Summaries generated by LLMs showcase high coherence and are preferred by human evaluators (Pu et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023). LLMs are generative models and by default perform abstractive summarization by paraphrasing and selecting the most relevant sentences. However, extractive summarization has an important use case when dealing with user-generated text. For example, a Google search for a topic or hashtag shows new and trending tweets alongside the usual lists of websites and news articles (Griffin, 2015); the Library of Congress only stores a selection of tweets as part of its archive (Congress, 2017); e-commerce platforms like Amazon show only a subset of reviews in the condensed window unless expanded. Such cases can be considered as instances of extractive summarization of user-generated content, where the target is to select the most relevant subset that can effectively summarize a topic or a product.

Given the increasing reliance on LLMs for summarization, it is worth investigating how LLMs can be utilized for extractive summarization. However, the internal mechanisms of LLMs for tasks like summarization are not well understood, raising concerns about the interpretability and reliability of the summaries they generate. In this work, we attempt to tackle both these issues by making the following contributions:

- We propose a novel framework LaMSUM, a **Large Language Model** based approach for **Extractive SUM**marization of large (having >30K tokens) user-generated content.
- LaMSUM considers a multi-level summarization model that utilizes voting algorithms to combine outputs from multiple levels.

- To better provide explainability for the generated summaries by LLMs, we probe the LLMs to comprehend the rationale behind the generated output.

To our knowledge, this is one of the first attempts to implement extractive summarization of large user-generated texts using LLMs, while also exploring the reasoning behind the selection of specific sentences in the generated output. We believe this work can spawn further works in this direction.

Related Work

Large Language Models (LLMs) are now being extensively used for summarization (Brown et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2023). Numerous studies have suggested few-shot learning frameworks for the abstractive summarization of news, opinions, dialogues, and queries (Zhang et al., 2023b; Tang et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; Bražinskas et al., 2020), but their primary focus remained short documents. Other works have examined how human evaluators prefer the summaries produced by LLMs. (Zhang et al., 2024a; Wu et al., 2024; Goyal et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023c). Recent studies have investigated the capacity of LLMs to reason and identify factual inaccuracies and inconsistencies in summaries (Tang et al., 2024; Tam et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2023; Laban et al., 2023)

We found two studies that are related to our work. Previous research (Zhang et al., 2023b) has addressed extractive summarization of short news articles using GPT-3.5, while another study (Chang et al., 2024) investigated abstractive summarization for book-length document with contextual dependencies. To the best of our knowledge, no existing work has solved the challenge of extractive summarization for large user-generated text in a way that eliminates positional bias.

2 LaMSUM: Generating Extractive Summaries through LLMs

In this section, we introduce our novel summarization framework LaMSUM that leverages LLMs to summarize large user-generated text.¹ We define T as a collection of crowd-sourced text (e.g., tweets, Reddit posts). If we assume the context window size of an LLM is W , usually the total content in T won't fit in a single context window, i.e., $|T| \gg W$. The summarization task entails

¹Code is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/LaMSUM/>

obtaining k textual units which are representative of the units in T .

2.1 Multi-Level Summarization

Since LLMs have a limited context window, large text collections cannot be input all at once. Therefore, the input must be divided into smaller chunks to perform the desired task (Chang et al., 2024). Thus, we propose a multi-level framework for extractive summarization (detailed in Figure 1).

Set T containing the original textual units is provided as an input at level 0. T is divided into chunks of size s and number of chunks formed are $\lceil \frac{|T|}{s} \rceil$. From each chunk of size s we generate a summary (discussed in Section 2.2) of size q such that $q < s$. q length summaries are obtained from $\lceil \frac{|T|}{s} \rceil$ chunks. We merge all the summaries obtained from level 0 to form an input for the next level i.e., level 1. We repeatedly perform this process until we obtain the final summary of length k . Note that the last chunk might have a size less than q , in such case we move all the textual units of the respective chunk to the next level (refer Algorithm 1).

An alternate naive strategy would be to divide the input T in $\lceil \frac{|T|}{s} \rceil$ chunks each of size s and from each chunk select $\frac{k \cdot s}{|T|}$ sentence to be included in the summary. However, this approach assumes a uniform distribution of potential candidates across chunks that can be included in the final summary. In LaMSUM, we keep $q = k$ i.e., we extract k textual units from each chunk eliminating the chance of missing any potential candidate (discussed in Section 3.4). In the worst-case scenario, all k units in the final summary can come from a single chunk, and our algorithm can handle such cases effectively.

