

# Generating Text from Uniform Meaning Representation

Emma Markle

Amherst College

emarkle26@amherst.edu

Reihaneh Iranmanesh

Amherst College

riranmanesh25@amherst.edu

Shira Wein

Amherst College

swein@amherst.edu

## Abstract


Uniform Meaning Representation (UMR) is a recently developed graph-based semantic representation, which expands on Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) in a number of ways, in particular through the inclusion of document-level information and multilingual flexibility. In order to effectively adopt and leverage UMR for downstream tasks, efforts must be placed toward developing a UMR technological ecosystem. Though still limited amounts of UMR annotations have been produced to date, in this work, we investigate the first approaches to producing text from multilingual UMR graphs: (1) a pipeline conversion of UMR to AMR, then using AMR-to-text generation models, (2) fine-tuning large language models with UMR data, and (3) fine-tuning existing AMR-to-text generation models with UMR data. Our best performing model achieves a multilingual BERTscore of 0.825 for English and 0.882 for Chinese when compared to the reference, which is a promising indication of the effectiveness of fine-tuning approaches for UMR-to-text generation with even limited amounts of UMR data.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Uniform Meaning Representation (UMR) is a graph-based semantic representation designed to capture the core elements of meaning for a wide range of languages (Van Gysel et al., 2021b).

The UMR project has seen recent progress but is still in the early stages, with new resources such as an online web annotation tool (Ge et al., 2023) and a relatively small recently-released annotated dataset (Bonn et al., 2024).

Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR; Banarescu et al., 2013) on which UMR is based, has seen success and adoption by the broader NLP community, and this is in large part due to the substantial efforts made towards high-quality text-to-



```
(s / search-01
 :Arg0 (p / person
 :refer-person 3rd
 :refer-number Singular)
 :Arg1 (c / clue
 :refer-number Singular)
 :aspect Activity
 :modstr FullAff)
```

Figure 1: UMR graph for the sentence “He was searching for a clue” in graph form (top) and in ‘PENMAN’ notation (Kasper, 1989) (bottom).

AMR parsing and AMR-to-text generation models (Sadeddine et al., 2024).<sup>2</sup> This progress on parsing and generation is integral to being able to incorporate AMR graphs into downstream applications and studies of language (Wein and Opitz, 2024). Thus, in order to see similar success for UMR, efforts towards UMR-to-text generation and text-to-UMR parsing are critical.

In this work, we leverage the recent release of human-annotated UMR data (detailed in Section 3.1) to tackle UMR-to-text generation and introduce the first UMR-to-text generation models.

<sup>1</sup>Our checkpoints and code are available at <https://github.com/ACNLP1ab/UMR-Text-Gen>

<sup>2</sup>The breadth of parsing and generation work for AMR is shown in the AMR Bibliography.

We investigate generation from the six languages included in the UMR v1.0 dataset: English, Chinese, Sanapaná, Arápho, Kukama, and Navajo. Our approaches and contributions include:

- A baseline analysis as to how well six AMR-to-text generation models generate text from UMR out-of-the-box (Section 4).
- A novel pipelined approach to UMR-to-text generation, which converts UMR graphs into AMRs, then uses them as input to AMR-to-text generation models (Section 5).
- Seven fine-tuned UMR-to-text generation models, three using pretrained large language models and four pretrained AMR-to-text generation models as bases, demonstrating the potential benefits of leveraging AMR graphs for UMR tools (Section 6).

## 2 Uniform Meaning Representation

UMR is based on Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR), which was designed for English (Banarescu et al., 2013) but has since seen various cross-lingual extensions and applications (Wein and Schneider, 2024).

Similarly to AMR, UMR annotations are rooted, directed graphs that capture the meaning of a sentence (Van Gysel et al., 2021b). UMR incorporates aspect and modality at the sentence-level and additionally includes document-level graphs, enabling annotation of coreferential relations. Alignments between the coreferential elements are also provided.

In order to ensure that UMR could reflect meaning for many languages, the UMR schema is flexible in its annotation while ensuring consistency across languages. At the sentence-level, UMR accounts for linguistic diversity across languages through the use of a lattice-like annotation schema (Van Gysel et al., 2019). This enables annotators to choose a more coarse-grained versus a more fine-grained annotation for numerous annotation categories (including discourse relations, modality, number, spatial relations, aspect, and temporality) based on the features of the language being annotated. Particular care is also given to the annotation of low- or no-resource languages (Vigus et al., 2020), as “Stage 0” annotation is performed for languages that do not have existing rolesets available. Stage 0 annotation enables annotators to establish predicate-argument structures and develop rolesets while performing UMR annotation.

UMR successfully accommodates the multilingual issues addressed in individual language adaptations of AMR, showing its promise as a multilingual representation (Wein and Bonn, 2023). Its effectiveness at capturing meaning across languages was also indicated in the pilot annotation of UMR in four indigenous languages (Van Gysel et al., 2021a).

