Knowledge-Enhanced Pretrained Language Models

2021.11.09

Jeonbuk National University

Seung-Hoon Na

Contents

- Introduction
- Memory-augmented pretrained language models
  - External-knowledge-convertible memory (knowledge-injectable)
    - Corpus memory (retrieval-augmented): REALM/RAG/MARGE
    - Contextual memory: KNN-LM/TNF/TOME/GNN-LM
    - Concept &Entity memory: KnowBERT/EAE/LUKE/Dict-BERT/KALM
      - Lexicon memory
    - Relational memory: FAE/JAKET
    - Hybrid memory: OPQL-LM
  - Internationally defined memory
  - Working memory
    - Cache for long document
      - READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al ’21]
- Knowledge-distilled pretrained language models
- Reasoning-enhanced pretrained language models
- Discussion & Future issues
- Summary & Conclusion

Deep Learning for NLP: Brief history

- Neural language models [Bengio et al '03]
  - Starting in the 2000s, neural networks begin to be used for language modeling
  - Equipped with word embeddings, the task aims at predicting the next word in a text given the previous words
- Contextual pretrained language models: BERT [Devlin et al. , 2018]
  - Have made significant breakthrough in various NLP tasks by training on large scale of unlabeled text resources.



Pretrained Language Models for NLP (2018~)

- Pretraining
  - Use very large corpus
  - Based on self-supervised losses
  - E.g.) MaskLM
- Finetuning
  - Require only a very simple application-specific NN (mostly a single output layer)



Pretrained Language Models for NLP (2018~)

- BERT
  - Pretrain deep bidirectional representations from unlabeled text by jointly conditioning on both left and right context in all layers
  - Finetune the pre-trained BERT model with just one additional output layer to create state-of-the-art models for a wide range of tasks
    - » Without substantial task-specific architecture modifications



BERT [Devlin et al '18]

Pretrained Language Models for NLP: Extension

- Alternative pretraining methods
  - **XLNet**: autoregressive but bidirectional pretraining method
  - **RoBERTa**: Dynamic word mask and pretraining w/o the next sentence loss
  - **ALBERT**: Model parameter compression using factorized embedding & cross-layer parameter sharing
- Extensions of transformer architecture
  - Decoder (**GPT**): An unidirectional left-to-right Transformer
  - Encoder & decoder (**UniLM, MASS, BART**): use combined architecture a bidirectional encoder and an unidirectional decoder
- Novel losses for self-supervised learning
  - **SpanBERT**: Propose the Span Boundary Objective (SBO)
    - Predict each token of a masked span using only the representations of the boundary tokens
  - **ELECTRA**: Based on generative adversarial networks
    - Generator: sample new masked words
    - Discriminator (ELECTRA): predicts whether those words are replaced or original

Pretrained Language Models for NLP: Extension

- Knowledge-enhanced pretraining methods
  - **ERNIE**, **KnowBERT**, **KEPLER**, **WKLM**, **JAKET**, **LUKE**, etc.
- Retrieval-augmented methods
  - **REALM**: augments language model pre-training with a neural knowledge retriever that retrieves knowledge from a textual knowledge corpus
  - **RAG**: Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Mostly based on external memory: memory-augmented LMs

- Model distillation
  - **DistillBERT**: use knowledge distillation to transfer the knowledge from a teacher to a student
  - **TinyBERT**: Additionally use transformer-layer and embedding-layer distillation
- Other extensions
  - Multilingual: **mBERT**, **XLM** (cross-lingual language model pretraining)
  - Multimodal: **ViLBERT**, **VisualBERT**, **VideoBERT**
  - Domain-specific: **BioBERT**, **ClinicalBERT**, **SciBERT**, **PatentBERT**, **FinBERT**, **SentiBERT**
  - Language-specific:
    - Korean: KR-BERT, KR-BERT-KOSAC, KorBERT, Ko-RoBERTa
    - French: CamemBERT and FlauBERT
    - Chinese: ZEN, NEZHA, BERT-wwm-Chinese
    - Dutch: BERTje, RobBERT
    - Arabic: AraBERT

Pretrained Language Models: Challenge

- Huge pretrained language models: Too resource-intensive
  - E.g.) GPT3 has 175 billion parameters



Pretrained Language Models: Challenge

- Learning factual knowledge requires much more data ➔ much more LM parameters



When Do You Need Billions of Words of Pretraining Data? [Zhang et al '21]

Pretrained Language Models: Challenge

- But, LM with much more parameters effectively capture knowledge of large dataset



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

Contents

- Introduction
- Memory-augmented pretrained language models
  - External-knowledge-convertible memory (knowledge-injectable)
    - Corpus memory (retrieval-augmented): REALM/RAG/MARGE
    - Contextual memory: KNN-LM/TNF/TOME/GNN-LM
    - Concept &Entity memory: KnowBERT/EAE/LUKE/Dict-BERT/KALM
      - Lexicon memory
    - Relational memory: FAE/JAKET
    - Hybrid memory: OPQL-LM
  - Internationally defined memory
  - Working memory
    - Cache for long document
      - READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al '21]
- Knowledge-distilled pretrained language models
- Reasoning-enhanced pretrained language models
- Discussion & Future issues
- Summary & Conclusion

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- kNN-LM
  - Use a k-nearestneighbor (kNN) component to improve language model performance
- BERT-kNN
  - Use the idea of kNN-LM for QA, showing that it is beneficial for open-domain QA tasks.
  - Contribution
    - i) BERT-kNN outperforms BERT on cloze-style QA by large margins without any further training.
    - ii) We show that BERT often identifies the correct response category (e.g., US city), but only kNN recovers the factually correct answer (e.g., "Miami").
    - iii) Compared to BERT, BERT-kNN excels for rare facts.
    - iv) BERT-kNN can easily handle facts not covered by BERT's training set, e.g., recent events.

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

BERT-kNN interpolates BERT's prediction for question q with a kNN-search.



BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- Method
  - Datastore
    - Our text collection C is the 2016- 12-21 English Wikipedia
    - For each single-token word occurrence w in a sentence in C, we compute the pair (c, w) where c is a context embedding computed by BERT
    - Mask the occurrence of w in the sentence and use the embedding of the masked token.
    - Store all pairs (c, w) in a key-value datastore D where c serves as key and w as value
  - Information Retrieval
    - Just using the datastore D does not give good results
    - Use Chen et al. (2017)'s IR system to first select a small subset of D using a keyword search
    - The IR index contains all Wikipedia articles.
    - Find the top 3 relevant Wikipedia articles using TF-IDF search.
    - For KB queries, we use the subject to query the IR index. If the subject has its dedicated Wikipedia page, we simply use this.
    - For non-knowledge base queries, we use the cloze-style question q ([MASK] is removed).

