

LUNA: A Framework for Language Understanding and Naturalness Assessment

Marat Saidov*, Aleksandra Bakalova*, Ekaterina Taktasheva

Vladislav Mikhailov, Ekaterina Artemova

Work done at HSE University

Correspondence: ekaterina.l.artemova@gmail.com

Abstract

The evaluation of Natural Language Generation (NLG) models has gained increased attention, urging the development of metrics that evaluate various aspects of generated text. LUNA addresses this challenge by introducing a unified interface for 20 NLG evaluation metrics. These metrics are categorized based on their reference-dependence and the type of text representation they employ, from string-based n -gram overlap to the utilization of static embeddings and pre-trained language models.

The straightforward design of LUNA allows for easy extension with novel metrics, requiring just a few lines of code. LUNA offers a user-friendly tool for evaluating generated texts.

1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in finding better ways to evaluate how well natural language generation (NLG) models perform (Zhou et al., 2022; Sai et al., 2022). This involves creating new metrics that assess different aspects of the generated text, ranging from nuanced task-specific phenomena (Zhao et al., 2023) to overall quality (Rei et al., 2020) and its correlation with human judgements (Chhun et al., 2022a). However, comparing NLG models directly is becoming more challenging due to the increasing diversity of evaluation metrics and datasets used to showcase novel evaluation approaches. Nonetheless, a consistent and reproducible way to run evaluation is crucial for the progress in the field.

Prior efforts have yielded valuable unified evaluation tools, such as HuggingFace Evaluate¹, which targets LLM performance, and TextAttack (Morris et al., 2020), focused on large language models' (LLMs) robustness evaluation. Building on this progress, we introduce a specialized tool for evalu-

ating NLG models with respect to a wide range of metrics.

In this paper, we present LUNA, a Python framework for language understanding and naturalness assessment. LUNA offers a unified interface encompassing 20 NLG evaluation metrics widely used in popular sequence-to-sequence and open-ended text generation tasks. These metrics are categorized based on two primary design choices: (i) reference-based and reference-free metrics (i.e., metrics that require and do not require any reference to compare the generated output with), and (ii) the text representation they utilize, which range from string-based n -gram overlap to employing word embedding models and contextualized representations from pre-trained LLMs. To streamline the evaluation, we provide two setups, in which either a single example or a batch of examples is evaluated. This ensures that LUNA can accommodate a wide range of evaluation scenarios, from fine-grained analysis to large-scale assessments. LUNA is agnostic to specific tasks and can be applied to assess the outputs of any generative LLMs. This includes task-specific models like machine translation, as well as more general open-ended generation models.

LUNA leverages HuggingFace Transformers (Wolf et al., 2020), enabling integration with any Transformer-based LLM required for specific metrics. Additionally, the framework's design allows for straightforward extensions with new metrics, requiring only a few lines of code.

LUNA is distributed under the MIT license as a Python package installed via direct cloning from GitHub². Use cases for LUNA include: (i) Comparative analysis and correlation of NLG evaluation metrics from existing literature; (ii) Ranking of generation hypotheses based on multiple metrics; (iii) Development and testing of novel NLG evaluation metrics.

*Equal contribution.

¹hf.co/evaluate/

²<https://github.com/Moonlight-Syntax/LUNA>

	Reference-based	Reference-free
String-based metrics	BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) ROUGE (Lin, 2004) chrF (Popović, 2015) METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005)	Coverage (Grusky et al., 2018) Density (Grusky et al., 2018) Compression (Grusky et al., 2018) Length (Fabbri et al., 2021) Novelty (Fabbri et al., 2021) Repetition (Fabbri et al., 2021)
Embedding-based metrics	ROUGE-We (Ng and Abrecht, 2015) BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2019) MoverScore (Zhao et al., 2019) BaryScore (Colombo et al., 2021) DepthScore (Staerman et al., 2021)	
Model-based metrics	S3 (Peyrard et al., 2017) SummaQA (Scialom et al., 2019) InfoLM (Colombo et al., 2022b)	BLANC (Vasilyev et al., 2020) BARTScore (Yuan et al., 2021)

Table 1: Metrics supported in the LUNA framework.

