

OPINESUM: Entailment-based self-training for abstractive opinion summarization

Annie Louis
Google Research

annielouis@google.com

Joshua Maynez
Google Research

joshuahm@google.com

Abstract

A typical product or place often has hundreds of reviews, and summarization of these texts is an important and challenging problem. Recent progress on abstractive summarization in domains such as news has been driven by supervised systems trained on hundreds of thousands of news articles paired with human-written summaries. However for opinion texts, such large scale datasets are rarely available. Unsupervised methods, self-training, and few-shot learning approaches bridge that gap. In this work, we present a novel self-training approach, OPINESUM for *abstractive opinion summarization*. The summaries in this approach are built using a novel application of textual entailment and capture the consensus of opinions across the various reviews for an item. This method can be used to obtain silver-standard summaries on a large scale and train both unsupervised and few-shot abstractive summarization systems. OPINESUM achieves state-of-the-art performance in both settings.

1 Introduction

Understanding the essence of multiple reviews or opinions is a frequent problem today. High quality opinion summaries can improve search, product comparison, recommender systems, and even dialog assistants. In this domain, abstractive summarization is particularly promising for fluently comparing and contrasting opinions from source reviews. However, while language models trained on huge numbers of source-summary pairs have driven summarization performance in some domains, it is harder to find such pairs on the web for opinions, and it is difficult to present tens or hundreds of reviews to human annotators and train them to write an informative summary. This paper presents a new self-training approach that automatically identifies and leverages *common opinions* across reviews, for example as in Table 1.

| | |
|----|--|
| R1 | ...very large and clean with a nice size kitchen. The hotel is located right across the street from balboa park and within walking distance of a rite aid drug-store.. |
| R2 | ...If you insist on staying here, reserve a refurbished room and get that promise in writing! The location was great for tourists, right across from balboa park . You could walk to the zoo (about 1/4 mi)... |
| R3 | ...I decided to stay at the park manor suites hotel since it seemed to be close to san diego zoo. The hotel is conveniently located in front of balboa park , walking distance to san diego zoo,... |
| R4 | ...The staff are both pleasant and professional. Hotel is across from balboa park on sixth ave . This is the park west area, and features a diverse array of restaurants... |
| R5 | ...As other reviewers have said, it's very easy to be here without a car - balboa park is just across the road and the airport is a short taxi ride away. |

Table 1: Example showing a consensus or common opinion between 5 reviews for a hotel on TripAdvisor.com, taken from the SPACE corpus (Angelidis et al., 2021)

This lack of data for opinion summarization has motivated many abstractive summarization methods based on auto-encoders (Chu and Liu, 2019; Bražinskas et al., 2020b; Isonuma et al., 2021), and these do not use any supervision from gold human summaries. A few recent approaches propose self-training of encoder-decoder models on synthetic summary examples. These examples are created by randomly sampling one of the input reviews and treating it as a pseudo-summary and treating other topically-related reviews as the source texts. (Amplayo and Lapata, 2020; Bražinskas et al., 2020a; Amplayo et al., 2021; Elshahar et al., 2021; Bražinskas et al., 2022) While such pseudo or silver-summaries are able to provide pretraining

signals, their objective is one of missing review prediction rather than aggregation of multiple texts. Their pseudo-summaries are also entire reviews which might contain other non-summary worthy content.

In this paper, we present a new self-training method which leverages textual entailment signals to produce silver summaries of *high quality and combining information across multiple reviews*. Intuitively, the method aims to identify the consensus or most agreed upon opinions in the source set. In the example in Table 1, if many reviews mention that the “location is right across balboa park”, we would consider it a highly agreed upon opinion, and as a summary-worthy one. We create silver summaries using a set of such opinions with the highest agreement. We generate such silver summaries on a large scale and show how to train encoder-decoder transformer models using this data. We evaluate our model in both zero-shot or unsupervised setting as well as few-shot learning. Our results show that our method produces huge gains in both cases, outperforming other approaches and achieving new state-of-the-art performance.

2 Related work

Opinion summarization is a widely studied problem, where the role of sentiment, and product aspects (such as ‘lens’ and ‘focus’ for a camera) are well documented. This paper focuses on abstractive summarization for general purpose summaries (not aspect-based) and we provide an overview of the approaches closest to our work.

Unsupervised neural networks. As in other areas of text generation, modern opinion summarization methods are also predominantly neural networks. Since large scale data for supervision of encoder-decoder models is largely absent in this domain, many prior methods focused on unsupervised approaches. Common techniques here include auto-encoders and associated generative approaches such as VAEs.

