

Simple is not Enough: Document-level Text Simplification using Readability and Coherence

Laura Vásquez-Rodríguez^{1,2,*}, Nhung T.H. Nguyen²,
Piotr Przybyła^{3,6}, Matthew Shardlow⁴, Sophia Ananiadou^{2,5}

¹Idiap Research Institute, Martigny, Switzerland

²National Centre for Text Mining, Department of Computer Science,
The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

³Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

⁴Department of Computing and Mathematics, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

⁵Artificial Intelligence Research Center (AIRC), Tokyo, Japan

⁶Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

laura.vasquez@idiap.ch, nhung.nguyen@manchester.ac.uk, m.shardlow@mmu.ac.uk
piotr.przybyla@upf.edu, sophia.ananiadou@manchester.ac.uk

Abstract

In this paper, we present the *SimDoc* system, a simplification model considering simplicity, readability, and discourse aspects, such as coherence. In the past decade, the progress of the Text Simplification (TS) field has been mostly shown at a sentence level, rather than considering paragraphs or documents, a setting from which most TS audiences would benefit. We propose a simplification system that is initially fine-tuned with professionally created corpora. Further, we include multiple objectives during training, considering simplicity, readability, and coherence altogether. Our contributions include the extension of professionally annotated simplification corpora by the association of existing annotations into (complex text, simple text, readability label) triples to benefit from readability during training. Also, we present a comparative analysis in which we evaluate our proposed models in a zero-shot, few-shot, and fine-tuning setting using document-level TS corpora, demonstrating novel methods for simplification. Finally, we show a detailed analysis of outputs, highlighting the difficulties of simplification at a document level.

1 Introduction

In recent years, Text Simplification (TS) research has explored methods at a sentence level (Alva-Manchego et al., 2020) without considering the benefits of simplifying paragraphs or documents. Except for Siddharthan (2003); Štajner and Glavaš (2017), simplification efforts at a document level have been overlooked, and is not until recent years,

that initiatives in this domain started to be developed (Sun et al., 2021; Srikanth and Li, 2021; Crippwell et al., 2023), together with our document level approach proposed in this paper. Overall, this path is challenging due to data scarcity in all languages and unreliable evaluation metrics. Nevertheless, the community has started to work towards this avenue as well (Dmitrieva and Tiedemann, 2021; Rios et al., 2021; Devaraj et al., 2021; Stodden et al., 2023) and to improve previous resources (Xu et al., 2015; Vajjala and Lučić, 2018).

We considered three factors for driving simplification models at a document level: simplicity, readability, and coherence. Simplicity is represented by a text that is easy to understand for the target audience (Štajner and Saggion, 2018). In contrast, readability is focused on how legible a document is and we assess this property based on the difficulty of reading a text (Vajjala, 2022). Simplification and readability concepts are closely related and often used interchangeably, as a simplified text would also improve its readability while still preserving its meaning (Al-Thanyyan and Azmi, 2021). Finally, there is coherence (Jurafsky and Martin, 2021), which measures logical relationships between sentences, e.g., sentences that follow the same topic rather than being randomly assembled.

In this work, we develop the *SimDoc* system, combining relevant aspects to simplify text. We enumerate our contributions as follows: 1) An adapted dataset from professionally annotated corpora (i.e., people with expertise in content simplification) using multiple levels of readability; 2) A comparative analysis using professionally annotated and automatically aligned corpora on T5 model in multiple settings such as zero-shot, few-

*This work was done as a PhD student at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom.

shot and fine-tuning; 3) A simplification model using a joint measurement of simplification, readability and coherence during training; 4) A detailed analysis of the system outputs, that highlights the limitations and future work of our approach.¹

2 Related Work

Aside from the work done in recent years, both models and datasets for TS at a document level have been limited and scarce (Alva-Manchego et al., 2019). Document-level simplification inherits the generative nature of closely related tasks such as summarisation and machine translations and hence, its similarity in its methods (e.g., BERT-based). Starting with the general domain, TS work has developed multiple strategies for English where content is either simplified or extended, considering elaboration as a subtask of simplification. For example, Sun et al. (2021) proposed and assessed the D-Wikipedia-based dataset with a vanilla transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017), BertSumextabs (Liu and Lapata, 2019) and BART (Lewis et al., 2020). In a more elaborative setting, Srikanth and Li (2021) used GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) for content insertion and explanation generation for TS. More recently, Cripwell et al. (2023), developed a system that created a simplification plan to predict simplification operations (e.g., copy, rephrase, split and delete) over sentences in a document. Work in document-level simplification has also been prominent in the medical domain. Devaraj et al. (2021) proposed a paragraph-aligned corpus based on the Cochrane dataset, using BART as a TS system.

Except for Cripwell et al. (2023), the aforementioned approaches show novel strategies at a document level, but, these do not follow a controllable, multi-task-oriented setting where multiple tasks can be combined during training. The controllability of generative tasks in LLMs has been popular in general (Zhang et al., 2023), but also in simplification (Nishihara et al., 2019; Maddela et al., 2021; Martin et al., 2020), and multi-task settings where, in addition, we consider readability and readability combined with summarisation (Luo et al., 2022; Goldsack et al., 2022; Guo et al., 2024). These tasks are also considered as a two-step process, when the text is first summarised and further, simplified (Guo et al., 2021; Shaib et al., 2023). Conversational LLMs have also been key in

these domains, proposing novel methods for simplification and readability for specific target levels (Farajidizaji et al., 2024).

It has been proven that the inclusion of linguistic features in readability is relevant (Wilkins et al., 2024). In the same avenue, we proposed the use of coherence as a novel element that has not been considered before in simplification. This is relevant, as diverse types of TS modifications such as in syntactic simplification can affect the coherence of the models (Abdolahi and Zahedi, 2016). In other domains, coherence has been well explored (Lai and Tetreault, 2018; Mesgar and Strube, 2018; Naismith et al., 2023), but it has been narrowly applied in simplification research (Siddharthan, 2006; Leroy et al., 2013). We contribute with our work to this effort through the integration of coherence during training.

Finally, we would like to highlight contributions that are closely related to our work (but still, without the coherence aspect). Sheang and Saggion (2021) considered a text-to-text approach for sentence simplification. Although this effort is different in the sentence-document setting, they validated the use of the T5 model (Raffel et al., 2020) for the first time in the task of TS, using control tokens as in Martin et al. (2020). We suggest the use of this model for document-level TS with natural language tokens as proposed in the original paper combined with readability and coherence aspects of language. In our work, we will use tags for each task, such as “simplify” to perform simplification, rather than adding information about the expected simplification (e.g., using token “chars 0.5” to define the length ratio between the source and target sentence) as done in previous work.

3 Methodology

In this section, we present our methods, starting with the description of our task (Section 3.1). Further, we present our selected simplification, readability and coherence models for the proposed joint task (Section 3.2). Altogether, we merge the capabilities of these models with a customised loss function (Section 3.4). Finally, we detailed our data selection and preprocessing steps (Section 3.6).