2 Framework

LUNA offers a unified and user-friendly interface for running a variety of NLG evaluation metrics. Table 1 lists NLG evaluation metrics currently supported by LUNA, which includes both traditional count-based metrics such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE (Lin, 2004), as well as newer metrics such as InfoLM (Colombo et al., 2022b) and BARTScore (Yuan et al., 2021). The base class within LUNA is implemented as below:

Listing 1: The base class in LUNA.

```
class Metrics:
    def evaluate_batch(self, candidates:
        List[str], references:
        Optional[List[str]]) -> List[float]:
        *some code here*

    def evaluate_example(self, candidate: str,
        reference: Optional[str]) -> float:
        *some code here*
```

Overall design. Each metric is implemented as a separate class, inheriting from the base class. The specific parameters for each metric are customized by providing them as input arguments to the initialization method. Evaluation can be performed in two ways: (i) using the “evaluate_example” method to evaluate a single example, or (ii) using the “evaluate_batch” method to evaluate a batch of examples.

In LUNA, evaluating the same input with multiple metrics is straightforward because all metrics utilize the same base interface. To accomplish this, the user simply needs to loop over all the required metrics, as demonstrated in the example below.

Listing 2: Consequent run of two metrics.

```
from luna.mover_score import MoverScoreMetrics
from luna.ngram import BLEUMetrics

metrics = [
    MoverScoreMetrics(
        n_gram=1,
        model_name="distilbert-base-uncased",
        compute_idfs=False,
        device="cuda"
    ),
    BLEUMetrics()
]
candidate = "Today is such a great day! I'm not
sure if I want to go get some tea or just
end it all."
reference = "What a good day today! Whether to
go have a cup of tea or hang oneself."
results = [metric.evaluate_example(candidate,
reference) for metric in metrics]
```

Additionally, we offer a specialized calculator mechanism that enables the simultaneous evaluation of multiple metrics on the same input with a single call. This mechanism also provides the option for parallel execution, where each metric runs in a separate process.

Input arguments. All metrics adhere to specific guidelines to ensure user-friendliness. During initialization, metric parameters are provided, including the underlying language model (via the model identifier in the HuggingFace hub), a customized list of stopwords, selected embeddings, and other relevant arguments. The extensive range of customizable parameters ensures that the metrics can be adapted to various models and languages, unless limited by metric architecture. Memory for storing language models or embeddings is also allocated during initialization.

Evaluation modes and tests. To evaluate multiple candidates efficiently, we recommend using “evaluate_batch” method, which is optimized for parallel processing. If a specific metric can be further optimized at its own level, the metric class overrides this method to implement the optimization. Multiprocessing is employed, where such optimization is not feasible. This means that the “evaluate_example” method is executed across multiple processes, taking advantage of parallel computing if multiple devices are available. In situations where optimization is not possible, calling “evaluate_batch” is essentially the same as sequentially applying the “evaluate_example” method to all candidates within a batch. To evaluate a single candidate without the need for parallel processing, we recommend using the “evaluate_example” method. We provide tests for each metric and suggest that new users run these tests before using LUNA to ensure that the framework functions correctly on their device.

3 Components

In LUNA, the NLG evaluation metrics are categorized into two coarse-grained categories: reference-based metrics and reference-free metrics, following the approach in [Chhun et al. \(2022b\)](#). *Reference-based metrics* evaluate a candidate text by comparing it to a reference text, typically produced by human experts. *Reference-free metrics*, on the other hand, rely solely on the candidate generation and, in some cases, on the input prompt. Both reference-free and reference-based metrics can be further divided into three fine-grained categories, depending on the type of information they access for evaluation: string-based, embedding-based, and model-based metrics.

String-based metrics String-based metrics refer to automatic metrics that operate on textual representations of the input, e.g. n-grams of words or characters. Such metrics, thus, rely only on surface level information, not taking semantics into account. Reference-based metrics of this type (e.g. BLEU ([Papineni et al., 2002](#)), ROUGE ([Lin, 2004](#)), inter alia) measure the word or character distance between the candidate generation and target text. Reference-free string-based metrics evaluate the degree of text overlap between the input and the model output, including novelty ([Fabbri et al., 2021](#)), text coverage, density, compression ratio, length, and repetition ([Grusky et al., 2018](#)).

Embedding-based metrics Embedding-based metrics operate on word embeddings and use measures such as cosine similarity to evaluate the generated text against a reference. We include both, metrics relying on non-contextual static vectors, namely ROUGE-We ([Ng and Abrecht, 2015](#)), and metrics based on pretrained contextualized representations, such as BERTScore ([Zhang et al., 2019](#)) or MoverScore ([Zhao et al., 2019](#)), among others. LUNA can be utilized in many languages if a metric of interest supports a multilingual LM.