In [Chu and Liu \(2019\)](#), summaries are generated from the mean of the embeddings of input reviews. A similarity loss encourages the generated summaries to be close to the review embeddings, while an autoencoder is used to improve the review embeddings. The intuition that summaries should capture the consensus opinions continues in [Bražinskas et al. \(2020b\)](#), this time employing a VAE that can steer towards common informa-

tion. [Isonuma et al. \(2021\)](#) also use VAEs but extend them to produce hierarchical summaries where some sentences convey general impressions, while other provide specific details about user experience.

Our work also presents an unsupervised method, but based on encoder-decoder models also taking advantage of self-training which we discuss next.

Self-training methods. Some very recent solutions have sought to take advantage of recent large pretrained encoder-decoder models via self-training ([Amplayo and Lapata, 2020](#); [Bražinskas et al., 2020a](#); [Amplayo et al., 2021](#); [Elsahar et al., 2021](#); [Bražinskas et al., 2022](#)). The approach here is to create large number of pairs of source review sets, paired with a pseudo or silver summary as an approximate target. In all these methods, one of the reviews from the source set is taken as the pseudo summary, and other reviews or topically related reviews to the target is taken as the set of source reviews. This dataset is then used for further pre-training of encoder-decoder transformer models to incorporate signals and language specific to review summarization. These models are usually better than unsupervised models based on generative approaches.

While allowing a favorable paradigm shift, and better performance, there are a few limitations of this type of self-training. As pointed out by [Bražinskas et al. \(2020a\)](#), reviews are considerably diverse from one another. So an objective that generates a review from other reviews will need to also predict content not present on the source side, a major difference from actual summaries of reviews. Such pseudo-summaries will also contain a lot of first person language which again are less desirable in a summary to users.

In this work, we present a novel method of pre-training. We also create silver-summaries on a large scale. However, our summaries actually contain propositions from multiple input summaries and in particular those which are reflective of the consensus among the review authors. These summaries are more powerful signals and move the training task away from review generation.

Few-shot learning. With increased use of encoder-decoder models, methods have also been proposed to efficiently augment the training with a small number of human-generated summaries (50 to 100). [Oved and Levy \(2021\)](#) train transformer models on a small number of examples and during inference, generate multiple summaries which are

later ranked according to coherence to arrive at a final one. Other approaches focus on an additional plug-in network that can predict desired properties of summaries based on a few labelled examples (Bražinskas et al., 2020a) that can augment training signals. Bražinskas et al. (2022) introduce the use of a few additional parameters in the form of adaptors and only these are finetuned instead of the full network, making the training efficient and robust for few-shot learning.

We also demonstrate our self-trained model in few-shot settings.

Consensus as a goal for summarization. When the summarization problem contains multiple input texts, intuitively the frequently held or common information across them is one important signal for summary worthy content. Multi-document news summarization has exploited frequency from early times (Nenkova et al., 2006; Radev et al., 2004) to most recent ones (Ernst et al., 2022a). Recent work has also used consensus as a goal for summarizing scientific publications around health topics (Shah et al., 2021), and identify agreement and discrepancies in Wikipedia document clusters (Schuster et al., 2022).

Intuitively, review summarization also expects to capture the voice of the majority of users as one of its aims. For example, if a majority of users complain about the battery of an item, we would expect a summary to mention that. Instructions to annotators in multiple annotation efforts for opinion summarization explicitly ask annotators to capture what is common and popular (Bražinskas et al., 2020a; Angelidis et al., 2021). The idea of consensus is also present in the objective of many recent models for opinion summarization (Chu and Liu, 2019; Bražinskas et al., 2020b; Angelidis et al., 2021). In this work, our self-training approach explicitly tries to capture statements which are agreed upon by a majority of reviews.

3 Textual entailment to identify consensus among review users

We propose a novel approach to create silver source-summary pairs for abstractive opinion summarization. A central idea here is the use of textual entailment to find statements reflecting user consensus. We first present our definition of the idea and describe the steps involved in silver data creation.

3.1 Defining review consensus

We define consensus as the number of reviews that support a particular claim. For example, 60 (out of 100) reviews might claim that the seafood dishes are great at a restaurant. Likewise 30 reviews might say that the staff are friendly and polite. Our aim is to obtain those sentences with most user consensus automatically, and use these to create our silver-standard data.