Chun and Xue (2024) released a text-to-UMR parser, which produces the document-level UMR graph based on the contents of the sentence, and the sentence-level UMR graph by running existing text-to-AMR parsers and then converting the AMR into a UMR.<sup>3</sup>

Recent work has investigated automated Arápho UMR annotation (Buchholz et al., 2024), automatic annotation of tense and aspect for UMR (Chen et al., 2021), and conversion of AMR graphs to UMR (Bonn et al., 2023b; Post et al., 2024). Special attention has been given to UMR annotation of multi-word expressions (Bonn et al., 2023a) and Chinese verb compounds (Sun et al., 2023).

## 3 Methodology

We develop four approaches, including our baseline, and evaluate them on the UMR data (Bonn et al., 2024), which we divide into train, dev, and test splits.

Our baseline approach uses six AMR-to-text generation models, passing the sentence-level UMR graphs as input. Next, using the same six models used for our baseline, we developed a pipeline approach (Section 5) to UMR-to-text generation, which involved first converting the UMR graphs to AMR graphs, and then passing the converted AMR graphs as input to the models. Then, based on the baseline performance of the AMR-to-text generation models, we fine-tuned the top performing models as well as three large language models (with no AMR input) on the UMR training set (Section 6).

### 3.1 Data

We used the first release of UMR data (Bonn et al., 2024), which contains annotations in six languages: English, Chinese, and four languages indigenous to the Americas: Arápho, Navajo, Sanapaná, and Kukama. The English data contains LORELEI news text and a description of a silent film. The

<sup>3</sup>This pipelined parsing approach mirrors our baseline approach, in the reverse direction.

Language	Training (70%)	Dev (10%)	Test (20%)
English	100 (96)	13 (13)	30 (28)
Chinese	236 (236)	40 (40)	82 (82)
Arápaho	256 (46)	36 (7)	114 (54)
Navajo	371 (148)	52 (20)	83 (0)
Sanapaná	433 (366)	62 (53)	107 (104)
Kukama	76 (76)	10 (10)	19 (0)
Total	1472 (968)	213 (143)	435 (268)

Table 1: Our training, dev, and test splits for the UMR data at the sentence-level, with the amount of sentence-level annotations that also had document-level information displayed in parentheses. We only counted data as being document-level if it contained both alignment and a document-level graph that was more complex than (s / sentence).

Chinese data consists of wikinews sentences. Arápaho, Navajo, and Kukama annotations all represent narrative documents, while it is not clear what genre the Sanapaná annotations are (Bonn et al., 2024). We first took out the English UMR data that contains equivalent AMRs in the AMR3.0 dataset (Knight et al., 2020), as to avoid leakage and unfair evaluations of models which contain the corresponding AMR data. This consisted of 66 English UMRs. Then, we divided it into training and testing sets.

Not all annotations contained sentence-level and document-level graphs. This is because some annotations without document-level data contained alignment data or could be referenced in other document-level annotations. Our final data split was 70% for training, 10% for dev, and 20% for testing (the number of sentences for each language is shown in Table 1).

### 3.2 Automatic Evaluation

We evaluated the generated text via both automatic metrics as well as human evaluation.

We compare the generated text from each of our approaches against the references (the ground-truth sentences that were annotated) by using BERTscore (Zhang et al., 2020), given its previously evidenced correlation with human judgments for AMR-to-English text generation (Manning et al., 2020). Specifically, we compare sentence similarity using multilingual BERTscore. We also use METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005) and BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) to enable ease of comparison with future work.

### 3.3 Indigenous Language Evaluation

During initial experimentation, we saw primarily positive quantitative indications as far as the ability of our models to produce text in the four indigenous languages, for example, multilingual BERTscores of 0.799 for Navajo, 0.816 for Sanapaná, 0.780 for Arápaho, and 0.673 for Kukama, as generated by amrlib trained on all languages’ sentence-level data.

However, given the fact that these languages are extremely low-resource and are not likely to be well-evaluated by BERTscore, METEOR, and BLEU, we consulted with speakers of Arápaho and Navajo to provide a human evaluation of the generated text. We provided the output from the amrlib sentence-level model fine-tuned on all languages, as the quantitative indications of the text quality were positive. Our Arápaho and Navajo speakers indicated that, while these fine-tuned models did do a fairly good job at imitating the script of the four indigenous languages, the output nonetheless was nonsensical and ungrammatical. As such, we opted against a full human evaluation for the four indigenous languages, with the understanding that even our top-performing models were outputting gibberish for these languages. This is likely because these four languages are all extremely low-resource and exhibit morphological complexity that would require additional resources for coherent text generation.

As a result, we moved forward with evaluating our approaches and models exclusively in English and Chinese (both with regard to automatic evaluation and human evaluation). We still leveraged the indigenous language data in the UMR splits (as indicated in Table 1) for our model fine-tuning (Section 6).

### 3.4 Human Evaluation

In order to validate the quantitative results obtained by the automatic metrics, we perform a human evaluation. Six college students participated in the evaluation of the English and Chinese texts, who were native speakers of English and Chinese accordingly. Each annotator judged fluency and adequacy on a scale from 1-4. Fluency was judged first, without exposure to the reference, and then adequacy was judged in relation to the reference.

