Dialogue Text Summarization

Final Project Report

Name: Jessica Anna James

Phone Number: 4256558646

james.jess@northeastern.edu

Signature of Student: Jessica Anna James

Submission Date: 12/15/2023

Introduction

The rapid evolution of natural language processing (NLP), notably in text summarization, has been catalyzed by neural network models and richly labeled datasets. However, despite the progress in monologic text summarization, dialogue summarization remains a relatively underexplored domain within the NLP research landscape. This gap primarily stems from the scarcity of datasets explicitly tailored for dialogue texts, posing significant limitations on the development of robust dialogue summarization models.

The current dialogue summarization research heavily relies on datasets like the AMI meeting corpus, which, although rich in content, presents constraints in scale and predominantly focuses on virtual multi-party meeting records. This limitation obstructs substantial advancements in the field, considering the inherent differences between existing datasets and real-life spoken dialogues. The SAMSum dataset, while a recent addition, features short conversations from messenger apps, exhibiting distinct language styles and topics that differ from spontaneous spoken daily dialogues.

The absence of a comprehensive and diverse dialogue summarization dataset introduces several challenges. The disparity in language style, topic diversity, and scenario complexity between existing corpora and real-life dialogues hampers the development of robust models. Moreover, the inherent characteristics of daily conversations, including varied communication patterns, task-oriented nature, and longer dialogue lengths, pose unique hurdles in the summarization process. The complexity is further amplified by the need to comprehend and summarize multi-turn dialogues while tracking entities and events across turns.

To bridge these gaps, the DIALOGSUM dataset is introduced, encompassing a wide spectrum of real-life scenarios and topics encountered in face-to-face spoken dialogues. Curated meticulously from diverse public dialogue corpora and an English speaking practice website, DIALOGSUM aims to provide a rich repository of dialogues for advancing research in dialogue summarization and related NLP tasks.

DIALOGSUM includes 13,460 dialogues meticulously categorized into training, validation, and test sets. The dataset covers various real-life scenarios, such as education, work, medication, business negotiations, banking services, leisure, and travel. Notably, DIALOGSUM distinguishes itself by its inclusivity of different conversational dynamics observed among friends, colleagues, service providers, and customers.

The dataset undergoes rigorous cleaning and preprocessing, removing non-English characters, correcting errors, and deduplicating to ensure uniformity and quality. The dialogues are standardized into a bi-turn dialogue flow with added speaker tags, resulting in a cleaned and preprocessed dataset ready for training and testing summarization models.

Problem Statement

The advancement in natural language processing, specifically in text summarization, has witnessed significant strides owing to neural network models and abundant labeled datasets. However, a noticeable void exists in the domain of dialogue summarization, marked by the limited attention given to this area within the research community. While text summarization has thrived in summarizing monologic texts such as news articles, patents, and academic papers, dialogue summarization remains relatively underexplored, primarily due to the scarcity of suitable datasets built specifically for dialogue texts.

Existing research in dialogue summarization primarily relies on datasets like the AMI meeting corpus, which, though rich in content, is limited in scale and largely focuses on virtual multiparty meeting recordings. The inadequacy of dialogue-specific datasets significantly hampers the progress in this field. For instance, the SAMSum dataset, while recently released, predominantly features short conversations from messenger apps, differing notably in language style, token usage, and topics from spoken daily dialogues, thereby posing limitations on its applicability to real-life scenarios.

The absence of a comprehensive and diverse dialogue summarization dataset poses several challenges. Firstly, the discrepancy in language style, topic diversity, and scenario complexity between existing datasets and real-life spoken dialogues hinders the development of robust dialogue summarization models. Secondly, the inherent characteristics of daily conversations, including their diverse task-oriented nature, nuanced communication patterns, and longer dialogue lengths, present unique challenges in summarization. Moreover, the necessity to comprehend and summarize multi-turn dialogues with varied discourse structures, while keeping track of entities and events mentioned across turns, adds complexity to the summarization task.

Hence, there exists a pressing need to address these challenges by introducing a dataset that bridges the gap between existing corpora and real-life spoken dialogues. This dataset should encapsulate the richness and diversity of face-to-face spoken conversations across a wide array of daily-life topics, catering to different conversational dynamics observed among friends, colleagues, and service providers and customers. Developing such a dataset will not only facilitate the training of more accurate and contextually aware dialogue summarization models but also pave the way for enhanced understanding and generation of coherent, salient summaries from multi-turn dialogues, vital for applications in business intelligence, personal assistants, and various natural language understanding systems.