3.1 Task Description

We proposed the use of the T5 models (Raffel et al., 2020) for simplification, which is suitable for controlling different tasks at the same time by the use

¹We make our code available in Github: <https://github.com/lmvasque/ts-doc>




Figure 1: TS model architecture. We input the complex (for TS) and the simple gold standard text (for readability) in the model. Predicted simplifications are used in the loss and coherence evaluation. The predicted readability labels are used for readability loss. Finally, we propose a combined loss using TS, readability and coherence.

of control tokens. These models have an explicit control of the task performed during training. Also, they have been trained in multiple tasks such as summarisation and classification, by explicitly stating the NLP task performed as part of the input.²

We leverage the capabilities of text-to-text models with control tokens for simplification generation and readability classification, with an additional coherence reward, supporting a multitasking scenario altogether. To achieve this, we appended into the input data the token “simplify:” to indicate the simplification task and “read classify:” for the readability classification task. Initially, we experimented with T5-models of different sizes (i.e., T5-small and T5-large) evaluated on a zero, few-shot and fine-tuning scenarios (See Section 3.5), with our customised simplification prompt but with no changes to the T5 model architecture (Section 3.3.1).

Further, we introduced a multitasking approach in which we considered simplification and readability altogether (Section 3.3.2). Then, we added a coherence reward (Section 3.3.3) to evaluate the inclusion of coherence into the model training. We trained our models in the aforementioned settings, incrementally evaluating the addition of simplification, readability and coherence into the loss (Section 3.4). Finally, we also considered additional experiments in which we trained the simplification task as a first step to improve the model performance. See Section 3.3.1 for more details.

²Although recent, instruct-based models may seem more proficient for the TS task (Wu and Arase, 2024; Kew et al., 2023), they are not suitable for our approach as we focus on architectures that can be deterministic and easily controlled to understand the potential benefit of learning simplification, readability and coherence.

3.2 Models

In this section, we explain our selected models to combine simplification (Section 3.3.1), readability (Section 3.3.2) and coherence (Section 3.3.3) as shown in Figure 1.

3.3 Baseline

We selected the Multilingual Unsupervised Sentence Simplification (MUSS) model (Martin et al., 2020) as the main baseline. For English, the MUSS model was trained in sentence pairs (complex-simple) using either mined paraphrases from the web (*muss_en_mined* model) or from the Wikilarge corpus to perform sentence simplification (*muss_en_wikilarge_mined* model) in a controllable setting. To emulate our document-level setting, we simplified the proposed texts sentence-by-sentence and then, we calculated the evaluation metrics for the whole text by joining all the simplified sentences together. Unlike our model, in which we have to truncate input sentences, MUSS does not require such truncation because each sentence is evaluated individually. Therefore, the FGKL and the FRE scores will slightly vary for the complex text in the baselines in comparison to the proposed systems at a document level.

3.3.1 Simplification-based TS Model

We fine-tuned the proposed T5-models using simplification data (Section 3.6). In this scenario, we evaluated and trained our models in zero, few-shot and fine-tuning scenarios, with no changes to the cross-entropy loss. First, models are dedicated solely to the simplification task.

Simplification Using Larger Datasets Initially, we ran our experiments on professionally created

Token	Type	Text	Label
<i>simplify:</i>	complex	People do it. So do chimpanzees, bonobos and baboons. Even dogs do it: They yawn when someone near them yawns.	-
<i>read classify:</i>	gold-reference	When someone near you yawns, you yawn too. So do chimpanzees and baboons. Even dogs do it. They all seem to "catch" yawns.	4

Table 1: Examples of inputs for the simplification models based on T5-family. We also include the readability label (‘read classify:’) for the gold reference.

corpora only, since automatically aligned datasets could introduce noise (e.g., poor simplifications) into the final results. Nevertheless, the existing datasets are relatively small, which also means that the models could fail to learn more aspects of language, such as fluency and grammar.

We propose an alternative scenario in which we fine-tune the T5 models using Wikipedia-based corpora and the default cross-entropy loss as a first step. Therefore, the model will learn exclusively the simplification task with large texts (143,546 texts). Once the training is completed, we continue with the introduction of datasets with better quality to learn simplification, readability and coherence altogether, as proposed in previous sections. We evaluated this scenario only for the T5-large model, using the NewselaSL dataset in zero, few-shot and fine-tuning settings, as it showed the best performance in our preliminary results where training was limited to Newsela only (Section 5).

3.3.2 Readability-based TS Model

The systems presented in Section 3.3.1 are limited to the simplification aspect. However, we suggest that with the addition of explicit readability levels, simplifications can be more varied and therefore, they could be better tailored to multiple audiences (e.g. non-native speakers, people with disabilities, and non-specialised audiences), similarly as it has been done in other fields such as summarisation (Luo et al., 2022). We explain the steps of the model architecture shown in Figure 1, for simplification and readability.

Simplification: complex texts are passed to the encoder of the T5 model, for the generation of a simple (simplified’) candidate or prediction. We obtained the simplification loss ($loss_{simp}$) by comparing the simplification predictions and the gold-standard simplification.

Readability: after the simplification stage, simple texts (gold-standard simplifications) are passed to the T5-encoder, which generates a label prediction (readability label’) according to the input

simple sentence. For the readability loss ($loss_{read}$), we compared the predicted readability level of the gold-standard simplification with the gold-standard readability label. We expect that the readability labels range from 1 to 4, representing different degrees of readability. The classification task and the expected values are learnt during training.

In this model, we evaluate simplification and readability using the same encoder, together in the forward pass to obtain the corresponding loss. Finally, we sum these values together to calculate the total loss ($loss_{total}$) in Equation 1:

$$loss_{total} = loss_{simp} + loss_{read} \quad (1)$$

Our combined loss considers the simplification aspects of the complex and simple pairs, but it also tailors simplification for a specific readability level, similar to a readability classification task (Vásquez-Rodríguez et al., 2022a). We control both tasks by the use of tokens to indicate the relevant task. For simplification generation we use the control token “simplify:” to obtain a simplified candidate. For the readability classification task, we control the task by using “read classify:” to obtain the level of simplification of the input sentence as explained in Section 3.1. In Table 1 we show a template of how the input text is labelled for the simplification and readability tasks, respectively.

3.3.3 Coherence-based Model

As mentioned earlier, our main aim is the implementation of a simplification model considering readability, simplification and coherence. However, we are limited by the availability of annotated corpora that express the quality of a simplified text concerning these 3 elements simultaneously. For simplification and readability, we rely on the Newsela dataset as presented in Section 3.3.2. For coherence, we still do not have the annotation of coherence in this corpus. To alleviate this setting, we proposed the evaluation of coherence during training for each prediction. We intervene in the loss individually for each aspect (simplification, readability and coherence) and aggregated scores