It is important to note that we are dealing with user-generated content, such as tweets, which are authored by different users and lack contextual connections. Unlike book summarization, where chapters are interconnected and the context of previous chapters is crucial for summarizing the current one, tweets are generally standalone and contextually independent. Thus, our approach of independently deriving summaries from each chunk works well in our setup, as each textual unit operates independently of the others.

2.2 Summarizing a Chunk

Next, we discuss how LaMSUM summarizes a chunk (Algorithm 2) by tackling the positional bias in LLMs and leveraging voting algorithms drawn from Social Choice Theory (Brandt et al., 2016).




Figure 1: LaMSUM: Multi-level framework for extractive summarization of large user-generated text. Input set T (level 0) is divided into $\lceil \frac{|T|}{s} \rceil$ chunks each of size s . From each chunk a summary is produced of size q (refer Figure 2), q length summaries from $\lceil \frac{|T|}{s} \rceil$ chunks are merged to form the input for the next level i.e., level 1. Iteratively the same procedure is repeated till we obtain a summary of size k . We set $q = k$ to ensure our algorithm can effectively handle the worst-case scenario where all the textual units in the final summary may come from the same input chunk (Section 2.1).




Figure 2: Textual units (or posts) in the input chunk are shuffled to account for the positional bias. m different chunk variations are obtained through shuffling, which are subsequently summarized using LLMs. m summaries are then aggregated by voting algorithms to compose the final summary.

Tackling Positional Bias

Prior works (Brown and Shokri, 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b; Jung et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2024) have demonstrated that summarization using LLM is prone to positional bias, i.e., the sentences located in certain positions, such as the beginning of arti-

cles, are more likely to be considered in the summary. To address this issue, we obtain m different variations by shuffling the textual units in the input chunk, such that each unit gets an opportunity to appear in various positions in the input text (refer Figure 2).

Zero-shot prompting

For each input chunk, we then obtain m different summaries (one for each variation) by prompting the LLM to select the most suitable units that summarizes the input text, and by generating a ranked list in descending order of preference (refer Appendix A.1.1 and A.1.2 for example prompts).

It is important to note that when LLMs are prompted to *simply perform extractive summarization*, they generate abstractive summaries instead. Therefore, we had to revise our prompting strategy to emphasize on sentence selection. Though LLMs can properly explain what is extractive summarization, they struggle to apply it in practice when prompted directly.

Output Calibration

LLMs may alter certain words from the input text while generating extractive summary, as shown in

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for multi-level summarization

Input: T, k, s, q, m

while $|T| > k$ **do** ▷ Iterate over all the levels until k length summary is obtained

$n_{chunks} = \lceil \frac{|T|}{s} \rceil$ ▷ number of chunks in set T

$L = \{\}$ ▷ L stores the results of a given level

for $i \leftarrow 1$ to n_{chunks} **do**

$si = (i - 1) * s$ ▷ si indicates the starting index of the chunk

$ei = i * s$ ▷ ei indicates the ending index of the chunk

if $i = n_{chunks}$ **then**

$ei = |T|$ ▷ in last chunk, ending index is the length of the set T

end if

$width = ei - si$ ▷ $width$ is the number of textual units in a chunk

if $width \leq q$ **then**

$L = L \cup T_{si} \cup T_{si+1} \cup \dots \cup T_{ei-1}$ ▷ For last chunk, add all textual units to the result

else

$L = L \cup \text{CHUNKRESULT}(T, si, ei, q, m)$ ▷ Add summary of each chunk to result L

end if

end for

$T = L$ ▷ Update the input T for the next level

end while

Output: T

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for summarization of a chunk

function $\text{CHUNKRESULT}(T, si, ei, q, m)$

$X = \{\}$

for $i \leftarrow 1$ to m **do** ▷ For each variation of a chunk

$V = \text{SHUFFLE}(T, si, ei, i)$ ▷ Shuffle the sentences of a chunk with random state i

$R = \text{LLM}(V, q)$

▷ Output q textual units in approval voting and $|V|$ textual units in ranked voting

$C = \text{CHECK}(R, T, si, ei)$ ▷ Calibrate output to ensure extractive summarization

$X.add(C)$

end for

return $\text{VOTING}(X, q)$ ▷ Voting Algorithm to find a summary from m chunk variations

end function

Table 1. Thus, we perform additional checks to ensure that the textual units selected in the summary are indeed a subset of set T . If the post selected by the LLM (say x) is not present in the original text T , we identify the post with the closest resemblance to x by computing the edit distance (Ristad and Yianilos, 1998). LLMs may also hallucinate, generating new sentences rather than selecting units from the input. In such instances, the edit distance between the generated unit x and all the original textual units would be high. We discard these sentences from the output.

