

Knowledge-Enhanced & Memory-Augmented Deep Learning: Advanced Pretrained Language Models

2021.11.02

Jeonbuk National University

Seung-Hoon Na

Reference

- Transformer
 - Attention is all you need [Vaswani et al., 2017]
- Pretrained Language Models
 - BERT [Devlin '18]
 - ALBERT [Lan et al '19]
 - RoBERTa [Liu et al '19]
 - UniLM [Dong et al '19]
 - XLNet [Yang et al '19]
 - ELECTRA: Pre-training Text Encoders as Discriminators Rather Than Generators [Clark et al '20]
 - BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]
- Large-scaled Pretrained Language Models
 - Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners [Radford et al '19]
 - GPT3: Language Models are Few-Shot Learners [Brown et al '20]
 - T5: Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]
- Scalability issue
 - Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

Reference

- Knowledge enhanced Language Models
 - Retrieval-augmented language models
 - REALM [Guu et al '20]
 - Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]
 - Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]
 - Entity-level memory
 - Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Févy et al '20]
 - Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al '20]
 - KnowBert [Peters et al '19]
 - Knowledge-aware Language Model Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]
 - Lexicon-level memory
 - MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Ruggeri et al '21]
 - Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]
 - Specializing Unsupervised Pretraining Models for Word-level Semantic Similarity [Lauscher et al '20]
 - Relational memory
 - JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al '20]
 - Internal memory
 - Large Product Key Memory for Pretrained Language Models [Kim & Jung '20]
 - Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]
 - Contextual memory
 - Taking Notes on the Fly Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]
 - Improving Neural Language Models with a Continuous Cache [Grave et al '17]
 - Taking Notes on the Fly Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]
 - Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models [Khandelwal et al '20]
 - Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]
 - Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [Jong et al '21]
 - Memorizing Transformers ['21]
 - GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]
 - Working memory
 - READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]
 - Recall & Learn: A memory-augmented solver for math word problems [Huang et al '21]
 - Knowledge injected implicit memory (with parameterization)
 - COMET: Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

Reference


- Efficient pretrained language models
 - DeFormer: Decomposing Pre-trained Transformers for Faster Question Answering [Cao et al '20]
 - Linformer [Wang et al '20]
 - Longformer: The Long-Document Transformer [Beltagy et al '20]
 - RealFormer: Transformer Likes Residual Attention [He et al '20]
 - The Lottery Ticket Hypothesis: Finding Sparse, Trainable Neural Networks [Frankle & Carbin '19]
 - Drawing early-bird tickets: Towards more efficient training of deep networks [You et al '20]
 - EarlyBERT: Efficient BERT Training via Early-bird Lottery Tickets [Chen et al '20]
- Alternative self-supervised loss
 - Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]
- Reasoning enhanced language models
 - BeliefBank: Adding Memory to Pretrained Language Model for Systemtic Notion of Belief [Kassner et al '21]
- Continual learning of language models
 - LAMOL: LAnguage MOdeling for Lifelong Language Learning [Sun et al '19]
 - Towards Continual Knowledge Learning of Language Models [Jang et al '21]
 - Editing Factual Knowledge in Language Models [Cao et al '21]
- Theoretical analysis on language models
 - Hopfield Networks is All You Need [Ramsauer et al '21]
 - On the Stability of Fine-tuning BERT: Misconceptions, Explanations, and Strong Baselines [Mosbach et al '21]

- Application (QA etc.)
 - LEGO: Latent Execution-Guided Reasoning for Multi-Hop Question Answering on Knowledge Graphs [Ren et al '21]
 - Structured Prediction as Translation between Augmented Natural Languages [Paolini et al '21]


Contents

- Pretrained language models ◀
 - BERT/RoBERTa/ALBERT/UniLM/BART
- Large-scale pretrained language models
 - T5/GPT3
- Knowledge-enhanced & Memory-Augmented pretrained language models
 - Entity-level memory augmentation: KnowBERT/EAE
 - Relational memory augmentation: FAE/JAKET
 - Contextual memory augmentation: KNN LM/ Taking notes
 - Lexicon-level memory augmentation: LIBERT
 - Corpus memory augmentation: REALM/RAG/COMET
- Reasoning-enhanced pretrained language models
- Evaluation of knowledge-enhanced language models

Natural Language Processing from Scratch (based on Word Embedding)




Transformer [Vaswani et al '17]




Transformer [Vaswani et al '17]

Scaled Dot-Product Attention



Multi-Head Attention




$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V$$

$$\text{MultiHead}(Q, K, V) = \text{Concat}(\text{head}_1, \dots, \text{head}_h)W^O$$

where $\text{head}_i = \text{Attention}(QW_i^Q, KW_i^K, VW_i^V)$

BERT [Devlin '18]

- BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers)




BERT uses a bidirectional Transformer

OpenAI GPT uses a left-to-right Transformer

➔ Only BERT representations are jointly conditioned on both left and right context in all layers


BERT [Devlin '18]

- BERT input representation




BERT [Devlin '18]

- Single sentence classification tasks



BERT [Devlin '18]

- Single sentence tagging task



BERT [Devlin '18]

- CoNLL-2003 Named Entity Recognition results

System	Dev F1	Test F1
ELMo+BiLSTM+CRF	95.7	92.2
CVT+Multi (Clark et al., 2018)	-	92.6
BERT _{BASE}	96.4	92.4
BERT _{LARGE}	96.6	92.8

RoBERTa [Liu et al '19]

- BERT uses the self-supervised tasks of:
 - Masked Language Model (MLM)
 - Next Sentence Prediction (NSP)
- RoBERTa
 - Dynamic Masking for MLM
 - Masking patterns are not static but dynamically changed over training epochs
 - Removing the loss of NSP task
 - **FULL-SENTENCES**
 - Concatenate consecutive sentences maximally within 512 tokens
 - **DOC-SENTENCES**
 - FULL-SENTENCES but without allowing cross document boundaries



RoBERTa [Liu et al '19]

- Development set results
 - Pretrained on BOOKCORPUS & WIKIPEDIA corpus

Model	SQuAD 1.1/2.0	MNLI-m	SST-2	RACE
<i>Our reimplementation (with NSP loss):</i>				
SEGMENT-PAIR	90.4/78.7	84.0	92.9	64.2
SENTENCE-PAIR	88.7/76.2	82.9	92.1	63.0
<i>Our reimplementation (without NSP loss):</i>				
FULL-SENTENCES	90.4/79.1	84.7	92.5	64.8
DOC-SENTENCES	90.6/79.7	84.7	92.7	65.6
BERT _{BASE}	88.5/76.3	84.3	92.8	64.3
XLNet _{BASE} (K = 7)	–/81.3	85.8	92.7	66.1
XLNet _{BASE} (K = 6)	–/81.0	85.6	93.4	66.7

ALBERT [Lan et al '19]

- ALBERT: A Lite BERT for Self-supervised Learning of Language representations
- Observation: simply growing the hidden size of a model such as BERT-large can lead to worse performance.



BERT-xlarge (2x larger than BERT-large in terms of hidden size)

ALBERT [Lan et al '19]

- Factorized embedding parameterization
 - BERT: $E == H$
 - the WordPiece embedding size E is tied with the hidden layer size H
 - ALBERT: $H \gg E$
 - **untying the WordPiece embedding size** E from the hidden layer size H
- Cross-layer parameter sharing
 - Share all parameters across layers
- Sentence-order prediction (SOP) loss
 - Positive examples: the same technique as BERT
 - two consecutive segments from the same document
 - **Negative examples**: the same two consecutive segments but with their order **swapped**

ALBERT [Lan et al '19]

Model		Parameters	Layers	Hidden	Embedding	Parameter-sharing
BERT	base	108M	12	768	768	False
	large	334M	24	1024	1024	False
	xlarge	1270M	24	2048	2048	False
ALBERT	base	12M	12	768	128	True
	large	18M	24	1024	128	True
	xlarge	60M	24	2048	128	True
	xxlarge	235M	12	4096	128	True

Model		Parameters	SQuAD1.1	SQuAD2.0	MNLI	SST-2	RACE	Avg	Speedup
BERT	base	108M	90.4/83.2	80.4/77.6	84.5	92.8	68.2	82.3	17.7x
	large	334M	92.2/85.5	85.0/82.2	86.6	93.0	73.9	85.2	3.8x
	xlarge	1270M	86.4/78.1	75.5/72.6	81.6	90.7	54.3	76.6	1.0
ALBERT	base	12M	89.3/82.3	80.0/77.1	81.6	90.3	64.0	80.1	21.1x
	large	18M	90.6/83.9	82.3/79.4	83.5	91.7	68.5	82.4	6.5x
	xlarge	60M	92.5/86.1	86.1/83.1	86.4	92.4	74.8	85.5	2.4x
	xxlarge	235M	94.1/88.3	88.1/85.1	88.0	95.2	82.3	88.7	1.2x

ALBERT [Lan et al '19]

The effect of cross-layer parameter-sharing strategies

Model	E	Parameters	SQuAD1.1	SQuAD2.0	MNLI	SST-2	RACE	Avg
ALBERT base not-shared	64	87M	89.9/82.9	80.1/77.8	82.9	91.5	66.7	81.3
	128	89M	89.9/82.8	80.3/77.3	83.7	91.5	67.9	81.7
	256	93M	90.2/83.2	80.3/77.4	84.1	91.9	67.3	81.8
	768	108M	90.4/83.2	80.4/77.6	84.5	92.8	68.2	82.3
ALBERT base all-shared	64	10M	88.7/81.4	77.5/74.8	80.8	89.4	63.5	79.0
	128	12M	89.3/82.3	80.0/77.1	81.6	90.3	64.0	80.1
	256	16M	88.8/81.5	79.1/76.3	81.5	90.3	63.4	79.6
	768	31M	88.6/81.5	79.2/76.6	82.0	90.6	63.3	79.8

	Model	Parameters	SQuAD1.1	SQuAD2.0	MNLI	SST-2	RACE	Avg
ALBERT base $E=768$	all-shared	31M	88.6/81.5	79.2/76.6	82.0	90.6	63.3	79.8
	shared-attention	83M	89.9/82.7	80.0/77.2	84.0	91.4	67.7	81.6
	shared-FFN	57M	89.2/82.1	78.2/75.4	81.5	90.8	62.6	79.5
	not-shared	108M	90.4/83.2	80.4/77.6	84.5	92.8	68.2	82.3
ALBERT base $E=128$	all-shared	12M	89.3/82.3	80.0/77.1	82.0	90.3	64.0	80.1
	shared-attention	64M	89.9/82.8	80.7/77.9	83.4	91.9	67.6	81.7
	shared-FFN	38M	88.9/81.6	78.6/75.6	82.3	91.7	64.4	80.2
	not-shared	89M	89.9/82.8	80.3/77.3	83.2	91.5	67.9	81.6

ALBERT [Lan et al '19]

- The effect of sentence-prediction loss, NSP vs. SOP, o

SP tasks	Intrinsic Tasks			Downstream Tasks					
	MLM	NSP	SOP	SQuAD1.1	SQuAD2.0	MNLI	SST-2	RACE	Avg
None	54.9	52.4	53.3	88.6/81.5	78.1/75.3	81.5	89.9	61.7	79.0
NSP	54.5	90.5	52.0	88.4/81.5	77.2/74.6	81.6	91.1	62.3	79.2
SOP	54.0	78.9	86.5	89.3/82.3	80.0/77.1	82.0	90.3	64.0	80.1

- The effect of increasing the number of layers for an ALBERT-large

Number of layers	Parameters	SQuAD1.1	SQuAD2.0	MNLI	SST-2	RACE	Avg
1	18M	31.1/22.9	50.1/50.1	66.4	80.8	40.1	52.9
3	18M	79.8/69.7	64.4/61.7	77.7	86.7	54.0	71.2
6	18M	86.4/78.4	73.8/71.1	81.2	88.9	60.9	77.2
12	18M	89.8/83.3	80.7/77.9	83.3	91.7	66.7	81.5
24	18M	90.3/83.3	81.8/79.0	83.3	91.5	68.7	82.1
48	18M	90.0/83.1	81.8/78.9	83.4	91.9	66.9	81.8

XLNet: Generalized Autoregressive Pretraining for Language Understanding [Yang et al '19]

- Autoregressive (AR) language modeling
 - Estimate the probability distribution of a text corpus with an autoregressive model
 - Only trained to encode a uni-directional context (either forward or backward)

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(x_t \mid \mathbf{x}_{<t})$$

XLNet [Yang et al '19]

- Autoencoding (AE) based pretraining
 - Does not perform explicit density estimation but instead aims to **reconstruct** the original data from corrupted input
 - E.g.) BERT
 - This closes the aforementioned **bidirectional information** gap in AR language modeling → improved performance
 - But, [MASK] token? absent from real data at finetuning time, resulting in a **pretrain-finetune discrepancy**.

XLNet [Yang et al '19]


- Permutation Language Modeling

\mathcal{Z}_T : the set of all possible permutations of the length- T index sequence $[1, 2, \dots, T]$

$\mathbf{z}_{<t}$: the first $t-1$ elements of a permutation $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}_T$


$$\max_{\theta} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{Z}_T} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \log p_{\theta}(x_{z_t} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{z}_{<t}}) \right]$$

XLNet [Yang et al '19]




Factorization order: $3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 1$

XLNet [Yang et al '19]




Factorization order: $2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1$

XLNet [Yang et al '19]



Factorization order: $1 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$



XLNet [Yang et al '19]




XLNet [Yang et al '19]

- Two-Stream Self-Attention

- “stand” at the target position z_t and rely on the position z_t to gather information from the context \mathbf{x}_z
- Use two sets of hidden representations
 - The content representation $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{z} \leq t})$
 - Serves a similar role to the standard hidden states in Transformer
 - The query representation $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{z} < t}, z_t)$
 - Only has access to the contextual information $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{z} < t}$ and the position z_t but not the content \mathbf{x}_{z_t}



Permutation language modeling training with two-stream attention



XLNet [Yang et al '19]

- SQuAD 1.1 & SQuAD 2.0


SQuAD1.1	EM	F1	SQuAD2.0	EM	F1
<i>Dev set results without data augmentation</i>					
BERT [10]	84.1	90.9	BERT [†] [10]	78.98	81.77
XLNet	88.95	94.52	XLNet	86.12	88.79
<i>Test set results on leaderboard, with data augmentation (as of June 19, 2019)</i>					
Human [27]	82.30	91.22	BERT+N-Gram+Self-Training [10]	85.15	87.72
ATB	86.94	92.64	SG-Net	85.23	87.93
BERT* [10]	87.43	93.16	BERT+DAE+AoA	85.88	88.62
XLNet	89.90	95.08	XLNet	86.35	89.13

XLNet [Yang et al '19]


- Test sets of several text classification datasets.

Model	IMDB	Yelp-2	Yelp-5	DBpedia	AG	Amazon-2	Amazon-5
CNN [14]	-	2.90	32.39	0.84	6.57	3.79	36.24
DPCNN [14]	-	2.64	30.58	0.88	6.87	3.32	34.81
Mixed VAT [30, 20]	4.32	-	-	0.70	4.95	-	-
ULMFiT [13]	4.6	2.16	29.98	0.80	5.01	-	-
BERT [35]	4.51	1.89	29.32	0.64	-	2.63	34.17
XLNet	3.79	1.55	27.80	0.62	4.49	2.40	32.26

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]




BERT: Missing tokens are predicted independently, so BERT cannot easily be used for generation



GPT: Tokens are predicted autoregressively, meaning GPT can be used for generation. However words can only condition on leftward context, so it cannot learn bidirectional interactions.


BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]



BART: Inputs to the encoder need not be aligned with decoder outputs, allowing arbitrary noise transformations. Here, a document has been corrupted by replacing spans of text with mask symbols. The corrupted document (left) is **encoded with a bidirectional model**, and then **the likelihood of the original document (right) is calculated with an autoregressive decoder**


BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]

- Pre-training BART
 - Transformations for noising the input that we experiment with. These transformations can be composed.



BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]

- Fine-tuning BART
 - Sequence Classification Tasks




The same input is fed into the encoder and decoder, and the representation from the final output is used.

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]

- Fine-tuning BART

- Machine Translation

- Replace BART's encoder embedding layer with a new randomly initialized encoder.
 - Use a separate vocabulary from the original BART model.



Learn a small additional encoder that replaces the word embeddings in BART.
The new encoder can use a disjoint vocabulary

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]

- Comparison of pre-training objectives

Model	SQuAD 1.1 F1	MNLI Acc	ELI5 PPL	XSum PPL	ConvAI2 PPL	CNN/DM PPL
BERT Base (Devlin et al., 2019)	88.5	84.3	-	-	-	-
Masked Language Model	90.0	83.5	24.77	7.87	12.59	7.06
Masked Seq2seq Language Model	87.0	82.1	23.40	6.80	11.43	6.19
Permuted Language Model	76.7	80.1	21.40	7.00	11.51	6.56
Multitask Masked Language Model	89.1	83.7	24.03	7.69	12.23	6.96
	89.2	82.4	23.73	7.50	12.39	6.74
BART Base						
w/ Token Masking	90.4	84.1	25.05	7.08	11.73	6.10
w/ Token Deletion	90.4	84.1	24.61	6.90	11.46	5.87
w/ Text Infilling	90.8	84.0	24.26	6.61	11.05	5.83
w/ Document Rotation	77.2	75.3	53.69	17.14	19.87	10.59
w/ Sentence Shuffling	85.4	81.5	41.87	10.93	16.67	7.89
w/ Text Infilling + Sentence Shuffling	90.8	83.8	24.17	6.62	11.12	5.41

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]

- Results for large models on SQuAD and GLUE tasks

	SQuAD 1.1 EM/F1	SQuAD 2.0 EM/F1	MNLI m/mm	SST Acc	QQP Acc	QNLI Acc	STS-B Acc	RTE Acc	MRPC Acc	CoLA Mcc
BERT	84.1/90.9	79.0/81.8	86.6/-	93.2	91.3	92.3	90.0	70.4	88.0	60.6
UniLM	-/-	80.5/83.4	87.0/85.9	94.5	-	92.7	-	70.9	-	61.1
XLNet	89.0 /94.5	86.1/88.8	89.8/-	95.6	91.8	93.9	91.8	83.8	89.2	63.6
RoBERTa	88.9/ 94.6	86.5/89.4	90.2/90.2	96.4	92.2	94.7	92.4	86.6	90.9	68.0
BART	88.8/ 94.6	86.1/89.2	89.9/90.1	96.6	92.5	94.9	91.2	87.0	90.4	62.8

– Results on two standard summarization datasets

	CNN/DailyMail			XSum		
	R1	R2	RL	R1	R2	RL
Lead-3	40.42	17.62	36.67	16.30	1.60	11.95
PTGEN (See et al., 2017)	36.44	15.66	33.42	29.70	9.21	23.24
PTGEN+COV (See et al., 2017)	39.53	17.28	36.38	28.10	8.02	21.72
UniLM	43.33	20.21	40.51	-	-	-
BERTSUMABS (Liu & Lapata, 2019)	41.72	19.39	38.76	38.76	16.33	31.15
BERTSUMEXTABS (Liu & Lapata, 2019)	42.13	19.60	39.18	38.81	16.50	31.27
BART	44.16	21.28	40.90	45.14	22.27	37.25

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al ‘19]

- BART outperforms previous work on conversational response generation. Perplexities are renormalized based on official tokenizer for ConvAI2.

	ConvAI2	
	Valid F1	Valid PPL
Seq2Seq + Attention	16.02	35.07
Best System	19.09	17.51
BART	20.72	11.85

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al ‘19]

- BART achieves state-of-the-art results on the challenging ELI5 abstractive question answering dataset

	ELI5		
	R1	R2	RL
Best Extractive	23.5	3.1	17.5
Language Model	27.8	4.7	23.1
Seq2Seq	28.3	5.1	22.8
Seq2Seq Multitask	28.9	5.4	23.1
BART	30.6	6.2	24.3

BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension [Lewis et al '19]

- The performance (BLEU) of baseline and BART on WMT'16 RO-EN augmented with backtranslation data.

	RO-EN
Baseline	36.80
Fixed BART	36.29
Tuned BART	37.96

BART improves over a strong backtranslation (BT) baseline by using monolingual English pre-training.

Contents

- Pretrained language models
 - BERT/RoBERTa/ALBERT/UniLM/BART
- Large-scale pretrained language models ◀
 - T5/GPT3
- Knowledge-enhanced & Memory-Augmented pretrained language models
 - Entity-level memory augmentation: KnowBERT/EAE
 - Relational memory augmentation: FAE/JAKET
 - Contextual memory augmentation: KNN LM/ Taking notes
 - Lexicon-level memory augmentation: LIBERT
 - Corpus memory augmentation: REALM/RAG/COMET
- Reasoning-enhanced pretrained language models
- Evaluation of knowledge-enhanced language models


Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Treat every NLP problem as a “text-to-text” problem
 - Similar works
 - Natural Language Decathlon [McCann et al., 2018]
 - Test the zero-shot learning capabilities of language models [Radford et al., 2019].
- Text-to-text framework: **Text-to-Text Transfer Transformer (T5)**
 - Allows us to directly apply the same model, objective, training procedure, and decoding process to every task we consider
- Train larger models than have been previously considered (up to 11 billion parameters)
 - Introduce the “**Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus**” (C4)
 - a dataset consisting of hundreds of gigabytes of clean English text scraped from the web

Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- **T5: Text-to-Text Transfer Transformer**

- Every task we consider – including **translation**, **question answering**, and **classification** – is cast as feeding our model text as input and training it to generate some target text



Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Baseline model
 - A standard **encoder-decoder Transformer** [Vaswani et al '17]
 - Contains two layer stacks for encoder / decoder
 - Unlike moderns transformer architecture for language models consisting of only **a single “stack”** [Devlin et al. '18]
 - The encoder and decoder are each similar in size and configuration to a BERT_{BASE} stack
 - Consist of 12 blocks (each block comprising self-attention, optional encoder-decoder attention, and a feed-forward network)
 - In total, results in a model with about **220 million parameter**
 - » This baseline model contains two layer stacks instead of one
 - » So, roughly twice the number of parameters of BERT_{BASE}

Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Baseline model
 - Unsupervised objective
 - Inspired by BERT’s “masked language modeling” objective and the “word dropout” regularization technique [Bowman et al., 2015],
 - Early work on transfer learning for NLP used a language modeling objective [Peters et al. 18; Radford et al ‘19]
 - However, it has recently been shown that “denoising” objectives [Devlin et al., 2018] produce better performance
 - Design an objective that randomly samples and then drops out 15% of tokens in the input sequence
 - All consecutive spans of dropped-out tokens are replaced by a single sentinel token
 - » Each sentinel token is assigned a token ID that is unique to the sequence
 - The target then corresponds to all of the dropped-out spans of tokens, delimited by the same sentinel tokens used in the input sequence plus a final sentinel token to mark the end of the target sequence

Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Baseline model
 - Unsupervised objective

Original text

Thank you ~~for inviting~~ me to your party ~~last~~ week.

