

# Evaluating LLMs and Pre-trained Models for Text Summarization Across Diverse Datasets

Tohida Rehman  
Dept. of Information Technology  
Jadavpur University  
Kolkata, India  
tohidarehman.it@jadavpuruniversity.in

Soumabha Ghosh  
Dept. of Information Technology  
Jadavpur University  
Kolkata, India  
soumagok@gmail.com

Kuntal Das  
Dept. of Information Technology  
Jadavpur University  
Kolkata, India  
iamkuntal2002@gmail.com

Souvik Bhattacharjee  
Dept. of Information Technology  
Jadavpur University  
Kolkata, India  
souvikbhattacharjee00076@gmail.com

Debarshi Kumar Sanyal  
School of Mathematical & Computational Sciences  
Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science  
Kolkata, India  
debarshi.sanyal@iacs.res.in

Samiran Chattopadhyay  
Jadavpur University and  
Techno India University  
Kolkata, India  
samirancju@gmail.com

**Abstract**—Text summarization plays a crucial role in natural language processing by condensing large volumes of text into concise and coherent summaries. As digital content continues to grow rapidly and the demand for effective information retrieval increases, text summarization has become a focal point of research in recent years. This study offers a thorough evaluation of four leading pre-trained and open-source large language models: BART, FLAN-T5, LLaMA-3-8B, and Gemma-7B, across five diverse datasets CNN/DM, Gigaword, News Summary, XSum, and BBC News. The evaluation employs widely recognized automatic metrics, including ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, ROUGE-L, BERTScore, and METEOR, to assess the models’ capabilities in generating coherent and informative summaries. The results reveal the comparative strengths and limitations of these models in processing various text types.

**Index Terms**—Text summarization, Natural language generation, Pre-trained models, Large language models, Evaluation metrics

## I. INTRODUCTION

Text summarization has seen significant advancements, particularly with the rise of deep learning techniques and large pre-trained models. These developments have allowed for more accurate and efficient summarization of lengthy texts, making it a valuable tool for various applications, including content organization, information retrieval, and decision-making. Summarization techniques are generally classified into two categories: extractive and abstractive [1]. Extractive methods select key phrases or sentences directly from the source text, while abstractive methods generate concise summaries by rephrasing the original content, similar to how humans would summarize it [1].

**Contributions.** The primary contributions of this paper are:

- 1) Fine-tuning and evaluation of four pre-trained models – BART, FLAN-T5, LLaMA-3-8B, and Gemma-7B – across five diverse datasets, namely, CNN/DM, Gigaword, News Summary, XSum, and BBC News, for abstractive summarization.

- 2) Comparison of summarization quality using established metrics.
- 3) Insights into model performance to guide future research and enhancements.

## II. RELATED WORK

Text summarization in NLP involves creating concise summaries from lengthy documents. Early, methods focused on extractive techniques, selecting key sentences or phrases [1].

Initially, text summarization research focused on single-document summarization, where key information is extracted from a single document to generate a concise summary. Several recent surveys, such as [2]–[4] provide a comprehensive overview of summarization datasets and techniques, spanning from statistical methods to deep learning models.

While the early methods struggled with rephrasing and merging content, the introduction of sequence-to-sequence models like the pointer-generator model, augmented with coverage and attention mechanisms [5] marked a significant advancement, although challenges like repeated content and factual inaccuracies or hallucinations persisted. Our earlier works [6]–[12] explored the performance of various pre-trained models in open-domain and scholarly domains. Pre-trained models such as T5 [13], BART [14], PEGASUS [15] and large language models (LLMs) like the GPT-family of models [16] established new state-of-the-art scores in summarization. This paper chooses models with parameters between a few hundred million to less than 10 billion and assess their performance on a diversity of datasets.

## III. MODELS USED

In our approach to summarization, we utilized pre-trained models, fine-tuning them to improve their ability to generate concise and accurate summaries. By adapting both large language models (LLMs) and other pre-trained models, we could compare the performance of diverse models across various

datasets. The generated summaries were not only precise but also coherent and informative.