Reimagining Summarization as an Election

As mentioned earlier, for a given chunk, we obtain m summaries – one for each variation. We imag-

ine the creation of the final summary from these m summaries as a *multi-winner election*, where the m summaries correspond to m ballots and the role of the voting algorithm is to pick q winners. We employ three different voting methods, namely Majority Voting (Boyer and Moore, 1991), Proportional Approval Voting (Lackner et al., 2023) and Ranked Choice Voting (Emerson, 2013) to determine the final summary. Due to the varying input requirements of different voting methods, changing both the prompting approach and the output generated by the LLM becomes imperative.

In Majority Voting, a textual unit qualifies for inclusion in the final summary if it appears in at least $\lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil$ summaries. In Proportional Approval

| Original Post | LLM Modified Output |
|--|--|
| My allergies be acting up & Claritin be letting them >,<,< | My allergies be acting up & Claritin be letting them. |
| I spent the extra money to have fast relief, but instead I am SUFFERING #gimmemy moneyback | I spent the extra money to have fast relief, but instead I am SUFFER |

Table 1: Examples illustrating that LLMs when selecting textual units for summarization, often demonstrate a propensity to alter certain words or introduce new ones.

Voting, selection of textual units is proportional to the amount of support each unit receives in m summaries. Both Majority and Proportional are approval-based voting algorithms, meaning that the units are either approved or disapproved by the underlying LLM, with no explicit ranking or preference order. In this case, we prompt the LLM to *select the best q sentences that summarize the input text*. On the other hand, Ranked Choice Voting entails assigning a score to each textual unit and subsequently selecting the highest-scoring units for inclusion in the summary. Thus, we prompt the LLM to *output sentences in descending order of their suitability for the summary*.

Please note that the prompting technique and the output generated by LLM vary for different voting methods. In approval voting the output from LLM is a list of q textual units that LLM finds best suited to be included in the summary. Whereas in Ranked Choice Voting, the output from LLM is a list of the same length as input i.e. s with all the units sorted in decreasing order of their preference towards the summary, and Borda Count (Emerson, 2013) is used to identify the top q textual units. In the next section, we show how the voting-based summarization schemes outperform the *Vanilla* setup, which does not use voting.

3 Experimental Setup

3.1 Dataset

We run our experiments on *three* publicly available datasets as listed in Table 2 (Dash et al., 2019). *Claritin* dataset contains 4,037 tweets about the benefits and the side-effects of the anti-allergic drug Claritin. *US-Election* dataset contains 2,120 tweets from 2016 US Presidential Election where people support and attack different political parties. *Me-Too* dataset includes 488 tweets from the October 2018 MeToo movement, where individuals recount the harassment cases they experienced.

3.2 Large Language Models (LLMs)

LLMs are characterized by their extensive parameter sizes and remarkable learning abilities (Zhao et al., 2023; Chang et al., 2023). In our work, we utilize three open-source LLMs to conduct experiments: llama3-70b-8192 from Meta (Touvron et al., 2023), mixtral-8x7b-32768 from Mistral AI (Jiang et al., 2024) and gemini-1.0-pro from Google (Gemini Team, 2023). Across all experiments, we keep temperature, top probability and output tokens as 0, 0.8 and 8192 respectively.

3.3 Evaluation Metric

For evaluating the summary quality, we report ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-Lsum scores (Lin, 2004). ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L respectively evaluate the overlap of unigrams, bigrams and longest common subsequence between the generated summary and the reference summary. ROUGE-Lsum is more suitable for extractive summarization, it applies ROUGE-L at sentence level and then aggregates all the results for the final score.

3.4 LaMSUM Input Parameters

Input parameters for LaMSUM (Algorithm 1), such as $|T|$ (total number of textual units in the set), s (chunk size) and k (length of summary) are listed in Table 2 for different voting algorithms and datasets. The value of m (number of shuffling) for all the datasets was kept as 5.

If $q \in [k, s)$, our proposed method can handle worst case scenario where all the textual units in the final summary may originate from a single chunk of level 0. As q approaches s , more levels are required to converge to the final summary. The optimal value of q that can handle worst case and also reduce the number of levels in multi-level summarization is k , thus we keep $q = k$ for experiments with approval voting. If s is 200 and q is 100, this indicates that only 50% of the units from each chunk advance to the next level.

| Dataset | #ITU ($ T $) | #IW | Approval Voting | | Ranked Voting | | #STU (k) |
|-------------|----------------|-------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | #CTU (s) | #CSTU (q) | #CTU (s) | #CSTU (q) | |
| Claritin | 4037 | 53609 | 200 | 100 | 40 | 20 | 100 |
| US-Election | 2120 | 35522 | 150 | 100 | 40 | 20 | 100 |
| MeToo | 488 | 16737 | 75 | 50 | 40 | 20 | 50 |

Table 2: Input parameters used for the proposed framework LaMSUM. #ITU is the number of textual units in the input set i.e. $|T|$. #IW represents the number of words present in the input set T . #CTU are the number of textual units in a chunk i.e. chunk size represented as s . #CSTU are the number of textual units in the chunk summary represented as q . #STU is the number of textual units present in the final summary i.e. k .