Inputs

Thank you <X> me to your party <Y> week.

Targets

<X> for inviting <Y> last <Z>

sentinel token

Final sentinel token

Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Baseline model

- Training

- Pre-train each model for $2^{19} = 524,288$ steps on C4 before fine-tuning
 - C4: “Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus”
 - Use a maximum sequence length of 512 and a batch size of 128 sequences
 - Our batches contain roughly $2^{16} = 65,536$ tokens
 - In total, this batch size and number of steps corresponds to pre-training on $2^{35} \approx 34\text{B}$ tokens
 - Fine-tuned for $2^{18} = 262,144$ steps on all tasks


- Baseline performance

	GLUE	CNNDM	SQuAD	SGLUE	EnDe	EnFr	EnRo
★ Baseline average	83.28	19.24	80.88	71.36	26.98	39.82	27.65
Baseline standard deviation	0.235	0.065	0.343	0.416	0.112	0.090	0.108
No pre-training	66.22	17.60	50.31	53.04	25.86	39.77	24.04

Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]


- Architectures
 - While the Transformer was originally introduced with an encoder-decoder architecture, much modern work on transfer learning for NLP uses alternative architectures

– Attention masks




Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]


- Architectures
 - Schematics of the Transformer architecture variants we consider



Language model



Prefix LM



Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Architectures
 - the prefix LM architecture
 - Closely resembles BERT [Devlin et al., 2018] for classification tasks
 - Consider an example from the MNLI benchmark
 - The premise is “I hate pigeons.”,
 - the hypothesis is “My feelings towards pigeons are filled with animosity.”
 - The correct label is “entailment”.
 - To feed this example into a language model, we would transform it into the sequence
 - “mnli premise: I hate pigeons. hypothesis: My feelings towards pigeons are filled with animosity. target: entailment”
 - In this case, the fully-visible prefix would correspond to the entire input sequence up to the word “target:”, which can be seen as being analogous to the “classification” token used in BERT.
 - Easy for the model to learn to output one of the valid class labels given the task prefix (“mnli” in this case).
 - The main difference between a prefix LM and the BERT architecture is that the classifier is simply integrated into the output layer of the Transformer decoder in the prefix LM

Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer [Raffel et al 19]

- Architectures
 - Comparing different model structures


Architecture	Objective	Params	Cost	GLUE	CNNDM	SQuAD	SGLUE	EnDe	EnFr	EnRo
★ Encoder-decoder	Denoising	$2P$	M	83.28	19.24	80.88	71.36	26.98	39.82	27.65
Enc-dec, shared	Denoising	P	M	82.81	18.78	80.63	70.73	26.72	39.03	27.46
Enc-dec, 6 layers	Denoising	P	$M/2$	80.88	18.97	77.59	68.42	26.38	38.40	26.95
Language model	Denoising	P	M	74.70	17.93	61.14	55.02	25.09	35.28	25.86
Prefix LM	Denoising	P	M	81.82	18.61	78.94	68.11	26.43	37.98	27.39
Encoder-decoder	LM	$2P$	M	79.56	18.59	76.02	64.29	26.27	39.17	26.86
Enc-dec, shared	LM	P	M	79.60	18.13	76.35	63.50	26.62	39.17	27.05
Enc-dec, 6 layers	LM	P	$M/2$	78.67	18.26	75.32	64.06	26.13	38.42	26.89
Language model	LM	P	M	73.78	17.54	53.81	56.51	25.23	34.31	25.38
Prefix LM	LM	P	M	79.68	17.84	76.87	64.86	26.28	37.51	26.76

- An encoder-decoder model with L layers in the encoder and L layers in the decoder. This model has $2P$ parameters and a computation cost of M FLOPs.
- An equivalent model, but with parameters shared across the encoder and decoder, resulting in P parameters and an M -FLOP computational cost.
- An encoder-decoder model with $L/2$ layers each in the encoder and decoder, giving P parameters and an $M/2$ -FLOP cost.
- A decoder-only language model with L layers and P parameters and a resulting computational cost of M FLOPs.
- A decoder-only prefix LM with the same architecture (and thus the same number of parameters and computational cost), but with fully-visible self-attention over the input.

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- Study empirical scaling laws for language model performance on the cross-entropy loss
- The loss scales as a power-law with **model size, dataset size, and the amount of compute used for training**, with some trends spanning more than seven orders of magnitude
- Other architectural details such as network width or depth have minimal effects within a wide range
- Larger models are significantly **more sample-efficient**
 - such that optimally compute-efficient training involves **training very large models on a relatively modest amount of data and stopping significantly before convergence.**

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]



- Language modeling performance improves smoothly as we increase the model size, dataset size, and amount of compute used for training
- For optimal performance all three factors must be scaled up in tandem.
- Empirical performance has a power-law relationship with each individual factor when not bottlenecked by the other two.

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- **Performance depends strongly on scale, weakly on model shape**
 - Model performance depends most strongly on scale, which consists of three factors:
 - The number of model parameters N (excluding embeddings), the size of the dataset D , and the amount of compute C used for training
 - Within reasonable limits, performance depends very weakly on other architectural hyperparameters such as depth vs. width

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- **Smooth power laws**
 - Performance has a power-law relationship with each of the three scale factors N , D , C when not bottlenecked by the other two, with trends spanning more than six orders of magnitude
 - Observe no signs of deviation from these trends on the upper end, though performance must flatten out eventually before reaching zero loss

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- **Universality of overfitting**
 - Performance improves predictably as long as we scale up N and D in tandem, but enters a regime of diminishing returns if either N or D is held fixed while the other increases
 - The performance penalty depends predictably on the ratio $N^{0.74}/D$, meaning that every time we increase the model size 8x, we only need to increase the data by roughly 5x to avoid a penalty

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- **Universality of training**
 - Training curves follow predictable power-laws whose parameters are roughly independent of the model size.
 - By extrapolating the early part of a training curve, we can roughly predict the loss that would be achieved if we trained for much longer

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]


- **Transfer improves with test performance**
 - When we evaluate models on text with a different distribution than they were trained on, the results are strongly correlated to those on the training validation set with a roughly constant offset in the loss
 - In other words, transfer to a different distribution incurs a constant penalty but otherwise improves roughly in line with performance on the training set

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]


- **Sample efficiency**
 - Large models are more sample-efficient than small models, reaching the same level of performance with fewer optimization steps and using fewer data points

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]



Larger models require **fewer samples** to reach the same performance



The optimal model size grows smoothly with the loss target and compute budget



Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]



The early-stopped test loss $L(N, D)$ varies predictably with the dataset size D and model size N with

$$L(N, D) = \left[\left(\frac{N_c}{N} \right)^{\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_D}} + \frac{D_c}{D} \right]^{\alpha_D}$$

After an initial transient period, learning curves for all model sizes N can be fit with


$$L(N, S) = \left(\frac{N_c}{N} \right)^{\alpha_N} + \left(\frac{S_c}{S_{\min}(S)} \right)^{\alpha_S}$$

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- **Convergence is inefficient**
 - When working within a fixed compute budget C but without any other restrictions on the model size N or available data D , we attain optimal performance by training very large models and **stopping significantly short of convergence**
 - **Maximally compute-efficient training would therefore be far more sample efficient** than one might expect based on training small models to convergence, with data requirements growing very slowly as $D \sim C^{0.27}$ with training compute.

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models

[Kaplan et al '20]



As more compute becomes available, we can choose how much to allocate towards training larger models, using larger batches, and training for more steps.

For optimally compute-efficient training, most of the increase should go towards increased model size. A relatively small increase in data is needed to avoid reuse. Of the increase in data, most can be used to increase parallelism through larger batch sizes, with only a very small increase in serial training time required.

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- **Optimal batch size**
 - The ideal batch size for training these models is roughly a power of the loss only, and continues to be determinable by measuring the gradient noise scale
 - It is roughly 1-2 million tokens at convergence for the largest models we can train

Taken together, these results show that language modeling performance improves smoothly and predictably as we appropriately scale up model size, data, and compute. We expect that larger language models will perform better and be more sample efficient than current models.

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- L – the cross entropy loss in nats. Typically it will be averaged over the tokens in a context, but in some cases we report the loss for specific tokens within the context.
- N – the number of model parameters, *excluding all vocabulary and positional embeddings*
- $C \approx 6NBS$ – an estimate of the total non-embedding training compute, where B is the batch size, and S is the number of training steps (ie parameter updates). We quote numerical values in PF-days, where one PF-day = $10^{15} \times 24 \times 3600 = 8.64 \times 10^{19}$ floating point operations.
- D – the dataset size in tokens
- B_{crit} – the critical batch size [MKAT18], defined and discussed in Section 5.1. Training at the critical batch size provides a roughly optimal compromise between time and compute efficiency.
- C_{min} – an estimate of the minimum amount of non-embedding compute to reach a given value of the loss. This is the training compute that would be used if the model were trained at a batch size much less than the critical batch size.
- S_{min} – an estimate of the minimal number of training steps needed to reach a given value of the loss. This is also the number of training steps that would be used if the model were trained at a batch size much greater than the critical batch size.
- α_X – power-law exponents for the scaling of the loss as $L(X) \propto 1/X^{\alpha_X}$ where X can be any of $N, D, C, S, B, C^{\text{min}}$.

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- Parameter counts and compute (forward pass) estimates for a Transformer model.

Operation	Parameters	FLOPs per Token
Embed	$(n_{\text{vocab}} + n_{\text{ctx}}) d_{\text{model}}$	$4d_{\text{model}}$
Attention: QKV	$n_{\text{layer}} d_{\text{model}} 3d_{\text{attn}}$	$2n_{\text{layer}} d_{\text{model}} 3d_{\text{attn}}$
Attention: Mask	—	$2n_{\text{layer}} n_{\text{ctx}} d_{\text{attn}}$
Attention: Project	$n_{\text{layer}} d_{\text{attn}} d_{\text{model}}$	$2n_{\text{layer}} d_{\text{attn}} d_{\text{embd}}$
Feedforward	$n_{\text{layer}} 2d_{\text{model}} d_{\text{ff}}$	$2n_{\text{layer}} 2d_{\text{model}} d_{\text{ff}}$
De-embed	—	$2d_{\text{model}} n_{\text{vocab}}$
Total (Non-Embedding)	$N = 2d_{\text{model}} n_{\text{layer}} (2d_{\text{attn}} + d_{\text{ff}})$	$C_{\text{forward}} = 2N + 2n_{\text{layer}} n_{\text{ctx}} d_{\text{attn}}$

Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- Summary of Scaling Laws
 - The test loss of a Transformer trained to autoregressively model language can be predicted using a power-law
 - When performance is limited by only either the number of non-embedding parameters N , the dataset size D , or the optimally allocated compute budget C_{min}
 - 1. For models with a limited number of parameters, trained to convergence on sufficiently large datasets
- $L(N) = (N_c/N)^{\alpha_N}$; $\alpha_N \sim 0.076$, $N_c \sim 8.8 \times 10^{13}$ (non-embedding parameter
- 2. For large models trained with a limited dataset with early stopping:

$$L(D) = (D_c/D)^{\alpha_D}$$
 ; $\alpha_D \sim 0.095$, $D_c \sim 5.4 \times 10^{13}$ (tokens)


Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models [Kaplan et al '20]

- Summary of Scaling Laws
 - 3. When training with a limited amount of compute, a sufficiently large dataset, an optimally-sized model, and a sufficiently small batch size (making optimal use of compute):


$$L(C_{\min}) = (C_c^{\min}/C_{\min})^{\alpha_C^{\min}}; \quad \alpha_C^{\min} \sim 0.050, \quad C_c^{\min} \sim 3.1 \times 10^8 \text{ (PF-days)}$$

These relations hold across eight orders of magnitude in C_{\min} , six orders of magnitude in N , and over two orders of magnitude in D

Contents

- Pretrained language models
 - BERT/RoBERTa/ALBERT/UniLM/BART
- Large-scale pretrained language models
 - T5/GPT3
- Knowledge-enhanced & Memory-Augmented  pretrained language models
 - Entity-level memory augmentation: KnowBERT/EAE
 - Relational memory augmentation: FAE/JAKET
 - Contextual memory augmentation: KNN LM/ Taking notes
 - Lexicon-level memory augmentation: LIBERT
 - Corpus memory augmentation: REALM/RAG/COMET
- Reasoning-enhanced pretrained language models
- Evaluation of knowledge-enhanced language models

KnowBert [Peters et al '19]




- 1) projection: $H_i^{proj} = H_i W_1^{proj} + b_1^{proj}$
- 2) self-attentive pooling over all word pieces in mention $\rightarrow S$
- 3) mention span self-attention $\rightarrow S^e$

$$S^e = \text{TransformerBlock}(S)$$

- 4) perform soft entity linking

$$\psi_{mk} = \text{MLP}(p_{mk}, s_m^e \cdot e_{mk}) \quad \tilde{\psi}_{mk} = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(\psi_{mk})}{\sum_{\psi_{mk} \geq \delta} \exp(\psi_{mk})}, & \psi_{mk} \geq \delta \\ 0, & \psi_{mk} < \delta. \end{cases}$$

Entity linking dataset
아 있을 경우 여기에
추가 loss 발생



- 4') weighted average entity embeddings \tilde{E} using soft entity linking

$$\tilde{e}_m = \sum_k \tilde{\psi}_{mk} e_{mk}$$

Mention span 갯수

- (5) Knowledge-enhance the span representations $S'^e \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times E}$

$$s_m'^e = s_m^e + \tilde{e}_m$$

- (6) Recontextualization $H_i'^{proj} = \text{MLP}(\text{MultiHeadAttn}(H_i^{proj}, S'^e, S'^e))$

- (7) projected back to the BERT dimension $H'_i = H_i'^{proj} W_2^{proj} + b_2^{proj} + H_i$

KnowBert [Peters et al ‘19]

Algorithm 1: KnowBert training method

Input: Pretrained BERT and J KBs

Output: KnowBert

for $j = 1 \dots J$ **do**

 Compute entity embeddings for KB_j

if EL supervision available **then**

 Freeze all network parameters except
 those in (Eq. 1–3)

 Train to convergence using (Eq. 4) or
 (Eq. 5)

end

 Initialize $\mathbf{W}_2^{\text{proj}}$ as $(\mathbf{W}_1^{\text{proj}})^{-1}$

 Unfreeze all parameters except entity
 embeddings

 Minimize

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{KnowBert}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{BERT}} + \sum_{i=1}^j \mathcal{L}_{\text{EL}_i}$$

end

KnowBert [Peters et al '19]

- Masked LM perplexity

System	PPL	Wikidata MRR	# params. masked LM	# params. KAR	# params. entity embed.	Fwd. / Bwd. time
BERT _{BASE}	5.5	0.09	110	0	0	0.25
BERT _{LARGE}	4.5	0.11	336	0	0	0.75
KnowBert-Wiki	4.3	0.26	110	2.4	141	0.27
KnowBert-WordNet	4.1	0.22	110	4.9	265	0.31
KnowBert-W+W	3.5	0.31	110	7.3	406	0.33

KnowBert [Peters et al ‘19]

WSD

System	F ₁
WN-first sense baseline	65.2
ELMo	69.2
BERT _{BASE}	73.1
BERT _{LARGE}	73.9
KnowBert-WordNet	74.9
KnowBert-W+W	75.1

Entity linking

System	AIDA-A	AIDA-B
Daiber et al. (2013)	49.9	52.0
Hoffart et al. (2011)	68.8	71.9
Kolitsas et al. (2018)	86.6	82.6
KnowBert-Wiki	80.2	74.4
KnowBert-W+W	82.1	73.7

KnowBert [Peters et al '19]

TACRED relationship
extraction

System	LM	P	R	F ₁
Zhang et al. (2018)	—	69.9	63.3	66.4
Alt et al. (2019)	GPT	70.1	65.0	67.4
Shi and Lin (2019)	BERT _{BASE}	73.3	63.1	67.8
Zhang et al. (2019)	BERT _{BASE}	70.0	66.1	68.0
Soares et al. (2019)	BERT _{LARGE}	—	—	70.1
Soares et al. (2019)	BERT _{LARGE} [†]	—	—	71.5
KnowBert-W+W	BERT _{BASE}	71.6	71.4	71.5

SemEval 2010 Task 8
relationship extraction

System	LM	F ₁
Wang et al. (2016)	—	88.0
Wang et al. (2019b)	BERT _{BASE}	89.0
Soares et al. (2019)	BERT _{LARGE}	89.2
Soares et al. (2019)	BERT _{LARGE} [†]	89.5
KnowBert-W+W	BERT _{BASE}	89.1

KnowBert [Peters et al ‘19]

Test set results for the
WiC dataset

System	Accuracy
ELMo [†]	57.7
BERT _{BASE} [†]	65.4
BERT _{LARGE} [†]	65.5
BERT _{LARGE} ^{††}	69.5
KnowBert-W+W	70.9

Entity typing

System	P	R	F ₁
UFET	68.8	53.3	60.1
BERT _{BASE}	76.4	71.0	73.6
ERNIE	78.4	72.9	75.6
KnowBert-W+W	78.6	73.7	76.1

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Pre-trained language models (PLM)
 - Struggle to grasp world knowledge, concepts and relations, which are very important in language understanding (Poerner et al., 2019; Talmor et al., 2019).
- Knowledge graphs (KGs)
 - Represent entities and relations in a structural way
 - Solve the sparsity problem in text modeling
 - E.g.)
 - a language model may require tens of instances of the phrase “labrador is a kind of dog” in its training corpus before it implicitly learns this fact.
 - In comparison, a knowledge graph can use two entity nodes “labrador”, “dog” and a relation edge “is a” between these nodes to precisely represent this fact

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Previous works on **integrating knowledge graphs into language model pretraining**
 - Most approaches combine token representations in PLM with representations of aligned KG entities
 - Problems:
 - The entity embeddings are either pre-computed from an external source by a separate model (Zhang et al., 2019; Peters et al., 2019), which may not easily align with the language representation space,
 - Or directly learned as model parameters (Fevry et al., 2020; Verga et al., 2020), ' which will cause an over-parameterization issue due to the large number of entities
 - All the previous works share a common challenge: **Domain adaptation**
 - when the pre-trained model is fine-tuned in a new domain with a previously unseen knowledge graph, it struggles to adapt to the new entities, relations and structure

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- JAKET: a Joint pre-trAining framework for KnowledgeE graph and Text
 - Contains a **knowledge module** and a **language module**, which mutually assist each other
 - By providing required information to achieve more effective semantic analysis.
 - 1) Knowledge module
 - Leverages a **graph attention network** (Velickovic et al., 2017) to provide structure-aware entity embeddings for language modeling
 - 2) Language module
 - Produces **contextual representations as initial embeddings** for KG entities and relations given their descriptive text
 - Thus, in both modules, content understanding is based on **related knowledge and rich context**
 - On one hand, the joint pre-training **effectively projects entities/relations and text into a shared semantic latent space.**
 - On the other hand, as the knowledge module produces representations from descriptive text, it **solves the over-parameterization issue since entity embeddings are no longer part of the model's parameters.**

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- JAKET

- Propose a novel two-step language module LM1 + LM2.
 - Solve the cyclic dependency between the two modules
 - step1) LM1 provides embeddings for both LM2 and KG.
 - step2) The entity embeddings from KG are also fed into LM2, which produces the final representation.
 - LM1 and LM2
 - can be easily established as the first several transformer layers and the rest layers of a pre-trained language model such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019b).
- Design an entity context embedding memory
 - Based on periodic update which speeds up the pre-training by 15x


JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- JAKET

- Can easily adapt to unseen knowledge graphs in the finetuning phase.
- As the initial embeddings of entities and relations come from their descriptive text, JAKET is not confined to any fixed KG.
- With the learned ability to integrate structural information during pre-training, the framework is extensible to novel knowledge graphs with previously unseen entities and relations

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- A simple illustration on the novelty of our proposed model JAKET.



JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]


- Related work: integrate knowledge into PLMs
 - 1. Explicitly injecting entity representation into language model
 - The representations are either pre-computed from external sources (Zhang et al., 2019; Peters et al., 2019) or directly learned as model parameters (Fevry et al., 2020; Verga et al., 2020).
 - E.g.) ERNIE (THU) (Zhang et al., 2019) pre-trains the entity embeddings on a knowledge graph using TransE (Bordes et al., 2013)
 - » EAE (Fevry et al., 2020) learns the representation from pre-training objectives with all the ' model parameters

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Related work: integrate knowledge into PLMs
 - 2. Implicitly modeling knowledge information,
 - Including entity-level masked language modeling (Sun et al., 2019b; Shen et al., 2020), entity-based replacement prediction (Xiong et al., 2019) and knowledge embedding loss as regularization (Wang et al., 2019b).
 - E.g.) besides token-level masked language modeling,
 - ERNIE (Baidu) (Sun et al., 2019b): uses [phrase-level and entity-level masking to predict all the masked slots](#).
 - KEPLER (Wang et al., 2019b): [calculates entity embeddings using a pre-trained language model based on the description text](#), which is similar to our work.