#### A. BART and FLAN-T5

For this study, we employed the BART-base model [14], a transformer-based architecture designed for sequence-to-sequence tasks like summarization. BART-base model, with 139 million trainable parameters, uses a denoising autoencoder to reconstruct text, which aids in producing high-quality summaries. Pre-trained on large corpora, the model excels at understanding and generating natural language.

For this study, we employed the FLAN-T5-base [17] model for the summarization task. The FLAN-T5 tokenizer was then downloaded and applied to prepare the training data.

#### B. LLaMA-3-8B and Gemma-7B

We fine-tuned the LLaMA-3-8B model [18], a decoder-only Transformer with 8 billion parameters, trained on publicly available datasets, making it ideal for a wide range of natural language processing tasks. By leveraging LoRA [19], we optimized its performance for each dataset, minimizing both computational costs and memory usage. Similarly, the Gemma-7B model, with 7 billion trainable parameters, was fine-tuned using LoRA optimization techniques for each dataset separately, also minimizing computational costs and memory usage.

### IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

#### A. Datasets

We fine-tuned our models on five distinct datasets, each dataset divided into 1,000 training examples and 100 test examples for concise and precise summaries. We now present a brief overview of the datasets. The **CNN/DM dataset** [20], contains over 300k news articles from CNN and the Daily Mail. The **Gigaword dataset** [21], with over 6 million articles from sources like the Associated Press and the New York Times, pairs each article with a headline or brief summary, making it suitable for supervised learning tasks. The **News Summary dataset** includes 4,515 examples with author names, headlines, URLs, short texts, and complete articles, collected from Inshorts, The Hindu, Indian Times, and The Guardian from February to August 2017. The **XSum dataset** [22] features 226,711 BBC news articles from 2010 to 2017, each with a one-sentence summary across various domains, such as news, politics, sports, weather, business, technology, science, health, family, education, entertainment, and arts. The **BBC News dataset** [23], on the other hand, comprises 417 political news articles from 2004 to 2005, with each article accompanied by five summaries.

#### B. Data Processing

We first obtained the datasets from Hugging Face. To prepare the data for fine-tuning BART and FLAN-T5 models, the input articles and their corresponding summaries were organized into separate arrays, which were then paired into tuples to establish a clear relationship between the input

text and its target summary. These pairs were subsequently transformed into tensor slices for efficient batch processing during training. This meticulous preprocessing ensures that the BART and FLAN-T5 models learn to generate concise and accurate summaries.

For the fine-tuning of the LLaMA-3-8B and Gemma-7B models, we developed a custom function, `formatting_prompt_func()`, to structure the dataset by combining essential components of the main article and its summary into a cohesive string. Each string was marked with an `EOS_TOKEN` to indicate the end of the sequence. This structured approach ensures seamless data integration for optimizing LLaMA-3-8B and Gemma-7B for effective text summarization.

#### C. Implementation Details

We selected the following pre-trained models from the Hugging Face repository: BART-base<sup>1</sup>, FLAN-T5-base<sup>2</sup>, LLaMA-3-8B<sup>3</sup>, and Gemma-7B<sup>4</sup>.

To fine-tune LLaMA-3-8B and Gemma-7B models, we used a batch size of 2, an evaluation batch size of 1, learning rate of  $2e-4$ , and adaptation matrices with a rank of  $r=16$ . Additionally, we set `lora_alpha = 16` as the scaling factor and employed `peft_config` for loading LoRA. We used the following prompt to generate a summary with LLaMA-3-8B and Gemma-7B LLMs:

Create a concise and abstract summary of the following <text>

The same prompt was utilized for both fine-tuning and evaluation. We fine-tuned each model for three epochs on each of the datasets.