There were a total of four surveys: English fluency, English adequacy, Chinese fluency, and Chinese adequacy, each of which contained 25 ques-

tions. For English, we chose to exclude the 5 shortest sentences, which left us with a final set of 25 sentences. For Chinese, we randomly selected the sentences. Each question in the English fluency and adequacy surveys displayed six sentences, with five being from each of our top-performing models from each approach (with two models included for some approaches), as well as the reference. The instructions provided to the human raters for the English fluency and adequacy surveys can be seen in Figures 2 and 3.<sup>4</sup>

We evaluated the inter-annotator agreement using the Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson and Galton, 1895), calculating pairwise agreement for each of the four surveys (Chinese and English, fluency and adequacy for each). The average correlation coefficient for English fluency was 0.72,

<sup>4</sup>The Chinese instructions are identical to the English instructions but include the word “Chinese” instead of “English.”

How **fluent** is this text as an example of English? Is it well-formed grammatically with correct spelling and punctuation? Are the terms appropriately used according to common convention? Is the text generally interpretable by a native speaker of English?  
**Note:** A number of these sentences are transcripts of speech, and thus pauses are indicated in a number of ways such as ellipsis or dashes neither of which should be counted against fluency.

For all of the items that follow, select one of these four levels of fluency:

1. **Nonsense:** Not understandable.
2. **Poor:** Many or serious mistakes which make the text hard to understand.
3. **Good:** Few or minor mistakes. The text is mostly understandable.
4. **Flawless:** Perfectly formed English with no mistakes.

Figure 2: Instructions for English fluency survey.

How much of the **meaning** from the reference text (text located at the top of each page) is included in the text options?  
**Note:** Grammatical or spelling mistakes should not be considered here. This is not a question of fluency.  
**Note:** A number of these sentences are transcripts of speech, and thus pauses are indicated in a number of ways such as ellipsis or dashes neither of which should be counted against fluency.

For all of the items that follow, select one of these four levels of adequacy / meaning preservation:

1. **None:** The text is completely unrelated to the reference.
2. **Little:** Some of the meaning is preserved, but much of the meaning has been lost or much additional meaning has been added.
3. **Most:** Most of the meaning from the reference is preserved, with a little information missing or added in the text.
4. **All:** All of the meaning is conveyed.

Figure 3: Instructions for English adequacy survey.

for English adequacy was 0.78, for Chinese fluency was 0.55, and for Chinese adequacy was 0.64. This indicates that there is a strong correlation between the annotators’ scores, validating the judgments, while the English raters exhibited even greater agreement.<sup>5</sup> Note also that all pair-wise correlation coefficients had a statistically significant p-value ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## 4 Baseline Approach

Given the similarity of UMR to AMR and the prevalence of AMR technologies, we use AMR-to-text generation models out-of-the-box as a baseline model for sentence-level UMR graphs, to see how they perform as a zero-shot approach with no exposure to UMR. We elect to perform the baseline experimentation on sentence-level UMR graphs given that the AMR-to-text generation models are not designed to handle document-level data (as AMR does not contain document-level information).

### 4.1 Models

We apply this approach to six AMR-to-text generation models:

1. **amrlib**<sup>6</sup>: generates text using a pretrained Sequence-to-Sequence T5 model, trained on AMR3.0 (Knight et al., 2020).
2. **AMRBART** (Bai et al., 2022): BART-based (Lewis et al., 2020) model pretrained on English text and AMR graphs from AMR2.0 (Knight et al., 2017) and AMR3.0, pretrained on 200k silver AMRs parsed by SPRING.
- 3-4. **SPRING2** and **SPRING3** (Bevilacqua et al., 2021): BART-based sequence-to-sequence model that simplifies AMR parsing and generation by treating them as symmetric tasks. SPRING2 and SPRING3 differ in their training datasets: SPRING2 is trained on AMR2.0 while SPRING3 is trained on AMR3.0.
5. **BiBL** (Cheng et al., 2022): utilizes the architectural framework of SPRING to align AMR graphs and text, in order to share information across the parsing and generation tasks trained on AMR2.0 and AMR3.0.
6. **Smelting** (Ribeiro et al., 2021): trained mT5 (Xue et al., 2021) on gold English AMR graphs and sentences as well as silver machine-translated sentences.

<sup>5</sup>This is likely due to the generated text being both more fluent and more adequate for English than Chinese (see Sections 5.2 and 6.2).

<sup>6</sup>amrlib GitHub Repository

Amrlib, AMRBART, SPRING2, SPRING3 and BiBL are all trained to generate English text, while Smelting can produce Spanish, Italian, German, and Chinese text. Thus, as a baseline, we run the first five models on the English UMR graphs (to generate into English), and run Smelting on the Chinese UMR graphs (to generate into Chinese).

## 4.2 Results

The automatic metric results for the English and Chinese baseline models were highly comparable, a promising indication of the utility of AMR-to-text generation tools for UMR-to-text generation.

Out-of-the-box, the English results from the five baseline models (Table 2) all achieved multilingual BERTscores of around 0.7 (ranging from 0.681-0.704). The BLEU and METEOR scores were noticeably lower. The Chinese baseline results (Table 3) were similarly high, with the baseline Smelting model achieving a multilingual BERTscore of 0.716.