But note that the same claim may be expressed in different ways or granularity, and so their frequency in reviews cannot be easily computed. Eg. ‘*This hotel is in the heart of Times Square*’ and ‘*Hotel’s location is slap bang in the middle of Times Square.*’ both express the same claim, and ‘*The fish is tasty*’ and ‘*The salmon is delicious*’, both support the claim that ‘*The seafood is great.*’. Our idea is to capture this variability using natural language entailment.

At a high level, our approach identifies potential claims in the form of *propositions* from a large collection of texts, uses textual entailment to find out how often the collection supports the proposition, and computes a score for the support.

Now we explain how we obtain these statements and their scores automatically.

3.2 Extracting propositions

For texts, even when they are sentence-level units, it is hard to reason about them precisely. Many review sentences in addition tend to be rather long. For example, “*I love eating in Likya, the Chefs are so passionate and professional about the food they cook and the staffs are well trained, they treat me very well like a customer.*” contain a bunch of different claims. It is difficult to find support for such complex sentences since the same information is unlikely to be present in other users’ reviews.

Instead, we split review sentences into *propositions* and use these as our key units. We define a proposition as a ‘single claim or fact’ about the item and extract these as snippets from the original review texts. In fact, recent work on supervised news summarization also uses the extraction and clustering of proposition units to find frequent subtopics, and then fusing the information in the biggest clusters into a summary (Ernst et al., 2022b).

In this work, we use simple rules to split review sentences into propositions. We split sentences at conjunctions, period, and comma subject to a minimum clause length of four. Our algorithm pro-

cesses sentences from left to right to find a delimiter. If the proposed span will create a clause less than the minimum length, we do not split and attach the span to the proposition on the left. Note that these propositions are a linear segmentation of the input sentence, and their concatenation yields the original sentence. Intuitively, this process primarily performs syntactic simplification, without changing the total content that is expressed.

The resulting propositions for different sentences in our data is shown in Table 2. Note that there are some propositions which end up ungrammatical, and our length constraints do not always separate out all the aspects (as in the third example in Table 2). But overall this simple method works well for review sentences where syntactic embedding is less complex than in genres such as news, and we can scale to large collections efficiently.

We extract propositions from all the reviews for an item. Suppose there are N reviews for an item which result in M propositions where $M \gg N$.

3.3 Scoring consensus

Our aim is to find the number of supporting reviews for each of the M propositions. We compute this number using natural language entailment. Specifically, consider review R_i and proposition m_j belonging to the same item. Let us represent a textual entailment relation as $P \rightarrow H$, where P is a premise and H is a hypothesis. In our case, if $R_i \rightarrow m_j$, then we consider that R_i supports m_j . The final score for proposition m_j , $S(m_j) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} E(R_i, m_j)$ where $E(R_i, m_j) = 1$ if $R_i \rightarrow m_j$ else 0.

We obtain $E(R_i, m_j)$ using the predictions of an entailment classifier which treats the R_i as the premise and m_j as the hypothesis. If the most likely label from the classifier is ‘entailment’, then $E(R_i, m_j) = 1$ and 0 if other labels had the highest probability.

In this work, we use a cross attention model, BERT-large (Devlin et al., 2019) to obtain these predictions. The input to the model concatenates the premise and hypothesis with a separator symbol and the CLS token’s embedding is sent through a linear layer to predict three classes: entailment, contradiction and neutral. We trained this model on the MNLI corpus (Williams et al., 2018) reaching a development accuracy of 84%. Note that the training data for the entailment model does not contain any examples from the review domain. But

we found that predictions are rather reasonable and even better when a higher threshold is applied on the probability of the entailment label.

Note that this score computation for all propositions requires an entailment prediction between all pairs of (R_i, m_j) . Even though the computation is done only within each item, there are still a quadratic number of pairs per item.

So we implement the full computation of silver summaries in a Apache Beam¹ pipeline which allows to create parallel data-processing pipelines. Our typical pipelines do inference billions of times by the entailment models.

In Table 3, we show some of the entailment predictions from our models. We take a proposition and sample random reviews from the set of reviews which entail that proposition. Our model does not explicitly do any sentiment classification, we have picked a positive and negative proposition for demonstrating how precise and clear entailment based support prediction tends to be.