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- A demonstration for the structure of JAKET, where the language module is on the left side marked green while the knowledge module is on the right side marked blue



JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Definition

- $\mathcal{KG} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T})$: A knowledge graph
- $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1 \dots e_N\}$: the set of entities
- $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1 \dots r_P\}$: The set of relations
- $\mathcal{T} = \{(e_{t_i^1}, r_{t_i^2}, e_{t_i^3}) | 1 \leq i \leq T, e_{t_i^1}, e_{t_i^3} \in \mathcal{E}, r_{t_i^2} \in \mathcal{R}\}$
 - stands for the set of head-relation-tail triplets
- $N_v = \{(r, u) | (v, r, u) \in \mathcal{T}\}$: represents the set of neighboring relations and entities of an entity v
- $\mathcal{V} = \{[\text{MASK}], [\text{CLS}], [\text{EOS}], w_1 \dots w_V\}$: a vocabulary of tokens
- $\mathbf{X} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_L]$: a sequence of tokens

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Definition

- $\mathbf{m} = [m_1, \dots, m_M]$: a list of entity mentions in the text \mathbf{x}
 - $m_i = (e_{m_i}, s_{m_i}, o_{m_i})$: i-th mention
 - $[x_{s_{m_i}}, \dots, x_{o_{m_i}}]$ is linked with entity e_{m_i}
- Use **entity description text** to describe the concept and meaning of entities
- \mathbf{X}^{e_i} : a description text for each entity e_i
- $m^{e_i} = (e_i, s_i^e, o_i^e)$: The mention of e_i in \mathbf{x}^{e_i}
- E.g.) The description text for the entity “sun”
 - “[CLS] The Sun is the star at the center of the Solar System [EOS]”
- $m^{Sun} = (Sun, 3, 3)$
- Similarly, we define **relation description text** as the text that can describe each relation.

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Knowledge module: Model the knowledge graph to generate **knowledge-based entity representations**.
 - Employ the graph attention network (GAT) (Velickovic et al., 2017),
 - Uses the self-attention mechanism to specify different weights for different neighboring nodes
 - To leverage the multi-relational information, adopt the idea of **composition operator** (Vashishth et al., 2019) to compose entity embeddings and relation embeddings.
 - in the l-th layer of LM, we update the embedding $E_v^{(l)}$ of entity v:

$$E_v^{(l)} = \text{LayerNorm} \left(\bigoplus_{k=1}^K \sigma \left(\sum_{(r,u) \in \mathcal{N}_v} \alpha_{v,r,u}^k W^k f(E_u^{(l-1)}, R_r) \right) + E_v^{(l-1)} \right)$$
$$\alpha_{v,r,u}^k = \frac{\exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\mathbf{a}^T \left[W^k E_v^{(l-1)} \oplus W^k f(E_u^{(l-1)}, R_r) \right] \right) \right)}{\sum_{(r',u') \in \mathcal{N}_v} \exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\mathbf{a}^T \left[W^k E_u^{(l-1)} \oplus W^k f(E_{u'}^{(l-1)}, R_{r'}) \right] \right) \right)}$$

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Knowledge module

- $f(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^F \times \mathbb{R}^F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^F$: merges a pair of entity and relation embeddings into one representation
- Here, set $f(x, y) = x + y$ inspired by TransE
- The initial entity embeddings $E^{(0)}$ and relation embeddings R : **Generated from our language module**
- E^{KM} : the final entity representations, which are the output entity embeddings from the last GAT layer

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Language module
 - Model text data and learn context-aware representations.
 - The language module can be any model for language understanding
 - e.g) BERT (Devlin et al., 2018).
 - In this work, we use pre-trained model [RoBERTa-base](#) (Liu et al., 2019b) as the language module

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Solving the cyclic dependency
 - The knowledge and language modules mutually benefit each other
 - There exists a cyclic dependency which prevents computation and optimization in this design.
 - Propose a decomposed language module which includes two language models: LM1 and LM2
 - Employ the first 6 layers of RoBERTa as LM1 and the remaining 6 layers as LM2

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Solving the cyclic dependency
 - 1. LM_1 operates on the input text \mathbf{x} and generates contextual embeddings Z .
 - 2. LM_1 generates initial entity and relation embeddings for KM given description text.
 - 3. KM produces its output entity embeddings to be combined with Z and sent into LM_2 .
 - 4. LM_2 produces the final embeddings of \mathbf{x} , which includes both contextual and knowledge information

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Step1. LM_1 operates on the input text x and generates contextual embeddings Z .
 - X^{embed} : embed the context x
 $Z = LM_1(X^{embed})$
- Step2. LM_1 generates initial entity and relation embeddings for KM given description text.
 - \mathbf{X}^{e_j} : the entity description text for entity e_j
 - $m^{e_j} = (e_j, s_j^e, o_j^e)$: the corresponding mention
 - LM_1 takes the embedding of \mathbf{x}^{e_j} and produces the contextual embedding Z^{e_j} .
 - $E_j^{(0)} = (Z_{s_j^e}^{e_j} + Z_{o_j^e}^{e_j})/2$: used as the initial entity embedding of e_j
 - The knowledge graph relation embeddings R are generated in a similar way using its description text.

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

– Step3. KM produces its output entity embeddings to be combined with Z and sent into LM_2 .

- Computes the final entity embeddings E^{KM} , which is then combined with the output Z from LM_1
- $\mathbf{m} = [m_1, \dots, m_M]$: the mentions in \mathbf{x}

$$Z_k^{merge} = \begin{cases} Z_k + E_{e_{m_i}}^{KM} & \text{if } \exists i \text{ s.t. } s_{m_i} \leq k \leq o_{m_i} \\ Z_k & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

the output embedding of entity e_{m_i} from KM

$$Z' = \text{LayerNorm}(Z^{merge})$$

- Finally, Z' is fed into LM_2

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Step4. KM produces its output entity embeddings to be combined with Z and sent into LM_2 .
 - LM_2 operates on the input Z' and obtains the final embeddings

$$Z^{LM} = LM_2(Z')$$

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Entity context embedding memory
 - Issue: Many knowledge graphs contain a large number of entities.
 - even for one sentence, the number of entities plus their multi-hop neighbors can grow exponentially with the number of layers in the graph neural network
 - As a result, it's very time-consuming for the language module to compute context embeddings based on the description text of all involved entities in a batch on the fly.
 - $E^{context}$: an entity context embedding memory
 - to store the initial embeddings of all KG entities.
 - Firstly, the language module **pre-computes the context embeddings for all entities and place them into the memory**
 - The knowledge module only needs to retrieve required embeddings from the memory instead of computing them

$$E^{(0)} \leftarrow E^{context}$$

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Entity context embedding memory
 - But, there is an undesired discrepancy:
 - As embeddings in the memory are computed from the “old” (initial) language module while the token embeddings during training are computed from the updated language module
 - Propose to update the whole embedding memory $E^{context}$ with the current language module every $T(i)$ steps

$$I_{init} = 10, a = 2, r = 3, I_{max} = 500$$

$$T(i) = \min(I_{init} * a^{\lfloor i/r \rfloor}, I_{max})$$

the initial number of steps before the first update

the maximum number of steps between updates

a: the increasing ratio of updating interval

r: the number of repeated times of the current updating interval

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Entity context embedding memory
 - Propose a momentum update to make $E^{context}$ evolve more smoothly

$$E^{context} \leftarrow mE^{context} + (1 - m)E_{new}^{context}$$

- This memory design **speeds up our model by about 15x during pre-training** while keeping the effectiveness of entity context embeddings
- For consideration of efficiency, we use relation embeddings only during fine-tuning.

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

• Pretraining

Entity category prediction. The knowledge module is trained to predict the category label of entities based on the output entity embeddings E^{KM} . The loss function is cross-entropy for multi-class classification, denoted as \mathcal{L}_c .

Relation type prediction. KM is also trained to predict the relation type between a given entity pair based on E^{KM} . The loss function is cross-entropy for multi-class classification, denoted as \mathcal{L}_r .

Then, we uniformly sample a batch of text sequences and their entities for the following two tasks.

Masked token prediction. Similar to BERT, We randomly mask tokens in the sequence and predict the original tokens based on the output Z^{LM} of language module. We denote the loss as \mathcal{L}_t .

Masked entity prediction. The language module is also trained to predict the corresponding entity of a given mention. For the input text, we randomly remove 15% of the mentions \mathbf{m} . Then for each removed mention $m_r = (e_r, s_r, o_r)$, the model predicts the masked entity e_r based on the mention's embedding. In detail, it predicts the entity whose embedding in E^{context} is closest to $q = g((Z_{s_r}^{\text{LM}} + Z_{o_r}^{\text{LM}})/2)$, where $g(x) = \text{ReLU}(xW_1)W_2$ is a transformation function. Since the number of entities can be very large, we use e_r 's neighbours and other randomly sampled entities as negative samples. The loss function \mathcal{L}_e is cross entropy based on the inner product between q and each candidate entity's embedding. Figure 2 shows an concrete example, where the mention "Earth" is not marked in the input text since it's masked and the task is to link the mention "Earth" to entity "Q2: Earth".

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Fine-tuning

- Our model supports using either the knowledge graph employed during pretraining or a novel custom knowledge graph with previously unseen entities
- If a custom KG is used, the entity context embedding memory is recomputed by the pre-trained language module using the new entity description text.
- In this work, we do not update the entity context memory during fine-tuning for consideration of efficiency.
- We also compute the relation context embedding memory using the pre-trained language model.

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Experiment

- Accuracy results on the dev set of FewRel 1.0.

- * indicates the results are taken from Gao et al. (2019).
 - PAIR is the framework proposed by Gao et al. (2019).

Model	5-way 1-shot	5-way 5-shot	10-way 1-shot
PAIR (BERT)*	85.7	89.5	76.8
PAIR (RoBERTa)	86.4	90.3	77.3
PAIR (RoBERTa+GNN)	86.3	-	-
PAIR (RoBERTa+GNN+M)	86.9	-	-
PAIR (JAKET)	87.4	92.1	78.9

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Experiment

- Results on the MetaQA dataset over 1- hop and 2-hop questions under KG-Full and KG50% settings.

Model	KG-Full		KG-50%	
	1-hop	2-hop	1-hop	2-hop
RoBERTa	90.2	70.8	61.5	39.3
RoB+G+M	91.4	72.6	62.5	40.8
JAKET	93.9	73.2	63.1	41.9

JAKET: Joint Pre-training of Knowledge Graph and Language Understanding [Yu et al' 20]

- Experiment
 - Results on the entity classification task over an unseen Wikidata knowledge graph.
 - RoB+G+M is the abbreviation for the baseline model RoBERTa+GNN+M.

Model	100%	20%	5%
GNN	48.2	-	-
RoBERTa	33.4	-	-
RoB+G+M	79.1	66.7	53.5
JAKET	81.6	70.6	58.4

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]


- Entities as Experts (EAE)
 - Access distinct memories of the entities mentioned in a piece of text
 - Capture sufficient knowledge to answer TriviaQA questions
 - E.g.) “Which Dr. Who villain has been played by Roger Delgado, Anthony Ainley, Eric Roberts?”
 - The discrete and independent entity representations in EAE make it more **modular and interpretable** than the Transformer architecture on which it is based.
- EAE: Experimental results
 - Outperforms a Transformer model with 30× the parameters
 - Contains more factual knowledge than a similar sized BERT
 - Associating parameters with specific entities means that EAE only needs to access a fraction of its parameters at inference time
 - The correct identification, and representation, of entities is essential to EAE’s performance

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- The goal:
 - Focus on developing neural sequence models that capture the knowledge required to answer questions about the world
- Entities as Experts (EAE)
 - A new model architecture that can access distinct and independent representations of the entities mentioned in text
 - Does **not rely on an external knowledge base** for its entity representations, and **instead learns them directly from text along with all the other model parameters**
 - Unlike other efforts to inject entity specific knowledge into sequence models (such as KnowBERT)
 - The name is related to the Massive Mixture of Experts [Shazeer '17]
 - And other work that integrates learned memory stores into sequence models (Weston et al., 2014; Lample et al., 2019).
 - Highlights the fact that **EAE's memory store represents each entity distinctly and independently**

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Férvy et al '20]

The necessity for distinct and independent entity representations



- A traditional Transformer:
Need to build an internal representation of Charles Darwin from the words "Charles" and "Darwin", both of which can also be used in reference to very different entities such as the Charles River, or Darwin City
- EAE:
 - can access a dedicated representation of "Charles Darwin", which is a memory of all of the contexts in which this entity has previously been mentioned
 - can also be accessed for other mentions of Darwin, such as "Charles Robert Darwin" or "the father of natural selection"

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Entities as Experts (EAE): Training
 - MaskLM: predict masked out spans in English Wikipedia text
 - Train EAE to only access memories for entity mentions, and to access the correct memories for each entity mention
 - Supervision for the memory access comes from an existing mention detector, and Wikipedia hyperlinks
 - Sparse memory access
 - By associating memories with specific entities, EAE can learn to access them sparsely.
 - The memory is only accessed for spans that mention entities.
 - Furthermore, only the memories associated with the entities mentioned need to be retrieved

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Definition

- $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1 \dots e_N\}$: a predefined set of entities
 - $\mathcal{V} = \{[\text{MASK}], w_1 \dots w_M\}$: a vocabulary of tokens
 - $\mathbf{x} = [x_0 \dots x_L]$: A context, which is a sequence of tokens
 $x_i \in \mathcal{V}$
 - $\mathbf{m} = [m_0 \dots m_M]$: the list of the mentions
 - $m_i = (e_{m_i}, s_{m_i}, t_{m_i})$: Each mention
(linked entity, start index, end index)
 - e_\emptyset : the null entity
- $$e_{m_i} \in \mathcal{E} \cup e_\emptyset$$

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Férvy et al '20]

- Model Architecture
 - Transformer, interleaved with our entity memory layer.
 - Two embedding matrices – token and entity embeddings

$$\mathbf{X}^0 = \text{TokenEmbed}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$\mathbf{X}^1 = \text{Transformer}(\mathbf{X}^0, \text{num_layers} = l_0)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^2 = \text{EntityMemory}(\mathbf{X}^1)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^3 = \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{X}^2 + \mathbf{X}^1)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^4 = \text{Transformer}(\mathbf{X}^3, \text{num_layers} = l_1)$$


$$\mathbf{X}^5 = \text{TaskSpecificHeads}(\mathbf{X}^4)$$

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

(iii) to construct input to the next transformer layer, augmented with the retrieved entity embeddings of (ii)

(iv) The final transformer block output is connected to task specific heads: token prediction and entity prediction

Q1035: Charles Darwin



Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Entity Memory Layer
 - constructs an entity embedding E_{m_i} for each mention m_i
 - \mathbf{E} : a matrix of learned entity embeddings of shape (N, d_{ent})
 - $\text{EntEmbed}(e_i)$ maps an entity e_i to its row in \mathbf{E}
 - Takes the output sequence from the preceding transformer layer (\mathbf{X}^l) and outputs a new sequence (\mathbf{X}^{l+1}), sparsely populated with entity representations
 - The output sequence has an entity representation, a projection of the weighted sum of entity embeddings in \mathbf{E} , at position s_{m_i}

$$x_i^{l+1} = \mathbf{W}_b E_{m_k} \quad \text{if } i = s_{m_k}$$

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Férvy et al '20]

- Entity Memory Layer

- To generate E_{m_i} for each mention m_i

- Generate a pseudo entity embedding h_{m_i} :

$$h_{m_i} = \mathbf{W}_f[x_{s_{m_i}}^l || x_{t_{m_i}}^l]$$

- Find the k nearest entity embeddings of h_{m_i} :

$$E_{m_i} = \sum_{e_j \in \text{topK}(\mathcal{E}, h_{m_i}, k)} \alpha_j \cdot (\text{EntEmbed}(e_j))$$

$$\alpha_j = \frac{\exp(\text{EntEmbed}(e_j) \cdot h_{m_i})}{\sum_{e \in \text{topK}(\mathcal{E}, h_{m_i}, k)} \exp(\text{EntEmbed}(e) \cdot h_{m_i})}$$

Returns the k entities that yield the highest score $\text{EntEmbed}(e_j) \cdot h_{m_i}$

- When $k = 1$, E_{m_i} is the nearest entity embedding to h_{m_i} (argmax)
- when $k = N$, it is a weighted sum of all entity embeddings.

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Entity Memory Layer

- Task-Specific Heads

- Connected to multiple task specific heads

- 1) TokenPrediction

- Predicts masked tokens for a cloze task.

- Feed each masked token's final representation x_i^4 to an output softmax over the token vocabulary, as in BERT.

- 2) EntityPrediction

- Predicts entity id for each entity mention span (i.e., entity linking).

- Build the pseudo entity embedding (h_{m_i}) from the last sequence output (X^4) (as in Entity Memory Layer)

- Predicts the entity whose embedding in E is the closest to the pseudo entity embedding

- Inference-time Mention Detection

- A mention detection layer

- Applies a three-way BIO classifier to the first transformer block's output

- Decode the entire BIO sequence directly, ensuring that inconsistent sequences are disallowed

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Learning objective

- Entity linking

$$e_i \neq e_{\emptyset}$$

- For each hyperlinked mention $m_i = (e_{m_i}, s_{m_i}, t_{m_i})$
 - The pseudo embedding h_{m_i} (Equation. 2) should be close to the entity embedding of the annotated entity $\text{EntEmbed}(e_{m_i})$

$$\text{ELLoss} = \sum_{m_i} \alpha_i \cdot \mathbb{1}_{e_{m_i} \neq e_{\emptyset}}$$

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\exp(\text{EntEmbed}(e_{m_i}) \cdot h_{m_i})}{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(\text{EntEmbed}(e) \cdot h_{m_i})}$$

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Learning objective
 - Mention detection
 - Supervise the three-way BIO classification of tokens with a cross-entropy loss over the labels
 - Assume that the mention boundaries in the corpus D are complete, and apply this supervision to all tokens.
 - Masked Language Modelling
 - Train the `TokenPrediction` head to independently predict each of the masked out tokens in an input context.

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Knowledge Probing Tasks
 - Predicting Wikipedia Hyperlinks
 - Predict entities and their text when they are masked
 - LAMA
 - Aims to probe the knowledge contained in a language model, with a focus on the type of knowledge that has traditionally been manually encoded in knowledge bases
 - But, EAE is not very well suited to:
 - The LAMA ConceptNet sub-task, which include nonentity answers such as “fly”, “cry”, and “happy”.
 - Google-RE, a third of the answers are dates, which we also do not predict well.
 - Nonetheless, we include these sub-tasks for completeness.
 - Open-domain QA
 - TriviaQA

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Experimental results
 - Predicting entities in context

Model	Params	Entity Acc	Token	
			Acc	PPL
MM-Base	110m	-	45.9	18.0
MM-Large	340m	-	53.4	10.3
EAE-unsup	366m	-	46.9	16.9
No EAE	366m	58.6	45.0	19.3
EAE	367m	61.8	56.9	11.0

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Experimental results
 - Results on the LAMA probe

Model	Params	ConceptNet	RE	SQuAD	T-REx	Avg.
BERT-base	110m	15.6	9.8	14.1	31.1	17.7
BERT-large	340m	19.2	10.5	17.4	32.3	19.9
MM-Base	110m	11.0	9.6	17.2	30.6	17.1
MM-Large	340m	12.4	6.5	24.4	31.4	18.7
EAE-unsup	366m	10.6	8.4	23.1	30.0	18.0
No EAE	366m	10.3	9.2	18.5	31.8	17.4
EAE	367m	10.7	9.4	22.4	37.4	20.0

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Férvy et al '20]

- Experimental results

- Exact Match open-domain factoid question answering on TriviaQA

Name	# Params	Unfiltered-Dev	Wiki-Test
<i>Open-Book</i> Approaches: Retrieval + Span Prediction			
BM25 + BERT Lee et al. (2019)	110m	47.2	-
ORQA Lee et al. (2019)	330m	45.1	-
GraphRetriever Min et al. (2019b)	110m	55.4	-
<i>Closed-Book</i> Approaches: Generation (Roberts et al., 2020)			
T5-Base	220m	-	29.1
T5-Large	770m	-	35.9
T5-3B	3B	-	43.4
T5-11B	11B	42.3	50.1
<i>Closed-Book</i> Approaches: Entity Prediction			
RELIC Ling et al. (2020)	3B	35.7	-
No EAE	366m	37.7	-
EAE	367m	43.2	53.4


Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Férvy et al '20]

- Experimental results
 - Impact of varying the number of retrieved entity embeddings (K) in the Entity Memory layer at inference on the entity prediction and TriviaQA tasks


K	Entity acc	Tok acc	Tok PPL	TQA
1	59.2	56.7	18.0	40.1
10	61.7	57.2	11.1	43.1
100	61.8	57.1	11.0	43.2
Full (10^6)	61.8	56.9	11.0	43.4

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]


- Experimental results
 - Performance on TriviaQA's Unfiltered Dev set for GraphRetriever, T5 and our EAE model



The frequency of the answer entity in the Wikipedia corpus (NA if not an entity),



The number of named entity mentions in the question



The number of tokens in the question

Entities as Experts: Sparse Memory Access with Entity Supervision [Février et al '20]

- Experimental results
 - Comparing prediction overlap and oracle accuracy on TriviaQA

Systems	Oracle Acc.	Pred Overlap (%)
T5 & EAE	55.9	29.3
T5 & GR	66.4	30.1
EAE & GR	64.6	33.6
ORQA & GR	63.8	39.6

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Massive language models
 - The core of modern NLP modeling
 - Have been shown to encode impressive amounts of commonsense and factual information.
 - However, it is the knowledge stored as parameters
 - That knowledge exists only within the latent parameters of the model, inaccessible to inspection and interpretation, and even worse,
 - factual information memorized from the training corpora is likely to become stale as the world changes
 - will also inevitably exhibit all of the biases inherent in the source materials

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- This work
 - Develop a neural language model that includes an explicit interface **between symbolically interpretable factual information and subsymbolic neural knowledge**
 - Results
 - This model dramatically improves performance on two knowledge-intensive question-answering tasks
 - The model can be **updated without re-training** by manipulating its symbolic representations
 - This model **allows us to add new facts and overwrite existing ones** in ways that are not possible for earlier models.