Our qualitative analysis of the baseline models revealed that it was very common to see the inclusion of UMR-specific terms such as refer-number singular, full-affirmative, umr-unknown, and 3rd person in the text output. Examples of this can be seen in the following generated sentence: Full-affirmative, though, the first singular thought that the second singular would not see the apron at first, is a state of 'full affirmative'. The only UMR graphs that were converted to highly fluent and adequate text were one-word sentences such as "ok..." or "anyway...". We also noted that the generated output from the UMR graphs tended to be much longer than the reference output, which was likely due to the inclusion of the UMR-specific terms mentioned previously.<sup>7</sup>

Based on the shorter output length and higher perceived fluency in our initial qualitative analysis, we determined that BiBL was the best baseline English model, and Smelting was our only baseline Chinese model. Thus, we included the baseline BiBL and Smelting models in the human evaluation survey. The human evaluation scores (Table 4 and Table 5) were low with regard to both fluency and adequacy, in spite of the fairly high BERTscore values. Baseline BiBL for English had a fluency score of 1.44 (scale of 1-4) and an adequacy score

<sup>7</sup>The average sentence length for each model was 11.7 words for amrlib, 13.6 for AMRBART, 14.6 for SPRING3, 14.7 for SPRING2, and 11.8 for BiBL.

Models	BERT	BLEU	METEOR
Baseline amrlib	0.704	0.081	0.386
Baseline amrbart	0.691	0.062	0.333
Baseline SPRING3	0.681	0.050	0.298
Baseline SPRING2	0.698	0.068	0.357
<b>Baseline BiBL</b>	0.702	0.038	0.333
UMR-AMR amrlib	0.761	0.119	0.418
UMR-AMR amrbart	0.775	0.181	0.409
UMR-AMR SPRING3	0.764	0.133	0.392
UMR-AMR SPRING2	0.774	0.193	0.436
<b>UMR-AMR BiBL</b>	0.784	0.159	0.428
amrlib-Sent (EN)	0.700	0.041	0.213
SPRING2-Sent (EN)	0.825	0.355	0.584
<b>BiBL-Sent (EN)</b>	0.825	0.289	0.570
<b>SPRING2-Doc (EN)</b>	0.824	0.358	0.582
BiBL-Sent (EN&ZH)	0.825	0.355	0.601
amrlib-Sent (All)	0.751	0.057	0.383
BiBL-Sent (All)	0.800	0.265	0.520
SPRING2-Sent (All)	0.809	0.281	0.550
Gemma-Sent (All)	0.440	0.000	0.004
mT5-Sent (All)	0.772	0.181	0.368
<b>MBART-Sent (All)</b>	0.767	0.146	0.423
mT5-Doc (All)	0.774	0.201	0.417
MBART-Doc (All)	0.740	0.111	0.324

Table 2: English automatic evaluation Results. BERT: multilingual BERTscore, EN: fine-tuned only on English, Sent: sentence-level, Doc: document-level, All: trained on all languages. Bolded entries were selected for the human evaluation. Due to having trained over 50 individual models, here we show a representative sample of the best performers from each approach.

Models	BERT	BLEU	METEOR
<b>Baseline Smelt</b>	0.716	0.000	0.029
<b>UMR-AMR (Smelt)</b>	0.767	0.000	0.019
Smelt-Sent (ZH)	0.689	0.000	0.027
<b>BiBL-Sent (ZH)</b>	0.881	0.247	0.593
BiBL-Doc (ZH)	0.881	0.247	0.593
<b>SPRING2-Doc (ZH)</b>	0.882	0.231	0.586
BiBL-Sent (EN&ZH)	0.879	0.250	0.602
BiBL-Sent (All)	0.878	0.235	0.592
mT5-Doc (ZH)	0.815	0.122	0.375
mBART-Sent (All)	0.837	0.146	0.467
<b>MT5-Sent (All)</b>	0.853	0.172	0.476

Table 3: Chinese - Automatic Evaluation Results. BERT: multilingual BERTscore, ZH: Chinese fine-tuning, Sent: sentence-level, Doc: document-level, All: trained on all languages. Bolded entries were selected for the human evaluation, Smelt: Smelting model. Due to the large number of models trained, here we show a representative sample of the best performers from each approach.

of 1.37, while baseline Smelting for Chinese received a fluency score of 1.69 and an adequacy score of 1.48. The English and Chinese reference sentences received a fluency score of 3.35 and 3.27, respectively, showing that even the ground-truth sentences were not perceived as perfectly fluent by the adjudicators, perhaps due to the narrative structure of the UMR data.

## 5 Pipelined Approach

Our next approach again leveraged existing AMR-to-text generation models, but in this case first converting the UMR graph into an AMR.