3.4 Silver summaries

We order the propositions in decreasing order of their scores $S(m_i)$, and take the top n as the silver summary sentences. We trim the silver summary up to a certain summary length expressed in tokens. Additionally, we employ a MMR (Goldstein and Carbonell, 1998) style redundancy removal technique to keep diverse content in the summary. We implement this control using a simple method of content word overlap.² Suppose S is the set of propositions selected in the summary so far. The next proposition chosen is the highest scoring proposition p_k where $overlap(p_k, s_i) < 2$, $\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq |S|$. $overlap$ is computed as the number of content words in common between the two propositions based on the stopword list within NLTK (Bird et al., 2009).

The top propositions for two hotel items from our dataset is shown in Table 4. Note that these are snippets from actual reviews for that item or product.

This final set of summary propositions, S , chosen for a given summary length, are then concatenated in the chosen order to create the silver summary. When the propositions are not full sentences, we polish them for capitalization and punctuation

¹<https://beam.apache.org/>

²We also explored entailment based diversity measures, but we found that simple content word overlap kept the maximum diversity in aspects commented on within the summaries.

| Review sentence | Extracted propositions |
|--|--|
| There was loads of cupboard space and a fantastic easy to use safe. | There was loads of cupboard space and ₁ a fantastic easy to use safe. ₂ |
| Metro station (Ilcuna, line 4) is 5 minute walk away, beach is a 10 minute walk away. | Metro station (Ilcuna, line 4) is 5 minute walk away, ₁ beach is a 10 minute walk away. ₂ |
| The room was very nice and clean, quiet location, staff were helpful, easy access to the centre of town by metro, bakeries and a supermarket nearby. | The room was very nice and clean, quiet location, staff were helpful, ₁ – easy access to the centre of town by metro, bakeries and a supermarket nearby. ₂ |

Table 2: Example propositions split from source sentences. The propositions on the right are numbered according to their position in the sentence.

| |
|--|
| <p>Proposition: “the property has a lot of character”</p> <p>Supporting reviews:</p> <p>R1. ...Though i understand the previous posters point that the park manor has charm, I’d say that the actual “charm” happens in all the wrong places. That there’s a nice and funky lobby with some amazing artistic featurettes and a cute patio with a coy boy, or the spacious rooms with a hodgepodge of furniture and beautiful molding on the walls that seems to go nowhere - yes, charming.</p> <p>R2. ...but the views higher would have been spectacular. A quirky place which people will love or hate...</p> <p>R3. ...this hotel is beautiful! It ’s so elegantly decorted but in an antique way. The ceiling in the lobby... a huge king bed, sofa, armoire, vanity desk, kitchen - stove, refridgerator and the necessary kitchenware. I loved all the antique furniture, so nice to look at and change from standard hotel decor...</p> <p>R4. ...I would highly recommend this hotel to anyone who is looking for accommodations with more character than you ’ll find at the big chain hotels. A marriott looks like a marriott whether you’re in singapore or st. Louis. Why not try the local flavor?...</p> <p>R5. ...This hotel is old and dated. The furnishings are very old and the whole hotel needs refurbishing . there are gas stoves in the rooms...</p> |
| <p>Proposition: “obvious neglect to fixtures and fittings.”</p> <p>Supporting reviews:</p> <p>R1. ...i leant on the bannister at one point and almost fell down three floors...the window would not close... the electricity in our room kept cutting out if we had more than one item on...</p> <p>R2. ...my friends also got two leaks in their room... the carpets were old and they were obviously never hoovered in years...i saying they should knock the building down and do the whole thing up...</p> <p>R3. ...there were loose electric wires hanging from the ceilings-which i tripped over constantly...the locks on the doors were poor...</p> <p>R4. ...there are no elevators and the stairs are falling apart- literally!...broken window which was taped up with parcel tape and cardboard... broken heaters...wardrobe with door falling off...</p> <p>R5. ...could not charge phones because outlets did not work...cable tv was finnecky...internet was one computer on the second floor and did not work most of the time...broken fixtures and missing electrical covers...building seemed to be crumbling and it leaked in the foyer when it rained...</p> |

Table 3: Two example propositions (from two hotels in our dataset) with 5 reviews which entail them. The reviews were randomly selected from the full list of reviews which entail each proposition.

to match full summaries. Note that no special facility is present for ordering these sentences by coherence. In many cases, the list of top propositions is a very reasonable summary, and in this first work, we have not carried out further processing for coherence.