DIALOGSUM is designed to address the limitations of existing datasets, offering a comprehensive collection of face-to-face spoken dialogues, thereby serving as a catalyst for advancing research in dialogue summarization and related natural language processing tasks.

Dataset Overview:

DIALOGSUM is a comprehensive dialogue summarization dataset curated from diverse sources, encompassing DailyDialog, DREAM, MuTual, and an additional English speaking practice website. This dataset aims to facilitate advancements in dialogue summarization by offering a rich repository of face-to-face spoken dialogues covering a wide spectrum of real-life scenarios and topics, including education, work, medication, business negotiations, banking services,

leisure, and travel. The dataset comprises a total of 13,460 dialogues, carefully divided into training (12,460), validation (500), and test (500) sets.

Data Collection

DailyDialog: Consisting of 13k multi-turn dialogues sourced from websites aiding English learners in practicing spoken English.

DREAM and MuTual: These datasets include 6k and 9k speech transcripts, respectively, gathered from online English listening exam materials.

Crawled Data: Additional dialogues were obtained from an English-speaking practice website (tingroom.com), offering examples of conversations in practical circumstances like business negotiations and banking services.

Data Characteristics

The dialogues in DIALOGSUM share essential characteristics conducive to summarization tasks. They depict rich real-life scenarios, exhibit clear communication patterns, and intentions, making them suitable summarization sources. The average dialogue lengths are within a reasonable scale and are longer compared to chitchats, signifying more events and discourse relations. The dataset distribution from various sources is summarized, showcasing proportions in terms of the number of dialogues and tokens.

	fname	dialogue	summary	topic
0	train_0	#Person1#: Hi, Mr. Smith. I'm Doctor Hawkins	Mr. Smith's getting a check-up, and Doctor Haw	get a check-up
1	train_1	#Person1#: Hello Mrs. Parker, how have you bee	Mrs Parker takes Ricky for his vaccines. Dr. P	vaccines
2	train_2	#Person1#: Excuse me, did you see a set of key	#Person1#'s looking for a set of keys and asks	find keys
3	train_3	#Person1#: Why didn't you tell me you had a gi	#Person1#'s angry because #Person2# didn't tel	have a girlfriend
4	train_4	#Person1#: Watsup, ladies! Y'll looking'fine t	Malik invites Nikki to dance. Nikki agrees if	dance

Data Cleaning and Pre-Processing

To ensure data uniformity and quality, non-English characters were removed, typos and grammatical errors were corrected, and duplicates were filtered out based on text similarity. The dialogues from different sources underwent standardization into a bi-turn dialogue flow, consolidating continuous turns from the same speaker. Speaker tags (#Person 1# and #Person 2#) were added to distinguish between speakers. The final cleaned and pre-processed DIALOGSUM dataset comprises 13,460 dialogues, ready for training, validation, and testing purposes.

	fname	dialogue	summary	topic
0	train_0	Person1: Hi, Mr. Smith. I'm Doctor Hawkins. Wh	Mr. Smith's getting a check-up, and Doctor Haw	get a check-up
1	train_1	Person1: Hello Mrs. Parker, how have you been?	Mrs Parker takes Ricky for his vaccines. Dr. P	vaccines
2	train_2	Person1: Excuse me, did you see a set of keys?	#Person1#'s looking for a set of keys and asks	find keys
3	train_3	Person1: Why didn't you tell me you had a girl	#Person1#'s angry because #Person2# didn't tel	have a girlfriend
4	train_4	Person1: Watsup, ladies! Y'll looking'fine ton	Malik invites Nikki to dance. Nikki agrees if	dance
4	train_4	Person1: Watsup, ladies! Y'll looking'fine ton	Malik invites Nikki to dance. Nikki agrees if	dan

```
Person1: Hi, Mr. Smith. I'm Doctor Hawkins. Wh...
         Person1: Hello Mrs. Parker, how have you been?...
1
2
         Person1: Excuse me, did you see a set of keys?...
3
         Person1: Why didn't you tell me you had a girl...
4
         Person1: Watsup, ladies! Y'll looking'fine ton...
12455
         Person1: Excuse me. You are Mr. Green from Man...
         Person1: Mister Ewing said we should show up a...
12456
12457
         Person1: How can I help you today?\nPerson2: I...
12458
         Person1: You look a bit unhappy today. What's ...
12459
         Person1: Mom, I'm flying to visit uncle Lee's ...
Name: dialogue, Length: 12460, dtype: object
```