### 5.1 Conversion Process

In order to convert UMR graphs into AMR, we designed a rule-based conversion process. When converting UMR graphs into AMR graphs, some elements of UMR graphs do not appear in AMR (such as aspect and mode) and were thus simply removed. Other changes included converting split roles, renaming roles, and introducing additional roles. This process was informed by [Bonn et al. \(2023b\)](#) as well as the AMR guidelines ([Banarescu et al., 2019](#)) and the UMR guidelines ([UMR, 2022](#)). The “person” concepts (:refer-number or refer-person) and pronouns generally are handled in a more complicated way in UMR than AMR, so in order to convert these concepts into their AMR counterparts, we changed all “person” concepts to a single node of the equivalent English pronoun. We converted third-person pronouns, both singular and plural, to “they,” opting for a gender-neutral approach. Additionally, if a graph referred to the first person but did not include a refer-number tag, we defaulted to using the singular pronoun “I.” The Sanapaná data also included a number of instances of :wiki, which we removed.<sup>8</sup>

In order to verify the validity of the conversion process itself, we leveraged the 66 held-out English UMRs which contained equivalent AMRs in the AMR3.0 dataset (detailed in Section 3.1), and compared the generated graphs to their equivalent human-annotated AMR graphs using SMATCH. The average Smatch score for our conversion process was 0.63, indicating a fairly accurate conversion process. One of the ways in which our rule-based approach to conversion struggled to meet AMR norms was that substantial additional information is contained in the UMR, which is not removed during conversion, such as in the case of the sentence “Pleasure:”

Original AMR:

(p / pleasure)

<sup>8</sup>We also chose to map :material to :consist-of, :concessive-condition to :condition, and have-91 to have-03.

Models	Fluency	Adequacy	Sum
Reference	3.35	/	3.35
UMR-AMR (BiBL)	3.59	2.71	6.30
BiBL-Sent (EN)	3.37	3.19	6.56
Baseline BiBL	1.44	1.37	2.81
SPRING-Doc (EN)	3.44	3.29	6.73
MBART-Sent (All)	2.77	2.28	5.05

Table 4: English - Human Evaluation Results. EN: English fine-tuning, Sent: sentence-level, Doc: document-level, All: trained on all languages in our dataset

Models	Fluency	Adequacy	Sum
Reference	3.27	/	3.27
UMR-AMR (Smelt)	2.19	1.69	3.88
BiBL-Sent (ZH)	1.76	2.79	4.55
Baseline Smelt	1.69	1.48	3.17
SPRING-Doc (ZH)	1.92	2.81	4.73
MT5-Sent (All)	2.28	2.29	4.57

Table 5: Chinese - Human Evaluation Results. ZH: Chinese fine-tuning, Sent: sentence-level, Doc: document-level, All: trained on all languages in our dataset, Smelt: Smelting model.

Original UMR:

```
(s29s / say-01
  :ARG0 (s29p / person)
  :ARG1 (s29h / have-experience-91
    :ARG1 s29p
    :ARG2 (s29p3 / pleasure)
    :ARG3 (s29t / thing)
    :aspect state)
  :ARG2 (s29p2 / person)
  :aspect performance)
```

Converted AMR:

```
(s29s / say-01
  :ARG0 (s29p / person)
  :ARG1 (s29h / have-experience-91
    :ARG1 s29p
    :ARG2 (s29p3 / pleasure)
    :ARG3 (s29t / thing))
  :ARG2 (s29p2 / person))
```

Generated text from BiBL of the converted AMR: “People said it was a pleasurable experience.”

## 5.2 Results

Our pipelined approach outperformed the baseline approach for both English and Chinese. For English, BiBL achieved the highest BERTscore, 0.784, and for Chinese, Smelting achieved a BERTscore of 0.767.

This approach proved to be very effective in reducing the amount of UMR terms that appeared in the output, which led to more comprehensible sentences. The perceived fluency of this approach was validated by the adjudicators of the human evaluation survey. For English, we saw that this approach led to the most fluent output, with a score

of 3.59 and an adequacy score of 2.71, which is a major improvement from the baseline approach. In addition, we saw that Chinese also had increased scores of 2.19 for fluency and 1.69 for adequacy. It is evident that this approach was more successful for English, but we did observe quantitative and qualitative improvements for both languages.

While the pipelined approach makes use of AMR graphs as the input of the well-developed ecosystem of AMR technologies, it is also worth noting that UMR contains *more* information than AMR does. This would suggest that converting from UMR to AMR may result in less accurate generated text (with regard to the UMR-specific content, such as tense and aspect), than generating text directly from the UMR itself.

## 6 Fine-tuning Processes

### 6.1 Methods

We determined which AMR-to-text generation models to fine-tune based on the results from the Section 4 and Section 5, picking the best-performing models for the baseline and pipelined approaches. Accordingly, the first model we fine-tuned was amrlib, also following Wein et al. (2022) (which fine-tuned the t5wtense AMR-to-English generation model for Spanish generation). Next, we fine-tuned SPRING2 and Smelting, given their quantitative performances for English and Chinese, respectively. Finally, we fine-tuned BiBL due to its high scores, relative brevity, and perceived fluency (as discussed in Section 4.2).

Then, in order to investigate whether the inclusion of AMR data in the fine-tuning process aided model performance, we fine-tuned large language models with no prior exposure to AMR (as opposed to fine-tuning the AMR-to-text generation models). These models were mT5 (Xue et al., 2021), mBART (Liu et al., 2020), and Gemma 2B (Gemma Team, 2024).