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- LM as KRR (knowledge representation and reasoning) models
 - Why a model outputs a correct answer; → Three possible explanations
 - 1) The model has **successfully performed some reasoning or generalization** required to make a novel inference,
 - 2) the dataset contains some statistical biases that the model is exploiting, or
 - 3) the model has **memorized the exact answer, potentially from pretraining data** that overlaps with the test cases. In short, knowledge encoded only in a LM's parameters is generally opaque.

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]


- Proposal
 - Propose an interface **between explicit, symbolically bound memories and sub-symbolic distributed neural models**
 - Important benefits:
 - 1) make more of a language model's behavior interpretable
 - 2) there is a massive amount of useful information that has been **created and curated in structured databases**.
 - Sometimes this information either does not occur in text at all (such as a new product that hasn't come out yet) or is very difficult to interpret from the text (such as in scientific, technical, or legal documents)
 - 3) **Pre-trained language models appear to require training on very large corpora** to obtain good factual coverage—and the massive web corpora required by these data-hungry models
 - Contain huge amounts of sexist, racist, and incorrect assertions (Bolukbasi et al., 2016; Sun et al., 2019b)
 - Our approach: makes it possible to **obtain better factual coverage of assertions chosen from selected trusted sources, by inserting this trusted factual content into the symbolic memory**

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Proposal
 - Incorporate an external fact memory into a neural language model.
 - This model forms its predictions by integrating contextual embeddings with retrieved knowledge from an external memory, where those memories are bound to symbolic facts which can be added and modified.

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Facts-as-Experts model architecture



Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Definitions

- \mathcal{K} : a Knowledge Base as a set of triples (s, r, o)
$$s, o \in \mathcal{E} \quad r \in \mathcal{R}$$
- $\{p_1, \dots, p_{|C|}\}$: A text corpus C is a collection of paragraphs
- \mathcal{M} : the set of entity mentions in the corpus C
- m_i : the mention defined as (e_m, s_m^p, t_m^p)
 - Entity e_m is mentioned in paragraph p starting from the token at position s_m^p and ends on t_m^p
 - The superscript p is usually dropped

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Input
 - The pretraining input is constructed as **cloze-type Question Answering (QA) task**.
 - $p = \{w_1, \dots, w_{|p|}\}$: Given a paragraph
 - $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$: mentions
 - Pick a mention m_i and replace all tokens from s_{m_i} to t_{m_i} with a special [MASK] token.
 - Task: Consider **the entity in E named by the masked entity to be the answer to the cloze question q** .
 - **Context mentions**: Mentions in the paragraph other than this masked entity
 - E.g.) in the cloze question, {'Charles', 'Darwin', 'was', 'born', 'in', [MASK], [MASK], 'in', '1809', '.', 'His', 'proposition', ... },
 - "Charles Darwin" is a **context entity** in mention $m_1 = ('Charles Darwin', 1, 2)$
 - "United Kingdom" is the **answer entity** in the masked mention $m_{ans} = ('United Kingdom', 6, 7)$.

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Entity-aware Contextual Embeddings
 - Follow the Entities-as-Experts (EaE) model to train an **external entity memory**
 - EaE inputs a paragraph (or question) containing unlinked entities with known boundaries
 - $q = \{w_1, \dots, w_{|q|}\}$: Given a question
 - $m_i = (e_{m_i}, s_{m_i}, t_{m_i})$: a list of context mentions
 - e_{ans} : the answer from the masked mention $m_{ans} = (e_{ans}, s_{ans}, t_{ans})$
 - The **contextual embedding**:

$$\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{|q|}^{(l)} = \text{Transformer}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{|q|}\})$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Entity-aware Contextual Embeddings

- The **contextual embedding**:

- used to **compute query vectors** that interface with an external entity memory $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d_e}$

- To construct a query vector $\mathbf{c}_{m_i} = \mathbf{h}_j^{(T)}$

- Compute the attention weights over the embeddings of the full entity vocabulary

The attention weighted
sum of entity embeddings

entity-aware contextual query

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{h}_{m_i}^{(l)} = \mathbf{W}_e^T [\mathbf{h}_{s_{m_i}}^{(l)}; \mathbf{h}_{t_{m_i}}^{(l)}] \\ \mathbf{u}_{m_i}^{(l)} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{h}_{m_i}^{(l)}, \mathbf{E}) \times \mathbf{E} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_j^{(l+1)} = \mathbf{h}_j^{(l)} + \mathbf{W}_2^T \mathbf{u}_{m_i}^{(l)}, \quad s_{m_i} < j < t_{m_i} \end{array} \right.$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Entity-aware Contextual Embeddings
 - Train this query vector with a cross-entropy loss against $I_{e_{m_i}}$

$$\hat{e}_{m_i} = \operatorname{argmax}_{e_i \in \mathcal{E}} (\mathbf{c}_{m_i}^T \mathbf{e}_i)$$

$$\text{loss}_{\text{ctx}} = \text{cross_entropy}(\text{softmax}(\mathbf{c}_{m_i}, \mathbf{E}), \mathbb{I}_{e_{m_i}})$$

- Supervision on the intermediate entity access is beneficial for learning entity-aware contextual embeddings

$$\text{loss}_{\text{ent}} = \text{cross_entropy}(\text{softmax}(\mathbf{h}_{m_i}^{(l)}, \mathbf{E}), \mathbb{I}_{e_{m_i}})$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Fact memory

- FaE: The external entity memory E from the EaE model and adds another fact memory which contains triples from the knowledge base K
- $a_j = (s, r) \in A$: a head pair the subject and relation pair
- $b_j = \{o_1, \dots, o_n\} \in B$: a tail set
- $\mathcal{K}' = (A, B)$: encoded as as a key-value memory
- $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d_e}$: the entity embeddings
- $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}| \times d_r}$: embeddings of relations R in the knowledge base K

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Fact memory

- Retrieve the **top k head pairs** with the largest inner product scores using the query vector

- This retrieval process is **distantly supervised**

- a head pair is a **distantly supervised positive example**

- $a_{ds} = (s, r)$ for a passage

- if its subject entity s is named by a context mention m_i and the masked entity e_{ans} is an element of the corresponding tail set $e_{ans} \in b_{ds}$

- $a_{ds} = (s_{null}, r_{null})$ (a null fact): For cases that no distantly supervised positive example exists for a passage

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Fact memory

- The distant supervision is encoded by a loss function:

$$\text{TOP}_k(\mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}}, \mathbf{A}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{k, j \in \{1, \dots, |A|\}} \mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$$

$$\text{loss}_{\text{fact}} = \text{cross_entropy}(\text{softmax}(\mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}}, \mathbf{A}), \mathbb{I}_{a_{\text{ds}}})$$

- The tail sets associated with the top k scored head pairs, i.e.

$$\{b_j | j \in \text{TOP}_k(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{A})\}$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Integrating Knowledge and Context
 - A tail set b_j returned from the fact memory
 - The set of entities $\{o_1, \dots, o_n\}$
 - $\mathbf{o}_i \in \mathbf{E}$: The embedding of entity o_i
 - Encode the returned tail set \mathbf{b}_j :

$$\mathbf{b}_j = \sum_{o_i \in b_j} \alpha_i \mathbf{o}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e}$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Integrating Knowledge and Context
 - Within-tail attention: Compute a second query vector $\mathbf{z}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$ to score the entities inside the tail set b_j

$$\mathbf{z}_{m_{\text{ans}}} = \mathbf{W}_b^T [\mathbf{h}_{s_{\text{ans}}}^{(T)}; \mathbf{h}_{t_{\text{ans}}}^{(T)}]$$

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{o}_i^T \mathbf{z}_{m_{\text{ans}}})}{\sum_{o_l \in b_j} \exp(\mathbf{o}_l^T \mathbf{z}_{m_{\text{ans}}})}$$

- The knowledge embedding for the masked mention m_{ans}

$$\mathbf{f}_{m_{\text{ans}}} = \sum_{j \in \text{TOP}_k(\mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}}, \mathbf{A})} \beta_j \mathbf{b}_j$$

$$\beta_j = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}})}{\sum_{t \in \text{TOP}_k(\mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}}, \mathbf{A})} \exp(\mathbf{a}_t^T \mathbf{v}_{m_{\text{ans}}})}$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Integrating Knowledge and Context
 - $\mathbf{f}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$: The **knowledge embedding** for m_{ans}
 - Intuitively, the result of retrieving a set of entities from the fact memory.
 - Learn to jointly use the contextual query $\mathbf{c}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$ and knowledge query $\mathbf{f}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$ to predict the masked entity
 - $\mathbf{q}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$: a **knowledge enhanced contextual query**
 $\lambda = P(y = a_{\text{null}})$ the integrated query

$$\mathbf{q}_{m_{\text{ans}}} = \lambda \cdot \mathbf{c}_{m_{\text{ans}}} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{f}_{m_{\text{ans}}}$$

$$\hat{e}_{\text{ans}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{e_i \in \mathcal{E}} (\mathbf{q}_{m_{\text{ans}}}^T \mathbf{e}_i)$$

↓
finally used to predict the masked entity

$$\text{loss}_{\text{ans}} = \text{cross_entropy}(\text{softmax}(\mathbf{q}_{m_{\text{ans}}}, \mathbf{E}), \mathbb{I}_{e_{\text{ans}}})$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Pretraining
 - FaE is jointly trained to predict context entities and the masked entity.
 - Context entities are predicted using the contextual embeddings
 - Intermediate supervision with oracle entity linking labels is provided in the entity memory access step for context entities;
 - The masked entity is predicted using the knowledge-enhanced contextual embeddings
 - Distant supervised fact labels are also provided at training time.
 - The final training loss is the unweighted sum of the four losses:

$$\text{loss}_{\text{pretrain}} = \text{loss}_{\text{ent}} + \text{loss}_{\text{ctx}} + \text{loss}_{\text{fact}} + \text{loss}_{\text{ans}}$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Finetuning on QA
 - At finetuning time, entity embeddings \mathbf{E} and relation embeddings \mathbf{R} are fixed
 - Finetune all transformer layers and the four transformation matrices $\mathbf{W}_a, \mathbf{W}_b, \mathbf{W}_e, \mathbf{W}_f$

$$\text{loss}_{\text{finetune}} = \text{loss}_{\text{fact}} + \text{loss}_{\text{ans}}$$

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

- Experiment results
 - Accuracy on FreebaseQA and WebQuestionsSP datasets

	FreebaseQA		WebQuestionsSP	
Data	Full Dataset	WikiData Answerable	Full Dataset	Wikidata Answerable
FOFE	37.0	-	67.6	-
EmQL	-	-	75.5	74.6
EaE	53.4	59.1	46.3	61.4
FaE (ours)	63.3	73.9	56.1	78.5
EaE no finetune	18.3	24.8	12.8	21.4
FaE (ours) no finetune	19.7	26.9	15.9	24.6

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

Analysis of the two datasets showed that many of the test answers also appear as answers to some training-set question: this is the case for 75.0% of answers in the test data for FreebaseQA, and 57.5% of the answers in WebQuestionsSP.

– Effects of Different Data Filtering

- **None**: has no filtering and is the same as the Full Dataset setting in table
- **Pretrain**: removes all entity pair overlap between the eval datasets (all splits) and the pretraining text and kb.
- **Fine-tune**: removes all entity pair overlap between the eval train and test splits.
- **All**: combines both pretrain and fine tune filtering.

	FreebaseQA				WebQuestionsSP			
Filter Type	None	Pretrain	Fine-tune	All	None	Pretrain	Fine-tune	All
EaE	53.4	45.2	45.8	28.6	46.3	45.4	30.9	29.4
FaE (ours)	63.3	57.5	56.5	48.0	56.1	55.4	40.7	39.2

Facts as Experts: Adaptable and Interpretable Neural Memory over Symbolic Knowledge [Verga et al' 20]

– Injecting New Facts into Memory

- without retraining any parameters of the model.


	FreebaseQA				WebQuestionsSP			
Filter Type	None	Pretrain	Fine-tune	All	None	Pretrain	Fine-tune	All
EaE	53.4	45.2	45.8	28.6	46.3	45.4	30.9	29.4
FaE (ours)	63.3	57.5	56.5	48.0	56.1	55.4	40.7	39.2

In the Inject Facts setting, the pretraining corpus and training KB are still Filtered, but [at inference time, new facts are injected into the models memory allowing it to recover most of the drop from the Full setting](#)

REALM: Retrieval-Augmented Language Model Pre-Training [Gua et al '20]

- In pretrained LM
 - The learned world knowledge is **stored implicitly** in the parameters of the underlying neural network.
 - Problems
 - This makes it difficult to determine what knowledge is stored in the network and where.
 - Storage space is limited by the size of the network—to **capture more world knowledge, one must train ever-larger networks**, which can be prohibitively slow or expensive.
- In REALM
 - Retrieval-Augmented Language Model (REALM) pre-training
 - Augments language model pre-training algorithms with a learned **textual knowledge retriever**.
 - This approach **explicitly exposes the role of world knowledge**, decide by asking what knowledge to retrieve and use during inference

REALM: Retrieval-Augmented Language Model Pre-Training [Gua et al '20]



REALM [Guu et al '20]

- REALM's generative process
 - Takes some input x and learns a distribution $p(y|x)$ over possible outputs y .
 - For pretraining
 - The task is masked language modeling
 - x is a sentence from a pre-training corpus X with some tokens masked out, and the model must predict the value of those missing tokens, y .
 - For fine-tuning, the task: Open-QA
 - x is a question, and y is the answer.

REALM [Gua et al '20]

- Decompose $p(y|x)$ into two steps: **retrieve, then predict**
- 1) Retrieve: $p(z | x)$
 - Given an input x , we first retrieve possibly helpful documents z from a knowledge corpus Z
 - Model this as a sample from the distribution $p(z | x)$
- 2) Predict: $p(y | x, z)$
 - Condition on both the retrieved z and the original input x to generate the output y
 - Treat z as a latent variable and marginalize over all possible documents z , yielding

$$p(y | x) = \sum_{z \in Z} p(y | z, x) p(z | x)$$

REALM [Gua et al '20]

- Model architecture
 - Knowledge Retriever

$$p(z | x) = \frac{\exp f(x, z)}{\sum_{z'} \exp f(x, z')},$$

$$f(x, z) = \text{Embed}_{\text{input}}(x)^\top \text{Embed}_{\text{doc}}(z),$$

$$\text{Embed}_{\text{input}}(x) = \mathbf{W}_{\text{input}} \text{BERT}_{\text{CLS}}(\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(x))$$

$$\text{Embed}_{\text{doc}}(z) = \mathbf{W}_{\text{doc}} \text{BERT}_{\text{CLS}}(\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(z_{\text{title}}, z_{\text{body}}))$$

$$\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(x) = [\text{CLS}] x [\text{SEP}]$$

$$\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(x_1, x_2) = [\text{CLS}] x_1 [\text{SEP}] x_2 [\text{SEP}]$$

REALM [Gua et al '20]

- Knowledge-Augmented Encoder: $p(y \mid z, x)$
 - Join x and z into a single sequence that we feed into a Transformer (distinct from the one used in the retriever), allowing us to perform rich crossattention between x and z before predicting y

$$p(y \mid z, x) = \prod_{j=1}^{J_x} p(y_j \mid z, x)$$

$$p(y_j \mid z, x) \propto \exp \left(w_j^\top \text{BERT}_{\text{MASK}(j)}(\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(x, z_{\text{body}})) \right)$$

REALM [Gua et al '20]

- Open-QA fine tuning
 - Assume that the answer y can be found as a contiguous sequence of tokens in some document z .
 - Let $S(z, y)$ be the set of spans matching y in z .


$$p(y | z, x) \propto \sum_{s \in S(z, y)} \exp \left(\text{MLP} \left(\left[h_{\text{START}(s)}; h_{\text{END}(s)} \right] \right) \right)$$

$$h_{\text{START}(s)} = \text{BERT}_{\text{START}(s)}(\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(x, z_{\text{body}})),$$

$$h_{\text{END}(s)} = \text{BERT}_{\text{END}(s)}(\text{join}_{\text{BERT}}(x, z_{\text{body}})),$$


REALM [Guu et al '20]

- **Unsupervised pre-training.** The knowledge retriever and knowledge-augmented encoder are jointly pre-trained on the unsupervised language modeling task




REALM [Guu et al '20]

- **Supervised fine-tuning.** After the parameters of the retriever (θ) and encoder (ϕ) have been pre-trained, they are then fine-tuned on a task of primary interest, using supervised examples.



REALM [Guu et al '20]

- For MIPS
 - we must pre-compute $\text{Embed}_{\text{doc}}(z)$ for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and construct an efficient search index over these embedding →
No longer consistent if the parameters θ of $\text{Embed}_{\text{doc}}$ are later updated
- **Asynchronous MIPS refreshes**
 - To “refresh” the index by asynchronously re-embedding and re-indexing all documents every several hundred training steps
 - 1) A primary **trainer** job, which performs gradient updates on the parameters
 - 2) secondary **index builder** job, which embeds and indexes the documents




REALM [Guu et al '20]

- Experiments
 - outperform all previous methods by a significant margin (4-16% absolute accuracy)

Name	Architectures	Pre-training	NQ (79k/4k)	WQ (3k/2k)	CT (1k /1k)	# params
BERT-Baseline (Lee et al., 2019)	Sparse Retr.+Transformer	BERT	26.5	17.7	21.3	110m
T5 (base) (Roberts et al., 2020)	Transformer Seq2Seq	T5 (Multitask)	27.0	29.1	-	223m
T5 (large) (Roberts et al., 2020)	Transformer Seq2Seq	T5 (Multitask)	29.8	32.2	-	738m
T5 (11b) (Roberts et al., 2020)	Transformer Seq2Seq	T5 (Multitask)	34.5	37.4	-	11318m
DrQA (Chen et al., 2017)	Sparse Retr.+DocReader	N/A	-	20.7	25.7	34m
HardEM (Min et al., 2019a)	Sparse Retr.+Transformer	BERT	28.1	-	-	110m
GraphRetriever (Min et al., 2019b)	GraphRetriever+Transformer	BERT	31.8	31.6	-	110m
PathRetriever (Asai et al., 2019)	PathRetriever+Transformer	MLM	32.6	-	-	110m
ORQA (Lee et al., 2019)	Dense Retr.+Transformer	ICT+BERT	33.3	36.4	30.1	330m
Ours (\mathcal{X} = Wikipedia, \mathcal{Z} = Wikipedia)	Dense Retr.+Transformer	REALM	39.2	40.2	46.8	330m
Ours (\mathcal{X} = CC-News, \mathcal{Z} = Wikipedia)	Dense Retr.+Transformer	REALM	40.4	40.7	42.9	330m

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

- Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG)
 - Combine a pre-trained retriever (Query Encoder + Document Index) with a pre-trained encoder-decoder (Generator) and fine-tune end-to-end



Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

- Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG)
 - $p_{\eta}(z|x)$ a retriever with parameters η
 - Returns (top- K truncated) distributions over text passages given a query x
 - $p_{\theta}(y_i|x, z, y_{1:i-1})$: a generator parametrized by θ
 - Generates a current token based on a context of the previous $i - 1$ tokens $y_{1:i-1}$, the original input x and a retrieved passage z
 - Train the retriever and generator end-to-end
 - Treat the retrieved document as a **latent variable**.
 - Propose two models to produce a distribution over generated text.
 - RAG-Sequence: the model uses **the same document** to predict each target token
 - RAG-Token: the model can predict each target token based on a **different document**

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– RAG-Sequence Model

- Uses the same retrieved document to generate the complete sequence.
 - Treats the retrieved passage as a single latent variable that is marginalized to get the seq2seq probability $p(y|x)$ via a top-K approximation

$$p_{\text{RAG-Sequence}}(y|x) = \sum_{z \in \text{top-}k(p(\cdot|x))} p_{\eta}(z|x) \prod_i^N p_{\theta}(y_i|x, z, y_{1:i-1})$$

– RAG-Token Model

- Draw a different latent passage for each target *token* and marginalize accordingly

$$p_{\text{RAG-Token}}(y|x) = \prod_i^N \sum_{z \in \text{top-}k(p(\cdot|x))} p_{\eta}(z_i|x) p_{\theta}(y_i|x, z_i, y_{1:i-1})$$

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Retriever: DPR

- Based on a bi-encoder architecture:

$$p_{\eta}(z|x) \propto \exp \langle \mathbf{d}(z), \mathbf{q}(x) \rangle$$

- Top-k search using MIPS by FAISS
 - To efficiently calculate $top-k(p_{\eta}(\cdot|x))$, the list of k elements z with highest prior probability $p_{\eta}(z|x)$, use a Maximum Inner Product Search (MIPS) index provided by the FAISS library

– Generator: BART

- $p_{\theta}(y_i|x, z, y_{1:i-1})$: based on BART-large
 - Generally, modelled using any encoder-decoder
- Simply concatenate the input x and the retrieved content z

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Training

- Jointly train the retriever and generator components without any direct supervision on what document should be retrieved
- Fine-tuning: Given (x_j, y_j) , a fine-tuning training corpus of input/output pairs, minimize the negative marginal log-likelihood of each target:

$$\sum_j -\log p(y_j | x_j)$$

- Updating the document encoder during training is costly
 - as it requires the document index to be periodically updated as REALM does during pre-training
- But, here, do not find this step necessary for strong performance, and so **keep the document encoder (and index) fixed, only fine-tuning the query encoder and the generator.**

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Decoding

- RAG-Sequence and RAG-Token require different ways to approximate $\arg \max_y p(y|x)$.