For fine-tuning BART and FLAN-T5, we used a batch size of 8, an evaluation batch size of 8, and a learning rate of  $5e-5$ . Across all models, the sequence length during fine-tuning was set to 1000, while the generated outputs had a maximum length of 100. We fine-tuned BART-base and FLAN-T5-base models for three epochs on each of the datasets.

#### D. Observation on Computational Resources

Table I presents a summary of the computational resources utilized during the fine-tuning process of the models.

Factors	BART	FLAN-T5	LLaMA-3-8B	Gemma-7B
Trainable Params	139M	248M	8B	7B
RAM (12.7GB)	4.8	3.5	4	4.5
GPU (15GB)	8	9	9.8	9.2
Disk (78GB)	7.7	10.4	33.6	33.5
GPU Utilization	100%	97%	95%	100%
CPU Utilization	100%	100%	96%	98%
Time per Epoch (min)	6.45	1.5	50	67

TABLE I  
COMPUTATIONAL EFFICIENCY AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION ACROSS SUMMARIZATION MODELS.

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/facebook/bart-base>

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/google/flan-t5-base>

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/unsloth/llama-3-8b-bnb-4bit>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/unsloth/codegemma-7b-bnb-4bit>

### E. Evaluation Metrics

ROUGE (Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation) [24] is a widely used evaluation metric in NLP tasks, such as summarization, that assesses the quality of a machine-generated summary  $M$  by comparing it to a human-written reference summary  $H$ . **ROUGE-1** measures unigram overlap, **ROUGE-2** assesses bigram overlap, and **ROUGE-L** calculates the longest common subsequence (LCS) between  $M$  and  $H$ . METEOR [25] assesses unigram precision and recall, aligning machine-generated and reference summaries at the sentence level with a fragmentation penalty. BERTScore [26] calculates a similarity score for each token in the machine-generated summary  $M$  with each token in the human-written reference summary  $H$ , where token similarity is computed using BERT contextual embeddings. Thus, contextual similarity is used instead of exact token matches. BERTScore is reported to correlate better with human judgments, compared to other metrics [26].

## V. RESULTS

### A. Model Comparison

This section compares the performance of the models across the datasets used in this study. We evaluate their performance using multiple metrics: F1 scores for ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L, as well as METEOR and BERTScore. This multi-metric approach provides a comprehensive evaluation of each model’s ability to generate high-quality summaries, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses in different scenarios.

Model Name	R-1	R-2	R-L	METEOR	BERTScore
BART	0.25	0.07	0.18	0.53	0.23
FLAN-T5	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.34</b>
LLaMA-3-8B	0.32	0.12	0.23	0.56	0.25
Gemma-7B	0.33	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.58</b>	0.29

TABLE II

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MODELS: ROUGE F1-SCORES, METEOR, AND BERTSCORE ON THE **CNN/DM** DATASET.

Model Name	R-1	R-2	R-L	METEOR	BERTScore
BART	0.29	0.10	0.26	0.53	0.18
FLAN-T5	0.33	0.12	0.28	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.35</b>
LLaMA-3-8B	0.29	0.09	0.25	0.50	0.25
Gemma-7B	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.32</b>	0.55	0.29

TABLE III

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MODELS: ROUGE F1-SCORES, METEOR, AND BERTSCORE ON THE **GIGAWORD** DATASET.

Model Name	R-1	R-2	R-L	METEOR	BERTScore
BART	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.49</b>
FLAN-T5	0.52	0.29	0.39	0.70	0.44
LLaMA-3-8B	0.51	0.27	0.37	0.67	0.41
Gemma-7B	0.51	0.28	0.38	0.68	0.38

TABLE IV

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MODELS: ROUGE F1-SCORES, METEOR, AND BERTSCORE ON THE **NEWS SUMMARY** DATASET.