3.5 Source texts

The silver summaries from the previous step are composed of extracted text spans from the source reviews. A system trained to produce such sequences from the full set of input reviews will predominantly copy from the input texts. So we make

| Hotel with 106 reviews | Hotel with 61 reviews |
|--|--|
| 1. very comfortable (a big deal for me). (58%) | 1. well equipped with good privacy setting. (82%) |
| 2. well maintained, clean, comfortable suites, (57%) | 2. the family-owned vacation spot is very family oriented. (68%) |
| 3. the rooms were very comfortable, and (55%) | 3. this resort is a comfortable family retreat providing a great get-away. (60%) |
| 4. they have a place to eat but (52%) | 4. a very family friendly place to stay. (60%) |
| 5. the size of the room is nice, (51%) | 5. our unit was very clean, comfortable.. (55%) |
| 6. that was a great rate for a suite. (50%) | 6. units have had great proximity to a pool and (54%) |
| 7. still professional; the room was clean and (50%) | |

Table 4: The top propositions for two hotels in our dataset. We take the top 10 propositions and show only the ones kept after redundancy filtering. The percentage of total reviews which entail each proposition is shown within braces.




Figure 1: Example which demonstrates how reviews are removed from the summarization input side if they were the original source from which a proposition was extracted. Here, P1 was extracted from R2 and P2 from R4. R2 and R4 will be removed entirely from the summarization input. But note that the summary content is present in other reviews which entail P1 and P2.

changes to the set of source reviews to turn the data into one suitable for abstractive summarization.

Let N be the total set of input reviews. For each proposition p_i in the summary, we remove the review R_j , where p_i came from, i.e. p_i is a span in R_j . This deletion discourages the verbatim copying of text spans from the source, and encourages systems to perform abstraction. The final input reviews on the source side is a reduced set N' , $|N'| < |N|$. Note that sentences (propositions) in the silver standard are supported by many other reviews, albeit in different surface forms, so the signals to produce the silver summary are still present in N' . An illustration of input review selections is shown in Figure 1. This way of creating source-summary pairs resembles one of the powerful pre-training objectives for abstractive summarization known as Gap Sentences Generation, introduced by the Pegasus (Zhang et al., 2020) model.

In practice, the number of source reviews that can be processed as input in most standard sequence to sequence models is fewer than the hundreds present in N' . So we sample a smaller set N'' , size k , of reviews to fit the sequence length of the encoder. We could further aid the training by adapting N'' to be most useful for generating the target sentences. We can create this sample of size k in three ways.

UNIFORM. In the simplest case, we can sample k source reviews uniformly at random.

The remaining two methods focus on those reviews which entail one of the silver-summary propositions.

EQUAL. We sample $k/|S|$ reviews from the set of reviews entailing each proposition in the summary. The intuition here is that the summarization source contains an equal number of reviews supporting each (silver) summary proposition.

PROPORTIONAL. We sample l reviews from the entailment set of each summary proposition, where l is proportional to the size of the entailment set. For example, if ‘seafood is great’ is a summary proposition with 40% entailment support, then 40% of the summarization input are reviews on the topic of great seafood, although the review containing the verbatim proposition is filtered out.

In the next sections, we describe how we use this data to train abstractive summarization systems.

4 Datasets

We use two sources of data in our experiments. The first is an unlabelled review corpus (no gold or human summaries are available for the items). This dataset is used to create silver-standard summaries for self-training. The second source is an evaluation dataset containing a much smaller set of items

(not seen during training) and here for each item, the set of source reviews are paired with one or more human summaries of those reviews.

In our experiments we use the SPACE corpus collected by (Angelidis et al., 2021). It comprises of reviews for hotels from the TripAdvisor website.

SPACE-unlabelled. This is a collection of 1.1 million reviews for 11,000 hotels. These reviews are not paired with human summaries. We use this set for silver data creation and further for training.

SPACE-eval. contains human generated summaries for a smaller set of 50 hotels. For each of these hotels, 100 input reviews are paired with 3 gold-standard human-written abstractive summaries. The human-summaries were created via a two-step process where annotators first selected key sentences from the input reviews, and then wrote a summary based on the sentence collection. The dataset contains 3 general summaries for each hotel, as well as aspect based such as for food and cleanliness. We only use the general summaries for each input. These 50 hotels are divided into 25 for development and 25 for test sets.

This evaluation dataset ideally suits our task since the input contains 100 reviews on which one could ask for common opinions and claims. Most other evaluation sets (Bražinskas et al., 2020b,a) contain about 8 randomly sampled reviews which may often not have much in common.