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- Method
  - Inference
    - During testing, first run the IR search to identify the subset D' of D that corresponds to the relevant Wikipedia articles
    - For the kNN search, q is embedded in the same way as the context representations c in D
    - $BERT(q)$: the embedding computed by BERT for [MASK]
    - Then retrieve the k = 128 nearest-neighbors of $BERT(q)$ in D'
    - Convert the distances (Euclidean) between $BERT(q)$ and the kNNs to a probability distribution using $softmax$
    - Since a word w can occur several times in kNN, we compute its final output probability as the sum over all occurrences.
    - Interpolate kNN's (weight 0.3) and BERT's original predictions (weight 0.7)

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

– Inference

The probability of the kNN search for word w is given by:

$p_{kNN}(w \mid q) \sim \sum_{(c_w,w)\in kNN} e^{-d(BERT(q),c_w)/l}$.

The final probability of BERT-kNN is the interpolation of the predictions of BERT and the kNN search:

$p_{BERT-kNN}(q) = \lambda p_{kNN}(q) + (1-\lambda) p_{BERT}(q)$,

with

q question,

$BERT(q)$ embedding q,

w target word,

s_w context of w,

$c_w = BERT(s)$ embedded context,

d distance,

l distance scaling,

λ interpolation parameter.

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- Experiment results

Mean P@1 on LAMA and LAMA-UHN on the TREx and GoogleRE subsets for BERT-base, BERTlarge, ERNIE (Zhang et al., 2019), KnowBert (Peters et al., 2019), E-BERT (Poerner et al., 2019) and BERT-kNN. BERT-kNN performs best.

Dataset	BERT-base	BERT-large	ERNIE	Know-BERT	E-BERT	BERT-kNN
LAMA	27.7	30.6	30.4	31.7	36.2	**39.4**
LAMA-UHN	20.6	23.0	24.7	24.6	31.1	**34.8**

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- Experiment results

Mean P@1 for BERT-base, kNN and their interpolation (BERT-kNN) for LAMA subsets and unseen facts. BERT results differ from Petroni et al. (2019) where a smaller vocabulary is used

Dataset	**Statistics**		**Model**		
	Facts	Rel	BERT	kNN	BERT -kNN
GoogleRE	5527	3	9.8	**51.1**	48.6
TREx	34039	42	29.1	34.4	**38.7**
ConceptNet	11153	16	**15.6**	4.7	11.6
SQuAD	305	-	14.1	**25.5**	24.9
unseen	34637	32	18.8	21.5	**27.1**

Mean P@1 on LAMA (TREx, GoogleRE subsets) for different context embedding strategies

Configuration	P@1
hidden layer 12	36.8
hidden layer 11	**39.4**
hidden layer 10	34.7
hidden layer 11 (without IR)	26.9

BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- Experiment results

Mean P@1, P@5, P@10 on LAMA for original BERT and BERT-kNN



BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA [Kassner & Schutze '20]

- Experiment results

Examples of generation for BERT-base, kNN, BERT-kNN. The last column reports the top three tokens generated together with the associated probability (in parentheses).

	Query and True Answer	Generation
Google RE	hans gefors was born in [MASK]. True: stockholm	BERT-kNN: stockholm (0.36), oslo (0.15), copenhagen (0.13) BERT: oslo (0.22), copenhagen (0.18), bergen (0.09) kNN: stockholm (1.0), lund (0.00), hans (0.00)
TREx	regiomontanus works in the field of [MASK]. True: mathematics	BERT-kNN: astronomy (0.20), mathematics (0.13), medicine (0.06) BERT: medicine (0.09), law (0.05), physics (0.03) kNN: astronomy (0.63), mathematics (0.36), astronomical (0.00)
Concept Net	ears can [MASK] sound. True: hear	BERT-kNN: hear (0.27), detect (0.23), produce (0.06) BERT: hear (0.28), detect (0.06), produce (0.04) kNN: detect (0.77), hear (0.14), produce (0.10)
Squad	tesla was in favour of the [MASK] current type. True: ac	BERT-kNN: alternating (0.39), electric (0.18), direct (0.11) BERT: electric (0.28), alternating (0.18), direct (0.11) kNN: alternating (0.87), direct (0.12), ac (0.00)

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

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

  - The corresponding contextual representation:

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

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 $p\left(c^{(i)}\right)$

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

      - 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

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

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)

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

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, +∞)			OVERALL (0, +∞)		
	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

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al ’21]

- Non-parametric methods for LM
  - E.g.) kNN-LM, REALM, RAG
  - Properties
    - 1) *Expressive*: use an arbitrary amount of data at test time
    - 2) *Adaptable*: predictions can be controlled by changing the datastore
    - 3) *Interpretable*: the data used to make the prediction can be directly inspected
- Proposal: kNN-MT
  - A simple non-parametric method for machine translation (MT) using nearest neighbor retrieval
  - Can be added to any pre-trained neural translation model without further training,
  - Significantly improves performance for in-domain, out-of-domain, and multi-lingual evaluations.
    - E.g.) it improves a state-of-the-art GermanEnglish translation model by 1.5 BLEU.

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]



- The datastore: constructed offline, consists of representations of training set translation contexts and corresponding target tokens for every example in the parallel data
- During generation, the query representation, conditioned on the test input as well as previously generated tokens, is used to retrieve the k nearest neighbors from the datastore, along with the corresponding target tokens.

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- kNN-MT
  - $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_{M_1})$: an input sequence of tokens in a source language
  - $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_{M_2})$: a sequence of tokens in the target language
  - $p(t_i|s, t_{1:i-1})$: With autoregressive decoders, the output distribution for each token t_i in the target sequence, which is conditioned on the entire source sequence as well as the previous target tokens
  - $(s, t_{1:i-1})$: the translation context
  - t_i : the target token.

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- kNN-MT
  - Datastore creation
    - $f(s, t_{1:i-1})$: the key, a high-dimensional representation of the entire translation context computed by the MT decoder
    - $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$: a parallel text collection
    - The representations are generated by a single forward pass

$$(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V}) = \{(f(s, t_{1:i-1}),\ t_i),\ \forall t_i \in t \mid (s, t) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})\}$$

  - Generation
    - $p_{MT}(y_i|x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1})$: a distribution over the vocabulary for the target y_i at every step of generation
    - $f(x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1})$: outputs the representation used to query the datastore for the k nearest neighbors N according to squared-L 2 distance

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- kNN-MT
  - Generation
    - Then convert retrieved set into a distribution over the vocabulary
      - By applying a softmax with temperature T to the negative distances and aggregating over multiple occurrences of the same vocabulary item

$$p_{\text{kNN}}(y_i|x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1}) \propto \sum_{(k_j,v_j)\in\mathcal{N}} \mathbb{1}_{y_i=v_j} \exp\left(\frac{-d(k_j, f(x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1}))}{T}\right)$$

Using a temperature greater than one flattens the distribution, and prevents overfitting to the most similar retrievals.