After having selected these models, we fine-tuned each model using the UMR data. In order to determine whether document-level information and UMR data of other languages benefit UMR-to-text generation via fine-tuning, we created 8 different datasets: (1) sentence-level English data, (2) sentence-level Chinese data, (3) sentence-level English and Chinese data, (4) sentence-level all languages, (5) document-level English data, (6) document-level Chinese data, (7) document-level English and Chinese data, and (8) document-

level all languages. This culminates in 8 fine-tuned versions of each of the 7 models; we highlight the key findings in Table 2.

For reproducibility, details of our hyperparameters follow. For BiBL and SPRING, training occurred over 30 epochs with a constant learning rate of 0.0001, incorporating gradient clipping at 2.5 and dropout regularization at 0.25. The data is processed in batches of 8 with gradient accumulation over 16 steps. To maintain model stability and performance, we implemented a weight decay of 0.004 and restricted sequence length to 1024 tokens, while generation tasks utilize a beam size of 100 and a maximum generation length of 500 tokens.

We fine-tuned mBART-large-50 and MT5 models for 15 epochs (effectively 30 epochs since each training instance is processed twice through silversent and silveramr files) using Adafactor optimization (learning rate=0.0001), batch size 8, and 2-step gradient accumulation, with beam search generation and 1024 token limits. Similarly, we fine-tuned Gemma2-2b using the same optimization parameters but with mixed-precision training for memory efficiency, gradient checkpointing, and extended output sequence length (2048 tokens).

### 6.2 Results

While the fine-tuning model scores varied more widely than the scores of the individual baseline and pipelined approaches, the best-performing fine-tuning models outperformed the baseline and the pipeline methods. For English, BiBL and SPRING2 trained on English sentence-level data, as well as BiBL trained on English and Chinese sentence-level data, all received the highest BERTscores of 0.825. SPRING2 trained on English document-level data achieved the highest BLEU score of 0.358, and BiBL trained on English and Chinese sentence-level data had a METEOR score of 0.601. For Chinese, SPRING2 trained on Chinese document-level data achieved the highest BERTscore of 0.882. BiBL trained on English and Chinese sentence-level data had the highest BLEU score at 0.250 and the highest METEOR score of 0.602.

As suggested by the quantitative results, the fine-tuning approach resulted in the generation of highly fluent and accurate sentences, while also revealing unique patterns across all the models. After fine-tuning, amrlib was very successful in generating comprehensible English text along with producing

the script for the four indigenous languages; however, it was unable to generate any Chinese text at all. BiBL produced remarkably intelligible text in English, the script of the four indigenous languages, and adequate but not fully fluent Chinese text. An interesting pattern found in BiBL’s generated output was that it included ellipses and pauses. Because the models were trained on descriptions of a silent film and narrative data, the data contained breaks in dialogue that were annotated as “-” or “.. ”, which were replicated by BiBL. SPRING produced exceptionally fluent and adequate text in English, replicated the four indigenous languages, and produced the most adequate Chinese text while being slightly more fluent than BiBL’s Chinese output. SPRING was also among the models that captured pauses, but to a much lesser extent than BiBL. The Smelting model was unable to produce meaningful output in English or the four indigenous languages, instead generating repetitive characters and words in various non-English languages like Spanish. Smelting repeated characters and words for these languages, leading to further diminished fluency and accuracy. However, after fine-tuning, it was more successful in producing exclusively Chinese script for Chinese UMRs.

The fine-tuned generation models consistently outperformed the fine-tuned LLMs across all three automatic metrics. Gemma’s performance notably differed from the other two LLMs due to its architecture as a causal language model rather than a sequence-to-sequence model. The model would continue generating nonsensical tokens until it reached the pre-specified maximum length of 1024 tokens. This architectural difference helps explain its lower performance scores compared to mT5 and mBART. The fine-tuned models generally performed better at a specific language when they were only trained on that language’s data versus being trained on all languages. This may be due to the “curse of multilinguality:” exposure to additional languages can degrade monolingual abilities (Conneau et al., 2020).

The Chinese and English human evaluation scores for the fine-tuned models were also much higher than the baseline scores and reflect that fine-tuning the models can improve both fluency and adequacy. For English, the best fluency score for this approach was 3.44, which was achieved by SPRING being trained on English document-level data. Additionally, SPRING trained on English document-level data, achieved the highest ade-

quacy score of any English model. These scores revealed a notable finding: the inclusion of document-level information does improve the generation task, which is a crucial difference in UMR from AMR. For Chinese, the best model for fluency using this approach was MT5, which was trained on sentence-level information for all six languages. For adequacy, SPRING trained on Chinese document-level data resulted in the highest adequacy score for Chinese across all models. Overall, our fine-tuning approach on AMR-to-text generation models was the best performing of all approaches introduced in this work, and the models which were exposed to both sentence-level and document-level information, trained on just the language of generation language, showed the most success.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we developed tools to generate text from Uniform Meaning Representation, introducing three distinct approaches that make use of existing Abstract Meaning Representation technologies to varying degrees.