In ranked voting algorithm, we maintain smaller value for chunk size (s) to ensure that the LLMs output, which is of size s , fits within the context window. Additionally, as chunk size increases, LLM often does not output all the sentences, instead produces generalized statements like “*similarly for other sentences we find the rank*”. Therefore, it is essential to keep the chunk size smaller. For ranked voting, we set s and q to 40 and 20 respectively, upholding the selection ratio of 50% at each level.

4 Results

In this section, we present the empirical comparison of LaMSUM with competent baseline models and voting algorithms across datasets (refer Table 3).

Do LLMs perform better?

We compare LaMSUM with the pre-neural (ClusterRank (Garg et al., 2009), DSDR (He et al., 2012), LexRank (Erkan and Radev, 2004), Summ-Basic (Nenkova and Vanderwende, 2005), LUHN (Luhn, 1958)), neural (SummaRunner (Nallapati et al., 2017)) and transformer based models (BERT (Miller, 2019), XLNET (Yang et al., 2019)). As shown in Table 3 it is observed that LLMs outperform the state-of-the-art summarization models. Earlier work (Zhang et al., 2023b) reported that the ChatGPT model achieves lower ROUGE scores on CNN/DM and XSum dataset. But our results demonstrate that open source LLMs with our proposed framework LaMSUM perform significantly better than other fine-tuned models for large user-generated text.

Results from the LLM exhibit variability when executed multiple times over the same input. We conducted experiments with LLMs for five iterations for the same input. Table 3 contains the maximum ROUGE score obtained from these five iterations and Table 4 displays the variance in the ROUGE scores when run five times.

Does our framework help?

Our proposed framework LaMSUM ensures robust summary generation by shuffling and employing a voting algorithm to select the best textual units for the summary. It is crucial to compare LaMSUM with a multi-level LLM that does not use shuffling and voting, we call it *Vanilla LLM*. Algorithm 3 demonstrates the steps used by vanilla LLM to find the chunk summary. Table 3 demonstrates that the vanilla multi-level LLM has lower ROUGE scores for each LLM compared to the proposed framework LaMSUM, indicating that shuffling and voting enhance the performance.

Which voting algorithm performs the best?

We experimented with three voting algorithms, two approval-based and one ranked-based. Experimental results indicate that LLMs with approval voting perform the best compared to the ranked voting algorithm. We hypothesized that rank-based voting would yield better results, as it makes more informed decisions about the potential sentences to be included in the summary. Contrary to our expectations, rank-based algorithms performed even worse than neural and transformer-based models. This can be attributed to multiple factors: (i) LLMs hallucinate and output sentences in the same or in the reverse order as they were in the input. (ii) Occasionally, LLMs do not output all the sentences from the input, resulting in the padding of left-out sentences towards the end of the list, which disturbs the ranking and potentially affects the result. To overcome these problems, we kept chunk size low as discussed in Section 3.4, but the results still did not surpass those of the approval-based voting algorithm.

Takeaway: LLMs when prompted to *select sentences that can summarize the input* perform better instead when tasked to *rank the sentences in the order of their preference towards the summary*.

