Text Simplification

Tom WYSOCKI, Peter PRIBIL, Margot GUETTIER, Morgan RUIZ-HUIDOBRO

October 2021

Presentation of the project

Final goal:

Text A in, text A/B out.

Current issues in text simplification

Issues with the technology:

- Lack of data for training
- Rules are difficult to make
- Which rules to use?

Notion in text comprehension

Structures which require higher brain activation:

- passive / active voices [1]
- multiple and double negation [2]
- relative clause (subject, object) [3]
- syntactic movement (Wh-fronting, inversion ...) [3]
- complex sentences
- PP?

Complex Sentences

Fewer words = happiness

- Higher brain activation on longer strings
- Poses difficulties on referencing

Syntactic movement

Linear ordering is good

- Transformed sentences proved to be more difficult
- High brain activation

PP Ambiguity

Do we need it?

- It did not increase brain activation
- Bad argument: "exponentially increasing number of trees"

Passive / Active voice sentences

Figure: Type examples of passive / active voice sentences[4]:



(a) The basic example

(b) The example of modal verb

Multiple Negations

Figure: Different types of multiple negations sentences:

A. Single negation	The authors [that the critics recommended] have never received acknowledgment for a best-selling novel.
B. Multiple negation	The authors [that no critics recommended] have never received acknowledgment for a best-selling novel.
C. Double negation	No authors [that the critics recommended] have never received acknowledgment for a best-selling novel.

This type of sentences is quite rarely and we will treat it as the last priority.

Existing systems

Syntactic simplification

- MUSST
- Utilizing Prolog for converting between active sentence and passive sentence with three-steps conversion (by Trung Tran Quang)
- Splitting method used on complex Noun Phrases

Semantic simplification:

- with BERT

System evaluation:

- EASSE: Easier Automatic Sentence Simplification Evaluation

Other system:

redalyc a web based TS system

A different take on TS

What is the purpose?

- Brain functionality vs intelligence?
- Simplification for the sake of simplicity?
- Shouldn't it be customizable?
- Time spent on reading?

Timeline

4 nov:

Collection of syntactic simplification rules / coding

22 nov:

Cognitive linguistics research

10 dec:

Collection of semantic simplification rules / coding

14 jan:

Evaluation phase / coding

15 fev:

Defense preparation

Questions

Questions?



S. Feng, J. Legault, L. Yang, J. Zhu, K. Shao, and Y. Yang, "Differences in grammatical processing strategies for active and passive sentences: An fMRI study," Journal of Neurolinguistics, vol. 33, pp. 104-117, Feb. 2015.



P. Mukherjee, G. Leroy, D. Kauchak, S. Rajanarayanan, D. Y. Romero Diaz, N. P. Yuan, T. G. Pritchard, and S. Colina, "NegAIT: A new parser for medical text simplification using morphological, sentential and double negation," Journal of Biomedical Informatics, vol. 69, pp. 55–62, May 2017.



M. Poulsen and A. K. D. Gravgaard, "Who Did What to Whom? The Relationship Between Syntactic Aspects of Sentence Comprehension and Text Comprehension," Scientific Studies of Reading, vol. 20, pp. 325-338, July 2016.



E. Shetreet, N. Friedmann, and U. Hadar, "The Neural Correlates of Linguistic Distinctions: Unaccusative and Unergative Verbs," *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, vol. 22, pp. 2306–2315, Oct. 2010.