Data Preprocessing and Exploratory Dataset Analysis

The dataset, named DIALOGSUM, consists of a collection of dialogues and their corresponding summaries, divided into three subsets: train, test, and validation. Each subset contains columns such as 'id', 'dialogue', and 'summary'. The 'dialogue' column encompasses multi-turn conversations between individuals, while the 'summary' column provides succinct summaries of these dialogues. The 'id' column uniquely identifies each dialogue entry.

```
DatasetDict({
    train: Dataset({
        features: ['id', 'dialogue', 'summary'],
        num_rows: 10000
    })
    test: Dataset({
        features: ['id', 'dialogue', 'summary'],
        num_rows: 1000
    })
    validation: Dataset({
        features: ['id', 'dialogue', 'summary'],
        num_rows: 1000
    })
}
```

Overview of Dataset Structure:

Total Dialogues: 12,460 entries across train (10,000), test (1000), and validation (1,000) subsets.

Columns: 'id' (dialogue identifier), 'dialogue' (multi-turn conversation text), 'summary' (concise summary), 'input_ids', 'attention_mask', 'labels' (processed for model input)

```
DatasetDict({
    train: Dataset({
        features: ['id', 'dialogue', 'summary', 'input_ids', 'attention_mask', 'labels'],
        num_rows: 10000
    })
    test: Dataset({
        features: ['id', 'dialogue', 'summary', 'input_ids', 'attention_mask', 'labels'],
        num_rows: 1000
    })
    validation: Dataset({
        features: ['id', 'dialogue', 'summary', 'input_ids', 'attention_mask', 'labels'],
        num_rows: 1000
    })
}
```

Data Cleaning and Standardization:

Cleaning Procedures: Preprocessing involved removing non-English characters, correcting typos, grammatical errors, and deduplicating based on text similarity.

Standardization: Speaker identifiers (e.g., #Person1#) were standardized to 'Person1:' for uniformity in dialogue formatting.

Data Distribution:

Dialogues' Characteristics: Average token count for multi-turn dialogues ranged from 118.8 to 136.1 tokens, reflecting varied conversation lengths across sources.

Proportions by Source: The dataset draws from multiple sources, with DailyDialog contributing the highest proportion (58.22%), followed by DREAM (16.94%), MuTual (13.89%), and additional crawled data (12.82%).

Text Preprocessing for Model Input:

Tokenization: Text was tokenized using a specified tokenizer, with dialogue text limited to 1024 tokens and summaries to 128 tokens for model input.

Encoding Scheme: Conversations ('dialogue') were encoded into 'input_ids' and 'attention_mask' tensors, while summaries were encoded as 'labels' for training the summarization model.

Initial Analysis:

Dialogue-Summary Relationship: Initial observations indicate a direct relationship between dialogues and their respective summaries, reflecting a summarization task's nature.

The dataset, after preprocessing, exhibits varied dialogue lengths, diverse sources, and processed encodings ready for model input. This exploration lays the groundwork for subsequent model development and evaluation for dialogue summarization tasks.

Model Development

Summarization models have significantly evolved in recent years, showcasing diverse architectures and approaches to generate concise and informative summaries from input text. Among the forefront models in this domain are BART (Bidirectional and Auto-Regressive Transformers), T5 (Text-to-Text Transfer Transformer), and Pegasus. Each model brings distinctive capabilities and methodologies to the task of text summarization.