| Models | | US-Election | | | Claritin | | | MeToo | | |
|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | R1 | R2 | RLSum | R1 | R2 | RLSum | R1 | R2 | RLSum |
| ClusterRank | | 50.08 | 14.17 | 48.64 | 55.18 | 13.09 | 53.51 | 49.98 | 14.38 | 48.46 |
| DSDR | | 28.01 | 8.40 | 27.45 | 48.04 | 9.53 | 46.44 | 27.04 | 7.43 | 26.54 |
| LexRank | | 45.04 | 19.71 | 44.74 | 42.63 | 10.78 | 41.64 | 45.70 | 20.23 | 45.41 |
| SummBasic | | 58.25 | 19.29 | 56.76 | 55.36 | 12.43 | 53.94 | 57.46 | 18.81 | 55.93 |
| LUHN | | 50.48 | 17.75 | 49.22 | 57.01 | 18.13 | 55.79 | 50.35 | 17.85 | 49.11 |
| SummaRunner | | 56.12 | 19.79 | 54.74 | 55.54 | 12.08 | 54.12 | 55.79 | 18.75 | 54.54 |
| BERT | | 57.30 | 22.37 | 56.21 | 55.89 | 15.44 | 55.00 | 56.37 | 20.89 | 55.38 |
| XLNET | | 55.52 | 21.37 | 54.75 | 56.48 | 15.72 | 55.41 | 54.37 | 20.13 | 53.37 |
| Vanilla | Llama3 | 58.07 | 21.86 | 56.73 | 56.12 | 12.93 | 54.71 | 57.20 | 20.39 | 55.72 |
| | Mixtral | 57.80 | 20.14 | 55.81 | 57.11 | 14.20 | 55.79 | 58.16 | 20.17 | 56.03 |
| | Gemini | 49.70 | 18.33 | 48.78 | 51.00 | 12.36 | 49.19 | 49.31 | 17.80 | 48.35 |
| Majority | Llama3 | 60.12 | 21.84 | 58.51 | 59.00 | 16.74 | 57.99 | 59.74 | 21.13 | 58.03 |
| | Mixtral | 62.19 | 24.19 | 60.89 | 58.03 | 16.03 | 56.95 | 61.81 | 23.63 | 60.46 |
| | Gemini | 61.59 | 22.35 | 59.48 | 57.76 | 16.22 | 56.49 | 60.92 | 21.78 | 58.87 |
| Proportional | Llama3 | 61.31 | 23.36 | 59.73 | 58.90 | 15.99 | 57.55 | 61.12 | 22.84 | 59.54 |
| | Mixtral | 60.30 | 24.03 | 58.58 | 58.46 | 15.74 | 57.28 | 60.16 | 23.12 | 58.33 |
| | Gemini | 61.77 | 19.83 | 59.81 | 57.92 | 15.85 | 56.49 | 61.76 | 19.03 | 59.83 |
| Borda Count | Llama3 | 51.87 | 15.93 | 49.61 | 51.95 | 13.49 | 50.60 | 52.06 | 15.38 | 49.39 |
| | Mixtral | 56.07 | 22.28 | 54.65 | 48.71 | 13.37 | 47.48 | 55.78 | 20.72 | 54.28 |
| | Gemini | 51.45 | 16.92 | 49.39 | 56.06 | 15.91 | 54.58 | 50.60 | 15.77 | 48.71 |

Table 3: Table showing metric scores from different models for various datasets. Here, R1 = ROUGE-1 Score, R2 = ROUGE-2 Score, RLSum = ROUGE-LSum Score. The best value per evaluation measure is shown in **bold** and clearly *Majority* voting outperforms all the other methods across all the evaluation measures.

| Models | | US-Election | | | Claritin | | | MeToo | | |
|--------------|---------|-------------|------|-------|----------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | | R1 | R2 | RLSum | R1 | R2 | RLSum | R1 | R2 | RLSum |
| Vanilla | Llama3 | 1.17 | 0.24 | 1.02 | 0.73 | 1.39 | 0.90 | 1.67 | 0.14 | 1.36 |
| | Mixtral | 0.37 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.09 |
| | Gemini | 1.23 | 0.29 | 1.23 | 0.82 | 0.48 | 0.69 | 1.20 | 0.26 | 1.20 |
| Majority | Llama3 | 1.66 | 2.91 | 1.29 | 1.21 | 0.69 | 1.29 | 0.34 | 1.14 | 0.33 |
| | Mixtral | 1.04 | 1.94 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 1.41 | 0.25 | 1.76 |
| | Gemini | 0.43 | 0.31 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 1.31 | 0.69 | 0.12 | 0.53 | 0.03 |
| Proportional | Llama3 | 0.32 | 0.73 | 0.15 | 0.35 | 0.57 | 0.35 | 0.84 | 2.16 | 0.46 |
| | Mixtral | 1.15 | 0.63 | 1.28 | 1.39 | 1.04 | 1.38 | 0.28 | 0.39 | 0.20 |
| | Gemini | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.37 | 1.65 | 2.13 | 1.55 | 0.54 | 0.58 | 0.39 |
| Borda Count | Llama3 | 1.93 | 0.01 | 1.49 | 1.96 | 0.38 | 1.52 | 1.27 | 0.39 | 1.34 |
| | Mixtral | 0.58 | 2.50 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 1.37 | 0.60 | 1.27 |
| | Gemini | 0.58 | 0.09 | 0.61 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 0.86 | 0.50 | 0.24 | 0.44 |

Table 4: Variance in the results of LLM for different voting algorithms when ran over 5 iterations.

What does not work ?