      - The model and kNN distributions are interpolated with a tuned parameter λ

$$p(y_i|x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1}) = \lambda\, p_{\text{kNN}}(y_i|x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1}) + (1-\lambda)\, p_{\text{MT}}(y_i|x, \hat{y}_{1:i-1})$$

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- kNN-MT vs. kNN-LM
  - kNN-MT is a generalization of kNN-LM applied to conditional sequence generation, with a few important differences:
    - 1) the keys are not only conditioned on prior context, but also on the source sequence (here, in a different language)
      - The representations must encode both source and target context;
    - 2) there is an additional tuned parameter, the softmax temperature. Higher temperatures flatten the distribution and allow for greater diversity without overfitting to the retrieved contexts

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Multilingual machine translation with kNN-MT
    - All test sets are from newstest2019, except ja-en/en-ja which are from newstest2020

	de-en	**ru-en**	**zh-en**	**ja-en**	**fi-en**	**lt-en**	**de-fr**	**de-cs**	**en-cs**
Test set sizes	2,000	2,000	2,000	993	1,996	1,000	1,701	1,997	2,000
Base MT	34.45	36.42	24.23	12.79	25.92	29.59	32.75	21.15	22.78
+kNN-MT	**35.74**	**37.83**	**27.51**	13.14	26.55	29.98	**33.68**	21.62	**23.76**
Datastore Size	5.56B	3.80B	1.19B	360M	318M	168M	4.21B	696M	533M

	en-de	**en-ru**	**en-zh**	**en-ja**	**en-fi**	**en-lt**	**fr-de**	**cs-de**	**Avg.**
Test set sizes	1,997	1,997	1,997	1,000	1,997	998	1,701	1,997	-
Base MT	36.47	26.28	30.22	21.35	21.37	17.41	26.04	22.78	26.00
+kNN-MT	**39.49**	**27.91**	**33.63**	**23.23**	22.20	18.25	**27.81**	23.55	**27.40**
Datastore Size	6.50B	4.23B	1.13B	433M	375M	204M	3.98B	689M	-

Adding kNN-MT increases BLEU scores in all cases, and by over 3 points for en-de, zh-en and en-zh

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Multilingual machine translation with kNN-MT

Adding datastores with English source-side data can improve translation from other languages by an average of 1 BLEU, suggesting that our representations generalize over different source languages

	Ted Talks					Newstest2019			Avg.
	de-ja	**ru-ja**	**uk-ja**	**de-ru**	**de-zh**	**fr-de**	**cs-de**	**de-cs**	
Test set sizes	4,442	5,090	3,560	4,288	4,349	1,701	1,997	1,997	-
Base MT	10.11	9.69	8.36	17.24	20.48	26.04	22.78	21.15	16.98
+kNN-MT (en-$*$)	11.08	10.42	9.64	18.02	21.22	27.85	23.71	21.74	17.96
Datastore Size	433M	433M	433M	4.23B	1.13B	6.50B	6.50B	533M	-

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Domain adaptation using kNN-MT

The base MT system is trained on WMT'19 data which is also treated as the in-domain data for newstest2019. kNN-MT improves the base model by an average of 9.2 BLEU, without training, to achieve the best reported results on this task.

	Newstest 2019	Medical	Law	IT	Koran	Subtitles	Avg.
Test set sizes	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	-
Aharoni & Goldberg (2020):							
one model per domain	-	**56.5**	59.0	43.0	15.9	27.3	40.34
one model for all domains	-	53.3	57.2	42.1	20.9	27.6	40.22
best data selection method	-	54.8	58.8	43.5	**21.8**	27.4	41.26
Base MT	37.59	39.91	45.71	37.98	16.30	29.21	33.82
+kNN-MT:							
in-domain datastore	39.08	54.35	**61.78**	45.82	19.45	**31.73**	**42.63**
WMT'19 datastore	39.08	40.22	46.74	40.27	17.99	29.23	34.89
all-domains datastore	38.88	54.54	**61.11**	**48.63**	19.22	**31.70**	**43.04**
Datastore Size (in-domain)	770M	5.70M	18.3M	3.10M	450K	159M	-

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation [Khandelwal et al '21]

– Tuning kNN-MT



Effect of the number of neighbors retrieved and the softmax temperature on the validation BLEU score for en-zh. Temperatures greater than 1 are important to prevent the model from overfitting to the most similar neighbor. For higher temperatures, more neighbors do not always result in improvements.



Effect of datastore size on the validation BLEU score for ru-en and en-zh. Performance improves monotonically with size but retrieval can be slow for datastores containing billions of tokens. Smaller datastores, which account for a large fraction of the improvement, can be used for faster retrieval.

Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation

: Example retrievals using kNN-MT **[Khandelwal et al '21]**

Test Input: *Dabei schien es, als habe Erdogan das Militär gezähmt.*
Generated tokens: *In doing so, it seems as if Erdogan has tamed the*

Training Set Translation Context (source and target)		**Training Set Target**	**Context Probability**
Dem charismatischen Ministerpräsidenten Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, der drei aufeinanderfolgende Wahlen für sich entscheiden konnte, ist es gelungen seine Autorität gegenüber dem Militär geltend zu machen.	*The charismatic prime minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, having won three consecutive elections, has been able to exert his authority over the*	military	0.132
Ein bemerkenswerter Fall war die Ermordung des gemäßigten Premierministers Inukai Tsuyoshi im Jahre 1932, die das Ende jeder wirklichen zivilen Kontrolle des Militärs markiert.	*One notable case was the assassination of moderate Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi in 1932, which marked the end of any real civilian control of the*	military	0.130
Sie sind Teil eines Normalisierungsprozesses und der Herstellung der absoluten zivilen Kontrolle über das Militär und bestätigen das Prinzip, dass niemand über dem Gesetz steht.	*They are part of a process of normalization, of the establishment of absolute civilian control of the*	military	0.129
Diese hart formulierte Erklärung wurde als verschleierte, jedoch unmissverständliche Warnung angesehen, dass das Militär bereit wäre einzuschreiten...	*That toughly worded statement was seen as a veiled but unmistakable warning that the*	military	0.123
...	...	...	...

Final kNN distribution: military $= 1.0$
Final Translation: In doing so, Erdogan seemed to have tamed the military.
Reference: In doing so, it seems as if Erdogan has tamed the military.

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 ct, a base LM model encodes it into a high-dimensional representation ht, 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 $\boldsymbol{c}_t = (w_1, w_2, ..., w_{t-1})$ and those similar to $\boldsymbol{c}_t$ 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 $\boldsymbol{c}_t$
    - a_n means the node is in $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{c}_t)$
  - $\mathcal{R} = \{r_{\text{inter}}, r_{\text{intra}}\}$: 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 ($i \leq j$)
  - $\tau(v) : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(e) : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{R}$: 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 $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{c}_t) = \{\boldsymbol{c}_{t_1}^{(1)}, ..., \boldsymbol{c}_{t_k}^{(k)}\}$
    - Use $\boldsymbol{h}_t$ to query the cached representations of all tokens for training samples, where the cached representations are obtained by a pretrained LM
    - Retrieve the top K tokens denoted by $\{w_j^{(i)}\}$ (the i-th training sample; j-th time step)
    - $\boldsymbol{c}_j^{(i)} = \{w_{j+p}^{(i)}\}_{p=-l}^{r}$: Extend $w_j^{(i)}$ to $c_j^{(i)}$ by adding both left and right contexts
    - $\{\boldsymbol{h}_{j+p}^{(i)}\}_{p=-l}^{r}$ 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:

$$\boldsymbol{h}_n^{[l]} = \underset{\forall s \in \mathcal{N}(n)}{\text{Aggregate}}\left(\text{Attention}(s, e, n) \cdot \text{Feature}(s, e, n)\right) + \boldsymbol{h}_n^{[l-1]}$$