1. BART (Bidirectional and Auto-Regressive Transformers):

- **Architecture:** BART, built on the transformer architecture, integrates bidirectional and autoregressive approaches. This fusion allows BART to proficiently handle both tasks of language generation and comprehension.
- **Fine-tuning:** The model is adept at finetuning on diverse summarization datasets, capturing nuanced relationships between inputs and outputs. BART's utilization of a denoising autoencoder objective aids in generating high-quality summaries.
- **Key Features:** BART is proficient in handling text infilling tasks, making it suitable for summarization tasks. The bidirectional nature of the model enables it to understand contextual cues effectively.

```
Dialogue:
Person1: Are things still going badly with your house guest?
Person2: It's getting worse. Now he's eating me out of house and home. I've tried talking to him but it all goes in one ear and out the other. He makes himself at home, which is firenessnal. How I really think you're beating around the bush with this guy. I know he used to be your best friend in college, but I really think it's time to lay down the law.

Person2: You're right. Everything is probably going to come to a head tonight. I'll keep you informed.

Reference Summary:
Leo tells #Person1# things are getting worse with his house guest, who used to be his best friend in college. #Person1# suggests that it's time to lay down the law.

Model Summary:
with #Person2#'s house guest. #Person1# thinks it's time to lay down the law with the house guest and tells Leo everything is probably going to come to a head tonight, and they'll

Your max_length is set to 160, but your input_length is only 86. Since this is a summarization task, where outputs shorter than the input are typically wanted, you might consider of Dialogue:

Person1: They'll do the operation for you this Friday.

Person2: But Saturday is my birthday.

Person2: But Saturday is my birthday.

Person2: But it won't be on my birthday.

Person1: But your health is more important. Believe me!

Reference Summary:

**Reference Summary:

**Ref
```

```
Dialogue:

Person1: It's difficult to find a suitable job this year. It's a lot of pressure.

Person2: Now college graduates are being encouraged to start their own business. It sounds really good for us. We can get some valuable social experience, which will be helpful in Person1: Yes, but it's not as easy as you imagine. There are a lot of problems. The main difficulty is money and our education doesn't provide enough knowledge on how to do it.

Person2: Maybe you are right. But our government allows college graduates to borrow money from banks and maybe some can get money from their parents.

Person2: But you have to pay back the money sooner or later. So most college graduates prefer to apply for a job rather than start their own business.

Person2: But I have made up my mind to start my own business. How about you?

Person1: Well, it always takes time to consider before making a decision.

Reference Summary:

#Person2# has decided to start #Person2#'s own business. #Person1# thinks college graduates lack of money and knowledge to do so, so it's difficult to make a decision.

Model Summary:

graduates are encouraged to start their own business. #Person1# and #Person2# think it's difficult to find a suitable job this year, so they prefer to apply for a job rather than
```

2. <u>T5 (Text-to-Text Transfe</u>r Transformer):

- **Text-to-Text Approach:** T5 introduces a unified text-to-text framework, converting diverse language tasks, including summarization, into text transformation tasks. It treats summarization as a translation problem, converting long-form text into a shorter summary.
- **Flexibility:** T5's flexibility allows it to adapt to various summarization datasets, handling multiple summarization lengths by predicting a range of summary lengths.
- Encoder-Decoder Architecture: Utilizing an encoder-decoder architecture, T5 processes input text and generates corresponding summaries, exhibiting proficiency in generating coherent and contextually relevant summaries.



3. Pegasus:

- **Pre-training Methodology:** Pegasus adopts a pre-training approach involving gap-sentences generation, wherein input documents are reconstructed by masking sections and predicting the missing content. This methodology helps in capturing long-range dependencies and enhancing document understanding.
- **Abstractive Summarization:** Pegasus specializes in abstractive summarization, producing summaries that entail synthesized content, incorporating information from the original text.
- **Performance and Versatility:** The model demonstrates strong performance across various summarization benchmarks, exhibiting the ability to generate high-quality summaries, particularly from long and complex documents.

```
Dialogue:

Person1: Are things still going badly with your house guest?

Person2: It's getting worse. Now he's eating me out of house and home. I've tried talking to him but it all goes in one ear and out the other. He makes himself at home, which is fi

Person1: leo, I really think you're beating around the bush with this guy. I know he used to be your best friend in college, but I really think it's time to lay down the law.

Person2: You're right. Everything is probably going to come to a head tonight. I'll keep you informed.

Reference Summary:

Leo tells #Person1# things are getting worse with his house guest, who used to be his best friend in college. #Person1# suggests that it's time to lay down the law.

Model Summary:

#Person2# tells #Person1# that #Person2#'s house guest is eating her out of house and home. #Person1# thinks #Person2# should lay down the law.
```

```
Your max_length is set to 128, but your input_length is only 74. Since this is a summarization task, where outputs shorter than the input are typically wanted, you might consider or Dialogue:
Person1: They'll do the operation for you this Friday.
Person2: But Saturday is my birthday.
Person2: But Saturday is my birthday.
Person3: But it won't be on my birthday.
Person3: But it won't be on my birthday.

Reference Summary:

Reference Summary:

#Person1#'s trying to persuade #Person2# that having the operation done is more important than #Person2#'s birthday party.

Model Summary:

#Person1# and #Person2# talk about #Person1#'s birthday and #Person2#'s health. #Person1# says #Person2#'s health is more important than #Person1#'s birthday.
```

```
Dialogue:

Person1: It's difficult to find a suitable job this year. It's a lot of pressure.

Person2: Now college graduates are being encouraged to start their own business. It sounds really good for us. We can get some valuable social experience, which will be helpful in Person1: Yes, but it's not as easy as you imagine. There are a lot of problems. The main difficulty is money and our education doesn't provide enough knowledge on how to do it.

Person2: Maybe you are right. But our government allows college graduates to borrow money from banks and maybe some can get money from their parents.

Person1: But you have to pay back the money sooner or later. So most college graduates prefer to apply for a job rather than start their own business.

Person2: But I have made up my mind to start my own business. How about you?

Person1: Well, it always takes time to consider before making a decision.

Reference Summary:

#Person2# has decided to start #Person2#'s own business. #Person1# thinks college graduates lack of money and knowledge to do so, so it's difficult to make a decision.

Model Summary:

#Person2# tells #Person1# it's difficult to find a suitable job this year. #Person2# suggests #Person1# start their own business.
```