While the UMR-to-AMR conversion pipeline successfully leverages existing AMR tools, our results indicated that the fine-tuned AMR-to-text generation models were stronger for both English and Chinese. Further, the best performing models were fine-tuned exclusively on the same language UMR data, suggesting that UMR data in other languages may not be helpful in enhancing monolingual UMR-to-text generation models. We also find that, while we only generate a single sentence at a time, the document-level information seems to improve model performance. Finally, we find that the inclusion of AMR in the language model performance fine-tuning also resulted in better model performance, as the AMR-to-text generation models fine-tuned on UMR data produced more adequate output than the fine-tuned LLMs (with no exposure to AMR, only UMR).

Future work may explore advancements toward producing text in other languages from UMR, perhaps leveraging additional external resources. The annotation and release of additional UMR data will support this effort, as well as improved performance in English and Chinese.

## Limitations

One of our limitations was the small size of the UMRv1.0 dataset, which constrained our



model fine-tuning capabilities—especially for low-resource languages where training data is scarce. Additionally, we lack robust automatic evaluation metrics for the four indigenous languages, with initial reviews by native speakers indicating the generated outputs were did not carry meaning. Due to inherent randomness in LLM generation, the LLMs used in this work exhibit slight variability across different runs, which may result in occasionally producing varied responses and thus different BLEU, METEOR, and multilingual BERTscores.

## Acknowledgments

Thank you to the adjudicators for our human evaluation: Crawford Dawson, Yilin Huang, Hank Hsu, Ryan Ji, Megan Li, and Yichen Liu. Thank you also to Javier Gutierrez Bach for a comment relevant to the draft, and to Lukas Denk and Andrew Cowell for providing comments on some of the Navajo and Arápho sentences, respectively. This work is supported by the Amherst College HPC, which is funded by NSF Award 2117377.

## References

2022. Uniform Meaning Representation (UMR) 0.9 specification. <https://github.com/umr4nlp/umr-guidelines/blob/master/guidelines.md>.
- Xuefeng Bai, Yulong Chen, and Yue Zhang. 2022. Graph pre-training for AMR parsing and generation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6001–6015, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Shu Cai, Madalina Georgescu, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Kevin Knight, Philipp Koehn, Martha Palmer, and Nathan Schneider. 2013. Abstract Meaning Representation for sembanking. In *Proceedings of the 7th Linguistic Annotation Workshop and Interoperability with Discourse*, pages 178–186, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Shu Cai, Madalina Georgescu, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Kevin Knight, Philipp Koehn, Martha Palmer, and Nathan Schneider. 2019. Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) 1.2.6 specification. <https://github.com/amrisi/amr-guidelines/blob/master/amr.md>.
- 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, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michele Bevilacqua, Rexhina Blloshmi, and Roberto Navigli. 2021. One SPRING to rule them both: Symmetric AMR semantic parsing and generation without a complex pipeline. In *Proceedings of AAAI*.
- Julia Bonn, Matthew J. Buchholz, Jayeol Chun, Andrew Cowell, William Croft, Lukas Denk, Sijia Ge, Jan Hajič, Kenneth Lai, James H. Martin, Skatje Myers, Alexis Palmer, Martha Palmer, Claire Benet Post, James Pustejovsky, Kristine Stenzel, Haibo Sun, Zdeňka Urešová, Rosa Vallejos, Jens E. L. Van Gysel, Meagan Vigus, Nianwen Xue, and Jin Zhao. 2024. Building a broad infrastructure for uniform meaning representations. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 2537–2547, Torino, Italy. ELRA and ICCL.
- Julia Bonn, Andrew Cowell, Jan Hajič, Alexis Palmer, Martha Palmer, James Pustejovsky, Haibo Sun, Zdenka Uresova, Shira Wein, Nianwen Xue, and Jin Zhao. 2023a. UMR annotation of multiword expressions. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Designing Meaning Representations*, pages 99–109, Nancy, France. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Julia Bonn, Skatje Myers, Jens E. L. Van Gysel, Lukas Denk, Meagan Vigus, Jin Zhao, Andrew Cowell, William Croft, Jan Hajič, James H. Martin, Alexis Palmer, Martha Palmer, James Pustejovsky, Zdenka Urešová, Rosa Vallejos, and Nianwen Xue. 2023b. Mapping AMR to UMR: Resources for adapting existing corpora for cross-lingual compatibility. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Workshop on Treebanks and Linguistic Theories (TLT, GURT/SyntaxFest 2023)*, pages 74–95, Washington, D.C. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew J. Buchholz, Julia Bonn, Claire Benet Post, Andrew Cowell, and Alexis Palmer. 2024. Bootstrapping UMR annotations for Arapaho from language documentation resources. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 2447–2457, Torino, Italy. ELRA and ICCL.
- Daniel Chen, Martha Palmer, and Meagan Vigus. 2021. AutoAspect: Automatic annotation of tense and aspect for uniform meaning representations. In *Proceedings of the Joint 15th Linguistic Annotation Workshop (LAW) and 3rd Designing Meaning Representations (DMR) Workshop*, pages 36–45, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziming Cheng, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. 2022. BiBL: AMR parsing and generation with bidirectional Bayesian learning. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*,