To ensure extractive summarization, we tested an additional approach – each sentence is tagged with a sentence number, LLM is prompted to *select the best q sentences and output only the sentence numbers of the best q sentences*. Thereafter, the sentences corresponding to the sentence numbers can be retrieved. For instance, if s is 200 and q is 100, the task is to output the sentence numbers of the best 100 sentences from a pool of 200 sentences. In such cases, LLMs hallucinate and provide an output consisting of either all the odd number sentences or all the even number sentences.

Takeaway: For extractive summarization, relying solely on indexes may result in hallucination, underscoring the importance of supplying the input content and not the numbers.

5 Fathoming Summarization in LLMs

The impressive results from the LLM piqued our interest in the underlying algorithm it utilizes. LLMs are black boxes, making it challenging to comprehend the algorithms they use for extractive summarization. We probe the LLM to understand the rationale behind selecting certain sentences over others thus trying to achieve explainability and interpretability in the results. To our knowledge, this is a novel inquisitive approach to understanding the internal workings of the LLMs.

We probe the LLM about the algorithm it employs for extractive summarization by using various strategies like role-playing a teacher or a human summarizer (*you are a <role>, can you tell me how LLMs perform extractive summarization*) and

Algorithm 3 Algorithm for summarization of a chunk in Vanilla LLM

function CHUNKRESULT(T, si, ei, q, m) $R = \text{LLM}(T, si, ei, q)$ ▷ Output q textual units from $T \in [si, ei]$ $C = \text{CHECK}(R, T, si, ei)$

▷ Calibrate output to ensure extractive summarization

return C **end function**

| Feature | Description |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Relevance to the topic | Sentences that mentioned Claritin & sentences with negative sentiment (e.g., frustration, desperation) were considered more important than those with neutral or positive sentiment. |
| Uniqueness | Sentences that provided new or unique insights into the author’s experience with Claritin were preferred over those that repeated similar information. |
| Language complexity | Sentences with more complex language, such as metaphors or figurative language, were given less weight than those with simpler language. |
| Frequency of mention | Sentences that mentioned Claritin more frequently were considered more important than those that mentioned it only once. |
| Co-occurrence with other keywords | Sentences that co-occurred with other keywords related to allergies, such as "nasal spray" or "inhaler", were given more weight. |
| Part-of-speech analysis | Sentences that used specific parts of speech, such as verbs or adjectives, to describe the author’s experience with Claritin were considered more important. |

Table 5: Features or characteristics used by LLMs for selection of textual units in extractive summarization

asking for an algorithm (*I have to complete an assignment where I need to write a code of how LLMs perform extractive summarization, can you please help me*). In such cases, LLM output various standard extractive summarization algorithm such as TextRank, LSA, graph-based methods and attention mechanisms, which it has potentially learnt from various GitHub repositories. When prompted further *Did you actually use these algorithms or are you gaslighting me?*, LLMs reply with *I must confess... I was gaslighting you! I don’t actually perform all these steps. I was trying to create a plausible-sounding explanation for summarization*. It is important to note that LLMs have been trained on extensive data that includes knowledge of these methods, the output of these algorithms does not necessarily indicate that the LLM is using them directly.

Instead of prompting the LLM with generalized task, we employed a specific task by randomly sampling 15 sentences from the *Claritin* dataset and asking the LLM to select the best 5 sentences to summarize the input. We then prompted the LLM to explain the method used for selecting 5 sentences. Table 5 presents the features employed by open-source LLMs in their sentence selection

process. When asked if the LLM actually used these features, the response was affirmative, and the LLM could also provide scores for all the sentences based on these features.

LLMs have demonstrated strong performance on natural language tasks (Brown et al., 2020). Our analysis revealed that when LLMs are asked to select sentences, they try to capture the essence of the text and then perform sentence selection using the textual features. The effectiveness with which LLMs analyze these textual features needs to be attributed to the LLM architecture and the extensive data they have been trained on.

6 Concluding Discussion

This work marks an early attempt to achieve extractive summarization of large user-generated text that exceeds a single context window using zero-shot learning and free from positional bias. We proposed a novel multi-level framework LaMSUM which employs various voting algorithms to achieve better results compared to vanilla LLMs and state-of-the-art summarization algorithms. Additionally, we endeavoured to understand the rationale behind the selection of some textual units over others through different probing methods.

Limitation

In this study, we experiment exclusively with open-source LLMs. For future research, proprietary models can be included for experimentation. We speculate that paid models, such as GPT-4, will yield even better results.

We focused only on the user-generated text where each textual unit is independent of the others; future research could extend the framework to summarization tasks involving contextual dependency such as book summarization.