5 Models

We build our abstractive systems using pretrained encoder-decoder models based on T5’s (Raffel et al., 2020) framework. These models encode the input reviews as a sequence and autoregressively generate the output summary words as a sequence.

In multi-document summarization, especially opinions, source reviews could easily span hundreds of reviews. Standard self-attention layers found in current transformer models have a polynomial scale relationship to input length, making it impossible to encode and attend to several reviews at once. Many summarization systems avoid this issue by including a content selection component as a first step of a pipeline. Recent work has shown that sparse transformers are able to overcome this issue, simplifying models and many times outperforming pipeline based alternatives. For this reason, we have also built models on top of LongT5 (Guo et al., 2022), which implements sparse atten-

tion by combining local attention with transient global attention, allowing tokens to attend locally and globally via transient global nodes.

In this work, we employ LongT5 models (of different sizes: Large (770M), XL (3B)) with a limit of 8,192 sentence pieces. We use the public pretrained checkpoint.³

6 Experiments

In this section, we explain how we trained our abstractive summarization models.

6.1 Silver Data

We create our silver data using the unlabelled review corpus introduced in Section 4. We called this silver dataset as **SPACE-OpineSum**.

To create this set, we followed the procedure outlined in 3. We used SPACE items with a minimum of 50 reviews (since very few reviews may not have a lot in common to extract out). This set contains about 4,729 items. Our beam pipelines computed a total of around 1.3B entailment predictions on review-proposition pairs from these items. The resulting silver data contains the same number of items, but now each item is paired with a silver summary.

6.2 Self-training

We explore the usefulness of our self-training in two setups: unsupervised and few-shot learning abstractive summarization. For the unsupervised case, we train our models on the silver-data only. For few-shot learning, we use a small number of annotated input-summary pairs (<100) for finetuning our self-supervised systems.

6.2.1 Unsupervised training

Given the silver-data, we trained LongT5-Large (770M parameters) and LongT5-(Large, XL) (Guo et al., 2022) models on the sequence-to-sequence task of generating the highest consensus opinions (i.e. most entailed) given a concatenated sequence of the input reviews. These models do not use any gold-annotated examples for training.

We compare these systems with prior unsupervised work in the SPACE-eval dataset introduced in Section 4. We select the best checkpoint based the ROUGE performance on the validation set.

³<https://github.com/google-research/longt5>

6.3 Few-shot Learning

Few-shot learning was implemented by finetuning our self-trained models on a few human annotated source-review and summary pairs. To facilitate this setup, we divide the development examples in SPACE-eval (25 total) into a training set with 15 items and a validation set with 10 items. The test set remains unchanged. We use this training set for few-shot learning and the best checkpoint was selected based on ROUGE scores on the validation set. These models trained better with a rather reduced learning rate, $1/5th$ of the standard $1e-4$.

We will compare these models with baselines which do not use self-training with silver summaries. Rather these latter models are warm started from the public pretrained checkpoints and similarly trained on the train split we created above.

7 Results

First we present which settings were most useful for self-training before describing summarization performance.

One aspect is the relationship between input source reviews and the silver summary. We trained all our models until validation performance plateaus. In this case, ROUGE was computed on the held-out validation silver data set.

In Section 3.5, we present three ways of sampling the set of source reviews to consider as input: equal, uniform, and proportional. We found that our model performance was similar across these settings. Since our output propositions are only a list, perhaps a model can learn the relationship as long as there are frequency signals in the input, but that frequency does not need to be proportional to the frequency seen in the full set of input reviews.

We also compared how many reviews, size k , should be present on the input side. While there were no strong patterns as for sampling methods, typically more reviews, eg. 160 performed better most of the time. Next we compare how well the models perform in the unsupervised summarization setting. Here we train our models on the silver data and evaluate on the test set of SPACE-eval. Table 5 presents the ROUGE scores. We compare with previous Lexrank (Erkan and Radev, 2004) results as well as the current best system ACESUM by (Amplayo et al., 2021).

We see that OPINESUM systems obtain very good performance. Sometimes we do not outperform the best state of art system since these systems

| Model | R1 | R2 | RL |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Previous systems | | | |
| Lexrank | 36.86 | 8.81 | 22.96 |
| Acesum | 42.64 | 14.50 | 25.20 |
| OPINESUM systems | | | |
| LongT5 Large | 45.84 | 16.30 | 29.18 |
| LongT5 XL | 43.41 | 13.82 | 23.84 |

Table 5: Results for the unsupervised setting. The OPINESUM systems use self-training only and *no gold summaries*.

are sophisticated and tend to employ a variety of techniques (such as aspect extraction) while our model is only driven by self-training. We would expect that the addition of other modules would improve upon our system.

