Empirical Analysis of the 19 Linguistic Patterns

I. CONTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL LINGUISTIC PATTERNS

We analyzed the contribution of each of the 19 linguistic patterns to the summarization accuracy of $ASSORT_S$. In particular, we created variants of $ASSORT_S$ by removing each linguistic pattern at a time, as well as a variant without all linguistic patterns. We use the same hyperparameters and dataset as in the original paper to train these model variants. Then, we measured the accuracy degradation of $ASSORT_S$ in terms of the F-1 score.

Table I shows the result. Column F1 shows the F1 score of the model variants in comparison to the original ASSORT_S model (the first row in Table I). Column Δ shows the accuracy difference after removing the corresponding linguistic patterns. The last row in Table I shows the model accuracy after removing all linguistic patterns.

While removing all patterns led to a non-trivial 4% decrease in the F1 score, some patterns were more influential than others. For example, the removal of "First, ..." caused the most decrease, 2%, among all patterns. A possible reason for the strong influence of this pattern is that many Stack Overflow users tend to use "First" to start a sentence with important information in the answer post, followed by some elaborations.

TABLE I: Contribution of each linguistic pattern in ASSORT_S

	F1	Δ
\mathbf{Assort}_S	0.71	-
w/o However,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o In practice,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o In fact,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o First,	0.69	-0.02
—w/o Otherwise,	0.71	-
—w/o In this case,	0.71	-
—w/o If you care,	0.71	-
—w/o In general,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o In contrast,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o Finally,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o In short,	0.71	-
—w/o Then,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o On the other hand,	0.71	-
—w/o Alternatively,	0.71	-
—w/o Below is	0.71	-
—w/o In other words,	0.71	-
-w/o Additionally,	0.71	-
—w/o In addition,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o Furthermore,	0.70	-0.01
—w/o all patterns	0.67	-0.04

[&]quot;-" in Column Δ means a change smaller than 1%