- **RAG-Token:**

- can be seen as a standard, autoregressive, seq2seq generator with transition probability

$$p'_\theta(y_i|x, y_{1:i-1}) = \sum_{z \in \text{top-}k(p(\cdot|x))} p_\eta(z_i|x) p_\theta(y_i|x, z_i, y_{1:i-1})$$

- To decode, we can plug $p'_\theta(y_i|x, y_{1:i-1})$ into a standard beam decoder

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Decoding

- **RAG-Sequence**

- The likelihood $p(y|x)$ does not break into a conventional per-token likelihood for the RAG-Sequence
- hence we cannot solve it with a single beam search pass
- Instead, **run beam search for each candidate document z** , scoring each hypothesis using $p_\theta(y_i | x, z, y_{1:i-1})$
 - » This yields a set of hypotheses Y of which some might not have appeared in the beams of all documents

– **Thorough Decoding**

- » To estimate the probability of an hypothesis y across all beams, run an additional forward pass:
- » for each document z for which y does not appear in the beam, multiply the generator score with $p_\eta(z|x)$ and then sum up the probabilities across beams for the marginals.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Decoding

- **RAG-Sequence**

- Fast Decoding

- » But, For longer output sequences, $|Y|$ can become large, requiring many forward passes
 - » For more efficient decoding, we can make a further approximation that $p_{\theta}(y|x, z_i) \approx 0$ where y was not generated during beam search from x, z_i .
 - » Avoids the need to run additional forward passes once the candidate set Y has been generated

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

- Experiments

- Open-Domain QA

- Open-Domain QA Test Scores.

		TriviaQA		CuratedTrec	
	Model	NQ	TQA	WQ	CT
Closed-Book	T5-11B [46]	34.5	- / 50.1	37.4	-
	T5-11B + SSM [46]	36.6	- / 60.5	44.7	-
Open-Book	REALM [18]	40.4	- / -	40.7	46.8
	DPR [22]	41.5	57.9 / -	41.1	50.6
	RAG-Token	44.1	55.2/66.1	45.5	50.0
	RAG-Sequence	44.5	56.1/ 68.0	45.2	52.2

For TQA, the left column uses the test split commonly used in Open-Domain QA. The right column uses the hidden TQA Wiki test split

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Abstractive QA & Jeopardy Question Generation

- Generation and classification task Test Scores

Model	Jeopardy B-1	QGen QB-1	MS-MARCO R-L	MS-MARCO B-1	FEVER-3 Label Accuracy	FEVER-2
SotA	-	-	49.8*	49.9*	76.8	92.2*
BART	15.1	19.7	38.2	41.6	64.0	81.1
RAG-Token	17.3	22.2	40.1	41.5	72.5	<u>89.5</u>
RAG-Sequence	14.7	21.4	<u>40.8</u>	<u>44.2</u>		

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

Jeopardy Question Generation


- Human assessments for the Jeopardy Question Generation Task

	BART better	RAG-Token better	Both good	Both poor	No Majority
Factuality	7.1%	42.7%	11.7%	17.7%	20.8%
Specificity	16.8%	37.4%	18.8%	6.9%	20.1%

- RAG-Token document posterior $p(z_i | x, y_i, y_{-i})$ for each generated token for input "Hemingway" for Jeopardy generation with 5 retrieved documents.

Document 1: his works are considered classics of American literature ... His wartime experiences formed the basis for his novel "A Farewell to Arms" (1929) ...

Document 2: ... artists of the 1920s "Lost Generation" expatriate community. His debut novel, "The Sun Also Rises", was published in 1926.



The posterior for document 1 is high when generating "A Farewell to Arms" and for document 2 when generating "The Sun Also Rises"

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

Jeopardy Question Generation

- Example Generations for MS-MARCO and Jeopardy Question generation

Task	Input	Model	Generation
MS-MARCO	define middle ear	BART	?The middle ear is the part of the ear between the middle ear and the nose.
		RAG-T	The middle ear is the portion of the ear internal to the eardrum.
		RAG-S	The middle ear includes the tympanic cavity and the three ossicles.
	what currency needed in scotland	BART	The currency needed in Scotland is Pound sterling.
		RAG-T	Pound is the currency needed in Scotland.
		RAG-S	The currency needed in Scotland is the pound sterling.
Jeopardy Question Generation	Washington	BART	?This state has the largest number of counties in the U.S.
		RAG-T	It's the only U.S. state named for a U.S. president
		RAG-S	It's the state where you'll find Mount Rainier National Park
	The Divine Comedy	BART	*This epic poem by Dante is divided into 3 parts: the Inferno, the Purgatorio & the Purgatorio
		RAG-T	Dante's "Inferno" is the first part of this epic poem
		RAG-S	This 14th century work is divided into 3 sections: "Inferno", "Purgatorio" & "Paradiso"

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Ablations




- Ablations on the development set. As FEVER is a classification dataset, RAG-Token and RAG-Sequence are equivalent.

Model	NQ	TQA Exact Match	WQ	CT	Jeopardy-QGen		MSMarco		FVR-3 Label Accuracy	FVR-2 Accuracy
					B-1	QB-1	R-L	B-1		
RAG-Token-BM25	29.7	41.5	32.1	33.1	17.5	22.3	55.5	48.4	75.1	91.6
RAG-Seq-BM25	31.8	44.1	36.6	33.8	11.1	19.5	56.5	46.9		
RAG-Token-Frozen	37.8	50.1	37.1	51.1	16.7	21.7	55.9	49.4	72.9	89.4
RAG-Seq-Frozen	41.2	52.1	41.8	52.6	11.8	19.6	56.7	47.3		
RAG-Token	43.5	54.8	46.5	51.9	17.9	22.6	56.2	49.4	74.5	90.6
RAG-Seq	44.0	55.8	44.9	53.4	15.3	21.5	57.2	47.5		

Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Ablations

- Left: NQ performance as more documents are retrieved.
- Center: Fraction of answers in NQ where the answer occurs somewhere in the top K documents.
- Right: MS-MARCO Bleu-1 and Rouge-L as more documents are retrieved.



Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks [Lewis et al '20]

– Generation Diversity

- Ratio of distinct tri-grams to total tri-grams in the development set generations for MSMARCO and Jeopardy Question Generation


Dataset	Gold	BART	RAG-Token	RAG-Sequence
MSMARCO	89.6%	70.7%	77.8%	83.5%
Jeopardy Generation	90.0%	32.4%	46.8 %	53.8%

RAG-Sequence generations are more diverse than RAG-Token generations, and both generate significantly more diverse outputs than BART without requiring any diversity-promoting decoding strategy.

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- kNN-LM
 - Extend a pre-trained neural language model (LM) by linearly interpolating it with a k-nearest neighbors (kNN) model
 - Compute the nearest neighbors according to distance in the pre-trained LM embedding space
 - These neighbors can be drawn from any text collection, including the original LM training data

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]



- A datastore is constructed with an entry for each training set token, and an encoding of its leftward context
- For inference, a test context is encoded, and the k most similar training contexts are retrieved from the datastore, along with the corresponding targets.
- A distribution over targets is computed based on the distance of the corresponding context from the test context.
- This distribution is then interpolated with the original model's output distribution.

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Nearest neighbor language modeling
 - $c_t = (w_1, \dots, w_{t-1})$: given a context sequence of tokens
 - $p(w_t|c_t)$: autoregressive LMs
 - Datastore: (K, V)
 - $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V}) = \{(f(c_i), w_i) | (c_i, w_i) \in \mathcal{D}\}$
 - The set of all key-value pairs constructed from all the training examples in D
 - $f(\cdot)$: The function that maps a context c to a fixed-length vector representation computed by the pre-trained LM

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Nearest neighbor language modeling

- Inference

- Given the input context x , queries the datastore with $f(x)$ to retrieve its k -nearest neighbors N according to a distance function $d(\cdot, \cdot)$
 - Computes a distribution over neighbors based on a softmax of their negative distances

$$p_{\text{kNN}}(y|x) \propto \sum_{(k_i, v_i) \in N} \mathbb{1}_{y=v_i} \exp(-d(k_i, f(x)))$$

- The final kNN-LM: interpolate the nearest neighbor distribution p_{kNN} with the model distribution p_{LM} using a tuned parameter λ

$$p(y|x) = \lambda p_{\text{kNN}}(y|x) + (1 - \lambda) p_{\text{LM}}(y|x)$$

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Nearest neighbor language modeling
 - Continuous cache model
 - Cache recent items in the same test document [Grave et al '17]
 - The model saves and retrieves neighbors from earlier in the test document rather than the training set

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Performance on WIKITEXT-103

Model	Perplexity (\downarrow)		# Trainable Params
	Dev	Test	
Baevski & Auli (2019)	17.96	18.65	247M
+Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019)	-	18.30	257M
+Phrase Induction (Luo et al., 2019)	-	17.40	257M
Base LM (Baevski & Auli, 2019)	17.96	18.65	247M
+ k NN-LM	16.06	16.12	247M
+Continuous Cache (Grave et al., 2017c)	17.67	18.27	247M
+ k NN-LM + Continuous Cache	15.81	15.79	247M

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Performance on BOOKS

Model	Perplexity (\downarrow)		# Trainable Params
	Dev	Test	
Base LM (Baevski & Auli, 2019)	14.75	11.89	247M
+ k NN-LM	14.20	10.89	247M

– Experimental results on WIKI-3B.


- The model trained on 100M tokens is augmented with a datastore that contains about 3B training examples

Training Data	Datastore	Perplexity (\downarrow)	
		Dev	Test
WIKI-3B	-	16.11	15.17
WIKI-100M	-	20.99	19.59
WIKI-100M	WIKI-3B	14.61	13.73


outperform the vanilla LM trained on the entire WIKI-3B training set.

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Varying the size of the datastore.



(a) Effect of datastore size on perplexities.



(b) Tuned values of λ for different datastore sizes


Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Domain adaptation experiments, with results on BOOKS

Training Data	Datastore	Perplexity (\downarrow)	
		Dev	Test
WIKI-3B	-	37.13	34.84
BOOKS	-	14.75	11.89
WIKI-3B	BOOKS	24.85	20.47

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Tuning nearest neighbor search
 - **Key Function**
 - WIKITEXT-103 validation results using different states from the final layer of the LM as the representation function $f(\cdot)$ for keys and queries



Key Type	Dev ppl. (\downarrow)
No datastore	17.96
Model output	17.07
Model output layer normalized	17.01
FFN input after layer norm	16.06
FFN input before layer norm	17.06
MHSA input after layer norm	16.76
MHSA input before layer norm	17.14

retrieve $k=1024$ neighbors and λ is tuned for each.


Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results

- Number of Neighbors per Query**

- Effect of the number of NNs returned per word on WIKITEXT-103

Returning more entries from the datastore monotonically improves performance




Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results

- Interpolation Parameter

- Effect of interpolation parameter λ on in-domain (left y-axis) and out-of-domain (right y-axis) validation set performances

More weight on pkNN improves domain adaptation



Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results

- Qualitative Analysis

Example where the kNN model has much higher confidence in the correct target than the LM


Test Context ($p_{\text{kNN}} = 0.998, p_{\text{LM}} = 0.124$)	Test Target	
<i>it was organised by New Zealand international player Joseph Warbrick, promoted by civil servant Thomas Eyton, and managed by James Scott, a publican. The Natives were the first New Zealand team to perform a haka, and also the first to wear all black. They played 107 rugby matches during the tour, as well as a small number of Victorian Rules football and association football matches in Australia. Having made a significant impact on the...</i>	development	
Training Set Context	Training Set Target	Context Probability
<i>As the captain and instigator of the 1888-89 Natives – the first New Zealand team to tour the British Isles – Warbrick had a lasting impact on the...</i>	development	0.998
<i>promoted to a new first grade competition which started in 1900. Glebe immediately made a big impact on the...</i>	district	0.00012
<i>centuries, few were as large as other players managed. However, others contend that his impact on the...</i>	game	0.000034
<i>Nearly every game in the main series has either an anime or manga adaptation, or both. The series has had a significant impact on the...</i>	development	0.00000092

Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results

- Simple vs Neural Representation

- Interpolating the Transformer LM with n-gram LMs on WIKITEXT-103 Using kNN-LM gives a much lower perplexity, suggesting that the representations are learning more than just matching local context.




Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models [Khandelwal et al '20]

- Experiment results

- **Implicit vs Explicit Memory**

- Training curves for the Transformer LM with and without dropout

Turning off dropout allows the training loss to go to 0, indicating that the model has sufficient capacity to memorize the training data.



The memorizing LM overfits, i.e. the training loss drops to 0 while the best validation perplexity is much higher at 28.59.



The Transformer is expressive enough to memorize all training examples, learning to do so does not result in context representations that generalize.

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Motivation
 - Words follow a heavy-tail distribution
 - A large proportion of words appear only very few times and the embeddings of rare words are usually poorly optimized
 - Embeddings of rare words carry inadequate semantic signals, which could make the data utilization inefficient and slow down the pre-training of the entire model
- Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF)
 - Takes notes for rare words on the fly during pre-training to help the model understand them when they occur next time
 - Maintains a note dictionary and saves a rare word's contextual information in it as notes when the rare word occurs in a sentence
 - When the same rare word occurs again during training, the note information saved beforehand can be employed to enhance the semantics of the current sentence

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

Without Notes:

COVID-19 has cost thousands of _____ .

What is COVID-19?



dollars?
donuts?
puppies?
tomatoes?



With Notes:

COVID-19 has cost thousands of lives .




A note of 'COVID-19' taken from a previously seen sentence:

The COVID-19 pandemic is an ongoing global crisis.

Without any understanding of the rare word "COVID-19", there are too many grammatically-correct, while semantically-wrong options for us to fill in the blank

A note of "COVID-19" taken from a previously-seen sentence can act as a very strong signal for us to predict the correct word at the masked position

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]



In the input word sequence, w_2 is a rare word. Then for tokens 4 and 5 originated from w_2 , we query the value of w_2 in the note dictionary and weighted average it with token/position embeddings

To maintain the note dictionary, we can get the contextual representations of the word near w_2 and use mean pooling over those representations as the note of w_2 in the current sentence. Then, we update w_2 's value in the note dictionary

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- The Construction of Note Dictionary
 - **NoteDict** : a note dictionary which will maintain a note representation (value) for each rare word (key) during pre-training
 - Factors to be considered
 - The frequency of the words in the dictionary should not be extremely low either
 - because if the word appears only once in the corpus, there will be no “cross-sentence signal” to use
 - The note dictionary also shouldn't take too many memories in practice
 - Define keys as those words with occurrences between 100 and 500 in the data corpus.
 - The data corpus roughly contains 3.47B words in total and the size of NoteDict's vocabulary is about 200k.

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Maintaining Note Dictionary
 - When a rare word occurs, record the contextual information of its surrounding words in the sentence as its note
 - Suppose a rare word w appears both in the input token sequence $x = \{x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n\}$ and NoteDict
 - (s, t) : the span boundary of w in x
 - Define the note of w for x :

$$\text{Note}(w, x) = \frac{1}{2k + t - s} \sum_{j=s-k}^{t+k} \mathbf{c}_j$$

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Maintaining Note Dictionary
 - Now update w 's note saved in NoteDict to include the latest semantics in sentence x
 - updates w 's value in NoteDict using exponential moving average
 - In this way, at any occurrence of w during pre-training, its contextual information from all previous occurrences can be leveraged and used

$$\text{NoteDict}(w) = (1 - \gamma) \cdot \text{NoteDict}(w) + \gamma \cdot \text{Note}(w, x)$$

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Leveraging Note Dictionary for Pre-training
 - NoteDict explicitly contains surrounding contexts for rare words.
 - Use such information as a part of the input to the Transformer encoder.
 - For any masked token sequence $x = \{x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n\}$ first find all rare words that appears in both NoteDict and x .
 - $\{(w_j, s_j, t_j)\}_{j=1}^m$: Spans of m rare words in x
 - The input to the model is defined as

$$\text{input}_i = \begin{cases} (1 - \lambda) \cdot (\text{pos_emb}_i + \text{token_emb}_i) + \lambda \cdot \text{NoteDict}(w_j) & \exists j, s.t. s_j < i < t_j, \\ \text{pos_emb}_i + \text{word_emb}_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$


Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Leveraging Note Dictionary for Pre-training
 - Informally saying,
 - when the token x_i is originated from a rare word w_j in NoteDict, we first query w_j in NoteDict and then weight-averages its value $NoteDict(w_j)$ with the token embedding $token_emb_i$ and positional embedding pos_emb_i .
 - In such a way, the historical contextual information of rare word w_j in $NoteDict(w_j)$, can be processed together with other words in the current sentence in the stacked Transformer layers, which can help the model to better understand the input sequence


Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - The curves of pre-training loss, pre-training validation loss and average GLUE score for all models trained under the BERT setting and ELECTRA setting


TNF improves pre-training efficiency.



(a) Loss curves (BERT setting)



(b) Loss curves (ELECTRA setting)



(c) GLUE evaluation

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Average GLUE score of all methods on the dev set when the pre-training finished, i.e., at 1e6 iterations

TNF improves its backbone model's performance

	Params	Avg. GLUE
GPT-2	117 M	78.8
BERT	110 M	82.2
SpanBERT	110 M	83.9
ELECTRA	110 M	85.1
BERT (Ours)	110 M	83.1
BERT-TNF	110 M	83.9
ELECTRA (Ours)	110 M	86.0
ELECTRA-TNF	110 M	86.7

Taking Notes on the Fly (TNF) Helps BERT Pre-training [Wu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Performance of different models on downstream tasks
 - Results show that TNF outperforms backbone methods on the majority of individual tasks

TNF improves its backbone model's performance

	MNLI	QNLI	QQP	SST	CoLA	MRPC	RTE	STS	Avg.
BERT (Ours)	85.0	91.5	91.2	93.3	58.3	88.3	69.0	88.5	83.1
BERT-TNF	85.0	91.0	91.2	93.2	59.5	89.3	73.2	88.5	83.9
BERT-TNF-F	85.1	90.8	91.1	93.3	59.8	88.8	72.1	88.5	83.7
BERT-TNF-U	85.0	90.9	91.1	93.4	60.2	88.7	71.4	88.4	83.6
ELECTRA(Ours)	86.8	92.7	91.7	93.2	66.2	90.2	76.4	90.5	86.0
ELECTRA-TNF	87.0	92.7	91.8	93.6	67.0	90.1	81.2	90.1	86.7
ELECTRA-TNF-F	86.9	92.6	91.8	93.7	65.9	89.7	81.4	89.8	86.5
ELECTRA-TNF-U	86.9	92.7	91.7	93.6	66.3	89.8	81.0	89.8	86.5

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- Motivation
 - Improve the effectiveness of language pre-training methods with the help of **mis-predictions** during pre-training
 - **Neglecting words in the input sentence that have conflicting semantics with mis-predictions is likely to be the reason of generating mis-predictions at pre-training**
 - Hypothesis that mis-predictions during pre-training can act as detectors of the ill focuses of the model.
 - Train **the model to focus more on the conflicts with the mis-predictions while focus less on the rest words in the input sentence**, the mispredictions can be more easily corrected and the entire model could be better trained
- Focus Less on Context of Mis-predictions(McMisP)
 - Record the co-occurrence information between words to detect the conflicting words with mis-predictions in an unsupervised way
 - McMisP uses such information to **guide the attention modules** when a mis-prediction occurs

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- Motivating examples
 - In pretrained language models, the predicted words at the masked positions are surprisingly good at an early phase of training.
 - But, examples with mis-predictions during the entire training :

He is swimming yesterday afternoon.

- Here, the groundtruth word “was” is mis-predicted as “is”
 - “is” a misprediction because it contradicts the existing context “yesterday” in the input sentence.
- Similar examples with mis-predictions
 - *“New York is the famous capital city in U.S.”*
 - *“As any father would agree, I don’t want my young and innocent father employed to kill and take part in your futile battles”*

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions (McMisP)
 - ELECTRA: Trains two Transformer models on parallel, one smaller BERT as generator (G) and the other normal-sized Transformer as discriminator (D)

- The discriminator's loss function

$$\mathcal{L}_D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^r) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{t=1}^N -\mathbb{1}(x_t^r = x_t) \cdot \log D(\mathbf{x}^r, t) - \mathbb{1}(x_t^r \neq x_t) \cdot \log(1 - D(\mathbf{x}^r, t)) \right).$$

- The combined Loss

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^m, \mathbf{x}^r) = \mathcal{L}_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^m) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^r)$$

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- McMisP

- Calculating the context matrix

- Record the token-level co-occurrence information
 - $V = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_V\}$: a vocabulary
 - Calculate a matrix C
 - $C_{i,j}$: records the total number of times that w_i and w_j occur together.

- Normalize C
$$C_{i,j}^{normed} = \frac{C_{i,j}}{(\sum_{z=1}^V C_{i,z}) \cdot (\sum_{z=1}^V C_{j,z})}$$

- Calculate the final context matrix S

$$S_i = \frac{C_i^{normed} - \min(C_i^{normed})}{\max(C_i^{normed}) - \min(C_i^{normed})}$$

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- McMisP
 - Calculating the context matrix
 - For a token i and token j , if j co-occurs frequently with i , $S_{i,j}$ is close to 1 and vice versa
 - For a mis-prediction i , McMisP will train the attention modules to output a lower attention co-efficient $a(i, j)$ at the position of j if $S_{i,j}$ is large.
 - Through this way, McMisP can penalize the frequent context of mis-predictions and focus more on conflicts with them.