Model-based metrics Model-based metrics include evaluation metrics, that employ regression or pre-trained language models to predict a score. We include learned metrics, such as S3 ([Peyrard et al., 2017](#)), that are directly trained to predict human evaluation scores, as well as untrained metrics, for example, InfoLM ([Colombo et al., 2022b](#)) that uses information measures to predict the distance between two probability distributions without learning.

3.1 Adding new components

In the following section, we will elaborate on adding new components and extending LUNA. The metrics in LUNA can be categorized based on their implementation into three groups: (i) metrics with third-party library implementations; (ii) metrics with an implementation hosted in the reference repository; and (iii) metrics with an improved implementation.

Metrics with third-party library implementation The complex logic needed to run the metric is already encapsulated within a third-party class or function. For instance, BLANC ([Vasilyev et al., 2020](#)) utilizes its own PyPI package.

Listing 3: Implementation of a third-party metric

```
# BLANC (model-based, reference-free metric.)
from blanc import BlancHelp, BlancTune

class BlancMetrics(Metrics):
    def __init__(*args, **kwargs) -> None:
        # <...>
        if type == "help":
            self.metric = BlancHelp(*args,
                                   **kwargs)
        elif type == "tune":
            self.metrics = BlancTune(*args,
                                    **kwargs)
        else:
            raise ValueError(f"Type can be only
                             help or tune. Got type = {type}")
```

To efficiently design the evaluation function for either one instance or a batch of instances, one should utilize the third-party implementation. This approach is far more effective than developing the inference process from scratch. Leveraging the existing third-party implementation re-uses the codebase that has been thoroughly tested and optimized by the developers.

Metrics with an implementation hosted in the reference repository Metrics with an implementation hosted in the reference repository are saved in the “`luna.sources`” and then imported during the initialization of the corresponding metric. It is important to note that this approach adds some overhead to the codebase, which we address in the next section. Here is an example of the BaryScore metric (Colombo et al., 2021) pseudo code that uses the “`luna.sources`” module:

Listing 4: Implementation of a metric adopted from a reference repository.

```

from luna.base import Metrics
from luna.sources.bary_score import
    BaryScoreMetricsInternal

class BaryScoreMetrics(Metrics):
    *some code here*
    def __init__(self, *args, **kwargs) -> None:
        self.bary_score_metrics =
            BaryScoreMetricsInternal(*args,
                **kwargs)

    def _run_bary_score(self, hyps:
        tp.List[str], refs: tp.List[str]) ->
        tp.Dict[str, tp.Any]:
        idf_dict_hyp, idf_dict_ref = (
            self.bary_score_metrics
                .prepare_idfs(hyps, refs)
        )
        metrics_dict = (
            self.bary_score_metrics
                .evaluate_batch(
                    hyps, refs, idf_dict_hyp,
                    idf_dict_ref
                )
        )
        return metrics_dict

    def evaluate_example(self, hyp: str, ref:
        str) -> float:
        metrics_dict =
            self._run_bary_score([hyp], [ref])
        return metrics_dict[
            self.bary_score_key
                ][0]

    def evaluate_batch(self, hyps: tp.List[str],
        refs: tp.List[str]) -> tp.List[float]:
        *similar code goes here*

```

Metrics with an improved implementation For this class the available implementation is used but significantly improved. In particular, we optimize the SummaQA metric (Scialom et al., 2019) for both Russian and English languages since for each language different question generators and answer predictors are required. Besides, the algorithm which averages the answer correctness across masked sentences is precisely tested on the mocked dataset. Finally, due to the right decomposition we unify all of the metrics to the specific interface which allows us to orchestrate them and to calculate them simultaneously on a dataset of interest. Nevertheless, it is important to reduce the computational costs on the client-side and to move the most computationally intensive parts of the framework to the library- or server-side.

3.2 Enhancing LUNA to HuggingFace Spaces

Several metrics in LUNA rely on Transformer-based LLMs. While LUNA currently operates exclusively in local environments, we are developing an extension to facilitate remote endpoints. For deploying the LUNA framework, HuggingFace Spaces serves as a free option for hosting metrics. Take SummaQA, BaryScore, or DepthScore as examples. These computationally-heavy metrics could be treated as remote containers with public inference endpoints, which LUNA accesses through a Python API.