Human Evaluation:

BART's bidirectional capabilities and auto-regressive nature make it suitable for tasks requiring nuanced understanding and context. T5's text-to-text approach enables versatility across summarization lengths and various summarization datasets.

Pegasus stands out for its abstractive summarization prowess and its adeptness in handling intricate document structures. These models—BART, T5, and Pegasus—signify significant advancements in text summarization, each showcasing distinct approaches and capabilities, thereby contributing to the evolution of natural language processing tasks, particularly in

In conclusion, after analyzing the summarization results, simpleT5 architecture (pretrained Model) performed the best out of all during inferencing.

Evaluation using the Rouge Score Metric

Pegasus:

As we can see The ROUGE-1 and ROUGE-L scores suggest that the Pegasus model captures some overlap in terms of unigrams and longer word sequences with the reference summary. However, these overlaps are relatively low (around 1.7%), indicating substantial divergence between the generated and reference summaries.

The very low ROUGE-2 score (0.000263) signifies an extremely low overlap of bigrams between the generated and reference summaries, which might indicate a significant difference in the word pairs use. Since Roug scores, focus on lexical overlap and might not fully capture semantic equivalence or the quality of the summary's coherence and readability, hence additional qualitative analysis and human judgment are essential to assess the summarization quality comprehensively.

	rouge1	rouge2	rougeL	rougeLsum
pegasus	0.017175	0.000263	0.017042	0.017027

Bart:

ROUGE-1 measures unigrams (single words), suggesting that only about 1.15% of words in the reference summaries were also present in the generated summaries on average.

ROUGE-2 measures bigrams (two-word sequences), showing an even lower overlap, with only 0.02% of two-word sequences in common between generated and reference summaries.

ROUGE-L emphasizes the longest common subsequence, indicating a slightly higher overlap in sequences, but still relatively low at around 1.15%.

ROUGE-Lsum is similar to ROUGE-L but with different weighting, showing a slightly different score but similar to ROUGE-L.



SimpleT5:

ROUGE-1 Score: Measures the overlap of unigrams (single words) between the generated summaries and the reference summaries. An average score of 0.459 suggests that, on average, nearly 46% of the unigrams in the reference summaries were also present in the generated summaries.

ROUGE-2 Score: Measures the overlap of bigrams (two-word sequences) between the generated summaries and the reference summaries. An average score of 0.206 indicates that there was less overlap in two-word sequences between the generated and reference summaries, around 20.6%.

ROUGE-L Score: Calculates the longest common subsequence between the generated summaries and the reference summaries, considering word sequences and their order. An average score of 0.423 suggests a moderate similarity in terms of the longest common sequences between the generated and reference summaries.

Average ROUGE-1 Score: 0.4590525178252598 Average ROUGE-2 Score: 0.2061086606842975 Average ROUGE-L Score: 0.422953347404966

Results and Conclusion:

Model Used	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L
Pegasus	1.7	0.000263	1.7
BART	1.15	0.02	1.15
SimpleT5	46	20.6	42.6

Based on the provided results and evaluation using ROUGE scores, SimpleT5 seems to outperform Pegasus and BART in terms of summarization quality. Here's an elaboration on why SimpleT5 might be considered the best choice and how it can address various business needs:

Higher ROUGE Scores:

SimpleT5 achieved significantly higher ROUGE scores across all metrics (ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, ROUGE-L) compared to Pegasus and BART. Higher ROUGE scores generally indicate better overlap and similarity between the generated summaries and the reference summaries.

Improved Content Retention:

SimpleT5's higher ROUGE scores suggest that it retains a larger portion of the content present in the reference summaries. This indicates that the generated summaries by SimpleT5 are more aligned with the essential information in the original text, making them potentially more informative and comprehensive.

Versatility in Summary Lengths:

T5, the architecture on which SimpleT5 is based, employs a text-to-text framework that can handle various summarization lengths. This flexibility allows it to generate summaries of different lengths, catering to specific requirements without sacrificing quality.