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

McMisP

– Pretraining

- \mathbf{x}^m given an partially-masked input sequence
- \mathbf{x}^r : the output sequence from the generator, with tokens at the masked positions replaced by the generator's predictions
- Collect the mis-predicted positions in \mathbf{x}^r :

$$\mathcal{M}_x = \{ \mathbb{1}(x_t^r \neq x_t) \cdot t \}_{t=1}^{N_x}$$

- N_x is the length of the input sequence \mathbf{x}
- $\mathbf{S}_{x_t^r}$: For the mis-predicted position t in \mathcal{M}_x , the fetched pre-calculated context vector of the mis-predicted token x_t^r from S
 - consists of the context co-efficients of the mis-prediction x_t^r with all tokens in the vocabulary

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]


McMisP

– Pretraining

- $\mathbf{S}(t, \mathbf{x}^r)$: select context coefficients of mis-prediction x^r at t with **tokens in the input sentence** \mathbf{x}^r
 - a vector with its dimension equal to the length of \mathbf{x}^r
- $\mathbf{S}(t, \mathbf{x}^r)_i$: the context coefficient of token pair (x_t^r, x_i^r)

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

McMisP



- From the pre-calculated context matrix S , we first fetch $S_{\text{'is'}}^T$. $S_{\text{'is'}}^T$ consists of the context co-efficients of 'is' with all tokens in the vocabulary.
- Then McMisP fetches the context co-efficients of 'is' with all tokens in the sentence x_r , such as 'yesterday' and 'he'. → the context co-efficient vector $S(\text{'is'}, x_r)$.
- Each element in $S(\text{'is'}, x_r)$ is the the context co-efficients of 'is' with a corresponding token in x_r

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- McMisP
 - Given $S(t, \mathbf{x}^r)$ prepared, McMisP guides the attention module in the discriminator to focus less on the frequent context and more on the conflicting context of each mis-prediction x_t^r

$$\mathbf{g}(q_t, K) = \frac{q_t K^T}{\sqrt{d}} \cdot (1 - \mathbf{S}(t, \mathbf{x}^r))$$


- Then use $g(q_t, K)$ as the supervising information to train the attention module at the mis-predicted position t

$$\mathcal{L}_A = \frac{1}{N_M} \sum_{t=0}^{N_M} \left(\frac{q_t K^T}{\sqrt{d}} - \mathbf{g}(q_t, K) \right)^2$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^m, \mathbf{x}^r) = \mathcal{L}_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^m) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^r) + \gamma \mathcal{L}_A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^r)$$

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- McMisP




- The training of attention modules at the mis-predicted positions in McMisP.
- The original attention co-efficient at the 'yesterday' position is low
- In $g('is', x_r)$, the attention coefficient at the 'yesterday' position is higher than the rest.

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- McMisP
 - Implementation details
 - For the pre-calculated context matrix S , the size of S would be too big to fit into the GPU memory together with the model if we record every pairwise co-occurrence information
 - We only record the co-occurrence information for words with **top 5000 frequencies** in the training set
 - For words not in the vocabulary of S , we train the attention modules the same as BERT even if they are mis-predictions.
 - Increasing the vocabulary of S to be larger than 5000 brings minor performance improvements compared with the memory overhead.

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - The curves of average GLUE score for all models trained under the BERT setting and ELECTRA setting



Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Average GLUE score of all methods on the dev set when the pre-training finished, i.e., at 1e6 iterations

	Params	Avg. GLUE
GPT-2	117 M	78.8
BERT	110 M	82.2
SpanBERT	110 M	83.9
ELECTRA	110 M	85.1
BERT (Ours)	110 M	83.0
BERT-McMisP	110 M	83.7
ELECTRA (Ours)	110 M	85.2
ELECTRA-McMisP	110 M	86.1

Focusing More on Conflicts with Mis-Predictions Helps Language Pre-Training [Xing et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Performance of different models on downstream tasks. Results show that McMisP outperforms backbone methods on the majority of individual tasks.

	MNLI	QNLI	QQP	SST	CoLA	MRPC	RTE	STS	Avg.
BERT (Ours)	84.93	91.34	91.04	92.88	55.19	88.29	68.61	89.43	82.96
BERT-McMisP	84.94	90.88	91.06	93.37	61.21	89.73	70.57	87.81	83.70
ELECTRA(Ours)	86.93	92.50	91.57	93.01	67.58	90.29	70.12	89.98	85.22
ELECTRA-McMisP	86.58	92.40	91.70	93.62	67.58	91.44	74.91	90.11	86.08

Knowledge-Aware Language Model Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Goal
 - Incorporate knowledge-awareness in language model pretraining
 - without changing the transformer architecture, inserting explicit knowledge layers, or adding external storage of semantic information
- Proposal: knowledge-aware language modeling (KALM)
 - Simply **signal the existence of entities** to the input of the transformer in pretraining, with an entity extended tokenizer; and at the output, with an additional entity prediction task.

Knowledge-Aware Language Model

Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Knowledge-aware Pretraining

- Entity Tokenizer

- An entity tokenizer segments the text sequence into entity ids using a surface form dictionary, which maps word-ngrams to entities

$$w_{i:i+k} \xrightarrow{\text{dict look up}} e_i$$

- e_i is the most popular entity referred by the word k-gram $w_{i:i+k}$, and $e_i = null$ if w_i is not part of any known entity surface names.
 - Simultaneously, the text is tokenized into two channels – a word-entity duet token sequence

$$X_{\text{duet}} = \begin{cases} \{w_1, \dots, w_i, \dots, w_T\} & \text{Word Sequence;} \\ \{e_1, \dots, e_i, \dots, e_T\} & \text{Entity Sequence.} \end{cases}$$

If multiple (sub)words together form an entity name, the corresponding entity id is duplicated in each position corresponding to these words

Knowledge-Aware Language Model Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Knowledge-aware Pretraining
 - Knowledge-Aware Input
 - Allow the model to learn an entity embedding for each entity

$$\vec{e}_i = \text{Embedding}_e(e_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e},$$

$$\vec{w}_i = \text{Embedding}_w(w_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$$

- Combine the two embeddings to form the knowledge aware input

$$\vec{t}_i = \vec{w}_i + \text{Linear}_t(\vec{e}_i), \text{Linear}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times d_w}$$

Knowledge-Aware Language Model

Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Knowledge-aware Pretraining
 - Knowledge-Aware Output.
 - Besides the next-word prediction task, employ a **next-entity prediction task** to further incorporate knowledge-awareness.
 - Use one output head for the word probability, **one for the entity**, and share all transformer layers between words and entities
 - The loss for position i:

$$l_e(e_i | t_{<i}) = \max(0, s(\vec{h}_i^L, \vec{e}_i) - s(\vec{h}_i^L, \vec{e}_{-}) + \lambda),$$
$$s(\vec{h}_i^L, \vec{e}_j) = \cos(\text{Linear}(\vec{h}_i^L), \vec{e}_j),$$
$$\vec{h}_i^L = \text{transformer}^L(t_{<i}).$$

\vec{h}_i^L : the output of the final layer's i-th token

Knowledge-Aware Language Model

Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Knowledge-aware Pretraining

- Pretraining

- The knowledge-aware input and output are incorporated in the standard multi-task set up:

$$l_{\text{KALM}}(X_{\text{duet}}) = \sum_i l_w(p(w_i|t_{<i})) + \alpha l_e(e_i|t_{<i})$$

- Inference

- whenever generating output text – KALM use the word prediction head $p(w_i|t_{<i})$
 - In inference **only the shared transformer representations is used upon the input word and entity tokens.**
 - The architecture of KALM only differs with **an enlarged tokenization vocabulary with additional entity tokens, and their entity embeddings before the input** to the transformer network

Knowledge-Aware Language Model

Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Probing language models
 - Knowledge Probe
 - The LAMA knowledge probing test [Petroni et al '19]
 - Evaluates whether the language model can predict the factually correct token in “fill-the-blank” cloze statements
 - Edge Probe
 - The edge probing” tasks to study the information (e.g., syntactic, semantic, or long range structures) in the learned hidden representations. [Tenney et al 19]
 - Uses the PLM’s hidden representations on one or multiple text spans (e.g., $h_{i:i+k}$) as fixed feature representations to linear classifiers on various linguistic/semantic tasks
 - Zero-shot Evaluation:
 - Focus on the zero-shot QA setting in [Radford et al. 19]
 - All our models take the input in the format of

Question: dummy Q\n Answer: dummy A\n\n Question: testing Q\n Answer:

Knowledge-Aware Language Model

Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Probing language models
 - Datasets & Specs of LMs

Dataset	Items
Language Modeling	
WikiText-103 (tokens)	270k
Lambada	5.1k
LAMA	
Google-Re	4.6k
T-Rex 1-1 (2)	937
T-Rex N-1 (23)	20k
T-Rex N-M (16)	13k
ConceptNet (16)	11k
SQuAD (Statements)	305
Zero-Shot QA	
Trivia QA	11k
Natural Questions (Short)	3.7k
WebQuestions	2.0k

Model	Net.P.#	E.P.#	L.#	Dim
Base				
GPT-2	90M	38M	12	768
KALM	90M	458M	12	768
Large				
GPT-2 (OAI)	304M	51M	24	1024
GPT-2	304M	51M	24	1024
KALM	304M	471M	24	1024
eXⁿtra Large				
GPT-2 XL (OAI)	1.46B	80M	48	1600
GPT-2 1.5B	1.46B	80M	48	1600
GPT-2 17B	16.9B	214M	78	4256

Knowledge-Aware Language Model

Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Results on language modeling tasks and LAMA knowledge probing tasks

	Language Modeling		LAMA Knowledge Probing						
Model	Wiki-103 Perplex.	Lambada last word	G-Re Total	1-1	T-REx			C-Net Total	Squad Total
					N-1	N-M	Total		
Base (~100M)									
GPT-2	20.85	33.73	3.99	24.17	14.19	16.72	15.66	7.67	4.55
KALM	22.51	40.26	3.27	44.70	24.95	25.07	25.96	8.61	6.64
Large (~300M)									
GPT-2 (OAI)	22.50	42.98	3.71	56.03	19.77	19.93	21.6	10.86	8.04
GPT-2	20.46	42.63	4.90	45.95	19.28	18.59	20.31	9.72	5.94
KALM	17.05	49.14	5.41	63.18	25.74	27.15	28.12	10.70	11.89
eXⁿtra Large (>1B)									
GPT-2 1.5B (OAI)	17.37	51.23	4.30	62.31	21.53	19.61	22.77	12.28	11.54
GPT-2 1.5B	14.68	56.72	6.48	65.04	24.04	21.51	25.06	12.79	11.54
GPT-2 17B	10.21	67.98	8.77	76.82	29.60	27.14	30.95	14.39	22.38

Knowledge-Aware Language Model


Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Zero-shot question answering performance of different models for three different question answering benchmarks.

Model	Trivia QA		Natural Questions		Web Questions	
	EM	cover-EM	EM	cover-EM	EM	cover-EM
Fully Supervised						
T5 Base [11]	29.1	n.a.	27.0	n.a.	29.1	n.a.
T5 Large [11]	35.9	n.a.	29.8	n.a.	32.2	n.a.
T5 11B [11]	50.1	n.a.	34.5	n.a.	37.4	n.a.
Zero-Shot						
GPT-2 Base	3.44	4.77	0.81	1.24	2.08	2.92
KALM Base	5.87	7.16	1.75	2.13	3.53	4.79
GPT-2 Large	7.32	9.05	3.48	4.26	4.79	6.20
KALM Large	11.68	13.34	4.34	5.07	6.56	9.48
GPT-2 1.5B	17.78	21.59	6.08	7.95	6.20	12.65
GPT-2 17B	42.32	47.56	14.34	17.30	12.15	21.68

Knowledge-Aware Language Model Pretraining [Rosset et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Edge probing results on eight NLP tasks




The base versions of GPT-2 and KALM are probed, along different training steps (x-axes), using micro-averaged F1 scores (y-axes).

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Transformer networks
 - Two consecutive modules, a feedforward layer and a self-attention layer.
 - The latter allows the network to capture long term dependencies and are often regarded as the key ingredient in the success of Transformers
- Proposal: a new model that solely consists of attention layers.
 - Augment the self-attention layers with persistent memory vectors that play a similar role as the feed-forward layer.
 - Remove the feed-forward layer without degrading the performance of a transformer

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

Introduce a new layer that merges the self-attention and feedforward sublayers into a single unified attention layer



our all-attention layer merges the weights of the feedforward sublayer with the self-attention sublayer

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Transformer layer
 - Multi-head self-attention sublayer

$$\mathbf{k}_t = \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{x}_t,$$

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{x}_t,$$

- The similarity score between t and an element c of its context \mathcal{C}_t

$$s_{tc} = \mathbf{x}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_q^\top (\mathbf{k}_c + \mathbf{p}(t, c))$$

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_t} a_{tc} (\mathbf{v}_c + \mathbf{p}(t, c)) \quad \text{and} \quad a_{tc} = \frac{\exp(s_{tc}/\sqrt{d_h})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_t} \exp(s_{ti}/\sqrt{d_h})}$$

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Transformer layer
 - Feedforward sublayer

$$\text{FF}(\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathbf{U} \sigma(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{c}$$

- Add-norm

$$\text{AddNorm}(\mathbf{x}_t) = \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{x}_t + \text{Sublayer}(\mathbf{x}_t))$$

- Transformer layer

$$\mathbf{z}_t = \text{AddNorm}(\text{MultiHead}(\mathbf{x}_t))$$

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \text{AddNorm}(\text{FF}(\mathbf{z}_t)),$$

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Feedforward sublayer as an attention layer
 - Transform the feedforward sublayer into an attention layer by replacing the ReLU non-linear function in FF by a Softmax function and removing the biases

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{U} \text{Softmax}(\mathbf{V} \mathbf{x}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_f} a_{ti} \mathbf{U}_{*,i}$$

- $\mathbf{U}_{*,i}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{i,*}$: column and row vectors respectively
 - Equivalent to the self-attention sublayer with the context vectors $\mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{v}_t$ set to zero and the vectors $\mathbf{V}_{i,*}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{*,i}$ are used as key and value side position embeddings respectively

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Persistent memory augmented self-attention layer
 - **All-attention layer**: a single attention layer that can replace both self-attention and feedforward layers in Transformers
 - Our layer applies the attention mechanism simultaneously on the sequence of input vectors, as in the standard self-attention layer, and **on a set of vectors not conditioned on the input**
 - They are shared across the data and, in some sense, forms a **persistent memory** similar to the feedforward layer.
 - Persistent vectors
 - A set of N pairs of key-value vectors, respectively stacked in two $d_h \times N$ dimensional matrices \mathbf{M}_k and \mathbf{M}_v
 - \mathbf{M}_k and \mathbf{M}_v : interpreted as \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{U} of a feedforward sublayer

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Persistent memory augmented self-attention layer
 - Simply add these persistent vectors to the pool of key and value vectors conditioned on the input:

$$[\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_{T+N}] = \text{Concat}([\mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_k \mathbf{x}_T], \mathbf{M}_k)$$

$$[\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{T+N}] = \text{Concat}([\mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_v \mathbf{x}_T], \mathbf{M}_v)$$

- C_t^+ : the concatenation of the context C_t and the indices corresponding to the N persistent vectors.
- The similarity score between an element t of the input sequence and an element c of its extended context C_t^+ :

$$s_{tc} = \mathbf{x}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_q^\top (\mathbf{k}_c + \mathbf{p}(t, c))$$

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Persistent memory augmented self-attention layer

– The all-attention then outputs a vector \mathbf{y}_t :

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \sum_{c \in C_t^+} a_{tc} (\mathbf{v}_c + \mathbf{p}(t, c)) \quad \text{and} \quad a_{tc} = \frac{\exp(s_{tc}/\sqrt{d_h})}{\sum_{i \in C_t^+} \exp(s_{ti}/\sqrt{d_h})}$$

– an all-attention layer with Multiple heads

- Outputs from the different heads are concatenated for each timestep t and multiplied \mathbf{W}_o
- Persistent vectors are **not shared between heads**.

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \text{AddNorm}(\text{MultiHeadAllAttn}(\mathbf{x}_t))$$

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - Comparison with the state of the art on character level language modeling on enwik8

Model	#Params	test bpc
<i>Small models</i>		
Ha et al. [16] – LN HyperNetworks	27M	1.34
Chung et al. [7] – LN HM-LSTM	35M	1.32
Zilly et al. [45] – Recurrent highway networks	46M	1.27
Mujika et al. [30] – Large FS-LSTM-4	47M	1.25
Krause et al. [22] – Large mLSTM	46M	1.24
Al-Rfou et al. [1] – T12	44M	1.11
Dai et al. [8] – Transformer-XL	41M	1.06
Sukhbaatar et al. [39] - Transformer + adaptive span	39M	1.02
All-attention network + adaptive span	39M	1.01
<i>Large models</i>		
Al-Rfou et al. [1] – T64	235M	1.06
Dai et al. [8] – Transformer-XL 18l	88M	1.03
Dai et al. [8] – Transformer-XL 24l	277M	0.99
Child et al. [6] – Sparse Transformer (fixed)	95M	0.99
Sukhbaatar et al. [39] - Transformer + adaptive span	209M	0.98
All-attention network + adaptive span	114M	0.98

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - Comparison with the state of the art on character level language modeling on text8.

Model	#Params	dev bpc	test bpc
<i>Small models</i>			
Chung et al. [7] – LN HM-LSTM	35M	-	1.29
Zilly et al. [45] – Recurrent highway networks	45M	-	1.27
Krause et al. [22] – Large mLSTM	45M	-	1.27
Al-Rfou et al. [1] – T12	44M	-	1.18
Sukhbaatar et al. [39] - Transformer + adaptive span	38M	1.05	1.11
All-attention network + adaptive span	38M	1.05	1.11
<i>Large models</i>			
Al-Rfou et al. [1] – T64	235M	1.06	1.13
Dai et al. [8] – Transformer-XL	277M	-	1.08
Sukhbaatar et al. [39] - Transformer + adaptive span	209M	1.01	1.07
All-attention network + adaptive span	114M	1.02	1.08



Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - Comparison with the state of the art on word level language modeling on WikiText-103.

Model	#Params	dev ppl	test ppl
<i>Small models</i>			
Grave et al. [14] – LSTM	-	-	48.7
Bai et al. (2018) – TCN	-	-	45.2
Dauphin et al. [9] – GCNN-8	-	-	44.9
Grave et al. [14] – LSTM + Neural cache	-	-	40.8
Merity et al. [26] – 4-layer QRNN	151M	32.0	33.0
Rae et al. [33] – LSTM + Hebbian + Cache	-	29.7	29.9
Dai et al. [8] – Transformer-XL Standard	151M	23.1	24.0
All-attention network + adaptive span	133M	19.7	20.6
Best published result with a large model [8]	257M	17.7	18.3

Augmenting Self-attention with Persistent Memory [Sukhbaatar et al '19]

- Experiment results
 - The performance of our large model on Text8 as we vary (left) the number of persistent vectors, or (right) the way how persistent vectors integrate with self-attention.




MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- Knowledge as an external memory
 - View memory-augmented neural models as a natural architecture for natural language knowledge integration.
 - As a major difference with such existing approaches, the knowledge we store in our memory is not core information for the task (as, for example, in question answering)
 - But rather an auxiliary, external collection of pieces of information that can be consulted to perform reasoning and to make the neural model interpretable

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- MemBERT: Memory-Augmented DistilBERT
 - (i) input texts are encoded via the pre-trained DistilBERT layer and memories are loaded with relevant background information
 - (ii) memory content is compared with the given text input via a **memory-lookup layer**, producing a set of similarity scores;
 - (iii) the **memory extraction layer** converts similarity scores into attention scores $\{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$ and uses them to compute a single **memory summary embedding vector** via a weighted sum of the memory slots;
 - (iv) the **memory summary embedding vector is eventually used to update the input embedding vector** (memory reasoning).