Table 7 presents results in the few-shot learning setup. There are no prior system results for this few-shot setup on the SPACE data. Nevertheless, the T5 models trained without silver-data are a strong ablation to compare against our few-shot trained models with OPINESUM warm start.

Here, we see that the baseline T5 examples are already rather strong and outperform earlier unsupervised systems. In particular, LongT5 is pre-trained with a summarization-relevant objective: the gap sentence prediction task. That is a probably cause for its high performance on this task. Even with this high baseline, we find that our simple self-training still leads to further significant improvements.

We show an example output of our system compared with gold standards and prior system in Table 6. One noteworthy difference is between our unsupervised and fewshot systems. The unsupervised system produces shorter summaries and at time disfluencies due to being trained on smoothed propositions. Fewshot learning improves along these dimensions being the summary much closer to the gold standards. Also note that ACESUM summaries contain many phrasal repetitions while that is absent in our outputs.

8 Conclusion

We have presented a simple self-training approach which leads to sizeable gains on both unsupervised and few-shot abstractive opinion summarization.

Our work is one of the first to demonstrate how an intuitive idea of consensus can be incorporated during self-training. It opens up a number of challenges and new problems for future work. In partic-

| Gold standard summaries | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>G1. This hotel was very nice and within walking distance of the Vatican, Colosseum, Forum, ST Peters, etc. Staff were helpful in every way, and the attention to each request and question was efficient and treated with courtesy. The air-conditioned rooms were very nice, clean, and comfortable, with immaculate bathrooms to boot. Breakfast, which is included, was pretty good for a continental buffet.</p> | | | | |
| <p>G2. Staff received mixed reviews, but were overall considered friendly, attentive, and helpful. The hotel, rooms, and bathrooms were very clean, with daily maid service and linen change. The room was beautiful and airy. The Breakfast was great and varied. The location is excellent, away from the hordes of tourists. It’s just a short walk over Ponte Umberto to Piazza Navona, or across Ponte Cavour to reach the popular shopping areas. The building is nice. The restaurant was first rate. However, some thought that the hotel is pricey for the quality of the room.</p> | | | | |
| <p>G3. The staff was extremely courteous and helpful. The wooden floors were all cleaned and maintained; as well as everything else in the hotel. The rooms were beautiful and large, and the bathroom was immaculate. There was a good, buffet style breakfast with particularly enjoyable cold meats, and with anything else desired. The hotel is located close enough to the Vatican, Colosseum, the Forum, and St. Peters- overall a great location.</p> | | | | |
| <p>ACESUM (Amplayo et al., 2021)</p> <p>The staff were very friendly and helpful. the room was clean and clean. it was a great place to stay. if you want to stay in cicerone, it is a good place to get to the shopping area. there are many restaurants, restaurants and restaurants. but the staff are very friendly, friendly and friendly. they are a very nice hotel, a nice place to eat, and a lot of good food, as well as a small restaurant, the breakfast was very good, but a bit of.</p> | | | | |
| <p>OPINESUM-unsupervised</p> <p>The hotel is located within walking distance of the Vatican. The rooms were clean and comfortable. The Cicerone is a nice hotel. As far as the hotel goes. The reception area is nice but the rooms. The breakfast buffet was fine. The room was a good size.</p> | | | | |
| <p>OPINESUM-fewshot</p> <p>The staff was friendly and helpful. The rooms and hotel itself is modern, extremely clean! The rooms are a good size, with comfy beds, a breadth of amenities such as a great shower and a comfortable bed. The breakfast buffet is average, but very good, with lots of variety. The location is very central. The hotel is within walking distance of the Vatican and Piazza Navona. The Cicerone is a beautiful hotel, but the hallways need refurbishing.</p> | | | | |

Table 6: Example summaries for one item in our dataset. We show the 3 gold standard summaries available on the evaluation set along with previous best system (ACESUM) and our unsupervised and few-shot self-trained systems.

| Model | Checkpoint | R1 | R2 | RL |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| LongT5 L | Vanilla | 45.51 | 13.03 | 29.28 |
| LongT5 L | OPINESUM | 47.19 | 14.60 | 30.13 |

Table 7: Results for the few-shot learning setting. All the models were finetuned on a small set of 15 training examples described in Section 6.3. ‘Vanilla’ systems are warm started from public checkpoints and do not see self-training data.

ular, while our silver data contains the provenance for each top proposition—meaning the set of reviews which support each the proposition—this information is only minimally used at the moment. Future work could explore how models could be trained using the entailment weights (scores) of each proposition and the exact links to entailing reviews to yield more performance improvements and faithful generation.