Quality of Extracted Information:

The higher overlap in unigrams, bigrams, and longer sequences between the generated summaries and the reference summaries implies that SimpleT5 captures more detailed and relevant information from the original text. This could be beneficial in scenarios where accuracy and completeness of the summary are crucial.

Application to Multiple Business Needs:

SimpleT5's superior summarization performance can be applied across various business sectors and use cases:

- 1. For content curation and aggregation, it can efficiently condense lengthy documents into concise, informative summaries.
- 2. In customer support, it can help extract key issues and sentiments from interactions.
- 3. For competitive analysis, it can quickly summarize market trends and competitor strategies.
- 4. In legal document review, it can highlight critical clauses and arguments.

Enhanced Decision Making and Efficiency:

By providing more comprehensive and accurate summaries, SimpleT5 can empower decision-makers to quickly grasp crucial information from vast amounts of data. This could lead to more informed and efficient decision-making within organizations.

Improved Content Creation and User Engagement:

Content creators and media professionals can benefit from SimpleT5's ability to generate engaging and informative summaries. It can assist in producing content that captures essential details while being concise and appealing to the audience.

Potential Cost and Time Savings:

Using SimpleT5 for automated summarization can potentially save businesses time and resources. Instead of manual summarization efforts, this model can swiftly process large volumes of text, reducing the time and cost involved in information extraction and analysis.

In summary, SimpleT5's superior performance in generating high-quality summaries with higher ROUGE scores makes it a suitable choice for various business needs. Its ability to extract relevant information accurately and efficiently can benefit organizations across different sectors by improving decision-making, content creation, and information processing while potentially saving time and resources.

References:

Chen, Y., Liu, Y., Chen, L., & Zhang, Y. (2021). DialogSum: A real-life scenario dialogue summarization dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06762*.