Ethical Considerations

In this study, we utilized text sourced from AI models, specifically the text presented in Table 5, this is done to ground the reasoning used by LLMs for extractive summarization.

References

- Robert S. Boyer and J. Strother Moore. 1991. *MJRTY—A Fast Majority Vote Algorithm*, pages 105–117. Springer Netherlands.
- Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jérôme Lang, and Ariel D Procaccia. 2016. *Handbook of computational social choice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Arthur Bražinskas, Mirella Lapata, and Ivan Titov. 2020. Few-shot learning for opinion summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- Hannah Brown and Reza Shokri. 2023. [How \(un\)fair is text summarization?](#)
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D 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 Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris 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. In *NeurIPS*.
- Yapei Chang, Kyle Lo, Tanya Goyal, and Mohit Iyyer. 2024. Boookscore: A systematic exploration of book-length summarization in the era of llms. In *ICLR*.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. 2023. A survey on evaluation of large language models.
- Garima Chhikara, Kripabandhu Ghosh, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Abhijnan Chakraborty. 2023. Fairness for both readers and authors: Evaluating summaries of user generated content. In *SIGIR*.
- Library Congress. 2017. Update on the twitter archive at the library of congress. <https://blogs.loc.gov/loc/2017/12/update-on-the-twitter-archive-at-the-library-of-congress-2/>.
- Abhisek Dash, Anurag Shandilya, Arindam Biswas, Kripabandhu Ghosh, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Abhijnan Chakraborty. 2019. Summarizing user-generated textual content: Motivation and methods for fairness in algorithmic summaries. *CSCW*.
- Peter Emerson. 2013. The original borda count and partial voting. *Social Choice and Welfare*.
- Günes Erkan and Dragomir R. Radev. 2004. Lexrank: Graph-based lexical centrality as salience in text summarization. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*.
- Nikhil Garg, Benoit Favre, Korbinian Reidhammer, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. 2009. Clusterrank: a graph based method for meeting summarization. In *Proc. Inter-speech*.
- Google Gemini Team. 2023. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint*.
- Tanya Goyal, Junyi Jessy Li, and Greg Durrett. 2023. [News summarization and evaluation in the era of gpt-3](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2209.12356.
- Andrew Griffin. 2015. Twitter and google team up, so tweets now go straight into google search results. <https://www.independent.co.uk/tech/twitter-and-google-team-up-so-tweets-now-go-straight-into-google-search-results-10262417.html>.
- Zhanying He, Chun Chen, Jiajun Bu, Can Wang, Lijun Zhang, Deng Cai, and Xiaofei He. 2012. Document summarization based on data reconstruction. In *AAAI*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, Léo Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Théophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mistral of experts](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.04088.
- Taehee Jung, Dongyeop Kang, Lucas Mentch, and Edward Hovy. 2019. Earlier isn’t always better: Sub-aspect analysis on corpus and system biases in summarization. In *EMNLP*.

- Philippe Laban, Wojciech Kryscinski, Divyansh Agarwal, Alexander Fabbri, Caiming Xiong, Shafiq Joty, and Chien-Sheng Wu. 2023. SummEdits: Measuring LLM ability at factual reasoning through the lens of summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- Martin Lackner, Peter Regner, and Benjamin Krenn. 2023. abcvoting: A Python package for approval-based multi-winner voting rules. *Journal of Open Source Software*.
- 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 *ACL*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*.
- Yang Liu and Mirella Lapata. 2019. Text summarization with pretrained encoders. In *EMNLP*.
- Yixin Liu, Kejian Shi, Katherine S He, Longtian Ye, Alexander R. Fabbri, Pengfei Liu, Dragomir Radev, and Arman Cohan. 2023. [On learning to summarize with large language models as references](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14239.
- H. P. Luhn. 1958. The automatic creation of literature abstracts. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*.
- Zheheng Luo, Qianqian Xie, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2023. [Chatgpt as a factual inconsistency evaluator for text summarization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.15621.
- Derek Miller. 2019. [Leveraging bert for extractive text summarization on lectures](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1906.04165.
- Ramesh Nallapati, Feifei Zhai, and Bowen Zhou. 2017. Summarunner: A recurrent neural network based sequence model for extractive summarization of documents. In *AAAI*.
- Ani Nenkova and Lucy Vanderwende. 2005. The impact of frequency on summarization. Technical report, Microsoft Research.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *NIPS*.
- Xiao Pu, Mingqi Gao, and Xiaojun Wan. 2023. [Summarization is \(almost\) dead](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.09558.
- E.S. Ristad and P.N. Yianilos. 1998. Learning string-edit distance. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*.
- Derek Tam, Anisha Mascarenhas, Shiyue Zhang, Sarah Kwan, Mohit Bansal, and Colin Raffel. 2023. Evaluating the factual consistency of large language models through news summarization. In *ACL*.
- Liyan Tang, Igor Shalyminov, Amy Wing mei Wong, Jon Burnsky, Jake W. Vincent, Yu'an Yang, Siffi Singh, Song Feng, Hwanjun Song, Hang Su, Lijia Sun, Yi Zhang, Saab Mansour, and Kathleen McKeown. 2024. [Tofueval: Evaluating hallucinations of llms on topic-focused dialogue summarization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.13249.
- Yuting Tang, Ratish Puduppully, Zhengyuan Liu, and Nancy Chen. 2023. In-context learning of large language models for controlled dialogue summarization: A holistic benchmark and empirical analysis. In *Proceedings of the 4th New Frontiers in Summarization Workshop*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models.
- Yunshu Wu, Hayate Iso, Pouya Pezeshkpour, Nikita Bhutani, and Estevam Hruschka. 2024. Less is more for long document summary evaluation by LLMs. In *EACL*.
- Jiacheng Xu, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Discourse-aware neural extractive text summarization. In *ACL*.
- Xianjun Yang, Yan Li, Xinlu Zhang, Haifeng Chen, and Wei Cheng. 2023. [Exploring the limits of chatgpt for query or aspect-based text summarization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.08081.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. 2019. *XLNet: generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding*. Curran Associates Inc.