4 Evaluating NLG with LUNA

Here we provide examples of how to use LUNA. Note that there is a specific additional calculator mechanism, which allows metrics to be processed simultaneously in one single call. It provides the parallel execution option.

```

from luna.calculate import Calculator

# candidates and references are batches
calculator = Calculator(execute_parallel=True)
metrics_dict = calculator.calculate(
    metrics=[depth_score_metrics, s3_metrics],
    candidates=candidates,
    references=references
)

print(metrics_dict)
>>> {"DepthScore": ..., "S3": ...}

```

4.1 Reference-free usage

Some evaluations in LUNA do not require references. These metrics operate directly on raw

hypotheses and are contained in a separate module called “`luna.reference_free`”. Unlike other metrics in this category do not rely on pre-trained LLMs. Instead, they perform basic counting operations on sentences, such as measuring *length*, *compression*, or *repetition*.

The arguments for the string-based reference-free metrics are uniform across all metrics in the “`luna.reference_free`” module, as they are inherited from the parent class. Here is an example of a string-based reference-free metric:

```
from luna.calculate import Calculator
from luna.reference_free import Length,
    Compression, Repetition

rf_args = {"n_gram": 3, "tokenize": True}
length_metrics = LengthMetrics(**rf_args)
compression_metrics =
    CompressionMetrics(**rf_args)
repetition_metrics =
    RepetitionMetrics(**rf_args)

# candidates is a batch, references is None
calculator = Calculator(execute_parallel=True)
metrics_dict = calculator.calculate(
    metrics=[length_metrics,
              compression_metrics,
              repetition_metrics],
    candidates=[...],
    references=None
)

print(metrics_dict)
>>> {"Length": ..., "Compression": ...,
      "Repetition": ...}
```

However, there are exceptions, which rely on embeddings and pre-trained LLMs. BLANC is an example of a reference-free metric, but it is model-based and typically requires a GPU for computation.

4.2 Sentence-level usage

The majority of evaluations in LUNA are designed for sentence-level usage. Below is an example demonstrating the initialization of classes and computation of metrics at the sentence level. This example follows the default usage pattern of LUNA.

```
from luna.rouge_we import RougeWeMetrics

candidate = "Today is such a great day! I'm not
    sure if I want to go get some tea or just
    end it all."
reference = "What a good day today! Whether to
    go have a cup of tea or hang oneself."

rouge_we_metrics =
    RougeWeMetrics(**rouge_we_kwargs)
rouge_value = rouge_we_metrics.evaluate_example(
    hyp=candidate,
```

```
        ref=reference
    )

print(isinstance(rouge_value, float))
>>> True
```

Note that the “`evaluate_example`” method returns a single floating-point number, while the “`evaluate_batch`” method outputs a list of floating-point numbers.

4.3 Corpus-level usage

Within LUNA, evaluations are designed to indirectly aggregate corpus-level statistics. For instance, some metrics calculate the TF-IDF matrix over the entire corpus. However, there is also a dedicated corpus-level evaluation metric, namely SummaQA.

Processing batches and the entire corpus are conceptually similar situations. The main difference is the metric’s method name and any exceptions or warnings that may be triggered. For example, let us consider SummaQA:

```
from luna.summaqa import SummaQAMetrics

# score_to_return is either "fscore" or "prob"
summaqa = SummaQAMetrics(lang="ru",
    score_to_return="fscore")

# Evaluate the single sentence
summaqa.evaluate_example(...)
>>> RuntimeError: Separate examples evaluation
    is not supported for corpus-level metrics

# Evaluate the batch
summaqa.evaluate_batch(...)
>>> Warning: Batch processing is considered as
    processing the textual corpus

# Evaluate the corpus
corpus = ["Very first sentence.",
    "Continuing.", "The end of the large
    corpus"]
summarization_candidates = ["First.",
    "Middle.", "Last."]
summaqa_metrics = summaqa.evaluate_corpus(
    candidates=summarization_candidates,
    references=corpus
)

print(len(summaqa_metrics) == len(corpus))
>>> True
```

5 Related work

We adopt the established approach of HuggingFace Transformers in developing a unified interface for NLP metrics. LUNA integrates with HuggingFace Transformers, leveraging LLMs from the Transformer Model Hub.

Prior efforts in developing NLG evaluation led to creation of multiple tools. NLG-eval (Sharma et al., 2017) focuses mainly on string-based and embedding-based metrics and does not support learnable model-based evaluators. Jury (Cavusoglu et al., 2022) offers a combination of numerical and text metrics that can be used in a broad range of NLP tasks, of which 10 are aimed at NLG evaluation. TorchMetrics (Detlefsen et al., 2022) offers a large collection of machine learning metrics implemented with PyTorch, including 16 tailored for language tasks, and among them, seven implemented specifically to NLG evaluation. The HuggingFace Evaluation framework is a versatile tool designed to evaluate a wide range of NLP tasks without a specific domain focus. However, it may not include some of the most recent NLG evaluation metrics. LUNA surpasses these tools by providing a more extensive set of NLG evaluation metrics and further advancements.