- pages 5461–5475, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Jayeol Chun and Nianwen Xue. 2024. [Uniform meaning representation parsing as a pipelined approach](#). In *Proceedings of TextGraphs-17: Graph-based Methods for Natural Language Processing*, pages 40–52, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. [Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sijia Ge, Jin Zhao, Kristin Wright-bettner, Skatje Myers, Nianwen Xue, and Martha Palmer. 2023. [UMR-writer 2.0: Incorporating a new keyboard interface and workflow into UMR-writer](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Linguistic Annotation Workshop (LAW-XVII)*, pages 211–219, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gemma Team. 2024. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*.
- Robert T. Kasper. 1989. [A flexible interface for linking applications to Penman’s sentence generator](#). In *Speech and Natural Language: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 21-23, 1989*.
- Kevin Knight, Bianca Badarau, Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Madalina Bardocz, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Daniel Marcu, Martha Palmer, Tim O’Gorman, and Nathan Schneider. 2017. [Abstract Meaning Representation \(AMR\) Annotation Release 2.0](#). Technical Report LDC2017T10, Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia, PA.
- Kevin Knight, Bianca Badarau, Laura Baranescu, Claire Bonial, Madalina Bardocz, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Daniel Marcu, Martha Palmer, Tim O’Gorman, et al. 2020. [Abstract Meaning Representation \(AMR\) Annotation Release 3.0](#). Technical Report LDC2020T02, Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia, PA.
- 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 *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Jiatao Gu, Naman Goyal, Xian Li, Sergey Edunov, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [Multilingual denoising pre-training for neural machine translation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08210*.
- Emma Manning, Shira Wein, and Nathan Schneider. 2020. [A human evaluation of AMR-to-English generation systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 4773–4786, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on 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, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karl Pearson and Francis Galton. 1895. [Vii. note on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents](#). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 58(347-352):240–242.
- Claire Benet Post, Marie C. McGregor, Maria Leonor Pacheco, and Alexis Palmer. 2024. [Accelerating UMR adoption: Neuro-symbolic conversion from AMR-to-UMR with low supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Workshop on Designing Meaning Representations @ LREC-COLING 2024*, pages 140–150, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Jonas Pfeiffer, Yue Zhang, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. [Smelting gold and silver for improved multilingual AMR-to-Text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 742–750, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zacchary Sadeddine, Juri Opitz, and Fabian Suchanek. 2024. [A survey of meaning representations – from theory to practical utility](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2877–2892, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haibo Sun, Yifan Zhu, Jin Zhao, and Nianwen Xue. 2023. [UMR annotation of Chinese verb compounds and related constructions](#). In *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Construction Grammars and NLP (CxGs+NLP, GURT/SyntaxFest 2023)*, pages 75–84, Washington, D.C. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jens E. L. Van Gysel, Meagan Vigus, Lukas Denk, Andrew Cowell, Rosa Vallejos, Tim O’Gorman, and William Croft. 2021a. [Theoretical and practical issues in the semantic annotation of four indigenous languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Joint 15th Linguistic Annotation Workshop (LAW) and 3rd Designing Meaning Representations (DMR) Workshop*, pages 12–22, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jens E. L. Van Gysel, Meagan Vigus, Pavlina Kalm, Sook-kyung Lee, Michael Regan, and William Croft. 2019. [Cross-linguistic semantic annotation: Reconciling the language-specific and the universal](#). In *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Designing Meaning Representations*, pages 1–14, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jens EL Van Gysel, Meagan Vigus, Jayeol Chun, Kenneth Lai, Sarah Moeller, Jiarui Yao, Tim O’Gorman, Andrew Cowell, William Croft, Chu-Ren Huang, et al. 2021b. Designing a uniform meaning representation for natural language processing. *KI-Künstliche Intelligenz*, 35(3):343–360.
- Meagan Vigus, Jens E. L. Van Gysel, Tim O’Gorman, Andrew Cowell, Rosa Vallejos, and William Croft. 2020. [Cross-lingual annotation: a road map for low- and no-resource languages](#). In *Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Designing Meaning Representations*, pages 30–40, Barcelona Spain (online). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shira Wein and Julia Bonn. 2023. [Comparing UMR and cross-lingual adaptations of AMR](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Designing Meaning Representations*, pages 23–33, Nancy, France. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shira Wein, Lucia Donatelli, Ethan Ricker, Calvin Engstrom, Alex Nelson, Leonie Harter, and Nathan Schneider. 2022. [Spanish Abstract Meaning Representation: Annotation of a general corpus](#). In *Northern European Journal of Language Technology, Volume 8*, Copenhagen, Denmark. Northern European Association of Language Technology.
- Shira Wein and Juri Opitz. 2024. [A survey of AMR applications](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6856–6875, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shira Wein and Nathan Schneider. 2024. [Assessing the Cross-linguistic Utility of Abstract Meaning Representation](#). *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–55.
- Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [mt5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11934*.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [BERTScore: Evaluating text generation with BERT](#). In *Proc. of ICLR*, Online.