Dataset	Split	Pair	Lines	Sent/D	W/sent	Char/w	FRE \uparrow	FKGL \downarrow
Newsela-S	train	source	1528	48.25	23.51	5.19	46.37	10.90
		target	1528	98.11	17.50	5.09	87.52	3.30
	valid	source	191	47.20	24.16	5.22	59.13	10.10
		target	191	97.76	17.69	5.11	94.76	2.60
	test	source	191	47.59	23.65	5.17	53.75	12.20
		target	191	96.90	17.52	5.07	88.43	3.00
Newsela-SL	train	source	6089	48.11	23.66	5.20	60.95	9.40
		target	6089	97.75	19.72	5.14	74.08	6.40
	valid	source	761	47.34	23.54	5.18	72.16	7.20
		target	761	96.66	19.63	5.13	76.22	5.60
	test	source	762	48.65	23.10	5.17	61.50	11.30
		target	762	99.90	19.37	5.12	71.95	7.20
D-Wikipedia	train	source	132546	4.92	28.77	5.48	67.49	9.00
		target	132546	8.97	24.55	5.39	78.59	6.80
	valid	source	3000	4.92	28.81	5.48	74.59	6.20
		target	3000	8.94	24.63	5.39	60.95	9.40
	test	source	8000	5.01	28.84	5.49	67.69	8.90
		target	8000	9.10	24.66	5.40	83.66	4.80
GCDC	train	-	4000	9.07	19.39	4.89	83.15	5.00
	test	-	800	9.00	19.96	4.91	68.81	8.50

Table 2: Statistics for our selected datasets. We report the total number of documents (Lines), average number of sentences per document (Sent/D), average number of words per sentence (W/sent), average number of characters per word (Char/w) and readability indices FRE and FKGL.

are reported after the final loss of each sample (i.e., each text) is calculated.³

3.4 Loss Function

In our experiments, we included simplification models using a default and a customised loss. In the default loss, we evaluate our predictions against the labels using the Cross-Entropy Loss (CL). This is the loss used in our simplification models (Section 3.3.1), where we do not consider any readability and coherence aspect. Further, we used a customised loss for *simplification+readability* model (Section 3.3.2), *simplification+readability+coherence* and *simplification+coherence* model variations.

In the customised loss simplification, readability and coherence aspects are considered individually for each sample. Further, we perform the aggregation of the simplification loss, readability loss and coherence evaluation altogether. We calculate the total loss of the model as follows:

1. We calculate the CL loss between each prediction (\hat{y}) and its label (y) for the simplification model ($loss_{simp}(\hat{y}, y)$) and readability model ($loss_{read}(\hat{y}, y)$).
2. We obtain the coherence value for the model prediction ($score_{coherence}(\hat{y})$).

3. When a prediction is coherent ($score_{coherence}(\hat{y})$ is equal to 1), we reduce the loss ($loss_{simp}(\hat{y}, y) + loss_{read}(\hat{y}, y)$) multiplying it by δ , otherwise, we do not include any coherence evaluation in the loss as shown in Equation 2:

$$loss_{partial}(x) = \begin{cases} \delta \times (loss_{simp}(\hat{y}, y) + loss_{read}(\hat{y}, y)), & \text{if } score_{coh}(\hat{y}) = 1 \\ loss_{simp}(\hat{y}, y) + loss_{read}(\hat{y}, y), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

4. Finally, we present the average values for all the samples, as shown in Equation 3:

$$loss_{total} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^n loss_{partial}(x_i) \quad (3)$$

3.5 Model Settings

We describe the proposed training settings for our models as follows:

Zero-shot: we directly evaluated the pre-trained model without using any training TS samples, a task which has not been seen before. This means that the model was not fine-tuned in the simplification generation and/or readability classification task.

³We refer to our preprocessing steps of our coherence models in the Appendix C.1 and the selection steps of our coherence models in the Appendix B.2.

Model	Setting	Train	Samples	Test	Samples	Fine-tuned	Task
NewselaS+simple	zero	—	—	NewselaS	191	☐	—
NewselaS+simple	few	NewselaS	10	NewselaS	191	☑	S
NewselaS+simple	fine	NewselaS	1528	NewselaS	191	☑	S
NewselaSL+simple	zero	—	—	NewselaSL	762	☐	—
NewselaSL+simple	few	NewselaSL	10	NewselaSL	762	☑	S
NewselaSL+simple	fine	NewselaSL	6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S
D-Wikipedia+NewselaSL+simple	fine	D-Wikipedia, NewselaSL	132546, 6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S
NewselaSL+simple+read	all	NewselaSL	6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S+R
NewselaSL+simple+coh	all	NewselaSL	6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S+C
NewselaSL+simple+read+coh	all	NewselaSL	6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S+R+C
D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+read	all	D-Wikipedia, NewselaSL	132546, 6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S+R
D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+coh	all	D-Wikipedia, NewselaSL	132546, 6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S+C
D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+read+coh	all	D-Wikipedia, NewselaSL	132546, 6089	NewselaSL	762	☑	S+R+C

Table 3: We present our proposed models according to the settings in Section 3.1. Each model is trained in zero-shot, few-shot, and fine-tuned, with a different number of samples. During training, we used either the standard CL loss for the TS task (S) standalone or a multi-task CL loss where we combined TS generation (S), readability classification (R) and/or coherence evaluation (C) at the same time. For the "all" setting, we report the parameters for the fine-tuned scenario, however, they were also evaluated in zero-shot and few-shot settings.

Few-Shot: we fine-tuned the model in simplification and/or readability task using just a few samples (10 samples) for 1 epoch. This will allow the models to learn the task and eventually, show a better evaluation in the test set of unseen data. We refer to this setting as a few-shot since we trained our models in a small set of instances.

Fine-tuning: the models are fine-tuned with the entire corpus for simplification generation and/or readability classification, further, we evaluate its performance on the test set.

3.6 Data Selection and Preprocessing

To simplify text based on simplicity, readability, and coherence, it is necessary to have annotated datasets to perform effective model training. Firstly, we focused on the simplicity and readability aspects. Except for the OneStopCorpus, which is smaller in size, the Newsela dataset (Xu et al., 2015) is the only corpus available with annotations for both simplicity and readability level.⁴ We used the dataset in its original version (Xu et al., 2015), *NewselaS*, and in an extended scenario, *NewselaSL*.

For the *NewselaS*, we matched the complex documents, represented by level 0 and simple documents from level 4. In cases where level 4 documents were not available, we used the ones in level 3. For *NewselaSL*, we considered adapting the datasets to include their simplification degree as well. We created a pair for each complex article and its corresponding simple article, one per each

simplification level. Hence, the complex article (level 0), will be mapped with its simpler counterparts (1, 2, 3 and 4 when available). Each record will include the following features: source and target simplification and simplification level of the target simplification (henceforth, readability label).

Additionally, we use GCDC—a professionally annotated dataset (Lai and Tetreault, 2018) for training the coherence models as an additional element in the simplification model and D-Wikipedia (Sun et al., 2021) as a means to initially fine-tune language models for better fluency.⁵

Our rationale for the proposed pipeline relies on the limitations of the Newsela dataset as sentences in documents are not aligned between complex and simple articles. Also, some of them are too large to fit together into the model. Therefore, we decided to build documents of 10 sentences each, with the hypothesis that the first part of the article would be aligned. We followed this decision as well for our manual analysis, as we discuss in Section 6.

4 Experiments

We discuss the implementation of the T5-models in zero-shot, few-shot, and fine-tuning scenarios, including further customisation of models for readability and coherence. Further, we explain the datasets selection (Section 4.1), model implementation (Section 4.2) and evaluation (Section 4.3).

⁴We requested the English Newsela dataset for our experiments at <https://newsela.com/data/>.