Appendix:

```
#Mount the google collab to the google drive to collect our data
from google.colab import drive
drive.mount('/gdrive')
!pip install transformers[sentencepiece] datasets sacrebleu rouge_score
py7zr
```

```
!pip install transformers[torch]
!pip install accelerate -U
!nvidia-smi
import pandas as pd
file path='/gdrive/MyDrive/Email Text Summarization/dialogsum.train.jsonl'
data=pd.read json(file path, lines=True)
from transformers import pipeline, set seed
from datasets import load dataset, load metric
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
from transformers import AutoModelForSeq2SeqLM, AutoTokenizer
import nltk
from nltk.tokenize import sent tokenize
from tqdm import tqdm
import torch
nltk.download("punkt")
device = "cuda" if torch.cuda.is available() else "cpu"
model="facebook/bart-large-cnn"
tokenizer = AutoTokenizer.from pretrained(model)
model bart=AutoModelForSeq2SeqLM.from pretrained(model).to(device)
def batch(elements, batch size):
 for i in range(0,len(elements),batch size):
dataset=pd.DataFrame(data)
dataset.head()
shape=dataset.shape
print(shape)
```

```
#Person2#, etc.) is followed by multiple colons and replaces them with a
import re
def clean dialogue(row):
    dialogue cleaned = re.sub(r'#(Person\d+)#:+', r'\1:', row)
    return dialogue cleaned
dataset['dialogue'] = dataset['dialogue'].apply(clean dialogue)
print(dataset['dialogue'])
pipe=pipeline("summarization", model=model)
pipe out=pipe(dataset["dialogue"][1])
print(pipe out)
cleaned=pipe out[0]['summary text'].replace(" .", ".\n")
summary text cleaned = cleaned.replace("<n>", "\n")
print(summary text cleaned)
from datasets import DatasetDict, Dataset
# Your DataFrame here
dataset = dataset.drop(columns=['topic'])
dataset = dataset.rename(columns={'fname': 'id'})
train data = dataset[:10000] # Example: First 10000 rows for training
test data = dataset[10000:11000] # Example: Next 1000 rows for testing
validation data = dataset[11000:12000] # Example: 1000 rows for
```

```
train dataset = Dataset.from pandas(train data)
test dataset = Dataset.from pandas(test data)
validation dataset = Dataset.from pandas(validation data)
formatted dataset dict = DatasetDict({
    'train': train dataset,
    'test': test dataset,
    'validation': validation dataset
def convert examples to features(example batch):
   input encodings = tokenizer(example batch['dialogue'] , max length =
1024, truncation = True )
    with tokenizer.as target tokenizer():
       target encodings = tokenizer(example batch['summary'], max length
= 128, truncation = True )
        'input ids' : input encodings['input ids'],
        'attention mask': input encodings['attention mask'],
        'labels': target encodings['input ids']
dataset samsum pt =
formatted dataset dict.map(convert examples to features, batched = True)
```

```
evaluation in sequence-to-sequence tasks such as text summarization or
from transformers import DataCollatorForSeq2Seq
seq2seq data collator = DataCollatorForSeq2Seq(tokenizer,
model=model bart)
%cd /gdrive/My Drive/Email Text Summarization/ModelBart
from transformers import TrainingArguments, Trainer
trainer args = TrainingArguments(
    output dir='bart-samsum', num train epochs=1, warmup_steps=500,
    per device train batch size=4, per device eval batch size=4,
    weight decay=0.01, logging steps=10,
    evaluation_strategy='steps', eval steps=500, save steps=1e6,
    gradient accumulation steps=16
trainer = Trainer(model=model bart, args=trainer args,
                  tokenizer=tokenizer,
data collator=seq2seq data collator,
                  train dataset=dataset samsum pt["train"],
                  eval dataset=dataset samsum pt["validation"])
trainer.train()
model bart.save pretrained("bart-samsum-model")
tokenizer.save pretrained("tokenizer")
```

```
device = "cuda" if torch.cuda.is available() else "cpu"
model="google/pegasus-cnn dailymail"
tokenizer = AutoTokenizer.from pretrained(model)
model pegasus=AutoModelForSeq2SeqLM.from pretrained(model).to(device)
pipe=pipeline('summarization',model=model)
pipe out=pipe(dataset["dialogue"][1])
print(pipe out)
cleaned=pipe out[0]['summary text'].replace(" .", ".\n")
summary text cleaned = cleaned.replace("<n>", "\n")
print(summary text cleaned)
from transformers import DataCollatorForSeq2Seq
seq2seq data collator = DataCollatorForSeq2Seq(tokenizer,
model=model pegasus)
from transformers import TrainingArguments, Trainer
trainer args = TrainingArguments(
    output dir='pegasus-samsum', num train epochs=1, warmup steps=500,
    per device train batch size=4, per device eval batch size=4,
    weight decay=0.01, logging steps=10,
    evaluation_strategy='steps', eval steps=500, save steps=1e6,
    gradient accumulation steps=16
trainer = Trainer(model=model pegasus, args=trainer args,
                  tokenizer=tokenizer,
data collator=seq2seq data collator,
                  train dataset=dataset samsum pt["train"],
                  eval dataset=dataset samsum pt["validation"])
model pegasus.save pretrained("pegasus-samsum-model")
tokenizer.save pretrained("tokenizer")
pipe = pipeline('summarization', model='bart-samsum-model',
tokenizer=tokenizer)
```

```
gen kwargs = {'length penalty': 0.8, 'num beams': 8, "max length": 160}
custom dialogue="""
#Person2#: Sure. It's my pleasure. I'd like to help you look for the
missing keys.
#Person2#: You're welcome.
print(pipe(custom dialogue, **gen kwargs))
sample text1 = formatted dataset dict["test"][0]["dialogue"]
reference1 = formatted dataset dict["test"][0]["summary"]
sample text2 = formatted dataset dict["test"][1]["dialogue"]
reference2 = formatted dataset dict["test"][1]["summary"]
sample text3 = formatted dataset dict["test"][2]["dialogue"]
reference3 = formatted dataset dict["test"][2]["summary"]
print("Dialogue:")
print(sample text1)
print("\nReference Summary:")
print(reference1)
print("\nModel Summary:")
print(pipe(sample text1, **gen kwargs)[0]["summary text"])
print("Dialogue:")
print(sample text2)
```

```
print("\nReference Summary:")
print(reference2)
print("\nModel Summary:")
print(pipe(sample text2, **gen kwargs)[0]["summary text"])
print("Dialogue:")
print(sample text3)
print("\nReference Summary:")
print(reference3)
print("\nModel Summary:")
print(pipe(sample text3, **gen kwargs)[0]["summary text"])
def calculate metric on test ds(dataset, metric, model, tokenizer,
                               batch size=16, device=device,
                               column text="article",
                               column summary="highlights"):
    article batches = list(batch(dataset[column text], batch size))
    target batches = list(batch(dataset[column summary], batch size))
    for article batch, target batch in tqdm(
        zip(article batches, target batches), total=len(article batches)):
```

```
inputs = tokenizer(article batch,
max length=1024, truncation=True,
                        padding="max length", return tensors="pt")
        summaries =
model.generate(input ids=inputs["input ids"].to(device),
                         attention mask=inputs["attention mask"].to(device
),
                         length penalty=0.8, num beams=8, max length=128)
        decoded summaries = [tokenizer.decode(s, skip special tokens=True,
                                clean up tokenization spaces=True)
               for s in summaries]
        decoded summaries = [d.replace("", " ") for d in
decoded summaries]
       metric.add batch (predictions=decoded summaries,
references=target batch)
    score = metric.compute()
    return score
rouge metric = load metric('rouge')
score = calculate metric on test ds(formatted dataset dict['test'],
rouge metric, model bart, tokenizer, column text = 'dialogue',
column summary='summary', batch size=8)
rouge names = ["rouge1", "rouge2", "rougeL", "rougeLsum"]
rouge dict = dict((rn, score[rn].mid.fmeasure ) for rn in rouge names )
pd.DataFrame(rouge dict, index = [f'Bart'] )
```

```
!pip install --upgrade simplet5
#Reading only the dialog and summary column from one dataframe to another
train df = dialog df[['dialogue', 'summary']]
sample train df=train df.head(5000)
sample train df = sample train df.rename(columns={"summary":"target text",
sample train df = sample train df[['source text', 'target text']]
sample train df['source text'] = "summarize: " +
sample train df['source text']
sample train df.head(3)
from simplet5 import SimpleT5
model = SimpleT5()
model.from pretrained(model type="t5", model name="t5-base")
model.train(train df=sample train df,
          eval df=sample train df[:100],
          source max token len=128,
          target max token len=50,
           batch size=8, max epochs=5, use gpu=True)
```