  - $Attention$: 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 $K(s)$:

$$K(s) = \boldsymbol{W}^{k}_{\tau(s)} \boldsymbol{h}^{[l-1]}_{s}, \quad Q(n) = \boldsymbol{W}^{q}_{\tau(n)} \boldsymbol{h}^{[l-1]}_{n},$$

$$\text{Attention}(s, e, n) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(K(s) \boldsymbol{W}^{\text{ATT}}_{\phi(e)} Q(n)^{\top} \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\langle \tau(s), \phi(e), \tau(n) \rangle}}{\sqrt{d}} \right)$$

$$Z = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{N}(n), e' \in \phi(e)} \text{Attention}(s', e', n),$$

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:

$$\text{Feature}(s, e, n) = \boldsymbol{W}^{v}_{\tau(s)} \boldsymbol{h}^{[l-1]}_{s} \boldsymbol{W}^{\text{FEA}}_{\phi(e)}$$

  - **Aggregate**
    - Weight-sums the feature Message(s, e, n) within the vicinity using Attention(s, e, n),

element-wise addition

$$\text{Aggregate}(\cdot) = \boldsymbol{W}^{o}_{\tau(n)} \left(\bigoplus_{\forall s \in \mathcal{N}(n)} (\text{Attention}(s, e, n) \cdot \text{Feature}(s, e, n)) \right)$$

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

$$p(w_t|\boldsymbol{c}_t) = \lambda p_{\text{kNN}}(w_t|\boldsymbol{c}_t) + (1-\lambda)p_{\text{LM}}(w_t|\boldsymbol{c}_t),$$

$$p_{\text{kNN}}(w_t|\boldsymbol{c}_t) = \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{w_t = w_{t_i}^{(i)}} \exp\left(\cos(f(\boldsymbol{c}_t), f(\boldsymbol{c}_{t_i}^{(i)}))/T\right)$$

GNN-LM: Language Modeling based on Global Contexts via GNN [Meng et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - WikiText-103: Test perplexity

Model	# Param	Test ppl (↓)
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+kNN	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 (↓)
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+kNN	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+kNN	48M	1.03

Contents

- Introduction
- Memory-augmented pretrained language models
  - External-knowledge-convertible memory (knowledge-injectable)
    - Corpus memory (retrieval-augmented): REALM/RAG/MARGE
    - Contextual memory: KNN-LM/TNF/TOME/GNN-LM
    - Concept &Entity memory: KnowBERT/EAE/LUKE/Dict-BERT/KALM
      - Lexicon memory
    - Relational memory: FAE/JAKET
    - Hybrid memory: OPQL-LM
  - Internationally defined memory
  - Working memory
    - Cache for long document
      - READTWICE: Reading Very Large Documents with Memories [Zemlyanskiy et al ’21]
- Knowledge-distilled pretrained language models ◀
- Reasoning-enhanced pretrained language models
- Discussion & Future issues
- Summary & Conclusion

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Motivation
  - While the tasks of improving the memorization and generalization of Transformers have been widely studied, it is not well known how to make transformers forget specific old facts and memorize new ones
- In this work
  - Propose a new task of explicitly modifying specific factual knowledge in Transformer models while ensuring the model performance does not degrade on the unmodified facts.
    - This task is useful in many scenarios, such as updating stale knowledge, protecting privacy, and eliminating unintended biases stored in the models

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Related works
  - **Memory augmented models**
    - E.g.) FAE, EAE, kNN-LM
    - This approach tends to cause wrong predictions for all other facts that shared the same object before modification, resulting in low accuracy on the unmodified facts.
      - Thus, our work on modifying the implicit memory of Transformer models also has utility for the task of updating knowledge in memory augmented Transformer models
  - **Generalization often requires memorization**
    - [Feldman (2020); Feldman and Zhang (2020)]
      - Demonstrated both theoretical results and empirical evidences to imply that close-to-optimal generalization requires memorization of labels for samples from the low-frequency sub-populations
    - We believe that our ¨ work on modifying the implicit memories in Transformer models can improve their generalization by boosting their factual knowledge in specific domains.

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- **Memory modification vs. continual learning**
  - Continual learning
    - Aims to learn a new task while preserving the performance on the previous tasks without access to their data
  - Memory modification
    - Also expects the predictions to be updated efficiently (potentially without access to the unmodified facts) while preserving the accuracy for the unmodified facts
  - In this case, both settings suffer from catastrophic forgetting, but memory modification further requires the model to memorize new facts that conflict with previously learned facts, posing new challenges to existing continual learning approaches
    - e.g.) we may need to update the Gradient Episodic Memory (Lopez-Paz and Ranzato, 2017) or the Conceptors (Liu et al., 2019).
  - Furthermore, our benchmark and the evaluated models are at larger scales as compared to the works mentioned above, posing a stricter requirement on the scalability of the proposed solution.

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Modification of Implicit Knowledge
  - $\theta_0 \in \Theta$: a pretrained Transformer based language model
  - $\mathcal{F}$: a collection of facts that the model has implicitly memorized
  - Task: $\mathcal{F}' = \{\mathcal{F} \backslash \mathcal{S}\} \cup \mathcal{M}$
    - update a desired subset of facts $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}$ to a new set of facts $\mathcal{M}$
  - θ^{new} : a model that implicitly stores the collection $\mathcal{F}'$
  - Ideally, the new model θ^{new} not only stores the desired modified knowledge, but also retains the performance of θ^0 on the unmodified knowledge $F \backslash S$

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Baseline approaches
  - **Retraining the model on modified training set**
    - Update all the training data, including both the pretraining corpora and the fine-tuning dataset, to be consistent with the new facts, and then fine-tuning the model on the modified training set or even training a new model from scratch to potentially obtain higher success rate
    - But, it is not practical for modifying a small amount of knowledge
      - identifying and updating the modified facts in the unstructured datasets is highly nontrivial and retraining the model from scratch is too expensive

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Baseline approaches
  - **Fine-tuning on modified facts.**
    - Fine-tune the model on the supporting evidences for the modified facts $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{M}}$

$$\text{minimize}_{\theta \in \Theta} \quad \frac{1}{m} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{M}}} L(x; \theta)$$

    - But due to overfitting and catastrophic forgetting, the model's knowledge about the unmodified facts $F \backslash S$ can significantly degrade

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Baseline approaches
  - **Fine-tuning on a mixture of modified and unmodified batches**
    - Use evidences of both M and F S in every iteration to fine-tune the model.
    - This biases the optimization trajectory towards the modified facts
    - Due to such imbalance, catastrophic forgetting still happens when only using mixed batches in our preliminary experiments