⁵We include the datasets statistics in Table 2 and additional details in the Appendix A.

4.1 Datasets

For our experiments, we have selected English Newsela corpus as the most suitable resource, given their annotations on simplification and readability. This corpus has 1528 articles, written in 4 levels of readability, where 0 represents the complex version and 4 the simplest one. As described in Section 3.6, we created our splits for train, validation and test. Although the corpus is not large, it is enough for the implementation of a multi-task loss proposed in Section 3.3.2. Despite the availability of other document-level simplification datasets such as D-Wikipedia, they do not have any readability or coherence annotations. For coherence, we used the GCDC corpus, a collection of 1200 texts for each domain (1000 for training and 200 for testing). This corpus is in the domain of emails and business reviews, professionally annotated by experts. We use this dataset to fine-tune our models for coherence evaluation. For the coherence annotations in this dataset, we use the consensus label defined by the experts, as their judgement was more accurate than the crowd-sourced labels. Finally, we evaluated all of our experiments using a model fine-tuned on the D-Wikipedia datasets, for the simplification task.

4.2 Models

For the implementation of our models in Section 3.2, we used the pretrained language models T5-small⁶ and T5-large⁷ from the Hugging Face using the Pytorch Lightning framework.⁸ We summarise in Table 3 the proposed models for our task.⁹

4.3 Evaluation

For the automatic evaluation of the results, we use D-SARI (SARI metric extended for document-level TS) for simplification and FKGL and FRE for readability. We understand the limitations of existing readability evaluation metrics (Tanprasert and Kauchak, 2021). However, we used these metrics as a means to compare with previous work and as a complementary evaluation metric to measure simplification generation quality.

Additionally, we performed a manual analysis of predictions to have a further understanding of the model results. We selected the following samples for the analysis, which we further discuss on Section 6:

⁶<https://huggingface.co/t5-small>

⁷<https://huggingface.co/t5-large>

⁸<https://lightning.ai/pages/open-source/>

⁹We include our training details in the Appendix B.1.

- The *NewselaS* test set, evaluated on the fine-tuned *T5-large* model comparing the complex, prediction and the gold standard for a total of 191 triplets (573 texts);
- The *NewselaSL* test set, evaluated on the fine-tuned *T5-large* model, comparing the complex, gold standard and predictions of the *NewselaSL+simple+fine*, *NewselaSL+simple+read*, *NewselaSL+simple+coh* and *NewselaSL+simple+read+coh* model;
- The *NewselaSL* test set, evaluated on the fine-tuned *T5-large* model, comparing the complex, gold standard and predictions of the *D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+fine*, *D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+read*, *D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+coh* and *D-Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+read+coh* model.

5 Results

We present our results for the model using *NewselaS* in Table 4. For both *T5-small* and *T5-large*, the zero-shot task showed the lowest performance. However, these models consistently gave a better performance from zero-shot setting to fine-tuning for D-SARI scores. For the D-SARI and FKGL metric, the difference between the *zero-shot* and the *few-shot* scenario was small, and in general, both models had the best performance in *fine-tuning* for all metrics. We can observe similar behaviour for the FRE metric. Overall, the readability of the outputs was improved concerning the complex documents for both FKGL and FRE metrics. Also, all the models reported better scores than the presented baselines, *muss_en_mined* and *muss_en_wikilarge_mined*.¹⁰

For the *NewselaSL* dataset, we obtained lower results in the *zero-shot* setting, compared to the performance of *NewselaS*, as shown in Table 5. However, for the *fine-tuning* settings, we obtained better D-SARI scores in both *T5-small* and *T5-large*. This is not the case for the *few-shot* scenario, as the improvement to the *zero-shot* scenario was minor. In the scenario where simplification models are fine-tuned with automatically aligned corpora using D-Wikipedia, the results in *zero-shot* and *few-shot* are significantly larger than the previous setting (no fine-tuning in any simplification corpora) with an increase of 29.25 and 30.01 (using the average for all loss types) in SARI score, for

¹⁰For more details, see Appendix 3.3.

Model	Dataset	Loss	Setting	D-SARI _S ↑	FKGL _C ↓	FKGL _S ↓	FRE _C ↑	FRE _S ↑	COH _S ↑
muss_mined	-	-	-	19.231	9.758	8.301	60.97	66.709	0.739
muss_wl				19.993		6.921		72.248	0.738
t5-small	NewselaS	simple	zero	32.271	10.065	5.019	60.049	81.170	0.131
			few	32.778		4.990		81.391	0.120
			fine	44.935		2.942		89.231	0.000
t5-large		simple	zero	30.531		5.920		77.924	0.204
			few	30.639		5.713		78.593	0.209
			fine	50.089		3.238		87.753	0.000

Table 4: Our results on *NewselaS* systems including D-SARI scores. We also report the FKGL scores for the complex ($FKGL_C$) and simple ($FKGL_S$) text. Similarly, we report the FRE scores for the complex (FRE_C) and simple (FRE_S) text as well. For each setting (e.g., simple) we report the results for zero, few, and fine-tuned.

zero-shot and *few-shot* respectively. In this dataset, the results for the *zero-shot* and *few-shot* scenarios using *t5-large* were closely equivalent to the *muss_en_mined* baseline. For the *t5-small* model, all scenarios improved the results presented by both MUSS baselines.

In contrast, the model trained in *NewselaSL* dataset with *simple+read+coh* and *simple+coh*, showed a decrease in performance in comparison to the rest of the experiments (*simple* and *simple+read*), but still better than the experiments in *zero-shot* and *few-shot* setting. For the *t5-large* model trained in *D-Wiki+NewselaSL* using *simple+read+coh*, there was a small increase of 0.43 with respect to the D-SARI metric, in comparison to the *simple+read* scenario for the same dataset. Overall, the predictions showed better readability in all settings than the complex texts. Similar to the experiments in *t5-small*, *simple+read+coh* also showed a decrease in both SARI and similar results in the readability metrics concerning the *simple* setting. For *D-Wiki+NewselaSL*, we noticed a minor decrease in D-SARI score in *simple+coh* compared to *simple+read+coh* scenario. The fine-tuned model using *D-Wikipedia* and *NewselaSL* reported scores are better in all scenarios.

6 Discussion

Firstly, we discuss the results of the *zero-shot* scenario. Although the *t5-model* was previously trained in multiple text-to-text tasks such as question answering, summarisation, and classification, it was not explicitly trained in simplification generation (“simplify:”) and readability classification (“read classify:”) task. Therefore, the D-SARI performance in *NewselaS* zero-shot experiments was low with a SARI score of 32.271 and 30.531, especially in *NewselaSL* using a *simple* loss, with values of 24.813 and 22.690 for *t5-small* and *t5-large*, respectively. In *NewselaS*, complex text (level 0) and simple texts (level 4) are significantly different

from each other since the pairs are not formed of contiguous readability levels. In *NewselaSL*, more complexity is added with the granularity on the readability levels, which we used to distinguish between the different levels of simplifications. For the D-Wikipedia experiments, the models explicitly learn the simplification task, showing a major improvement when evaluated in a *zero-shot* fashion using the *NewselaSL* dataset.