#### 1) Dataset: CNN/DM

The results for ROUGE-1 (R-1), ROUGE-2 (R-2),

Model Name	R-1	R-2	R-L	METEOR	BERTScore
BART	0.27	0.07	0.21	0.57	0.22
FLAN-T5	0.35	0.13	0.27	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.30</b>
LLaMA-3-8B	0.37	0.15	0.29	0.56	0.27
Gemma-7B	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.30</b>

TABLE V

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MODELS: ROUGE F1-SCORES, METEOR, AND BERTSCORE ON THE **XSUM** DATASET.

Model Name	R-1	R-2	R-L	METEOR	BERTScore
BART	<b>0.61</b>	0.47	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.51</b>
FLAN-T5	0.27	0.23	0.25	0.64	0.15
LLaMA-3-8B	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.49</b>	0.40	0.74	<b>0.51</b>
Gemma-7B	0.51	0.39	0.36	0.71	0.33

TABLE VI

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF MODELS: ROUGE F1-SCORES, METEOR, AND BERTSCORE ON THE **BBC NEWS** DATASET.

ROUGE-L (R-L), METEOR, and BERTScore on the CNN/DM dataset are presented in Table II. It can be observed that, among the four models, the fine-tuned FLAN-T5 model outperforms the others, achieving the highest values for the ROUGE, BERTScore, and METEOR metrics. Furthermore, the fine-tuned Gemma-7B model demonstrates performance similar to that of the fine-tuned FLAN-T5 model, particularly in terms of ROUGE-2, ROUGE-L, and METEOR scores.

#### 2) Dataset: Gigaword

The results for ROUGE-1 (R-1), ROUGE-2 (R-2), ROUGE-L (R-L), BERTScore, and METEOR on the Gigaword dataset are presented in Table III. It is evident from the results that the fine-tuned Gemma-7B model achieves the highest scores for the ROUGE metrics. In contrast, the fine-tuned FLAN-T5 model outperforms the others in terms of BERTScore and METEOR values.

#### 3) Dataset: News Summary

The results for ROUGE-1 (R-1), ROUGE-2 (R-2), ROUGE-L (R-L), BERTScore, and METEOR on the News Summary dataset are presented in Table IV. Among the four models, the fine-tuned BART model achieves the highest scores across all evaluated metrics, namely, ROUGE, BERTScore, and METEOR.

#### 4) Dataset: XSum

The results for ROUGE-1 (R-1), ROUGE-2 (R-2), ROUGE-L (R-L), BERTScore, and METEOR on the XSum dataset are presented in Table V. The fine-tuned Gemma-7B model demonstrates superior performance, achieving the highest scores across all evaluated metrics, namely, ROUGE, BERTScore, and METEOR. Furthermore, the fine-tuned FLAN-T5 model demonstrates performance similar to that of the fine-tuned Gemma-7B model, particularly in terms of METEOR score and BERTScore.

#### 5) Dataset: BBC News

The results for ROUGE-1 (R-1), ROUGE-2 (R-2), ROUGE-L (R-L), BERTScore, and METEOR on the BBC News dataset are displayed in Table VI. Among the four models, the fine-tuned BART model achieves the

highest scores for ROUGE-1, ROUGE-L, BERTScore, and METEOR. However, the fine-tuned LLaMA-3-8B model outperforms others in ROUGE-2 and attains the same highest scores as obtained by BART for R-1 and BERTScore. It is also very close to BART in R-L and METEOR.

We also performed an evaluation of the summaries using ChatGPT<sup>5</sup> as a judge. In particular, we randomly selected 5 examples from each dataset and collected the golden as well as the four model-generated summaries for each example. Then, we prompted ChatGPT to select the most preferred machine generated summary given the original text, the golden summary and the four generated ones. Ranking the models by the number of times their summaries were most preferred, we found that Gemma-7B was the top choice for Gigaword and XSum, LLaMA-3-8B for BBC News, and BART for News Summary. For CNN/DM, LLaMA-3-8B was preferred in 2 out of 5 cases; in the remaining 3 cases, a different model was preferred in each instance. Except for CNN/DM, the above preferences align closely with the earlier automatic metric-based evaluation. A major issue with BART and FLAN-T5 was that their outputs sometimes contained repeated information and grammatical errors, which were rarely present in LLaMA-3-8B and Gemma-7B. Another concern is that hallucinations [27] occasionally appeared in the generated summaries.