A concurrent work by Frisoni et al. (2022) introduces the NLG-Metricverse framework. While there is a significant overlap between the metrics supported by NLG-Metricverse and LUNA, it is worth noting that LUNA places a stronger emphasis on efficient data processing and supports batch-wise evaluation unlike NLG-Metricverse.

Research questions in NLG evaluation. Although frameworks like LUNA provide a useful tool for a researchers and developers, they fall short in addressing the deficiencies of current NLG evaluation approaches. Several works made attempts to explore and improve the alignment between automated metrics and human judgment (Caglayan et al., 2020; Hanna and Bojar, 2021), finding that current metrics not only show weak correlation with human scores (Zhang et al., 2004; Novikova et al., 2017), but exhibit social biases (Gao and Wan, 2022) and system preferences (Callison-Burch et al., 2006). Other works focus on meta-evaluation of automatic NLG metrics (Nimah et al., 2023; Sai et al., 2021).

6 Future work

The development of LUNA is ongoing, with several potential directions for expansion. Firstly, there are plans to incorporate **additional NLG evaluation metrics**, including SUPERT (Gao et al., 2020), an example of reference-free embedding-based metric, as well as more recent metrics like RoMe (Rony et al., 2022), and DiscoScore (Zhao et al., 2023).

Secondly, we plan to add support for **multi-reference formats**, similar to what has been implemented in (Cavusoglu et al., 2022). This will enable us to relax the strict exact match constraint that currently dominates event embedding-based metrics and account for structural variability (Fomicheva et al., 2020).

Thirdly, we will add an **explicit mechanism to rank generation hypotheses** based on either a single metric or multiple metrics, according to multi-criteria decision-making rules, as discussed by Colombo et al. (2022a).

Finally, we can achieve a significant speedup in runtime by **enhancing support for multiple devices** and implementing more efficient parallelization techniques.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced LUNA — a framework for evaluating natural language generation. It provides an easy-to-use interface to employ 20 popular NLG metrics varying in their type. LUNA supports efficient computation of the metric scores at both instance and batch level, and can be easily extended with new metrics of interest. We hope that LUNA provides NLP practitioners with an accessible and comprehensive tool for evaluating NLG models and assessing their performance.

References

- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. 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.
- Ozan Caglayan, Pranava Madhyastha, and Lucia Specia. 2020. **Curious case of language generation evaluation metrics: A cautionary tale**. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2322–2328, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Chris Callison-Burch, Miles Osborne, and Philipp Koehn. 2006. **Re-evaluating the role of Bleu in machine translation research**. In *11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 249–256, Trento, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Devrim Cavusoglu, Fatih Cagatay Akyon, Ulas Sert, and Cemil Cengiz. 2022. **Jury: Comprehensive NLP Evaluation toolkit**.