Secondly, we present the analysis for the *few-shot* scenario in Table 4 and Table 5. We consider that since the task of text simplification and readability classification are similar to previous pre-trained tasks (i.e., summarisation and sentiment classification tasks, respectively) in the model, it should be enough to train the model in a few samples to learn the new task. In this setting, we showed an increase of 0.26 on average for the *few-shot*, in comparison to the *zero-shot* experiments. Hence, by training with few samples (10 samples in this case) and running a minimum training epoch (1 epoch in this case), control token-based models could learn better the proposed task. However, it is necessary to train with larger samples for a more significant performance increase.

For the multi-task loss setting (*simple+read* and *simple+read+coh*), both simplification and readability tasks are learned in parallel from the first training steps. The performance measured by D-SARI in a few-shot setting is also lower, and more data and training iterations are required to stabilise the loss (i.e., learn properly each task), as seen in *fine* experiments. In the models fine-tuned with D-Wikipedia, the *few-shot* setting shows a larger increase concerning the *zero-shot* setting, as it has already seen the simplification task using the same control tokens (i.e., “simplify:”).

Thirdly, we look further into the *fine-tuning* experiments. For both datasets, *NewselaS* and *NewselaSL* we obtain the best D-SARI score within all of our settings *zero-shot*, *few-shot* and *fine-tuning*.

Within the multi-task loss, the addition of readability to the loss (*simple+read*) showed a decrease of 0.78 for *t5-small* and 1.274 for the *t5-large* model, both using the *NewselaSL* dataset. For *D-Wiki+NewselaSL*, readability experiments showed a minor decrease of 0.876, which could be related to the fact that the readability classification task has not been seen before, in contrast to the scenario in which simplification and readability tasks were both new to the model.

For the readability metrics, both FKGL and FRE showed similar results. Although the overall increase in this setting was not as large as in other experiments, it shows an indication that both tasks can be stabilised together and that readability could also support better simplifications. Simplifications should be considered for multiple audiences, meaning the same complex text should have several levels of readability. Our proposed *NewselaSL* dataset searches to model this scenario.

Additionally, we analyse the use of coherence in our experiments during training. For the models trained using the *NewselaSL* dataset, the combined loss *simple+read+coh* showed a decrease of 1.164 for the *t5-small* model and of 1.56 in *large* in SARI score, in comparison to *simple+read* model. We observe a similar scenario for *simple+coh*, where the fine-tuned scores are lower than *simple* and *simple+read* for both models. However, where the model uses a larger dataset for fine-tuning (*D-Wiki+NewselaSL*), *simple+read+coh* showed a slight improvement of 0.595 compared to the previous setting for *simple+coh*. We hypothesise that at the start of the training stage, predictions could be incoherent, so the loss would not benefit from coherence in the initial steps.

Finally, we consider the results from the manual analysis. We performed a comparison between 36 texts extracted from our articles (complex, gold references and predictions), using approximately 10 sentences of each text as explained in Section 3.6.¹¹ In terms of simplification operations, the model mainly performs **lexical simplification** and *syntactic simplification*, focused on sentences split, deletion to create shorter sentences and paraphrasing (See example 6, 7 and 8 in the Appendix).¹²

These features can also be seen in the gold-standard simplifications, where the content is significantly reduced from the original articles. Over-

all, the simplifications from all our models are fairly similar, with minor variations on the lexical and syntactic aspects. We acknowledge that the main limitation of our results is the fluency (i.e., grammaticality), meaning preservation and coherence of the text. Although the models were trained with quality data (i.e., professionally annotated), it is not enough to generate sentences that are both grammatical but also simplified. Also, we found issues in the coherence of the text. We believe that additional stages of fine-tuning with more simplified data and larger models could improve our results. The use of readability and coherence in simplification is encouraging, however, it is necessary to evaluate further scenarios such as assigning different weights for each aspect in simplification and initial warm-up steps for each task to proficiently manage all proposed tasks. In regards to our manual analysis, we acknowledge that while our findings are insightful for the community, it is still not clear the distinction between the benefits of coherence and readability independently. A more detailed and extensive human evaluation would need more specialised people and more diverse outputs to achieve conclusive results from this process. We discuss further the limitations and future work in Section 7.

Finally, we conclude that the inclusion of coherence and readability into simplification is not solved. This direction is underexplored, given that coherence is difficult and subjective to the model. We chose this avenue to share the possible alternatives and we find it valuable to share our findings until the moment. We expect that our research motivate the community to continue to tackle this direction effectively, with the development of better datasets and methods, as we will discuss Section 7.

7 Limitations

In this section, we discuss the limitations and future work for the research in document-level text simplification:

Data resources: for the development of better coherence models, it is necessary to create larger and more varied datasets, professionally annotated within multiple domains. This will contribute to more precise coherence models for the domain understudy. For simplification, specifically for the *Newsela* dataset, complex articles are usually large in comparison to their simple counterpart. Since these are not strictly aligned, (i.e., sentence-by-

¹¹Analysis was performed by the first author of this paper.

¹²Due to data licensing restrictions, we do not show large samples of generated texts from the *Newsela* corpus.

Model	Train	Loss	Setting	D-SARIS \uparrow	$FKGL_C$ \downarrow	$FKGL_S$ \downarrow	FRE_C \uparrow	FRE_S \uparrow	COH_S \uparrow
muss_mined	-	-	-	22.506	9.451	8.068	62.045	67.556	0.729
muss_wikiL				23.766		6.727		72.830	0.732
t5-small	NewselaSL	simple	zero	24.813	9.899	6.756	60.120	73.680	0.307
			few	25.253		6.599		74.591	0.249
			fine	48.971		5.787		76.592	0.026
		simple+read	zero	24.813		6.756		73.680	0.307
			few	25.208		6.605		74.531	0.260
			fine	47.697		5.798		76.496	0.020
		simple+coh	zero	24.813		6.756		73.680	0.307
			few	25.257		6.604		74.566	0.251
			fine	47.408		5.722		76.825	0.026
		simple+read+coh	zero	24.813		6.756		73.680	0.307
			few	25.209		6.608		74.517	0.259
			fine	46.533		5.812		76.535	0.022
t5-large	NewselaSL	simple	zero	22.690	9.899	7.697	60.120	70.026	0.429
			few	22.821		7.425		70.799	0.416
			fine	53.400		5.720		76.411	0.041
		simple+read	zero	22.690		7.697		70.026	0.429
			few	22.745		7.744		69.926	0.403
			fine	52.619		5.705		76.536	0.038
		simple+coh	zero	22.690		7.697		70.026	0.429
			few	22.820		7.375		70.993	0.417
			fine	51.519		5.729		76.486	0.041
		simple+read+coh	zero	22.690		7.697		70.026	0.429
			few	22.751		7.730		69.985	0.411
			fine	51.057		5.747		76.452	0.034
	D-Wiki+NewselaSL	simple	zero	51.935	9.899	6.752	60.120	74.159	0.024
			few	53.896		6.468		74.782	0.031
			fine	55.441		5.693		76.452	0.049
		simple+read	zero	51.935		6.752		74.159	0.024
			few	52.221		6.779		74.073	0.028
			fine	54.565		5.685		76.505	0.046
		simple+coh	zero	51.935		6.752		74.159	0.024
			few	53.919		6.466		74.797	0.031
			fine	54.398		5.690		76.538	0.046
		simple+read+coh	zero	51.935		6.752		74.159	0.024
			few	52.219		6.779		74.072	0.028
			fine	54.993		5.688		76.496	0.047

Table 5: Our results on the *NewselaSL* dataset for t5-small, t5-large model and baselines. We report D-SARIS, coherence (COH_S) for simple texts and FKGL and FRE scores for the complex ($FKGL_C$, FRE_C) and simple ($FKGL_S$, FRE_S) texts. For each setting (e.g., simple, simple+read) we report the results for zero, few and fine-tuned model.

sentence simplification), it is difficult to learn explicit simplification operations beyond those already observed in this study.