We also hope that such self-training models could serve as good checkpoints for other tasks in the opinion domain such as review helpfulness prediction or product popularity and ratings. We

hope to explore such directions in future work.

References

- Reinald Kim Amplayo, Stefanos Angelidis, and Mirella Lapata. 2021. Aspect-controllable opinion summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6578–6593.
- Reinald Kim Amplayo and Mirella Lapata. 2020. Unsupervised opinion summarization with noising and denoising. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1934–1945.
- Stefanos Angelidis, Reinald Kim Amplayo, Yoshihiko Suhara, Xiaolan Wang, and Mirella Lapata. 2021. Extractive Opinion Summarization in Quantized Transformer Spaces. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:277–293.
- Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit*. ” O’Reilly Media, Inc.”.
- Arthur Braźniskas, Mirella Lapata, and Ivan Titov. 2020a. Few-shot learning for opinion summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4119–4135.
- Arthur Braźniskas, Mirella Lapata, and Ivan Titov. 2020b. Unsupervised opinion summarization as copycat-review generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5151–5169.
- Arthur Braźniskas, Ramesh Nallapati, Mohit Bansal, and Markus Dreyer. 2022. Efficient few-shot fine-tuning for opinion summarization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 1509–1523, Seattle, United States.
- Eric Chu and Peter Liu. 2019. MeanSum: A neural model for unsupervised multi-document abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1223–1232. PMLR.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Hady Elsahar, Maximin Coavoux, Jos Rozen, and Matthias Gallé. 2021. Self-supervised and controlled multi-document opinion summarization. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 1646–1662.
- Günes Erkan and Dragomir R Radev. 2004. Lexrank: Graph-based lexical centrality as salience in text summarization. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 22:457–479.
- Ori Ernst, Avi Caciularu, Ori Shapira, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Mohit Bansal, Jacob Goldberger, and Ido Dagan. 2022a. Proposition-level clustering for multi-document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1765–1779.
- Ori Ernst, Avi Caciularu, Ori Shapira, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Mohit Bansal, Jacob Goldberger, and Ido Dagan. 2022b. Proposition-level clustering for multi-document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Jade Goldstein and Jaime Carbonell. 1998. Summarization: (1) using MMR for diversity- based reranking and (2) evaluating summaries. In *TIPSTER TEXT PROGRAM PHASE III: Proceedings of a Workshop held at Baltimore, Maryland, October 13-15, 1998*, pages 181–195.
- Mandy Guo, Joshua Ainslie, David Uthus, Santiago Ontanon, Jianmo Ni, Yun-Hsuan Sung, and Yinfei Yang. 2022. LongT5: Efficient text-to-text transformer for long sequences. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 724–736.
- Masaru Isonuma, Junichiro Mori, Danushka Bollegala, and Ichiro Sakata. 2021. Unsupervised Abstractive Opinion Summarization by Generating Sentences with Tree-Structured Topic Guidance. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:945–961.
- Ani Nenkova, Lucy Vanderwende, and Kathleen McKeown. 2006. A compositional context sensitive multi-document summarizer: exploring the factors that influence summarization. In *Proceedings of SIGIR 2006*.
- Nadav Oved and Ran Levy. 2021. PASS: Perturb-and-select summarizer for product reviews. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 351–365.
- Dragomir R Radev, Hongyan Jing, Małgorzata Styś, and Daniel Tam. 2004. Centroid-based summarization of multiple documents. *Information Processing & Management*, 40(6):919–938.

- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Tal Schuster, Sihao Chen, Senaka Buthpitiya, Alex Fabrikant, and Donald Metzler. 2022. Stretching sentence-pair nli models to reason over long documents and clusters. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*.
- Darsh Shah, Lili Yu, Tao Lei, and Regina Barzilay. 2021. Nutri-bullets hybrid: Consensual multi-document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5213–5222.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122.
- Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. 2020. PEGASUS: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11328–11339.