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Constrained fine-tuning on supporting evidences for modified facts
  - Fine-tune the original model only on the modified facts D_M while using explicit constraints on the weights θ to achieve minimum interference with the unmodified facts
  - In the ideal scenario, The model should learn the new facts while keeping the loss small on unmodified facts

$$\text{minimize}_{\theta\in\Theta} \quad \frac{1}{m}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{M}}} L(x;\theta) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{x'\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}} \big(L(x';\theta) - L(x';\theta_0)\big) \leq \delta$$

expensive to enforce this constraint

$$\text{minimize}_{\theta\in\Theta} \quad \frac{1}{m}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{M}}} L(x;\theta) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta,$$

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Constrained fine-tuning on supporting evidences for modified facts
  - Fine-tuning specific Transformer blocks.
    - Fine-tune only a small portion of the model (e.g., one layer), while keeping the rest of the model frozen
    - With appropriately chosen δ to avoid overfitting, full-model fine-tuning and 1-layer fine-tuning will explore very different functional spaces and the later is not contained in the former.
    - Results: fine-tuning the initial and final Transformer blocks of Transformers results in better adaptation to the modified facts and better preservation of performance on the unmodified facts

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experimental setting
  - Statistics of T-REx and zsRE.

Dataset	# question	# facts
T-REx (training)	1,282,567	34,039
T-REx (test)	34,039	34,039
zsRE (training)	197,829	147,905
zsRE (test)	59,527	47,156

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experimental setting
  - Statistics of T-REx and zsRE.

Dataset	# question	# facts
T-REx (training)	1,282,567	34,039
T-REx (test)	34,039	34,039
zsRE (training)	197,829	147,905
zsRE (test)	59,527	47,156

  - Zero-shot Relation Extraction (zsRE)

Fact: (Della Pia Glacier, continent, Antarctica)

Masked evidence (training): *What is the continent that Della Pia Glacier is located? [MASK]*

Masked evidence (test): *What continent is Della Pia Glacier found on? [MASK]*

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experimental setting
  - Performance measure.
    - Need to check a balanced set of modified/unmodified facts

As the model updates its memory with the modified facts, its memory on the unmodified facts may suffer undesirable changes. For example, finetuning a pretrained model on only modified facts without constraints gives high accuracy on them, but almost zero accuracy on the other facts

$$\bar{\mathfrak{A}} = \left(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}} + \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}\right)/2$$

The accuracy on the modified fact

The accuracy on the unmodified fact

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - A summary of the best results when modifying 32 facts with constraints on T-REx for various models

Model	BERT-Base FTM	BERT-Base FTA	BERT-Base FT+FTM	BERT-Base FT+FTA	BERT-Large FT+FTM	ALBERT FT+FTM	FaE FT+FTM
Best setting	Block 0	Block 0	Block 11	Block 11	Block 23	-	AWT
$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$ (%)	17.69	17.53	43.40	46.47	44.70	25.56	57.38
$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (%)	71.25	70.00	77.84	74.31	72.80	75.42	75.00
$\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ (%)	47.47	43.77	60.62	60.39	58.75	50.49	66.19

- **FT**: a finetuned mode
- **FTM**: Finetuning on the modified facts
- **FTA**: Finetuning on a mixture of modified and unmodified facts
  - Block n: refers to finetuning only its n-th Transformer block (layer)
  - AWT: weights outside its Transformer part for FaE

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Finetuning on modified facts without constraints
    - Fine-tuning BERT-Base without constraints on the modified supporting evidences DM of T-REx

Fine-tuned layer	0		5		11	
	$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (%)	$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$ (%)	$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (%)	$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$ (%)	$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (%)	$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$ (%)
RI + FTM	19.38 (2.40)	0.63 (0.12)	21.25 (1.05)	0.33 (0.06)	20.00 (0.68)	0.53 (0.09)
FTM	75.00 (3.19)	0.30 (0.03)	66.25 (2.40)	0.83 (0.05)	67.50 (1.12)	0.49 (0.03)
FT + FTM	77.50 (2.40)	0.37 (0.02)	77.50 (1.37)	15.09 (1.94)	82.50 (2.27)	1.12 (0.25)

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Finetuning on modified facts with constraints
    - Performance of constrained finetuning of all Transformer blocks for BERT-Large, BERT-Base, and ALBERT on T-REx



Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Finetuning on modified facts with constraints
    - Performance of fact modification for BERT-Base and BERT-Large on the T-REx benchmark



Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Finetuning on modified facts with constraints
    - Performance of fact modification for a BERT-Base model on the zsRE benchmark, using the FT+FTM setup with constrains during FTM.



From left to right, the columns show the test accuracy for modifying 32, 128, 512, and 2048 facts, respectively

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Finetuning on both modified and unmodified facts with constraints
    - Comparing the results of finetuning with constraints on the supporting evidence of $|M| = 512$ modified facts with and without the supporting evidences for the unmodified facts in every mini-batch (T-REx benchmark).

Fine-tuned layer	0		5		11	
	FT+FTA	FT+FTM	FT+FTA	FT+FTM	FT+FTA	FT+FTM
$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$	73.31 (0.74)	72.85 (0.51)	76.04 (0.65)	71.09 (0.88)	70.64 (0.68)	69.86 (0.46)
$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$	18.51 (0.94)	21.06 (0.31)	8.73 (0.41)	16.19 (0.50)	15.30 (0.50)	14.71 (0.60)

We report the results after averaging over 5 independent runs with standard error in parentheses

Modifying Memories in Transformer Models [Zhu et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Modifying symbolic memories in a finetuned FaE model
    - Results for finetuning different components of a FaE on the |M| = 32 modified facts of T-REx under a range of constraints (FT+FTM setting).

Fine-tuned parameters	NONE	AWT	**3 +** AWT	**7 +** AWT	**All**
$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$	46.88	75.00	78.12	81.25	75.00
$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$	60.38	57.38	45.22	41.06	53.37
$\Delta\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{F}\setminus\mathcal{S}}$	0.00	-3.00	-15.16	-19.32	-7.01

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- COMmonsEnse Transformers (COMET)
  - Generative models of commonsense knowledge
  - Learn to generate rich and diverse commonsense descriptions in natural language
  - Reveal promising results when implicit knowledge from deep pre-trained language models is transferred to generate explicit knowledge in commonsense knowledge graphs
- Results
  - COMET is able to generate novel knowledge that humans rate as high quality
    - with up to 77.5% (ATOMIC) and 91.7% (ConceptNet) precision at top 1, which approaches human performance for these resources
- Conclusion
  - Using generative commonsense models for automatic commonsense KB completion could soon be a plausible alternative to extractive methods

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- COMET learns from an existing knowledge base (solid lines) to be able to generate novel nodes and edges (dashed lines).



COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- COMET is based on the GPT architecture



COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- Learning to Generate Commonsense
  - Input Encoder
    - Represent a knowledge tuple $\{s, r, o\}$ as a concatenated sequence of the words of each item of the tuple:

$$\mathbf{X} = \{X^s, X^r, X^o\}$$

    - The input encoding: the sum of its word embedding, et with a position embedding encoding its absolute position in the sequence $\boldsymbol{X}$

$$h_t^0 = e_t + p_t$$

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- Training COMET
  - Learn to produce the phrase object o of a knowledge tuple given the tuple's phrase subject s and relation r
  - Learn to generate the tokens of o: X^o, given the concatenation of the tokens of s and r: $[X^s, X^r]$
  - Loss Function:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{t=|s|+|r|}^{|s|+|r|+|o|} \log P(x_t | x_{<t})$$

ATOMIC: An Atlas of Machine Commonsense for If-Then Reasoning [Sap et al '19]



ATOMIC: An Atlas of Machine Commonsense for If-Then Reasoning [Sap et al '19]



Event	Type of relations	Inference examples	Inference dim.
"PersonX pays PersonY a compliment"	If-Event-Then-Mental-State	PersonX wanted to be nice PersonX will feel good PersonY will feel flattered	xIntent xReact oReact
	If-Event-Then-Event	PersonX will want to chat with PersonY PersonY will smile PersonY will compliment PersonX back	xWant oEffect oWant
	If-Event-Then-Persona	PersonX is flattering PersonX is caring	xAttr xAttr
"PersonX makes PersonY's coffee"	If-Event-Then-Mental-State	PersonX wanted to be helpful PersonY will be appreciative PersonY will be grateful	xIntent oReact oReact
	If-Event-Then-Event	PersonX needs to put the coffee in the filter PersonX gets thanked PersonX adds cream and sugar	xNeed xEffect xWant
	If-Event-Then-Persona	PersonX is helpful PersonX is deferential	xAttr xAttr
"PersonX calls the police"	If-Event-Then-Mental-State	PersonX wants to report a crime Others feel worried	xIntent oReact
	If-Event-Then-Event	PersonX needs to dial 911 PersonX wants to explain everything to the police PersonX starts to panic Others want to dispatch some officers	xNeed xWant xEffect oWant
	If-Event-Then-Persona	PersonX is lawful PersonX is responsible	xAttr xAttr

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- Experient results
  - Automatic evaluations of quality and novelty for generations of ATOMIC commonsense

Model	PPL[5]	BLEU-2	N/T *sro*[6]	N/T *o*	N/U *o*
9ENC9DEC (Sap et al., 2019)	-	10.01	100.00	8.61	40.77
NearestNeighbor (Sap et al., 2019)	-	6.61	-	-	-
Event2(IN)VOLUN (Sap et al., 2019)	-	9.67	100.00	9.52	45.06
Event2PERSONX/Y (Sap et al., 2019)	-	9.24	100.00	8.22	41.66
Event2PRE/POST (Sap et al., 2019)	-	9.93	100.00	7.38	41.99
COMET (- pretrain)	15.42	13.88	100.00	7.25	45.71
COMET	**11.14**	**15.10**	100.00	**9.71**	**51.20**

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- Experient results
  - Human score of generations of ATOMIC commonsense

Model	oEffect	oReact	oWant	xAttr	xEffect	xIntent	xNeed	xReact	xWant	Avg
9Enc9Dec (Sap et al., 2019)	22.92	32.92	35.50	52.20	47.52	51.70	48.74	63.57	51.56	45.32
Event2(In)voluntary (Sap et al., 2019)	26.46	36.04	34.70	52.58	46.76	61.32	49.82	71.22	52.44	47.93
Event2PersonX/Y (Sap et al., 2019)	24.72	33.80	35.08	52.98	48.86	53.93	54.05	66.42	54.04	46.41
Event2Pre/Post (Sap et al., 2019)	26.26	34.48	35.78	52.20	46.78	57.77	47.94	72.22	47.94	46.76
COMET (- pretrain)	25.90	35.40	40.76	48.04	47.20	58.88	59.16	64.52	65.66	49.50
COMET	**29.02**	**37.68**	**44.48**	**57.48**	**55.50**	**68.32**	**64.24**	**76.18**	**75.16**	**56.45**

  - Human evaluation testing effect of different decoding schemes on candidate tuple quality

COMET Decoding method	oEffect	oReact	oWant	xAttr	xEffect	xIntent	xNeed	xReact	xWant	Avg
Top-5 random sampling (n=2500 per relation)	34.60	44.04	35.56	64.56	55.68	58.84	46.68	80.96	58.52	53.27
Top-10 random sampling (n=5000 per relation)	25.20	37.42	27.34	49.20	47.34	47.06	38.24	72.60	48.10	43.61
Beam search - 2 beams (n=1000 per relation)	43.70	54.20	47.60	**84.00**	51.10	73.80	50.70	85.80	78.70	63.29
Beam search - 5 beams (n=2500 per relation)	37.12	45.36	42.04	63.64	**61.76**	63.60	57.60	78.64	68.40	57.57
Beam search - 10 beams (n=5000 per relation)	29.02	37.68	44.48	57.48	55.50	68.32	64.24	76.18	75.16	56.45
Greedy decoding (n=500 per relation)	**61.20**	**69.80**	**80.00**	77.00	53.00	**89.60**	**85.60**	**92.20**	**89.40**	**77.53**
Human validation of gold ATOMIC	84.62	86.13	83.12	78.44	83.92	91.37	81.98	95.18	90.90	86.18

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

- Experient results
  - Effect of amount of training data on automatic evaluation of commonsense generations

% train data	PPL	BLEU-2	N/T *o*	N/U *o*
1% train	23.81	5.08	7.24	49.36
10% train	13.74	12.72	**9.54**	**58.34**
50% train	11.82	13.97	9.32	50.37
FULL (- pretrain)	15.18	13.22	7.14	44.55
FULL train	**11.13**	**14.34**	9.51	50.05

COMET : Commonsense Transformers for Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction [Bosselut et al '19]

Generations that were randomly selected from a subset of novel generations from the ATOMIC development set

Seed Concept	Relation	Generated	Plausible
X holds out X's hand to Y	xAttr	helpful	✓
X meets Y eyes	xAttr	intense	✓
X watches Y every ____	xAttr	observant	✓
X eats red meat	xEffect	gets fat	✓
X makes crafts	xEffect	gets dirty	✓
X turns X's phone	xEffect	gets a text	
X pours ____ over Y's head	oEffect	gets hurt	✓
X takes Y's head off	oEffect	bleeds	✓
X pisses on Y's bonfire	oEffect	gets burned	
X spoils somebody rotten	xIntent	to be mean	
X gives Y some pills	xIntent	to help	✓
X provides for Y's needs	xIntent	to be helpful	✓
X explains Y's reasons	xNeed	to know Y	✓
X fulfils X's needs	xNeed	to have a plan	✓
X gives Y everything	xNeed	to buy something	✓
X eats pancakes	xReact	satisfied	✓
X makes ____ at work	xReact	proud	✓
X moves house	xReact	happy	✓
X gives birth to the Y	oReact	happy	✓
X gives Y's friend ____	oReact	grateful	✓
X goes ____ with friends	oReact	happy	✓
X gets all the supplies	xWant	to make a list	✓
X murders Y's wife	xWant	to hide the body	✓
X starts shopping	xWant	to go home	✓
X develops Y theory	oWant	to thank X	✓
X offer Y a position	oWant	to accept the job	✓
X takes ____ out for dinner	oWant	to eat	✓

Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al ’21]

Extracts the commonsense from the large, general language model GPT-3, into 2 forms: a large commonsense knowledge graph ATOMIC^{10x}, and a compact commonsense model COMET^{DISTIL}.



Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al '21]

Event generation

```
1.  Event:  X overcomes evil with good
2.  Event:  X does not learn from Y
...
10.  Event:  X looks at flowers
11.
```

Inference Generation (xNeed)

```
What needs to be true for this event to take place?

...

Event <i>:  X goes jogging

Prerequisites:  For this to happen, X needed to wear running shoes

...

Event <i>:  X looks at flowers

Prerequisites:  For this to happen,
```

Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al ’21]

Prompt for head generation.

1. Event: PersonX unwraps PersonY’s hands

2. Event: PersonX overcomes evil with good

3. Event: PersonX is fed up with the present situation

4. Event: PersonX breaks PersonX’s back

5. Event: PersonX calls no one

6. Event: PersonX never gets angry

7. Event: PersonX does not learn from PersonY

8. Event: PersonX refuses to touch PersonY’s hands

9. Event: PersonX looks at flowers

10. Event: PersonX unloads an atomic bomb

11. Event:

Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al '21]

Prompt for generating xAttr.

Situation 1: Devin bullies Jean.

Devin is seen as dominant.

Situation 2: Jamie moves to another city.

Jamie is seen as adventurous.

Situation 3: Sydney changes Ryan's mind.

Sydney is seen as influential.

Situation 4: Lindsay writes a story.

Lindsay is seen as creative.

Situation 5: Rowan covers Pat's expenses.

Rowan is seen as wealthy.

Situation 6: Lee takes time off.

Lee is seen as carefree.

Situation 7: Riley advises Noel.

Riley is seen as informed.

Situation 8: Adrian bursts into tears.

Adrian is seen as depressed.

Situation 9: Hunter deals with problems.

Hunter is seen as responsible.

Situation 10: Sam follows Charlie.

Sam is seen as suspicious.

Situation 11: Alex makes Chris wait.

Alex is seen as

Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al ’21]

- Examples of automatically generated ATOMIC triples from ATOMIC^{10x} commonsense knowledge graph

X starts running	**xEffect** *so, X*	gets in shape	X sings a song	**HinderedBy** *but not if*	X can't remember the lyrics
X and Y engage in an argument	**xWant** *so, X wants*	to avoid Y	X is not well liked	**xReact** *so, X feels*	lonely
X learns to type fast	**xNeed** *X needed*	to have taken typing lessons	X takes care of a monkey	**xAttr** *X is seen as*	kind
X steals his grandfather's sword	**xEffect** *so, X*	is punished by his grandfather	X butts in	**HinderedBy** *but not if*	X is too shy to speak up
X takes up new employment	**xIntent** *because X wants*	to be self sufficient	X waits for the storm to break	**xEffect** *so, X*	is safe from the storm

Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Attributes of ATOMIC^{10x} and ATOMIC^{10x} (row 2) including the critic model (row 3-7)

Corpus	Accept	Reject	N/A	Size	Size (div)
ATOMIC$^{20}_{20}$	86.8	11.3	1.9	0.6M	0.56
ATOMIC^{10x}	78.5	18.7	2.8	**6.5M**	**4.38**
	88.4	9.5	2.1	5.1M	3.68
	91.5	6.8	1.7	4.4M	3.25
	94.3	4.6	1.1	3.6M	2.74
	95.3	3.8	1.0	3.0M	2.33
	96.4	2.7	0.8	2.5M	2.00

Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Precision vs. recall of our critic model on the human labelled validation set



Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models [West et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Human judgements for knowledge-base completion on held out events from the ATOMIC$^{20}_{20}$ commonsense knowledge graph (CKG).
  - COMET$^{DIS}_{TIL}$: trained on unfiltered ATOMIC^{10x}
    - +critic$_{low}$: filtered by the critic to 88.4% accuracy
    - +critic$_{high}$: filtered by the critic to 96.4% accuracy

CKG Completion Model	Train Corpus Acc	Accept	Reject	N/A
GPT2-XL zero-shot	-	45.1	50.3	4.6
GPT-3	-	73.3	24.1	2.6
COMET$^{20}_{20}$	86.8	81.5	16.3	2.2
COMET$^{\text{DIS}}_{\text{TIL}}$	78.5	78.4	19.2	2.4
+critic$_{\text{low}}$	91.5	82.9	14.9	2.2
+critic$_{\text{high}}$	96.4	**87.5**	10.2	2.3

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Previous approaches on zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering
  - Based on knowledge integration that rely on retrieval of existing knowledge from static knowledge graphs
- Current work
  - Present initial studies toward zero-shot commonsense question answering by formulating the task as inference over dynamically generated commonsense knowledge graphs.
  - Requires commonsense knowledge integration where contextually relevant knowledge is often not present in existing knowledge bases
  - Present a novel approach that generates contextually-relevant symbolic knowledge structures on demand using generative neural commonsense knowledge models.

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]



Previous approaches for accessing knowledge link situational contexts to static knowledge graphs

Our work generates knowledge dynamically from neural knowledge models.

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Notation
    - c: a context describing a situation, given an example
    - q: a question asked about that situation
    - $\mathcal{A} = \{a^0, ..., a^{n-1}\}$: a set of n possible answers to q
    - $Y^a = \{y_1, ..., y_{|a|}\}$ an answer is composed of multiple tokens

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Generating Commonsense Inferences
    - Use COMET to generate candidates $\mathcal{G}$
    - Each candidate $g \in G$ is associated with a score φ_g that approximates the model's confidence in the inference:

an arbitrary commonsense relation type

$$\phi_g = \frac{1}{|g|} \sum_{t=1}^{|g|} \log P(x_t | x_{<t}, c, r)$$

$$P(x_t | x_{<t}, c, r) = \mathbb{COMET}(c, r, x_{<t})$$

    - Any generation $g \in G$ conditioned on c can be seen as a 1-hop commonsense inference of c.

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Generating Commonsense Inferences
    - generalize this approach by conditioning on generated commonsense inferences to generate $\mathcal{G}^{\ell}$ a set of l-hop inferences from c

$$\phi_g^{\ell} = \phi_g^{\ell-1} + \frac{1}{|g^{\ell}|} \sum_{t=1}^{|g^{\ell}|} \log P(x_t | x_{<t}, g^{\ell-1}, r)$$

    - For an arbitrary node g^l , its parent is the node from the previous level $\mathcal{G}^{\ell-1}$ that COMET conditions on to generate g^l .