Methods for simplification: simplifications will vary according to the target audience, therefore, it would also be interesting to simplify documents according to their domain, using customised methods that classify data with more granularity (e.g., topic-based). Also, using datasets at a document level available in other languages could be beneficial. Similarly to experiments in previous work (Vásquez-Rodríguez et al., 2023), the model could be improved with an initial fine-tuning stage using a cross-lingual setting, leveraging simplification resources at a document level that are available in other languages.

Models for coherence: for our coherence model training stage, we used the professionally annotated GCDC corpus. However, we still depend on the generalisation of the model in other domains, such as news for Newsela dataset. This model was proposed as a guide for simplification generation, however, it should be improved further, together with the datasets enhancements proposed in *Data resources*.

Hyper-parameters tuning: we chose our prompts “simplify” and “read classify” as a starting point for using t5-models for simplification. However, further engineering of prompts could enable better performance of the models as done in previous work (Aumiller and Gertz, 2022; Vásquez-Rodríguez et al., 2022b). Finally, depending on the selected task, simplification, readability and coherence could be weighted to achieve a personalisation step towards the target audience, as all the aspects may not be equally relevant during training.

Computing resources: an alternative method to improve the quality and the fluency of the simplifications, it could be possible to train on larger language models (i.e., *t5-3b*, *t5-11b*) and larger datasets.

References

Mohamad Abdolahi and Morteza Zahedi. 2016. [An overview on text coherence methods](#). In *2016 Eighth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Technology (IKT)*, pages 1–5.

Suha S. Al-Thanyyan and Aqil M. Azmi. 2021. [Automated text simplification: A survey](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(2).

Fernando Alva-Manchego, Carolina Scarton, and Lucia Specia. 2019. [Cross-sentence transformations in text simplification](#). In *WINLP:2019:36*, pages 181–184, Florence, Italy. acl.

Fernando Alva-Manchego, Carolina Scarton, and Lucia Specia. 2020. [Data-Driven Sentence Simplification: Survey and Benchmark](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 46(1):135–187.

Dennis Aumiller and Michael Gertz. 2022. [UniHD at TSAR-2022 shared task: Is compute all we need for lexical simplification?](#) In *TSAR:2022:1*, pages 251–258, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Virtual). acl.

Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit*. “O’Reilly Media, Inc.”.

Liam Cripwell, Joël Legrand, and Claire Gardent. 2023. [Document-level planning for text simplification](#). In *EACL:2023:main*, pages 993–1006, Dubrovnik, Croatia. acl.

Ashwin Devaraj, Iain Marshall, Byron Wallace, and Junyi Jessy Li. 2021. [Paragraph-level simplification of medical texts](#). In *NAACL:2021:main*, pages 4972–4984, Online. acl.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *NAACL:2019:1*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. acl.

Anna Dmitrieva and Jörg Tiedemann. 2021. [Creating an aligned Russian text simplification dataset from language learner data](#). In *BSNLP:2021:1*, pages 73–79, Kiyv, Ukraine. acl.

Asma Farajidizaji, Vatsal Raina, and Mark Gales. 2024. [Is it possible to modify text to a target readability level? an initial investigation using zero-shot large language models](#). In *LREC:2024:main*, pages 9325–9339, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.

Tomas Goldsack, Zhihao Zhang, Chenghua Lin, and Carolina Scarton. 2022. [Making science simple: Corpora for the lay summarisation of scientific literature](#). In *EMNLP:2022:main*, pages 10589–10604, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. acl.

Alex Graves and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2005. [Framework phoneme classification with bidirectional lstm and other neural network architectures](#). *Neural Networks*, 18(5):602–610. IJCNN 2005.

Yue Guo, Wei Qiu, Gondy Leroy, Sheng Wang, and Trevor Cohen. 2024. [Retrieval augmentation of large language models for lay language generation](#). *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 149:104580.

- Yue Guo, Wei Qiu, Yizhong Wang, and Trevor Cohen. 2021. [Automated lay language summarization of biomedical scientific reviews](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(1):160–168.
- Ashish Jaiswal, Ashwin Ramesh Babu, Mohammad Zaki Zadeh, Debapriya Banerjee, and Fillia Makedon. 2021. [A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning](#). *Technologies*, 9(1).
- Daniel Jurafsky and James H. Martin. 2021. Discourse coherence. *Draft of December 29, 2021*, pages 1–25.
- Tannon Kew, Alison Chi, Laura Vásquez-Rodríguez, Sweta Agrawal, Dennis Aumiller, Fernando Alva-Manchego, and Matthew Shardlow. 2023. [BLESS: Benchmarking large language models on sentence simplification](#). In *EMNLP:2023:main*, pages 13291–13309, Singapore. acl.
- Alice Lai and Joel Tetreault. 2018. [Discourse coherence in the wild: A dataset, evaluation and methods](#). In *SIGDIAL:2018:50*, pages 214–223, Melbourne, Australia. acl.
- Gondy Leroy, David Kauchak, and Obay Mouradi. 2013. [A user-study measuring the effects of lexical simplification and coherence enhancement on perceived and actual text difficulty](#). *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 82(8):717–730.
- 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:2020:main*, pages 7871–7880, Online. acl.
- Jiwei Li and Eduard Hovy. 2014. [A model of coherence based on distributed sentence representation](#). In *EMNLP:2014:1*, pages 2039–2048, Doha, Qatar. acl.
- Jiwei Li and Dan Jurafsky. 2017. [Neural net models of open-domain discourse coherence](#). In *EMNLP:2017:1*, pages 198–209, Copenhagen, Denmark. acl.
- Yang Liu and Mirella Lapata. 2019. [Text summarization with pretrained encoders](#). In *EMNLP:2019:1*, pages 3730–3740, Hong Kong, China. acl.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. [Decoupled weight decay regularization](#). In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*, pages 1–18. OpenReview.net.
- Zheheng Luo, Qianqian Xie, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2022. [Readability controllable biomedical document summarization](#). In *FINDINGS:2022:emnlp*, pages 4667–4680, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. acl.
- Mounica Maddela, Fernando Alva-Manchego, and Wei Xu. 2021. [Controllable text simplification with explicit paraphrasing](#). In *NAACL:2021:main*, pages 3536–3553, Online. acl.
- Louis Martin, Éric de la Clergerie, Benoît Sagot, and Antoine Bordes. 2020. [Controllable sentence simplification](#). In *LREC:2020:1*, pages 4689–4698, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Mohsen Mesgar and Michael Strube. 2018. [A neural local coherence model for text quality assessment](#). In *EMNLP:2018:1*, pages 4328–4339, Brussels, Belgium. acl.
- Ben Naismith, Phoebe Mulcaire, and Jill Burstein. 2023. [Automated evaluation of written discourse coherence using GPT-4](#). In *BEA:2023:1*, pages 394–403, Toronto, Canada. acl.
- Daiki Nishihara, Tomoyuki Kajiwara, and Yuki Arase. 2019. [Controllable text simplification with lexical constraint loss](#). In *ACL:2019:2*, pages 260–266, Florence, Italy. acl.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, D. Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners](#). In *OpenAI*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(1).
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation](#). In *EMNLP:2020:main*, pages 4512–4525, Online. acl.
- Annette Rios, Nicolas Spring, Tannon Kew, Marek Kostrzewa, Andreas Säuberli, Mathias Müller, and Sarah Ebling. 2021. [A new dataset and efficient baselines for document-level text simplification in German](#). In *NEWSUM:2021:1*, pages 152–161, Online and in Dominican Republic. acl.
- Chantal Shaib, Millicent Li, Sebastian Joseph, Iain Marshall, Junyi Jessy Li, and Byron Wallace. 2023. [Summarizing, simplifying, and synthesizing medical evidence using GPT-3 \(with varying success\)](#). In *ACL:2023:short*, pages 1387–1407, Toronto, Canada. acl.
- Kim Cheng Sheang and Horacio Saggion. 2021. [Controllable sentence simplification with a unified text-to-text transfer transformer](#). In *INLG:2021:1*, pages 341–352, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK. acl.
- Advait Siddharthan. 2003. [Preserving discourse structure when simplifying text](#). In *ENLG:2003:23*, Budapest, Hungary. acl.
- Advait Siddharthan. 2006. [Syntactic Simplification and Text Cohesion](#). *Research on Language and Computation*, 4(1):77–109.