### B. Case study

We will now showcase various examples illustrating the results generated by the models discussed in this paper. In each case study presented, errors or incorrect information are highlighted in magenta, redundant information is shown in cyan, and repeated words are indicated in yellow.

In the case study shown in Figure 1, the fine-tuned BART model makes a mistake by repeating the phrase “Officials didn’t know what had caused the fire,” which had already been stated earlier in the summary, leading to redundancy. The fine-tuned LLaMA-3-8B model makes mistakes by unnecessarily repeating “NEW:” before relevant details and including extraneous information, such as the size of the park, which is irrelevant to the main summary. In the case study in Figure 2, the fine-tuned FLAN-T5 model introduces an error by mistakenly inserting “London” into the summary, which is contextually irrelevant, whereas the other models produce more accurate and relevant summaries.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of various pre-trained models and large language models for abstractive text generation, evaluating their ability to produce coherent, informative, and concise summaries. While these models show promising results, there are still areas for improvement, especially in syntactical accuracy and factual consistency. Future work will include human evaluations or a more detailed

evaluation with LLM-as-a-judge to assess the quality of AI-generated summaries. Additionally, we plan to analyze the issues of hallucination and its mitigation strategies in the context of abstractive summarization.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Wafaa S El-Kassas, Cherif R Salama, Ahmed A Rafea, and Hoda K Mohamed. Automatic text summarization: A comprehensive survey. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 165:113679, 2021.
- [2] Huan Yee Koh, Jiabin Ju, Ming Liu, and Shirui Pan. An empirical survey on long document summarization: Datasets, models, and metrics. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(8):1–35, 2022.
- [3] Mengqi Luo, Bowen Xue, and Ben Niu. A comprehensive survey for automatic text summarization: Techniques, approaches and perspectives. *Neurocomputing*, 28:128280, 2024.
- [4] Haopeng Zhang, Philip S Yu, and Jiawei Zhang. A systematic survey of text summarization: From statistical methods to large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11289*, 2024.
- [5] A. See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1073–1083, 2017.
- [6] Tohida Rehman, Debarshi Kumar Sanyal, Samiran Chattopadhyay, Plaban Kumar Bhowmick, and Partha Pratim Das. Automatic generation of research highlights from scientific. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Extraction and Evaluation of Knowledge Entities from Scientific Documents (EKE’21)*, collocated with JCDL’21, 2021.
- [7] Tohida Rehman, Debarshi Kumar Sanyal, Prasenjit Majumder, and Samiran Chattopadhyay. Named entity recognition based automatic generation of research highlights. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Scholarly Document Processing (SDP 2022) collocated with COLING 2022*, pages 163–169, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. ACL.
- [8] Tohida Rehman, Debarshi Kumar Sanyal, and Samiran Chattopadhyay. Research highlight generation with elmo contextual embeddings. *Scalable Computing: Practice and Experience*, 24(2):181–190, 2023.
- [9] Tohida Rehman, Debarshi Kumar Sanyal, Samiran Chattopadhyay, Plaban Kumar Bhowmick, and Partha Pratim Das. Generation of highlights from research papers using pointer-generator networks and scibert embeddings. *IEEE Access*, 11:91358–91374, 2023.
- [10] Tohida Rehman, Suchandan Das, Debarshi Kumar Sanyal, and Samiran Chattopadhyay. An analysis of abstractive text summarization using pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computational Intelligence, Data Science and Cloud Computing: IEM-ICDC 2021*, pages 253–264. Springer, 2022.
- [11] Tohida Rehman, Suchandan Das, Debarshi Kumar Sanyal, and Samiran Chattopadhyay. Abstractive text summarization using attentive gru based encoder-decoder. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning: ICAAAIML 2021*, pages 687–695. Springer, 2022.
- [12] Tohida Rehman, Raghubir Bose, Soumik Dey, and Samiran Chattopadhyay. Analysis of multidomain abstractive summarization using salience allocation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Intelligence in Communications and Business Analytics*, pages 182–193. Springer, 2024.
- [13] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.
- [14] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetraault, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.703>.
- [15] Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. PEGASUS: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICLR)*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR, 2020.