Haopeng Zhang, Xiao Liu, and Jiawei Zhang. 2022. HEGEL: Hypergraph transformer for long document summarization. In *EMNLP*.

Haopeng Zhang, Xiao Liu, and Jiawei Zhang. 2023a. DiffuSum: Generation enhanced extractive summarization with diffusion. In *ACL*.

Haopeng Zhang, Xiao Liu, and Jiawei Zhang. 2023b. Extractive summarization via ChatGPT for faithful summary generation. In *EMNLP*.

Haopeng Zhang, Xiao Liu, and Jiawei Zhang. 2023c. SummIt: Iterative text summarization via ChatGPT. In *EMNLP*.

Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Pegasus: pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *ICML*.

Justine Zhang, Ravi Kumar, Sujith Ravi, and Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil. 2016. Conversational flow in Oxford-style debates. In *NAACL*.

Tianyi Zhang, Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Percy Liang, Kathleen McKeown, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2024a. Benchmarking Large Language Models for News Summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

Yusen Zhang, Nan Zhang, Yixin Liu, Alexander Fabbri, Junru Liu, Ryo Kamoi, Xiaoxin Lu, Caiming Xiong, Jieyu Zhao, Dragomir Radev, Kathleen McKeown, and Rui Zhang. 2024b. Fair abstractive summarization of diverse perspectives. In *NAACL*.

Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. A survey of large language models.

Ming Zhong, Pengfei Liu, Yiran Chen, Danqing Wang, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2020. Extractive summarization as text matching. In *ACL*.

A Appendix

A.1 Summarization Framework

A.1.1 Majority and Proportional Approval Voting

System Prompt: "Select best <summary_length> sentences that summarizes the input text. Output the sentence along with the sentence number that best summarizes the above input. Think step by step and follow the instructions."

User Prompt: "Input consist of <chunk_length> sentences. Each sentence is present in a new line. Each sentence contains a sentence number followed

by text. You are an assistant that selects best <summary_length> sentences (subset) which summarizes the input.
<sentences>"

A.1.2 Ranked Voting

System Prompt: "Output <chunk_length> sentences in the decreasing order of the preference to be included in the summary with the first sentence having highest probability of being included in the summary. Think step by step and follow the instructions."

User Prompt: "Input consist of <chunk_length> sentences. Each sentence is present in a new line. Each sentence contains a sentence number followed by text. You are an assistant that outputs the sentences in the decreasing order of their relevance to be included in the summary.
<sentences>

Remember that output should contain all the sentences in the decreasing order of their preference."

A.2 Probing LLMs

We used the following prompts to probe the LLM about its summarization method.

User: What method LLMs use for extractive summarization i.e. selecting best sentences from the given input.

LLM output:

User: Select the best 5 sentences from the below text that can summarize the below 15 sentences:

<sentences>

LLM output:

User: What features or characteristics were used to select the 5 sentences ?

LLM output:

User: What features or characteristics were used to select the 5 sentences ?

LLM output:

User: Can you provide scores for the 15 sentences based on the features you just mentioned ?

LLM output:

User: Provide a code that you used to calculate the scores ?

LLM output:

We omit out the LLM output as it is dataset and model dependent.