IE7500: Applied Natural Language Process

```
#outputs folder and passing it as the path for the model inorder to predict the summary which is more precise.
model.load_model("t5","outputs/simplet5-epoch-4-train-loss-0.9907-val-loss-0.7411", use_gpu=True)
```

text_to_summarize="""summarize: Twitter's interim resident grievance officer for India has stepped down, leaving the micro-blogging site without a grievance official as mandated by the new IT rules to address complaints from Indian subscribers, according to a source.

The source said that Dharmendra Chatur, who was recently appointed as interim resident grievance officer for India by Twitter, has quit from the post.

The social media company's website no longer displays his name, as required under Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules 2021.

Twitter declined to comment on the development.

The development comes at a time when the micro-blogging platform has been engaged in a tussle with the Indian government over the new social media rules. The government has slammed Twitter for deliberate defiance and failure to comply with the country's new IT rules.

model.predict(text to summarize)

text_to_summarize="""summarize: Vaccination and safety measures such as wearing face masks are essential when it comes to fighting the Delta Plus coronavirus variant, World Health Organization (WHO) representative to Russia Melita Vujnovic said.

"Vaccination plus masks, because just a vaccine is not enough with 'Delta Plus'. We need to make an effort over a short period of time, otherwise there would be a lockdown," Vujnovic said on the Soloviev Live YouTube show

She explained that vaccination is essential because it lowers the probability of spreading the virus and lowers the risks of severe disease. However, "additional measures" will probably be required as well, Vujnovic warned.

Earlier in June, the WHO included the Delta variant in its list of coronavirus variants of concern as the strain had become prevalent and has caused a resurgence of COVID-19 cases in some countries, including Russia. India has also reported multiple cases of the Delta Plus strain, which was first discovered in March.

model.predict(text to summarize)

```
text to summarize="""summarize: Travellers vaccinated with Covishield may
model.predict(text to summarize)
generated summaries[:500]
flattened list = [item for sublist in generated summaries for item in
sublist]
flattened list[:500]
target summaries[:500]
rouge 1 scores = []
rouge_2 scores = []
rouge 1 scores = []
for generated summary, target summary in zip(flattened list,
target summaries):
    scores = rouge.get scores(generated summary, target summary)
    rouge 1 scores.append(scores[0]['rouge-1']['f'])
    rouge 2 scores.append(scores[0]['rouge-2']['f'])
    rouge 1 scores.append(scores[0]['rouge-l']['f'])
avg rouge 1 = sum(rouge 1 scores) / len(rouge 1 scores)
avg rouge 2 = sum(rouge 2 scores) / len(rouge 2 scores)
```

```
avg_rouge_l = sum(rouge_l_scores) / len(rouge_l_scores)

# Print or use the scores as needed
print(f'Average ROUGE-1 Score: {avg_rouge_1}')
print(f'Average ROUGE-2 Score: {avg_rouge_2}')
print(f'Average ROUGE-L Score: {avg_rouge_1}')
```