<sup>5</sup><https://chatgpt.com/>

<b>Ground-truth summary:</b> Fire breaks out at the General Electric Appliance Park in Louisville, Kentucky. City officials report no one is believed to be injured or trapped.
<b>BART:</b> Fire damages industrial park in Kentucky, official says. Video shows blaze spreading thick smoke over area. No injuries or trapped, official says. Officials didn't know what had caused the fire, which had gone to at least four alarms. Officials didn't know what had caused the fire.
<b>FLAN-T5:</b> Fire breaks out in Kentucky industrial park, sending plumes of thick smoke over the area. No reports of anyone injured or trapped in the blaze, officials say. GE's facility in Louisville Appliance Park is "revitalizing manufacturing in the United States."
<b>LLaMA-3-8B:</b> <b>NEW:</b> Fire began shortly before 7 a.m. at General Electric Appliance Park. <b>NEW:</b> No reports of anyone injured or trapped, official says. <b>NEW:</b> Firefighters spray water from the periphery of affected buildings. <b>NEW:</b> Park is large, such that 34 football fields could fit in one of its warehouses.
<b>Gemma-7B:</b> Massive fire breaks out at General Electric Appliance Park in Louisville, Kentucky. Firefighters take up positions around affected buildings, spraying water. Authorities don't know what caused the fire, which has gone to at least four alarms.

Fig. 1. Ground-truth summary and summaries generated by different models on the CNN/DM test dataset. Input taken from <https://edition.cnn.com/2015/04/03/us/kentucky-ge-fire/index.html>.

<b>Ground-truth summary</b> Sri lanka closes schools as war escalates.
<b>BART generated:</b> Sri lanka government shuts government schools amid military campaign against rebels.
<b>FLAN-T5 generated:</b> Sri lanka announces closure of government schools as tamil separatists campaign intensifies in north of london .
<b>LLaMA-3-8B generated:</b> Srilanka shuts schools as war intensifies.
<b>Gemma-7B generated:</b> Sri lanka closes schools amid escalating war.

Fig. 2. Ground-truth summary and summaries generated by different models on the Gigaword dataset. Input taken from <https://www.cfr.org/background/sri-lankan-conflict>

[16] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.

[17] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(70):1–53, 2024.

[18] AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card, 2024. [https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL\\_CARD.md](https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md).

[19] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LORA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.

[20] Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomas Kocisky, Edward Grefenstette, Lasse Espeholt, Will Kay, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. Teaching machines to read and comprehend. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.

[21] Ramesh Nallapati, Bowen Zhou, Cicero dos Santos, Caglar Gulcehre, and Bing Xiang. Abstractive text summarization using sequence-to-sequence RNNs and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 280–290, Berlin, Germany, 2016. ACL.

[22] Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. Don't give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08745*, 2018.

[23] Derek Greene and Pádraig Cunningham. Practical solutions to the problem of diagonal dominance in kernel document clustering. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '06*, page 377–384, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery.

[24] Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain, July 2004. ACL.

[25] Satandeep Banerjee and Alon Lavie. METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005.

[26] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. BERTScore: Evaluating text generation with BERT. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, (ICLR 2020)*, pages 1–43, 2020.

[27] Tohida Rehman, Ronit Mandal, Abhishek Agarwal, and Debarshi Kumar Sanyal. Hallucination reduction in long input text summarization. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Security, Surveillance and Artificial Intelligence (ICSSAI-2023)*, pages 307–316. CRC Press, 2023.

This figure "fig1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2502.19339v1>