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Answers as Leaf Nodes
    - Connect the answer choices $a \in \mathcal{A}$ to the generated commonsense inferences
    - Initialize a node in the graph for each answer choice a and connect it as a child node to each commonsense inference in the graph: $g \in \mathcal{G}^{\ell}$ for $\ell \in [0, L)$

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]



COMET receives the context c and generates new commonsense inferences to construct a local graph of knowledge about the situation



Our inference algorithms reason over the graph by aggregating commonsense paths to answer questions about the situation

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Knowledge Graph Reasoning
    - **Computing Answer Scores**
      - COMET is originally trained to maximize the conditional loglikelihood of the tokens of a target entity e2 from a knowledge graph tuple (e1, r, e2)
      - For each answer a $\in$ A, we define a factor based on each token's conditional log-likelihood as computed by COMET

$$\phi_{ga} = \frac{1}{|a|} \sum_{s=1}^{|a|} \log P(y_s | y_{<s}, g, q)$$

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Knowledge Graph Reasoning
    - Overcoming Answer Priors
      - Because certain answer candidates have a high probability of occurring for certain questions regardless of the context (e.g., happy is a common answer for questions about emotional reactions), we redefine φ_{ga} (Eq. 4) in terms of the point-wise mutual information between the commonsense path g and answer a

$$\phi_{ga} \propto \text{PMI}(a, g|q)$$

$$\phi_{ga} = \frac{1}{|a|} \sum_{s=1}^{|a|} \Big(\log P(y_s|y_{<s}, g, q) - \log P(y_s|y_{<s}, q) \Big)$$

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Knowledge Graph Reasoning
    - **Inference**
      - To find the most likely answer, we marginalize over all paths to the answers at layer l

$$\phi_a^\ell = f(\{\gamma_g \phi_g^\ell + \gamma_{ga} \phi_{ga}^\ell : g \in \mathcal{G}^\ell\})$$

      - Define an extremum estimator over the distribution of generated inferences G^l

$$\phi_{a_{max}}^\ell = \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}^\ell} \gamma_g \phi_g^\ell + \gamma_{ga} \phi_{ga}^\ell$$

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Dynamic Knowledge Graph Construction for QA
  - Knowledge Graph Reasoning
    - **Inference**
      - Once the answer scores at different levels in the graph are computed, $\{\phi_a^l\}_0^L$, the final score for each answer can be evaluated by averaging over the graph levels $l \in [0, L)$

$$\log P(a|q,c) \propto \phi_a = \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \beta^\ell \phi_a^\ell$$

$$\hat{a} = \arg\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi_a$$

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Experimental setting
  - Example contexts, paths, and answers for the COMET - DynaGen model on SOCIALIQA

Situation	Most Contributing Paths in Graph	Answers
Jesse drove Ash to the airport and dropped them off at the airport with ease. How would Jesse feel afterwards?	**Jesse wants to go home**	**a) *drained* ✓** b) went to the ticket counter c) dropped me off at the airport
	Jesse wanted to be helpful	a) drained b) *went to the ticket counter* ✗ c) dropped me off at the airport
After jumping off the roof of his house Quinn had trouble breathing. How would you describe Quinn?	**Quinn gets hurt**	**a) *foolish* ✓** b) patient c) light-headed
	Quinn wants to get medical help	a) foolish b) patient c) *light-headed* ✗
Alex took notice of the children who were singing at the playground. What will happen to Alex?	**Alex is happy**	a) hurt the children **b) *joy* ✓** c) tell the children to stop
	Alex wants to go home	a) hurt the children b) joy c) *tell the children to stop* ✗
Taylor was close to winning the game. Taylor ran straight for home plate. What will Taylor want to do next?	**Taylor wants to celebrate**	a) try to get over that they did win **b) *celebrate the win* ✗** c) wanted to score
	Taylor wants to be home	a) try to get over that they did win b) celebrate the win c) *wanted to score* ✓

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Accuracy on the development and test sets of SOCIALIQA. COMET - DynaGen is our model.

Model	Dev Acc.	Test Acc.
Random	33.3	33.3
GPT	41.8	41.7
GPT2 - 117M	40.7	41.5
GPT2 - 345M	41.5	42.5
GPT2 - 762M	42.5	42.4
SELF-TALK	46.2	43.9
COMET - Direct	48.7	49.0
COMET - DynaGen	**50.1**	**52.6**
BERT-large (sup.)	66.0	63.5
RoBERTa-large (sup.)	**78.1**	**77.0**
Human	86.9	84.4

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Precision, Recall, F1 on the STORYCS dataset. Best models in different training settings are bolded

Model	P	R	F1
Zero-shot CDF-weighted	**No Training Data**		
Random	20.6	20.8	20.7
GPT	34.7	36.4	35.5
GPT2 - 117M	30.8	31.8	31.3
GPT2 - 345M	33.3	35.3	34.3
GPT2 - 762M	35.5	37.4	36.4
COMET - Direct	37.4	36.9	37.2
COMET - DynaGen	**38.9**	**39.3**	**39.1**
Supervised			
BERT	**65.6**	56.9	61.0
BERT + LE	63.1	61.7	62.4
BERT + SS	57.9	**76.4**	**65.9**

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Development set accuracy for different graph construction techniques. The average number of nodes and edges in the constructed graphs is presented.

Algorithm	**# nodes**	**# edges**	ϕ_a^ℓ	$\phi_{a_{max}}^\ell$
Argmax Decoding	10.6	26.4	**50.1**	**49.6**
Beam Search - 5	43.2	156.8	49.5	49.1
Beam Search - 10	83.0	316.2	50.0	49.1
Top-5 sampling	32.0	111.9	49.0	49.0
Top-10 sampling	59.9	223.8	49.3	49.4

Dynamic Neuro-Symbolic Knowledge Graph Construction for Zero-shot Commonsense Question Answering [Bosselut et al '21]

- Experiment results
  - Example STORYCS context, high-scoring paths, and answers for our approach.

Situation	Most Contributing Paths in Graph	Answers
Daniel was excited to get a remote control boat for his birthday. He asked his dad to drive him to the lake to try it out. *How does Daniel feel?*	His dad is helpful	disgusted, angry, sad, afraid, happy, **trusting ✓**, excited, surprised
	Daniel wants to try something new	disgusted, angry, sad, afraid, happy, trusting , **excited ✓**, surprised

  - Development set Precision, Recall, and F1 of emotion prediction on the STORYCS dataset for different strategies for setting prediction thresholds

Model	P	R	F1
Zero-shot	**No Training Data**		
CDF-label	**39.5**	39.5	**39.5**
CDF-50	25.9	**75.0**	38.5
Few-shot Tuning			
Tuned from 4 examples	**31.1**	54.6	39.4
Tuned from 10 examples	30.2	64.3	41.0
Tuned from 20 examples	28.6	**73.5**	**41.1**
20% development tuning	31.2	65.1	42.2

BeliefBank: Adding Memory to a Pre-Trained Language Model for a Systematic Notion of Belief [Kassner et al '21]



BeliefBank: Adding Memory to a Pre-Trained Language Model for a Systematic Notion of Belief [Kassner et al '21]



(A) raw model



(B) constraint-solving



(C) feedback



(D) feedback + constraint-solving

Towards Continual Knowledge Learning of Language Models [Jang et al ‘21]

Continual Learning for Sentence Representations Using Conceptors [Liu et al ‘19]

What Neural Networks Memorize and Why: Discovering the Long Tail via Influence Estimation [Feldman & Zhang ‘20]