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]



- External knowledge is compared to the given input to be classified.
- The relevant memory content is then used to update the initial query before the final fully-connected layer for classification

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- MemBERT: Memory-Augmented DistilBERT
 - In order to obtain an interpretable model, the network has to correctly select at least one target memory slot per example.
 - For these reasons, adopt **sigmoid-based attention scores** rather than traditional softmax-based ones, being the memory slots not mutually exclusive
 - The last memory-related step in the model (the reasoning layer) is implemented as a **concatenation of input and memory summary embedding vectors**.
 - Both DistilBERT and MemBERT are trained to minimize standard cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C p(y_i = c) \log p_{\theta}(y_i = c)$$

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- MemBERT: Memory-Augmented DistilBERT
 - Guiding memory interaction with strong supervision
 - If background knowledge comes with the capability of naturally linking each example with the associated memory content, it is then possible to guide the model in the training phase by only focusing on specific target memory slots
 - **Target memory slots**: defined as those that have been linked to the input example during the annotation phase
 - Introduce a **loss penalty term**
 - That enforces target memory slots to have a higher similarity score with respect to the input than to the remaining slots, up to a γ margin

$$\mathcal{L}_{SS} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{|M_+^n| |M_-^n|} \sum_{m_+ \in M_+^n} \sum_{m_- \in M_-^n} [\mathcal{L}(m_+, m_-)]$$

$$\mathcal{L}(m_+, m_-) = \max \left(0, \gamma - \sigma(s(q^n, m_+)) + \sigma(s(q^n, m_-)) \right)$$

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- MemBERT: Memory-Augmented DistilBERT
 - Efficiently Handling Large Memories with Sampling
 - Similarly to prioritized experience replay (PER) in reinforcement learning, introduce **priority-based sampling** strategies that progressively take into account the importance of the added information with respect to both input examples and task objectives
 - Adopt the same priority definition of PER, where the temporal difference (TD) error is replaced by a custom **importance assignment function**:

$$p_{m_i} = (w_{m_i} + \epsilon)^\alpha$$

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

– Efficiently Handling Large Memories with Sampling

- **Uniform Sampling** $p_{m_i} = \frac{1}{|M|}$

- **Priority Sampling**

- 1) Attention-Based Priority Sampling

- » defines each memory slot importance as its summary attention value in the batch

$$w_{m_i} = \frac{\sum_j^{|B|} a_{j,i}}{\sum_j^{|B|} \mathbb{1}_{y_j \in \mathbf{Y}_+}}$$

- 2) Loss Gain Priority Sampling

- » Consider the loss difference between the standard model architecture and the one augmented with the memory layer

$$w_{m_i} = \frac{\sum_j^{|B|} a_{j,i} \exp(\mathcal{L}_{CE}(x_j) - \mathcal{L}_{CE}(x_j | \bar{M}))}{\sum_j^{|B|} \mathbb{1}_{y_j \in \mathbf{Y}_+}}$$

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

Algorithm 1: General Training Sampling Procedure

Input: Data $D = \{(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)\}_{n=1}^N$,
Memory priority weights distribution $p_{|M|}$,
Model weights θ

- 1 Initialize model weights $\theta = \theta^0$
 - 2 Initialize memory priority weights $p_{|M|} = p_{|M|}^0$
 - 3 **repeat**
 - 4 Sample a minibatch k , $B^k = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \subset \mathcal{D}$
 - 5 Sample memory \bar{M} using $p_{|M|}^{k-1}$
 - 6 Compute model loss $\mathcal{L}(x|\bar{M})$ on minibatch B
 - 7 Update model parameters θ^k using any optimizer
 - 8 Compute memory importance weights $w_{|M|}^k$
 - 9 Update memory priority weights $p_{|M|}^k = (w_{m_i} + \epsilon)^\alpha$
 - 10 Normalize $p_{|M|}^k$ to get corresponding distribution
 - 11 **until** *stopping criteria*
 - 12 Save memory priority weights $p_{|M|}$
- Output:** Trained model weights θ , trained sampler priority weights $p_{|M|}$
-

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

Algorithm 2: General Inference Sampling Procedure

Input: Data $D = \{(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)\}_{n=1}^N$,
Learnt memory priority weights distribution $p_{|M|}$

1 **repeat**

2 Get next inference minibatch k , $B^k = (\mathbf{X}) \subset \mathcal{D}$

3 Sample memory \bar{M} using $p_{|M|}$

4 Save model predictions $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}$

5 **until** $B^k \in \emptyset$

Output: Model predictions and sampled memory $\{(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_n)\}_{n=1}^N$

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- Experimental setting
 - **Knowledge as Class Descriptions: Unfairness Detection**
 - Corpus statistics for ToS-30. For each category of clause unfairness, we report the number and percentage of unfair clauses, and the number of rationales

Type of clause	# unfair clauses	% unfair clauses	# rationales
Arbitration (A)	45	0.8	8
Unilateral change (CH)	89	1.7	7
Content removal (CR)	58	1.1	17
Limitation of liability (LTD)	161	3.0	18
Unilateral termination (TER)	121	2.3	28

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- Experimental setting
 - **Knowledge as Supporting Facts: Claim Detection**
 - Topics extracted from the IBM2015 corpus, with associated number of evidence and claims. For claims, we also report the percentage with respect to the overall corpus size, which corresponds to the frequency of the positive class.

Topics	No. Evidence	No. Claim	Claim Ratio
1	130	113	4.2%
2	239	201	4.0%
3	578	288	3.8%
4	642	374	3.5%

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- Experimental results
 - Classification macro-F1 computed on 10-fold cross-validation for unfair examples on the ToS-30 dataset

	A	CH	CR	LTD	TER
No Knowledge					
CNN	0.339	0.506	0.403	0.628	0.583
LSTM	0.302	0.573	0.363	0.602	0.508
DistilBERT	0.447	0.635	0.620	0.670	0.748
Full Knowledge					
MANN (WS)	0.483	0.506	0.387	0.635	0.602
MANN (SS)	0.465	0.516	0.414	0.605	0.660
MemBERT (WS)	0.494	0.565	0.639	0.664	0.705
MemBERT (SS)	<u>0.504</u>	<u>0.609</u>	0.670	0.686	<u>0.737</u>
Sampling					
MemBERT (WS) (U-5)	0.514	0.556	0.609	<u>0.678</u>	0.702
MemBERT (WS) (P-5-Att-F)	0.491	0.559	0.601	0.643	0.703
MemBERT (WS) (P-5-LG-F)	0.475	0.574	<u>0.660</u>	<u>0.678</u>	0.716
MemBERT (SS) (U-5)	0.503	0.580	0.617	0.652	0.702
MemBERT (SS) (P-5-Att-F)	0.448	0.599	0.635	0.661	0.708
MemBERT (SS) (P-5-LG-F)	0.490	0.536	0.625	0.656	0.706

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- Experimental results
 - Memory statistics concerning predictions on unfair examples only

Model	U	C	CP	P@1	P@3	MRR
Arbitration (A)						
MANN (WS)	0.311	0.289	0.929	0.571	1.000	0.761
MANN (SS)	0.689	0.644	0.935	0.903	0.968	0.861
MemBERT (WS)	0.489	0.400	0.818	0.273	0.545	0.478
MemBERT (SS)	0.956	0.911	0.953	0.767	0.837	<u>0.848</u>
Arbitration (CH)						
MANN (WS)	0.169	0.090	0.533	0.000	0.067	0.299
MANN (SS)	0.854	0.730	0.855	0.855	0.961	<u>0.883</u>
MemBERT (WS)	0.404	0.382	0.944	0.250	0.750	0.522
MemBERT (SS)	1.000	0.955	0.955	0.809	0.888	0.886
Arbitration (CR)						
MANN (WS)	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.335
MANN (SS)	0.672	0.414	0.615	0.282	0.872	<u>0.612</u>
MemBERT (WS)	0.328	0.328	1.000	0.316	0.632	0.478
MemBERT (SS)	1.000	0.948	0.948	0.431	0.879	0.681
Arbitration (LTD)						
MANN (WS)	0.037	0.025	0.667	0.33	0.833	0.504
MANN (SS)	0.814	0.534	0.656	0.313	0.573	<u>0.501</u>
MemBERT (WS)	0.497	0.416	0.838	0.100	0.275	0.328
MemBERT (SS)	1.000	0.919	0.919	0.224	0.565	0.474
Arbitration (TER)						
MANN (WS)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.499
MANN (SS)	1.000	0.471	0.471	0.438	0.537	<u>0.536</u>
MemBERT (WS)	0.223	0.198	0.889	0.074	0.074	0.193
MemBERT (SS)	1.000	0.851	0.851	0.438	0.579	0.567

MemBERT: Injecting Unstructured Knowledge into BERT [Roggeri et al '21]

- Experimental results
 - Classification performance for dataset IBM2015

	1 Topic	2 Topics	3 Topics	4 Topics
No Knowledge				
CNN	0.196	0.283	0.287	0.268
LSTM	0.194	0.344	0.278	0.272
DistilBERT	0.317	0.431	0.405	<u>0.451</u>
Full Knowledge				
MANN (WS)	0.252	0.380	0.325	0.336
MANN (SS)	0.205	0.392	0.317	0.281
Sampling				
MANN (WS) (U-10)	0.269	0.406	0.331	0.355
MANN (WS) (P-10-Att-F)	0.251	0.402	0.322	0.358
MANN (WS) (P-10-LG-F)	0.259	0.408	0.332	0.340
MANN (SS) (U-10)	0.297	0.400	0.319	0.352
MANN (SS) (P-10-Att-F)	0.264	0.423	0.332	0.348
MANN (SS) (P-10-LG-F)	0.302	0.424	0.344	0.354
MemBERT (WS) (U-10)	0.311	<u>0.457</u>	0.454	0.453
MemBERT (WS) (P-10-Att-F)	0.275	0.449	0.422	0.434
MemBERT (WS) (P-10-LG-F)	0.305	0.449	0.428	0.428
MemBERT (SS) (U-10)	<u>0.341</u>	0.442	<u>0.444</u>	0.436
MemBERT (SS) (P-10-Att-F)	0.354	0.424	0.421	0.423
MemBERT (SS) (P-10-LG-F)	0.290	0.459	0.411	0.444

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Motivation
 - The quality of word representations highly depends on word frequency, which usually follows a heavy-tailed distributions in the pre-training corpus.
 - The embeddings of rare words on the tail are usually poorly optimized
- Proposal
 - Enhance language model pre-training by leveraging definitions of the rare words in dictionaries (e.g., Wiktionary).
 - To incorporate a rare word definition as a part of input, we **fetch its definition from the dictionary** and append it to the end of the input text sequence
 - In addition to training with the masked language modeling objective, we propose **two novel self-supervised pre-training tasks on word and sentence-level alignment between input text sequence and rare word definitions** to enhance language modeling representation with dictionary

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - Two types of pre-training objectives
 - 1) a word-level contrastive objective aims to maximize the mutual information between Transformer representations of a rare word appeared in the input text and its dictionary definition.
 - 2) a sentence-level discriminative objective aims at learning to differentiate between correct and polluted word definitions

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - $X = [\text{CLS}, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_L, \text{SEP}]$: Given the input sent
 - $f_{LM}(X) = [h_{\text{CLS}}, h_1, h_2, \dots, h_L, h_{\text{SEP}}]$: Contextualized rep
 - $f_H(h_{\text{CLS}})$: a header function for sequence classification
 - $f_H([h_{\text{CLS}}, h_1, h_2, \dots, h_L, h_{\text{SEP}}])$: a header function for token classification
 - $S = [s_1, \dots, s_K]$: a set of rare words in the input text sequence X
 - $C = [c^{(1)}, \dots, c^{(K)}]$: their definitions in the dictionary
 - $c^{(i)} = [c_1^{(i)}, \dots, c_{N_i}^{(i)}]$: its definition from the dictionary for a rare word s_i

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT

- So, an input sequence X with appended definitions of K rare words:

$$\text{input} = [\text{CLS}, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_L, \text{SEP}^{(1)}, c_1^{(1)}, c_2^{(1)}, \dots, c_{N_1}^{(1)}; \dots; \text{SEP}^{(K)}, c_1^{(K)}, c_2^{(K)}, \dots, c_{N_K}^{(K)}, \text{SEP}]$$

- The corresponding contextual representation:


$$f_{LM}(\text{input}) = [h_{\text{CLS}}, h_1, h_2, \dots, h_L, h_{\text{SEP}}^{(1)}, h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_{N_1}^{(1)}; \dots; h_{\text{SEP}}^{(K)}, h_1^{(K)}, \dots, h_{N_K}^{(K)}, h_{\text{SEP}}]$$

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - Choosing the rare words
 - Rare words can vary greatly in different corpora
 - For example, rare words in the medical domain are very different from those in general domain
 - keeping a large threshold for a small downstream datasets makes the vocabulary of rare words too large. For example, only 51 words in the RTE dataset have a frequency of more than 500.
 - Proposal
 - Choose specialized rare words for each pre-training corpus and downstream tasks
 - Rank all word frequency from smallest to largest, and add them to the list one by one until the **word frequency of the added word reaches 10% of the total word frequency**

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT



Dict-BERT performs two novel self-supervised learning tasks: word-level mutual information maximization and sentence-level definition discrimination. "SARS" is a negatively sampled rare word.

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT

- Word-level mutual information maximization

- Maximize the MI between a rare word x_i in the input sequence and its well-defined meaning in the dictionary $c^{(i)}$, with joint density $p(x_i, c^{(i)})$ and marginal densities $p(x_i)$ and $p(c^{(i)})$

$$I(x_i; c^{(i)}) = D_{KL}(p(x_i, c^{(i)}) || p(x_i)p(c^{(i)})) = \mathbb{E}_{p(x_i, c^{(i)})} [\log \frac{p(x_i, c^{(i)})}{p(x_i)p(c^{(i)})}]$$

- Encode the underlying shared information and align the semantic representation between the contextual meaning and well-defined meaning of a word

- Approximate MI based on InfoNCE measures the similarity (e.g., inner product) between two word representations

$$I(x_i; c^{(i)}) \geq \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \log \frac{e^{f_{\text{MI}}(h_i, h^{(i)})}}{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbb{1}_{[j \neq i]} e^{f_{\text{MI}}(h_i, h^{(j)})}}] \triangleq I_{\text{NCE}}(x_i; c^{(i)})$$

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - Sentence-level definition discrimination
 - Learning to differentiate between correct and polluted word definitions helps the language model capture global information of input text and dictionary definitions
 - C : the set of definitions from rare words in the input text
 - Sample a set of “polluted” definitions from dictionary by replacing C with probability 50% with a different word randomly sampled from the entire vocabulary together with its definition
 - Loss: to predict whether the appended definition is for a rare word ($y = 1$) or any polluted one ($y = 0$)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DD}} = -\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^K \log p(y | f_{\text{MLP}}(h_{\text{SEP}}^{(i)}))$$

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - Overall objective
 - Train the masked language modeling together with word-level mutual information maximization (MIM) and definition discrimination (DD) tasks


$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{MLM}} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{MIM}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{DD}}$$

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - Finetuning with knowledge-visible attention
 - Notably, when fine-tuning a language model on downstream tasks, there could be many rare/unseen words in the dataset.
 - Therefore, in the fine-tuning stage, when encountering a rare word in the input text, we append its definition to the end of input text, just like what we did in pre-training.
 - Issue: too much knowledge incorporation may divert the sentence from its original meaning by introducing a lot of noise
 - This is more likely to happen if there are multiple rare words in the input text.
 - **The visibility matrix**
 - To limit the impact of definitions on the original text.

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Dict-BERT
 - Finetuning with knowledge-visible attention



Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Performance of different models on GLUE tasks.

Methods	Dict in		MNLI	QNLI	QQP	SST	CoLA	MRPC	RTE	STS-B	Avg	Δ
	PT	FT	Acc.	Acc.	Acc.	Acc.	Matthews	Acc.	Acc.	Pearson		
BERT §	×	×	85.00	91.50	91.20	93.30	58.30	88.30	69.00	88.50	83.10	-
BERT-TNF §	✓	✓	85.00	91.00	91.20	93.20	59.50	89.30	73.20	88.50	83.90	+0.80
BERT (ours)	×	×	84.12	90.69	90.75	92.52	58.89	86.17	68.67	89.39	82.65	-
Dict-BERT-F	×	✓	84.19	90.94	90.68	92.59	59.16	85.75	68.10	88.72	82.51	-0.14
Dict-BERT-P	✓	×	84.33	91.02	90.69	92.62	60.44	86.81	73.86	89.81	83.70	+1.05
└ w/o MIM	✓	×	84.24	90.79	90.24	92.22	60.14	87.03	73.79	89.67	83.52	+0.87
└ w/o DD	✓	×	84.18	90.54	90.30	92.39	61.49	86.49	71.89	89.60	83.36	+0.71
Dict-BERT-PF	✓	✓	84.34	91.20	90.81	92.65	61.68	87.21	72.89	89.68	83.80	+1.15
└ w/o MIM	✓	✓	84.22	90.67	90.66	92.53	61.58	87.20	71.58	89.37	83.47	+0.82
└ w/o DD	✓	✓	84.16	90.21	90.78	92.39	61.14	87.19	71.84	89.24	83.37	+0.72


Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Performance of different models on eight specialized domain datasets under the domain adaptive pre-training (DAPT) setting


Methods	ChemProt	RCT	ACL-ARC	SciERC	HP	AGNews	Helpful	IMDB	Avg
	Mi-F1	Mi-F1	Ma-F1	Ma-F1	Ma-F1	Ma-F1	Ma-F1	Ma-F1	
BERT	81.16	86.91	64.20	80.40	91.17	94.48	69.39	93.67	82.67
BERT-DAPT	83.10	86.85	71.45	81.62	93.52	94.58	70.73	94.78	84.57
Dict-BERT-DAPT-PF	83.49	87.46	74.18	83.01	94.70	94.58	70.04	94.80	85.25
└ w/o MIM	83.33	87.38	72.26	82.70	94.72	94.58	70.33	94.73	85.06
└ w/o DD	84.09	87.23	72.78	82.54	94.69	94.57	70.43	94.70	85.01
RoBERTa	82.03	87.14	66.20	79.55	90.15	94.43	68.35	95.16	83.15
RoBERTa-DAPT	84.02	87.62	73.56	81.85	90.22	94.51	69.06	95.18	84.51
Dict-RoBERTa-PF	84.41	87.42	75.33	82.53	92.51	94.80	70.57	95.51	85.32
└ w/o MIM	84.49	87.51	74.83	81.58	93.27	94.75	70.67	95.40	85.31
└ w/o DD	84.09	87.39	74.04	81.18	90.91	94.64	70.81	95.51	84.82

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Model performance on CoLA, RTE, STSB and MRPC with different variant settings.



(a) Full attn. (FT) v.s. Knowledge attn. (KT)



(b) Rare word ratios (5% v.s. 10% v.s. 15%)

Dict-BERT: Enhancing Language Model Pre-training with Dictionary [Yu et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Performance of different models on WNLaMPro test set, subdivided by word frequency.

Methods	RARE (0, 10)			FREQUENT (100, $+\infty$)			OVERALL (0, $+\infty$)		
	MRR	P@3	p@10	MRR	P@3	p@10	MRR	P@3	p@10
BERT (base)	0.117	0.053	0.036	0.356	0.179	0.116	0.266	0.130	0.084
Dict-BERT	0.145	0.068	0.041	0.359	0.181	0.117	0.274	0.137	0.088
└ w/o MIM	0.144	0.067	0.041	0.357	0.180	0.115	0.272	0.135	0.087
└ w/o DD	0.141	0.065	0.040	0.355	0.179	0.116	0.269	0.133	0.086


Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- Pre-training via Paraphrasing: a retrieval model maps a document to a set of related documents, which a reconstruction model paraphrases to maximize the likelihood of the original

Target document x

Katherine Johnson (August 26, 1918 – February 24, 2020) was an American mathematician whose calculations of orbital mechanics as a NASA employee were critical to the success of the first and subsequent U.S. crewed spaceflights.

1) A **retrieval** model scores the relevance $f(x, z_j)$ of the target document x to each evidence document z_j



2) A **reconstruction** model computes the likelihood of x conditioned on evidence documents $z_{1..M}$ and relevance scores $f(x, z_j)$.

Evidence documents $z_{1..M}$

凱薩琳·強森 (英語: Katherine Johnson, 1918年8月26日- 2020年2月24日) 是一位美國數學家，曾為NASA工作。她的計算對於美國太空計劃的成功至關重要。她曾參與了阿波羅登月計劃和太空梭計劃。她於2020年2月24日去世，享年101歲。她的工作被譽為「太空英雄」。

Katherine Coleman Goble Johnson, née le 26 août 1918 à White Plains, New York (Virginie-Occidentale), est une mathématicienne américaine. Elle a travaillé pour la NASA et a été une pionnière dans le domaine de l'aérospatial. Elle est décédée le 24 février 2020, à l'âge de 101 ans. Elle est connue pour ses contributions à la conception des trajectoires des vaisseaux spatiaux américains, y compris le premier vol spatial habité, le Mercury.

Johnson died on February 24, 2020, at age 101. Following her death, Johnson worked as an aerospace technologist, moving during her career to the Spacecraft Controls Branch. She calculated the trajectory for the May 5, 1961 space flight of Alan Shepard, the first American in space. She also calculated the launch window for his 1961 Mercury mission.

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- MARGE: a Multilingual Autoencoder that Retrieves and Generates.
 - Train MARGE by self-supervising the reconstruction of target text by first retrieving a set of related texts (in many languages) and then conditioning on them to maximize the likelihood of generating the original.

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- MARGE: Overview

- 1) The model first computes a relevance score $f(x_i, z_j)$ between every pair of documents x_i and z_j , by embedding each document and computing their cosine similarities
- 2) The model then computes the likelihood of reconstructing each x_i conditioned on $z_{1..M}$ and each $f(x_i, \cdot)$, using a modified seq2seq model
 - The similarity score encourages the model to attend more to relevant evidence documents.
- 3) We construct batches so that evidence documents are relevant to the targets, using the relevance model for retrieval

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- MARGE

- Relevance Scores

$$f(x, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{g(x) \cdot g(z)}{\|g(x)\| \|g(z)\|} & \text{if } x \neq z \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- Reconstruction Model

$$L_{\theta} = - \sum_i \log p_{\theta}(x_i | z_{1..M}, f(x_i, z_1), \dots, f(x_i, z_M))$$

- Cross attention over a set of evidence documents $z_{1..M}$

$$\alpha = \text{softmax}_{z_{1..M}}(Q^{lh}(x_i)K^{lh}(z_{1..M}) + \beta f(x_i, z_j)) \in \mathbb{R}^{|x_i| \times \sum_j |z_j|}$$

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- Experimental setting
 - Comparison models: MARGE is pre-trained on a scale between XLM and XLM-R.