- Neha Srikanth and Junyi Jessy Li. 2021. [Elaborative simplification: Content addition and explanation generation in text simplification](#). In *FINDINGS:2021:acl*, pages 5123–5137, Online. acl.
- Sanja Štajner and Goran Glavaš. 2017. [Leveraging event-based semantics for automated text simplification](#). *Expert Systems with Applications*, 82:383–395.
- Sanja Štajner and Horacio Saggion. 2018. Data-driven text simplification. In *COLING:2018:3*, pages 19–23, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. acl.
- Regina Stodden, Omar Momen, and Laura Kallmeyer. 2023. [DEplain: A German parallel corpus with intralingual translations into plain language for sentence and document simplification](#). In *ACL:2023:long*, pages 16441–16463, Toronto, Canada. acl.
- Renliang Sun, Hanqi Jin, and Xiaojun Wan. 2021. [Document-level text simplification: Dataset, criteria and baseline](#). In *EMNLP:2021:main*, pages 7997–8013, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. acl.
- Teerapaun Tanprasert and David Kauchak. 2021. [Flesch-kincaid is not a text simplification evaluation metric](#). In *GEM:2021:1*, pages 1–14, Online. acl.
- Lewis Tunstall, Nils Reimers, Unso Eun Seo Jo, Luke Bates, Daniel Korat, Moshe Wasserblat, and Oren Pereg. 2022. Efficient few-shot learning without prompts. In *Proceedings of the second workshop on Efficient Natural Language and Speech Processing (ENLSP-II)*, pages 1–13. arXiv.
- Sowmya Vajjala. 2022. Trends, limitations and open challenges in automatic readability assessment research. In *LREC:2022:1*, pages 5366–5377, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Sowmya Vajjala and Ivana Lučić. 2018. [OneStopEnglish corpus: A new corpus for automatic readability assessment and text simplification](#). In *BEA:2018:5*, pages 297–304, New Orleans, Louisiana. acl.
- Laura Vázquez-Rodríguez, Pedro-Manuel Cuenca-Jiménez, Sergio Morales-Esquivel, and Fernando Alva-Manchego. 2022a. [A benchmark for neural readability assessment of texts in Spanish](#). In *TSAR:2022:1*, pages 188–198, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Virtual). acl.
- Laura Vázquez-Rodríguez, Nhung Nguyen, Matthew Shardlow, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2022b. [UoM&MMU at TSAR-2022 shared task: Prompt learning for lexical simplification](#). In *TSAR:2022:1*, pages 218–224, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Virtual). acl.
- Laura Vázquez-Rodríguez, Matthew Shardlow, Piotr Przybyła, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2023. Document-level text simplification with coherence evaluation. In *TSAR:2023:1*, pages 85–101, Varna, Bulgaria. INCOMA Ltd., Shoumen, Bulgaria.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rodrigo Wilkens, Patrick Watrin, Rémi Cardon, Alice Pintard, Isabelle Gribomont, and Thomas François. 2024. Exploring hybrid approaches to readability: experiments on the complementarity between linguistic features and transformers. In *FINDINGS:2024:eacl*, pages 2316–2331, St. Julian’s, Malta. acl.
- Xuanxin Wu and Yuki Arase. 2024. [An in-depth evaluation of gpt-4 in sentence simplification with error-based human assessment](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.04963.
- Peng Xu, Hamidreza Saghir, Jin Sung Kang, Teng Long, Avishek Joey Bose, Yanshuai Cao, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. 2019. [A cross-domain transferable neural coherence model](#). In *ACL:2019:1*, pages 678–687, Florence, Italy. acl.
- Wei Xu, Chris Callison-Burch, and Courtney Napoles. 2015. [Problems in current text simplification research: New data can help](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:283–297.
- Hanqing Zhang, Haolin Song, Shaoyu Li, Ming Zhou, and Dawei Song. 2023. [A survey of controllable text generation using transformer-based pre-trained language models](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(3).

A Datasets

Grammarly Corpus of Discourse Coherence (GCDC) (Lai and Tetreault, 2018): a collection of 1200 texts for each domain where 1000 samples are used for training and 200 for testing. These domains are based on the Yahoo Questions and Answers dataset,¹³ emails from Hillary Clinton’s office,¹⁴ emails from the Enron Corpus¹⁵ and business reviews from the Yelp Open Dataset.¹⁶ This dataset was annotated by 13 professional annotators and 32 lay people to evaluate the performance of untrained people. Among these groups, the experts had previous annotation experience, while the non-professional annotators were crowdsourced through Mechanical Turk,¹⁷ filtered by a qualification exam. The annotators were given an initial

¹³<https://webscope.sandbox.yahoo.com/catalog.php?datatype=1>

¹⁴https://foia.state.gov/Search/Results.aspx?collection=Clinton_Email

¹⁵<https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~.enron/>

¹⁶<https://www.yelp.com/dataset>

¹⁷<https://www.mturk.com/>

definition of coherence and examples for each category to get familiarised with the task. Further, each text was rated on a 3-point scale with values from 1 to 3 to denote low, medium and high coherence. Each text is rated by 3 experts and 5 crowdsourcing annotators. These annotations were released, including the individual score per each rater and a consensus label for each group. The consensus label was calculated based on the mean coherence value, using a threshold for a 3-way classification as follows: $\text{low} \leq 1.8 < \text{medium} \leq 2.2 < \text{high}$. For the annotator agreement between raters, the mean values for the intraclass correlation (ICC) and quadratic weighted Cohen’s k were reported.¹⁸

D-Wikipedia (Sun et al., 2021): this corpus was proposed as the first Wikipedia-based corpora for simplification at a document-level with 143,546 texts using Wikipedia¹⁹ and Simple Wikipedia²⁰ article headers of each article. This refers to the main text after the main title, which is also referred to as “abstracts” by the authors. The alignment of the complex and simple Wikipedia was done automatically, therefore, the dataset is prone to some errors (e.g., incorrect alignments). However, the dataset can be relevant since it is large and suitable for learning the task of simplification, despite its known limitations (Cripwell et al., 2023).

