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Abstract

Automatically highlighting a text aims at identifying key portions that are the most important to a reader. In this paper, we present a web-based framework designed to efficiently and scalably crowdsource two independent but related tasks: collecting highlight annotations, and comparing the performance of automated highlighting systems. The first task is necessary to understand human preferences and train supervised automated highlighting systems. The second task yields a more accurate and fine-grained evaluation than existing automated performance metrics.

1 Introduction

As people have access to an increasingly larger amount of information, technologies may enable them to consume that information more efficiently. Existing technologies have focused on automated summarization techniques. However, summarization techniques are not fully mature: emphasis mistakes are frequent and may cause the reader to miss crucial points in the summarized document. To address this issue, as an alternative to summarization, key portions of a document can instead be highlighted (or made more visible by bold, italic, etc). Highlights appear within their context (unlike a summary), and the impact of “bad” highlights is of much lower consequence than “bad” summaries.

We believe highlights to be motivated by reading intentions. Thus, we must determine if a difference exists between extractive summary sentences and human highlights. The framework presented in this paper allows users to efficiently and scalably crowdsource two related tasks: collecting highlight annotations, and comparing the performance of automated highlighting systems.

2 Related Work

Highlighting is one of the most common methods of annotation (Baron, 2009), making it a popular content annotation method for increasing comprehension in many reading domains. Passive highlighting, or highlights that already appear in text, has been shown in several studies to be a useful tool for information retention and comprehension (Fowler and Barker, 1974; Lorch Jr., 1989; Lorch Jr et al., 1995).

Rath (1961) asked human annotators to retrieve the “most representative” sentences in a document and failed to find significant human agreement for both human-retrieved and machine-retrieved sentences; Daumé (2004) showed that when instructed to choose the “most important” sentences from a passage, humans still fell short of significant agreement. Though Daumé (2004) had low expectations for human agreement for summarization, we believe that the effect of inline content, such as highlights, could significantly increase the efficacy of this task.

We explored several annotation frameworks, but none of them are designed for collecting and assessing highlights. For example, MAE (Stubbs, 2011) allows annotators to select entire spans of text and assign categories and labels to those spans, but did not allow researchers to normalize user input; one must rely on annotators to select the correct length of input and, in our case, define sentence boundaries. Similarly, BRAT (Stenetorp et al., 2012) makes it difficult to select a sentence with exact boundaries without post-processing annotator input.

https://github.com/Franck-Dernoncourt/sentence-highlighting
3 Framework Design

3.1 Overview

We present in the next two sections the interfaces corresponding to the two use cases of our framework: direct highlight annotation, and human evaluation of highlighting systems. For each of these two use cases, the framework collects a wide range of behind-the-scenes data during annotator interactions, including intermediate highlights (versus the final version of highlights an annotator is satisfied with) and the time spent on each section of a document. From the collected data, we can infer a variety of important information, such as how often users adjust their highlights, and whether users scroll across documents to skim the content, or read every word.

Our annotation framework is lightweight, requiring only a Node.js server, which is simple to deploy on Linux, macOS, or Windows.
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Practice Document

This is a practice document. Highlight any sentence by clicking anywhere in the bounds of the sentence. You may unhighlight a sentence by clicking again.

You will be asked to choose a specific number of sentences for each document. You may not move on to the next document until you have chosen the correct number of sentences. You can highlight your sentences for as long as you like, but you will not be able to change them once you move on to the next document.

![Practice Document](image2.png)

Figure 1: Interface for direct highlight annotation. Annotators may highlight or unhighlight any sentence by clicking on it.
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Practice Document

This is a practice document. Upvote any sentence by clicking anywhere in a sentence and choosing the thumbs up icon. Downvote any sentence by hovering and choosing the thumbs down icon. You can change your decision at any time. After reading the entire document, you will vote on both highlighted versions in the gray section below.

You may not move on to the next document until you have voted on each highlight and rated both versions. You may take as long as you like to vote, but once you move on you will not be able to return to this document.

![Practice Document](image4.png)

Figure 2: Interface for highlighting system assessment. Participants are presented with two versions of the same text with different highlights. Participants must upvote (green) or downvote (red) each highlight, then give a global grade between 1 and 10 for each of the two versions.
3.2 Use Case 1: Highlight Annotation Collection

Figure 1 presents the interface used to collect provided highlight annotations. Annotators are asked to highlight sentences that would make document comprehension easier and faster for another naive reader. A counter in the left column updates the number of highlights remaining as annotators work through each document.

Clicking anywhere within the boundaries of a sentence highlights the entire sentence in yellow. Annotators are allowed to highlight and unhighlight as many times as desired, but are not able to revisit the same document after moving to the next document. All annotators are required to complete a brief tutorial session before beginning that demonstrates the interface controls.

This highlight collection phase attempts to simplify user interaction; Highlighting and unhighlighting can be done with a single left click. There are no color variations; the text size for the left panel and the document title and content stay consistent throughout the task.

3.3 Use Case 2: Highlight System Assessment

Figure 2 presents the interface where participants evaluate highlighting systems. Participants are instructed to “upvote” and “downvote” individual highlights that they believe will help identify the main point(s) of the document. Participants are shown two different highlighted versions, generated from two highlighting systems. Systems are randomized and anonymized, both in location (e.g., left or right side of the content frame) and pairing.

To handle annotation of positive and negative votes on individual highlights, we introduced the “thumbs up” and “thumbs down” buttons, displayed after left clicking anywhere within the boundaries of a highlighted sentence. Participants must vote on every highlight displayed on the document. Once they reach the end of the document, they must rate the two versions of the highlights on a one-to-ten scale before moving to the next document.

4 Analysis Reporting

To help researchers analyze the results, our framework provides analysis scripts, written in Python 3. In this section, we present some of these analyses.
4.1 Use Case 1: Highlight Annotation Results

After annotators highlight sentences in a document, the annotations may be viewed as a binary heatmap, as shown in Figure 3. The heatmap may be used to identify highlight clusters (e.g., if highlights tend to be located at the beginning of the document) as well as an approximate overview of the inter-annotator agreement. The Krippendorff Alpha score (Krippendorff, 2011) is computed, which indicates the overall agreement across all annotators.

4.2 Use Case 2: Highlight Assessment Results

Figure 4 displays up- and down-votes on all sentences in a document, for all automated highlighting models. It can be used to visually determine the consistency of the annotators. E.g., ideally if a sentence is worth being highlighted, it should be upvoted across all annotators, regardless of the model that highlighted it.

Figure 5 contains one boxplot for each model. Specifically, each boxplot represents the distribution of participants’ votes that they cast on a document that was highlighted by the model corresponding to the boxplot.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a web-based framework designed to efficiently and scalably crowdsource the collection of highlight annotations as well as the human comparison of the performance of automated highlighting systems. The interface is highly customizable, easy to tune, and, based on our experience the framework with Amazon Mechanical Turk, easily understood by annotators. The framework as well as its source code is freely available. We hope it will help foster research in the field of automated highlighting.
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