- Cyril Chhun, Pierre Colombo, Fabian M. Suchanek, and Chloé Clavel. 2022a. [Of human criteria and automatic metrics: A benchmark of the evaluation of story generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5794–5836, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Cyril Chhun, Pierre Colombo, Fabian M Suchanek, and Chloé Clavel. 2022b. [Of human criteria and automatic metrics: A benchmark of the evaluation of story generation](#). In *29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 2022)*.
- Pierre Colombo, Nathan Noiry, Ekhine Irurozki, and Stéphan Cléménçon. 2022a. [What are the best systems? new perspectives on nlp benchmarking](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26915–26932.
- Pierre Colombo, Guillaume Staerman, Chloé Clavel, and Pablo Piantanida. 2021. [Automatic text evaluation through the lens of wasserstein barycenters](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10450–10466.
- Pierre Jean A Colombo, Chloé Clavel, and Pablo Piantanida. 2022b. [Infolm: A new metric to evaluate summarization & data2text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 10554–10562.
- Nicki Skafte Detlefsen, Jiri Borovec, Justus Schock, Ananya Harsh Jha, Teddy Koker, Luca Di Liello, Daniel Stancl, Changsheng Quan, Maxim Grechkin, and William Falcon. 2022. [Torchmetrics-measuring reproducibility in pytorch](#). *Journal of Open Source Software*, 7(70):4101.
- Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. [Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation](#).
- Marina Fomicheva, Lucia Specia, and Francisco Guzmán. 2020. [Multi-hypothesis machine translation evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1218–1232, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Giacomo Frisoni, Antonella Carbonaro, Gianluca Moro, Andrea Zammarchi, and Marco Avagnano. 2022. [NLG-metricverse: An end-to-end library for evaluating natural language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3465–3479, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Mingqi Gao and Xiaojun Wan. 2022. [Social biases in automatic evaluation metrics for nlg](#).
- Yang Gao, Wei Zhao, and Steffen Eger. 2020. [SUPERT: Towards new frontiers in unsupervised evaluation metrics for multi-document summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1347–1354, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Max Grusky, Mor Naaman, and Yoav Artzi. 2018. [Newsroom: A dataset of 1.3 million summaries with diverse extractive strategies](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 708–719.
- Michael Hanna and Ondřej Bojar. 2021. [A fine-grained analysis of BERTScore](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 507–517, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- John Morris, Eli Lifland, Jin Yong Yoo, Jake Grigsby, Di Jin, and Yanjun Qi. 2020. [TextAttack: A framework for adversarial attacks, data augmentation, and adversarial training in NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 119–126, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jun Ping Ng and Viktoria Abrecht. 2015. [Better summarization evaluation with word embeddings for rouge](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1925–1930.
- Iftitahu Nimah, Meng Fang, Vlado Menkovski, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. 2023. [NLG evaluation metrics beyond correlation analysis: An empirical metric preference checklist](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1240–1266, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jekaterina Novikova, Ondřej Dušek, Amanda Cercas Curry, and Verena Rieser. 2017. [Why we need new evaluation metrics for NLG](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2241–2252, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Maxime Peyrard, Teresa Botschen, and Iryna Gurevych. 2017. [Learning to score system summaries for better](#)

- content selection evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 74–84.
- Maja Popović. 2015. chrF: character n-gram f-score for automatic mt evaluation. In *Proceedings of the tenth workshop on statistical machine translation*, pages 392–395.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. **COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Md Rashad Al Hasan Rony, Liubov Kovriguina, Debanjan Chaudhuri, Ricardo Usbeck, and Jens Lehmann. 2022. **RoMe: A robust metric for evaluating natural language generation**. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5645–5657, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ananya B. Sai, Tanay Dixit, Dev Yashpal Sheth, Sreyas Mohan, and Mitesh M. Khapra. 2021. **Perturbation CheckLists for evaluating NLG evaluation metrics**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7219–7234, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ananya B Sai, Akash Kumar Mohankumar, and Mitesh M Khapra. 2022. A survey of evaluation metrics used for NLG systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 55(2):1–39.
- Thomas Scialom, Sylvain Lamprier, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Jacopo Staiano. 2019. Answers unite! unsupervised metrics for reinforced summarization models. In *2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3237–3247. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shikhar Sharma, Layla El Asri, Hannes Schulz, and Jeremie Zumer. 2017. Relevance of unsupervised metrics in task-oriented dialogue for evaluating natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.09799*.
- Guillaume Staerman, Pavlo Mozharovskiy, Pierre Colombo, Stéphan Cléménçon, and Florence d’Alché Buc. 2021. A pseudo-metric between probability distributions based on depth-trimmed regions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12711*.
- Oleg Vasilyev, Vedant Dharnidharka, and John Bohannon. 2020. Fill in the blanc: Human-free quality estimation of document summaries. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Evaluation and Comparison of NLP Systems*, pages 11–20.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. **Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. Bartscore: Evaluating generated text as text generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27263–27277.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ying Zhang, Stephan Vogel, and Alex Waibel. 2004. **Interpreting BLEU/NIST scores: How much improvement do we need to have a better system?** In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’04)*, Lisbon, Portugal. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Wei Zhao, Maxime Peyrard, Fei Liu, Yang Gao, Christian M Meyer, and Steffen Eger. 2019. Moverscore: Text generation evaluating with contextualized embeddings and earth mover distance. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Wei Zhao, Michael Strube, and Steffen Eger. 2023. **DiscoScore: Evaluating text generation with BERT and discourse coherence**. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3865–3883, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kaitlyn Zhou, Su Lin Blodgett, Adam Trischler, Hal Daumé III, Kaheer Suleman, and Alexandra Olteanu. 2022. **Deconstructing NLG evaluation: Evaluation practices, assumptions, and their implications**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 314–324, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.