B Models

B.1 Training Details

We trained the models using one Nvidia A100 GPUs with 80GB GPU RAM. For our models’ hyperparameters, we used a learning rate of 2×10^{-5} , weight decay of 0.01, batch size of 8, an AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) and 5 training epochs, except for the few-shot models which were trained only for 1 epoch. For δ , we selected a value of 0.90 based on the impact it would have on the loss values for readability and simplification. Further tuning of these parameters will remain as future work.

B.2 Coherence Model Selection

For the evaluation of coherence in simplification, we assessed 3 different systems: a BERT-based baseline (Devlin et al., 2019), sentence-embedding (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020) with an LSTM

(Graves and Schmidhuber, 2005) and the SetFit model (Tunstall et al., 2022). For this benchmark, we included scenarios in which data is synthetically generated, as has been traditionally done in previous work (Li and Hovy, 2014; Li and Jurafsky, 2017; Xu et al., 2019). We have also included the evaluation of real-world scenarios (Lai and Tetreault, 2018), which will determine the final selection of the model for TS evaluation.²¹

B.2.1 BERT-based model

We considered a **BERT**-based (Devlin et al., 2019) model as a baseline, particularly BERT base (uncased), with no further modifications to its parameters. In this model, we aim to contrast the input data representations encoded by BERT, instead of sentence embeddings (such as by sBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020)). We hypothesise that BERT embeddings would fail to capture the logical relationships between sentences if any, and that the model will under-perform in comparison to the ones which use better data representations such as sentence embeddings. Our main target is the evaluation at a discourse level and not at a word level, however, we include the BERT model for comparison. Finally, we fine-tune the BERT model using the preprocessed texts for the classification of coherence.




Figure 2: SBERT-based model architecture

B.2.2 sBERT+LSTM-based model

Next, we considered our system **sBERT+LSTM**. In terms of data representation, most of the previous work (refer to related work in Appendix 2) encodes text as strings or token-based embedding. Hence, text is encoded individually per word without capturing the semantic meaning of these words at a sentence or document level altogether. To mitigate this issue, we proposed a model that uses sentence transformers (sBERT) as inputs. In Figure 2, we present the sBERT+LSTM model, which describes the architecture of our system. We preprocessed our datasets as described in Section C.1. Then, the inputs are encoded using an sBERT

¹⁸The GCDC dataset is available upon request to the authors.

¹⁹<https://www.wikipedia.org/>

²⁰https://simple.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page

²¹Although we also experimented with synthetic data, we limit the discussion of our results to human-annotated data as this would be our main target datasets for simplification.

model. Each encoded text (i.e., instance) is represented by a collection of 10 encoded sentences. Texts are passed to a biLSTM layer and a linear layer (Graves and Schmidhuber, 2005). Finally, we performed binary classification of our inputs using the sigmoid function which will determine if the text is coherent (1) or incoherent (0).




Figure 3: SetFit model architecture (Tunstall et al., 2022). ST stands for Sentence Transformers.

B.2.3 SetFit model

Finally, we considered the **SetFit model**. Recently, Tunstall et al. (2022) proposed this model, which facilitates the implementation of the data augmentation step, typically challenging for contrastive learning methods (Jaiswal et al., 2021). In this architecture (Figure 3), sentence embeddings are used together with contrastive learning in a few-shot manner, implementing internally the required data representation. As a first step, sentence embeddings are fine-tuned using a few samples from the dataset. Then, the fine-tuned sentence transformer is used to encode the initial input sentences for training the model. This model does not expect large datasets to get competitive results, since it was designed to work in a few-shot setting. We pre-processed our input data concatenated in a single string, as in the BERT model as we expect one coherence value per each text. Once we prepared our data, we fine-tuned the SetFit model for coherence classification.

For the experiments using the GCDC dataset, we considered the three aforementioned models. In this setting, the SetFit model showed the best performance. Therefore, we selected this model for our simplification system. In contrast, *sBERT-LSTM* and *BERT*, did not achieve comparable performance, as in the synthetic data scenarios.

C Coherence Data Selection

C.1 Data Preprocessing

We selected texts (Section 3.6) from the general domain (e.g., news, emails and business reviews) for our coherence evaluation task. Then, we pre-processed the text to standardise it among all models

as follows: 1) We performed sentence segmentation on the input text using the NLTK library (Bird et al., 2009); 2) We selected the first 10 sentences of each instance since texts can have a varied number of sentences. These sentences were extracted from the first paragraph, which is likely to make sense by itself, without needing the following context. We also considered splitting the articles into multiple paragraphs, however, there is no guarantee that the consequent paragraphs are connected when they are extracted from their context, causing disruptions in the narrative; 3) We add one padding token per sentence to our tokenised text to those that have less than 10 sentences to complete the remaining sentences.

Type	Text
<i>Complex:</i>	...The sighting of the red fox - one of 14 mammals protected by California -...
<i>Gold-reference:</i>	...California protects 14 animals . The red fox is one of them. <i>It is against the law to hunt or kill them...</i>
<i>Simple (NewselaS+simp+fine):</i>	...The's 14 animals . The red fox was one of them. <i>The is one the law to hunt wild animals...</i>

Table 6: Example 1: Manual analysis for simplification models using NewselaS.

Type	Text
<i>Complex:</i>	...Volkswagen has admitted installing "defeat devices" in as many as 11 million diesel engines...
<i>Gold-reference:</i>	...The automaker cheated emissions tests on their diesel cars...
<i>Simple (NewselaSL+simp+read)</i>	...The dealers up devices to make the cars information tests...
<i>Simple (NewselaSL+simp+read+coh):</i>	...The dealers up cars to make the cars information tests...

Table 7: Example 2: Manual analysis for simplification models using NewselaSL.

Type	Text
<i>Complex:</i>	...Named for the color of their fatty tissue, green turtles go about nesting in a peculiar way...
<i>Gold-reference:</i>	...They knew that green turtles go about nesting in a peculiar way ...
<i>Simple (D Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+read)</i>	...Name are that the turtles go about nesting in a strange way...
<i>Simple (D Wiki+NewselaSL+simple+read+coh):</i>	...Name are that the turtles go about nesting in a peculiar way...

Table 8: Example 3: Manual analysis for simplification models using D-Wikipedia and NewselaSL.