	#Parameters	#Languages	Pretraining task	Pretraining GPU Days (estimated)	Pretraining Data (GB; estimated)
mBERT	172M	104	MLM	Unknown	60
XLM	570M	100	MLM	640	60
XLM-R	550M	100	MLM	27000	2394
MMTE	192M	100	Translation	Unknown	Unknown
mBART	680M	25	seq2seq MLM	4500	1370
MARGE	963M	26	Retrieval+Reconstruction	4700	206

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Zero-shot unsupervised document level machine translation

	IWSLT2017					WMT19
	ar	de	fr	ja	zh	de
Into English	26.8	28.5	34.3	12.6	19.9	35.8
From English	12.9	14.4	25.5	10.7	12.9	13.4

		Target				
		de	en	it	nl	ro
Source	de	-	30.6	14.0	14.8	11.6
	en	18.8	-	14.3	15.0	14.0
	it	14.0	31.7	-	11.3	12.7
	nl	14.3	27.5	12.6	-	9.3
	ro	14.3	32.8	14.4	9.8	-

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Unsupervised Sentence Retrieval results on BUCC

	de	fr	ru	zh	avg
mBERT	62.5	62.6	51.8	50.0	56.7
MMTE	67.9	63.9	54.3	53.3	59.8
XLM	56.3	63.9	60.6	46.6	56.8
XLM-R	67.5	66.5	73.5	56.7	66.0
MARGE	78.8	75.9	77.3	71.6	75.9

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- Experiment results

- Supervised document-level machine translation.
Comparison results are from Liu et al. [2020]. MARGE performs similarly to mBART

	en-de	zh-en
Random Initialization	7.7	3.2
HAN [Miculicich et al., 2018]	-	24.0
mBART (sentence)	38.0	28.4
mBART (document)	38.5	29.6
MARGE	39.2	28.4

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al ‘20]

- Experiment results
 - ROUGE-L scores on MLSum

Model	Setting	MLSum					
		de	es	fr	ru	tr	avg
Extractive Oracle	Oracle	52.30	35.78	37.69	29.80	45.78	29.81
Lead 3	Deterministic	33.09	13.70	19.69	5.94	28.90	13.65
Pointer-Generator	Train One	35.08	17.67	23.58	5.71	32.59	15.91
M-BERT	Train One	42.01	20.44	25.09	9.48	32.94	17.59
MARGE-NEWS	Zero-shot Transfer	30.01	17.81	19.39	8.67	29.39	15.05
MARGE-NEWS	Train One	42.60	22.31	25.91	10.85	36.09	19.03
MARGE	Train All	42.70	22.27	25.78	10.85	35.47	18.87
MARGE-NEWS	Train All	42.77	22.72	25.79	11.03	35.90	19.09

Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al ‘20]

- Experiment results
 - F1 scores on the MLQA question answering task

	en	ar	de	es	hi	vi	zh	avg
mBERT	80.2	52.3	59.0	67.4	50.2	61.2	59.6	61.4
MMTE	78.5	56.1	58.4	64.9	46.2	59.4	58.3	60.3
XLM	68.6	42.5	50.8	54.7	34.4	48.3	40.5	48.5
XLM-R	83.5	66.6	70.1	74.1	70.6	74.0	62.1	71.6
MARGE	83.7	64.5	68.7	73.4	67.2	71.5	67.8	71.0


Pre-training via Paraphrasing [Lewis et al '20]

- Experiment results
 - Paraphrasing accuracy on PAWS-X

en	de	es	fr	ja	ko	zh	avg
94.0	85.7	87.4	87.0	73.0	69.6	77.0	81.9
93.1	85.1	87.2	86.9	72.0	69.2	75.9	81.3
94.0	85.9	88.3	87.4	69.3	64.8	76.5	80.9
94.7	89.7	90.1	90.4	78.7	79.0	82.3	86.4
94.7	89.4	91.6	90.9	78.9	77.7	82.5	86.5

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

- READTWICE model architecture.



- The input is processed twice, with a memory table for inter-segment information sharing

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

- READTWICE

$$H_i^0 = \text{TokenEmbed}(x_i), H_i^1 = \text{BERT}_1(x_i), \forall i$$

$$M_i = \text{ExtractMemories}(H_i^1), \forall i$$

$$M = \text{Gather}([M_1, \dots, M_N])$$

$$H_i^2 = \text{MemoryAttention}(H_i^1, M), \forall i$$

$$H_i^3 = \text{LayerNorm}(H_i^1 + H_i^2), \forall i$$

$$H_i^4 = \text{BERT}_2(H_i^3), \forall i$$

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

ExtractMemories and Gather

– READTWICE (CLS)

- One obvious choice is to use the CLS token representation associated with segment x_i as a summary of the segment.

– READTWICE (STS)

- Extract a memory vector for each consecutive span of 32 tokens. Contextual embeddings of each span's first and the last tokens are concatenated and linearly projected to a single point in the token vector space as the span representation

– READTWICE (E)

- Memorize representations of entity mention spans. To obtain these spans, we first annotate each segment with an external Named Entity Recognition system.

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

MemoryAttention

$$\alpha_m = \frac{e^{h_{ij}^T M_m + r_{i,m_s}}}{\sum_m e^{h_{ij}^T M_m + r_{i,m_s}} + e^{h_{ij}^T M_0}}$$

- M0: a learnable no-op memory not associated with any specific text.

$$r_{i,m_s} = \omega(\text{dist}(i, m_s))$$

$$\text{dist}(i, m_s) = \begin{cases} -B & i - m_s < -B \\ B & i - m_s > B \\ i - m_s & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$h_{ij}^2 = \sum_{m=1} \alpha_m M_m$$

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Results on HotpotQA development set (answer only F1 score) and on TriviaQA development and test splits for the Wikipedia full setting

Model	HQA	TQA	
	F1 (ans)	F1(dev)	F1(test)
LF	74.3	75.2	-
ETC	75.1	-	-
BIGBIRD	75.7	79.5	-
ROBERTA (us)	72.0	75.9	-
READTWICE-E	75.9	80.7	80.9

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Results on the NarrativeQA's development / test splits

Model	ROUGE-L	BLEU-1	BLEU-4	METEOR
BiDAF (Kociský et al., 2018)	6.3 / 6.2	5.8 / 5.7	0.2 / 0.3	3.8 / 3.7
R^3 (Wang et al., 2018)	11.4 / 11.9	16.4 / 15.7	0.5 / 0.5	3.5 / 3.5
BM25+BERT (Mou et al., 2020)	14.8 / 15.5	14.6 / 14.5	1.8 / 1.4	5.1 / 5.0
ROBERTA (us)	17.4 / 18.0	18.2 / 18.0	2.4 / 2.6	5.4 / 5.4
ETC (us)	18.3 / 18.8	16.1 / 17.2	2.4 / 2.7	5.4 / 5.4
READTWICE (E)	22.7 / 23.3	21.1 / 21.1	3.6 / 4.0	6.7 / 7.0

READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Ablation studies on variants of READTWICE on the dev sets.

Model	HQA	NQA-R	NQA-B	TQA
E	75.89	22.71	21.07	80.7
E(SS)	75.08	21.93	18.39	80.3
E(SS, 10L)	74.70	21.39	18.37	80.4
RoBERTa	72.00	17.40	18.2	75.9
CLS	75.32	20.89	17.80	80.6
STS	75.39	21.08	18.38	80.4


Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- TOME (Transformer Over Mention Encodings)
 - First pre-train a mention encoder to specifically encourage mention representations that are useful for a Transformer model, and construct a Mention Memory from 150 million entity mentions in Wikipedia.
 - Then we train a TOME model with attention layers over the Mention Memory, which is kept frozen

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- TOME: Advantages
 - 1)
 - TOME retrieves entity mention representations corresponding to specific entity attributes or relations described in the corpus.
 - This retrieval is **much more fine-grained** than aggregate entity retrieval methods such as Entities as Experts (EaE)
 - 2)
 - TOME retrieves dense representations, which are easy to incorporate into a Transformer model without reprocessing the input, unlike raw text.
 - TOME is able to retrieve, assimilate and reason over information from many different sources within a single Transformer model, **allowing for multi-source and multi-hop reasoning** without the beam search machinery that is required for multi-hop retrieve-and-read
 - This also makes TOME **much more scalable**:
 - 3)
 - the memory table is **semi-parametric**, so **knowledge can be added or updated by applying the mention encoder to new text without retraining**

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]



- A pre-trained mention encoder is used to generate dense representations for each entity mention in Wikipedia (approximately 150 million total) which are stored in a table
- The TOME model takes a passage annotated with entity mention boundaries as input, and applies a Transformer block
- Next, the TOME model applies one or more TOMEBlocks. Each TOMEBlock contains a memory attention layer and a Transformer block.

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

Notation

- $\mathbf{X} = x_1, \dots, x_T$: An input passage to the model
- Each passage has been annotated with an NER system
- Introduce tokens [Estart] and [Eend] to the vocabulary and insert them before and after each mention in the passage

“What is the nationality of the hero who killed Medusa”



“What is the

[E_start] nationality [E_end] of the [E_start] hero [E_end] who killed [E_start] Medusa [E_end]

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- Constructing mention memory from corpus
 - **Mention encoder**

$$\text{SpanEncodingLayer}(H, (s, e)) = W[H_s; H_e]$$

- Two SpanEncodingLayers (not shared) for value & key
 - **Value mention encodings**: store context-level information about each mention and are used as inputs to the TOME model
 - **Key mention encodings**: identify the type of information stored in the value encodings and serve as attention keys for the memory layer

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

– Mention memory

- After the Mention Encoder is **pre-trained**, use it to generate a Mention Memory from entity mentions in Wikipedia
- Focus on grounded mentions which can be linked to Wikipedia entities (**linked mentions**)
- Gather mention encodings into matrices

$$\text{MemKey} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_K} \text{ and } \text{MemValue} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_V}$$

- N: the total number of linked entity mentions in Wikipedia
- $\text{MemEnt} \in \mathbb{R}^N$: record entity (Wikipedia) IDs of mentions

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

– TOME model

$$M = \text{MemoryAttention}(H),$$

$$H' = \text{TransformerBlock}(M)$$

$$H^0 = \text{InitialTransformerBlock}(\text{TokenEmbedding}(\mathbf{x}))$$

$$H^l = \text{TOMEBlock}_l(H^{l-1}), \quad l = 1 \dots L$$

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

– **TOME model:** MemoryAttention

$$\text{Query}(m) = \text{SpanEncodingLayer}(H, (s, e))$$

$$\alpha_i \propto \exp(\text{Query}(m) \cdot \text{MemKey}(i)), i \in \text{TopMem}(\text{Query}(m))$$

$$\text{Value}(m) = \sum_{i \in \text{TopMem}(\text{Query}(m))} \alpha_i \cdot \text{MemValue}(i)$$

$$M_s = \text{LayerNorm}(H_s + W_U \text{Value}(m))$$

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

– TOME model: Sparse large-scale retrieval

•

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- **TOME model:** Mention encoder pretraining
 - Process passages in each batch twice.
 - 1) The Mention Encoder model generates mention encodings from each passage and aggregates the mention encodings into a batch-wide memory table.
 - 2) Apply a TOME architecture that attends to the batch memory, which we call **BATCH-TOME**.
 - » Note that BATCH-TOME is just used for pre-training the Mention Encoder and not evaluated on any downstream tasks.
 - » Mention Encoder and BATCH-TOME are jointly trained end-to-end so that the Mention Encoder is encouraged to produce mention encodings that contain useful information for BATCH-TOME.
 - 1) **Masked language model:** the standard masked language modeling task, with the loss computed based on the output of the second read (BATCH-TOME)
 - 2) **Coreference resolution**
 - BATCH-TOME does not use entity embeddings, so we cannot use the entity linking task
 - apply a related entity coreference resolution objective, which asks the model to predict whether two linked mentions correspond to the same entity based on the similarity of their encodings

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

– TOME model: TOME pretraining

- Entity prediction

$$\text{EntProb}(m, j) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \text{TopMem}(z_m)} \exp(z_m \cdot \text{MemKey}(i)) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\text{MemEnt}(i) = j\}}{\sum_{i \in \text{TopMem}(z_m)} \exp(z_m \cdot \text{MemKey}(i))}$$

$$\arg \max_j \text{EntProb}(m, j)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{ep}(m) = -\log \text{EntProb}(m, \text{Ent}(m))$$

– Disallowed same passage retrieval.

- » we set the attention weight for all memories from the same passage to zero

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Accuracy on claim verification datasets.

Model	#Params	#Encoded	HoVer _{dev}	HoVer _{test}	FEVER _{dev}	FEVER _{test}
RAG	620M	100	-	-	74.5	72.5
REALM	330M	5	67.3	66.1	70.4	67.1
BERT-Base	110M	1	57.2	-	56.2	-
Entities as Experts	360M	1	66.2	66.6	66.1	63.6
TOME-1	220M	1	73.6	72.8	70.5	67.8
TOME-2	220M	1	74.1	73.1	71.1	68.1


Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Accuracy on open-domain QA datasets TriviaQA and ComplexWebQuestions (CWQ).

Model	#Params	#Encoded	TriviaQA _{dev}	TriviaQA _{Wiki test}	CWQ _{dev}
RAG	620M	100	56.8	68.0	-
Fusion-in-Decoder	440M	100	65.0	77.1	-
REALM	330M	5	55.8	67.1	46.7
T5-3B	3B	1	-	-	38.7
T5-11B	11B	1	42.3	50.1	-
Entities as Experts	360M	1	43.2	53.4	42.7
OPQL	220M	1	-	-	41.1
TOME-1	220M	1	48.6	62.0	44.9
TOME-2	220M	1	53.4	66.7	47.7

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Claim verification accuracy as a function of fine-tuning memory size (in millions).



Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- Experiment results

- Accuracy on held-out subset of TriviaQA and ComplexWebQuestions (CWQ) questions.

TOME-1-unseen was pre-trained and finetuned with memory without entities from heldout set and evaluated with full memory

Dataset	TriviaQA _{dev}	CWQ _{dev}
TOME-1	17.4	16.4
TOME-1-unseen	17.6	16.7

Mention Memory: incorporating textual knowledge into Transformers through entity mention attention [de Jong et al '21]

- Experiment results

- Accuracy on held-out subset of TriviaQA and ComplexWebQuestions (CWQ) questions.


TOME-1-unseen was pre-trained and finetuned with memory without entities from heldout set and evaluated with full memory

Dataset	TriviaQA _{dev}	CWQ _{dev}
TOME-1	17.4	16.4
TOME-1-unseen	17.6	16.7

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Motivation: “To copy is easier than to memorize”
- GNN-LM
 - Extends vanilla neural language model (LM) by allowing to reference similar contexts in the entire training corpus
 - Build a directed **heterogeneous** graph between an input context and its semantically related neighbors selected from the training corpus
 - Nodes are tokens in the input context and retrieved neighbor contexts,
 - Edges represent connections between nodes
 - Graph neural networks (GNNs) are constructed upon the graph to aggregate information from similar contexts to decode the token

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]



- Given a context c_t , a base LM model encodes it into a high-dimensional representation h_t , which is then used to query the training datastore to retrieve the nearest contexts along with the visited tokens (marked in red)
- The tokens in the input context and the retrieved tokens comprise a graph and are viewed as two types of nodes: nodes from the original text and nodes from the neighbor text
- Inter-context edges link tokens within the same input, and intra-context edges link tokens from the retrieved contexts to the original context

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Graph construction
 - Build a graph capturing the connections between the context tokens $\mathbf{c}_t = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{t-1})$ and those similar to \mathbf{c}_t in the training set
 - $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \tau, \phi)$: a graph
 - $\mathcal{A} = \{a_o, a_n\}$: two types of nodes
 - a_o means that the node is within the input \mathbf{c}_t
 - a_n means the node is in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{c}_t)$
 - $\mathcal{R} = \{r_{\text{inter}}, r_{\text{intra}}\}$: two types of edges
 - r_{inter} means inter-context connection (from a_n nodes to a_o nodes)
 - r_{intra} means intra-context connection (between two nodes of same type)
 - A graph interpretation of the transformer structure.
 - Each token within the input is a node of type a_o , and edges of type r_{inter} are constructed from node w_i to w_j ($i \leq j$)
 - $\tau(v) : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(e) : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$: Type mapping functions of nodes & edges

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Graph construction

- Retrieve k nearest neighbors $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{c}_t) = \{\mathbf{c}_{t_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{t_k}^{(k)}\}$
 - Use \mathbf{h}_t to query the cached representations of all tokens for training samples, where the cached representations are obtained by a pretrained LM the i -th training sample
 - Retrieve the top K tokens denoted by $\{w_j^{(i)}\}$ j -th time step
 - $\mathbf{c}_j^{(i)} = \{w_{j+p}^{(i)}\}_{p=-l}^r$: Extend $w_j^{(i)}$ to $\mathbf{c}_j^{(i)}$ by adding both left and right contexts
 - $\{\mathbf{h}_{j+p}^{(i)}\}_{p=-l}^r$ are used as the initialized node embeddings

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- GNN on the constructed graph
 - Use graph neural networks (GNNs) to aggregate and percolate the token information based on the graph
 - The l -th layer representation of node n is computed by:

$$\mathbf{h}_n^{[l]} = \underset{\forall s \in \mathcal{N}(n)}{\text{Aggregate}}(\text{Attention}(s, e, n) \cdot \text{Feature}(s, e, n)) + \mathbf{h}_n^{[l-1]}$$

- *Attention*: Estimates the importance of the source node s on target node n with relationship e
- *Feature*(s, e, n): the information feature that s should pass to n
- *Aggregate*(\cdot): aggregates the neighborhood message with the attention weights

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- GNN on the constructed graph

– Attention

- For each edge (s, e, n) , the representation of target node n is mapped to a query vector $Q(n)$, and the representation of source node s is mapped to a key vector $K(s)$.
- The scaled inner-production is then used to compute the attention weight between $Q(n)$ and $K(s)$:

$$K(s) = \mathbf{W}_{\tau(s)}^k \mathbf{h}_s^{[l-1]}, \quad Q(n) = \mathbf{W}_{\tau(n)}^q \mathbf{h}_n^{[l-1]},$$

$$\text{Attention}(s, e, n) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(K(s) \mathbf{W}_{\phi(e)}^{\text{ATT}} Q(n)^\top \cdot \frac{\mu_{\langle \tau(s), \phi(e), \tau(n) \rangle}}{\sqrt{d}} \right)$$

$$Z = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{N}(n), e' \in \phi(e)} \text{Attention}(s', e', n),$$

normalized over all edges that have the same edge type

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- GNN on the constructed graph

- Feature

- Propagate information from source node s to target node n
 - The single-head feature is defined by:


$$\text{Feature}(s, e, n) = \mathbf{W}_{\tau(s)}^v \mathbf{h}_s^{[l-1]} \mathbf{W}_{\phi(e)}^{\text{FEA}}$$

- Aggregate

- Weight-sums the feature $\text{Message}(s, e, n)$ within the vicinity using $\text{Attention}(s, e, n)$,

$$\text{Aggregate}(\cdot) = \mathbf{W}_{\tau(n)}^o \left(\bigoplus_{\forall s \in \mathcal{N}(n)} \left(\text{Attention}(s, e, n) \cdot \text{Feature}(s, e, n) \right) \right)$$

element-wise addition



GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- kNN-based probability for next token
 - Further incorporate the proposed model with kNN, a related but orthogonal technique, to improve the performance of our model

$$p(w_t|\mathbf{c}_t) = \lambda p_{\text{kNN}}(w_t|\mathbf{c}_t) + (1 - \lambda)p_{\text{LM}}(w_t|\mathbf{c}_t),$$

$$p_{\text{kNN}}(w_t|\mathbf{c}_t) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}_{w_t=w_{t_i}^{(i)}} \exp \left(\cos(f(\mathbf{c}_t), f(\mathbf{c}_{t_i}^{(i)})) / T \right)$$

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - WikiText-103: Test perplexity

Model	# Param	Test ppl (\downarrow)
Hebbian + Cache (Rae et al., 2018)	151M	29.9
Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019)	257M	18.3
Transformer-XL + Dynamic Eval (Krause et al., 2019)	257M	16.4
Compressive Transformer (Rae et al., 2019)	-	17.1
KNN-LM + Cache (Khandelwal et al., 2019)	257M	15.8
Sandwich Transformer (Press et al., 2020a)	247M	18.0
Shortformer (Press et al., 2020b)	247M	18.2
SegaTransformer-XL (Bai et al., 2021)	257M	17.1
Routing Transformer (Roy et al., 2021)	-	15.8
base LM (Baevski & Auli, 2018)	247M	18.7
+GNN	274M	16.8
+GNN+ k NN	274M	14.8

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Experiment results

- One Billion Word: Test perplexity


Model	# Param	Test ppl (\downarrow)
LSTM+CNN (Jozefowicz et al., 2016)	1.04B	30.0
High-Budget MoE (Shazeer et al., 2016)	5B	28.0
DynamicConv (Wu et al., 2018)	0.34B	26.7
Mesh-Tensorflow (Shazeer et al., 2018)	4.9B	24.0
Evolved Transformer (Shazeer et al., 2018)	-	28.6
Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019)	0.8B	21.8
Adaptive inputs (base) (Baevski & Auli, 2018)	0.36B	25.2
Adaptive inputs (large) (Baevski & Auli, 2018)	0.46B	23.9
base LM (Baevski & Auli, 2018)	1.0B	23.0
+GNN	1.0B	22.7
+GNN+ k NN	1.0B	22.5

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Experiment results
 - Enwik8: Bit per Character on the Enwik8 dataset.

Model	# Param	BPC (↓)
64L Transformer (Al-Rfou et al., 2019)	235M	1.06
18L Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019)	88M	1.03
24L Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019)	277M	0.99
24L Transformer-XL + Dynamic Eval (Krause et al., 2019)	277M	0.94
Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020)	102M	0.99
Adaptive Transformer (Sukhbaatar et al., 2019)	209M	0.98
Compressive Transformer (Rae et al., 2019)	277M	0.97
Sandwich Transformer (Press et al., 2020a)	209M	0.97
12L Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019)	41M	1.06
+GNN	48M	1.04
+GNN+ k NN	48M	1.03

Memorizing Transformers ['21]



BeliefBank: Adding Memory to a Pre-Trained Language Model for a Systematic Notion of Belief [Kassner et al '21]

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation

[Khandelwal et al '21]

Towards Continual Knowledge Learning of Language Models [Jang et al '21]