In this paper, we report on our system for FIN-CAUSAL 2021 Financial Document Causality Detection Task. In this task, the aim is to identify, in a causal sentence or text block, the causal elements and the consequential ones. We propose a system that uses a pre-trained model, fine-tuned on the extended dataset, and task-specific post-processing of the model’s inputs to improve the quality of the results. We tried two types of approaches: 1) a fine-tuned T5-model that generated cause and effect spans 2) and a sequence-to-sequence model based on XLNet that solved the task as token classification. The best result of our XLNet-large is 0.946 F1 on the test set while T5-model got the F1 score of 0.835 which may be due to the lower number of exact matches.

1 Introduction

Causality detection is an important problem as a vital part of natural language understanding. It is especially true for the domain of finance and economics where causes should contribute to the prediction model while effects should either be used as an output or omitted from the model altogether. A major contribution to the field was provided in the workshop FinCausal 2020 (Mariko et al., 2020) where the authors have provided a labelled dataset for causality and effect detection and a platform for the discussion of the results and further aligned measurement of the models. It contained two tracks: the first task was to classify whether a sentence contains causality or not, while the second one was devoted to the extraction of causes and effects from the sentences.

This work is focused on our approach to FinCausal 2021. Unlike the last year competition, this year shared task consisted of a single track equivalent to the second track from 2020. The dataset consists of texts each containing causes and effects. One text may contain several spans of the same type.

The winning solution of the 2020 2nd subtask consisted in a BERT-CRF system with a Viterbi decoder (Kao et al., 2020). This year we also tried to implement their solution but were unsuccessful with this approach and got the F1 score of 0.875 on our test dataset derived from 2021 training data.

2 Preprocessing

In this work we experimented on two datasets:

- FinCausal-2021 dataset, which consists of two subtasks, including causal meanings detection (Task 1) and cause-effect detection (Task 2). The numbers of training instances are 22,058

---

1http://wp.lancs.ac.uk/cfie/fincausal2021/
and 1,750 for Task 1 and Task 2, respectively. This work only focuses on Task 2.

- Balanced-COPA dataset (Kavumba et al., 2019), The Choice Of Plausible Alternatives dataset (COPA) contains 1000 examples of two question types: a) What is the CAUSE of this? and b) What is the EFFECT of this? Balanced COPA contains one additional, mirrored instance for each original training instance in COPA. A total of 1,500 examples are given.

Since we are experimenting with two different models, the data sets will be handled differently for both models.

For the Seq2Seq model, the data set is split into two parts. The model is to predict the cause part and the effect part of a text in two steps. In the first step, the model predicts only the Cause part of the text, is the second step – only the Effect part. To control which part of the sentence the model should generate, we use additional prefixes in the text that will be given to the input of the model. At the end of each text, we prepend an additional prefix as shown in 3.

For Sequence Tagging models we used encode_causal_tokens function provided by organizers to reformat all data to BIO format.

3 Models

The task of extracting textual relations can eventually be generalized to the task of selecting a subset of the words or sentences in the text. There are many approaches to solving this task. We have selected two variants: Sequence tagging and Sequence-to-Sequence generation.

3.1 Sequence tagging

In case of sequence tagging models we experimented with BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), ALBERT (Lan et al., 2019) and XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) models. Models were asked to predict sequences of labels in BIO format. Every input example was tokenized using ‘word_tokenize’ function from the NLTK library (Bird et al., 2009). Optionally, we feed the information about the number of input sentences to the models, which we get using PunktTrainer and PunktSentenceTokenizer from NLTK library trained on all provided textual data. We concatenate the one-hot encoded number of sentences to the output from pretrained models. Our models are quite similar to the BERT-base model from (Kao et al., 2020). The differences are in our post-processing steps and different training scheme. Also, we experiment with linear or non-linear classifier layers over pretrained models. In post-processing steps, we apply four transformations similar to the rules worked out by the Workshop organizers to annotate the training data (Mariko et al., 2020). They are:

- If a sentence contained only one fact (cause or effect), we tagged the entire sentence.
- The annotation of sentence-to-sentence causal relationships is prioritized
- When a causal chain is located inside a single sentence, in order to facilitate the extraction process, we chose to span the causal units as much as possible
- If two facts of the same type were located in the same sentence and were related to the same effect or cause, then we annotated these two facts as one unit
Table 1: Results for rule combinations on the dev set for the best performing model

| Rules     | F1   | Exact Match |
|-----------|------|-------------|
| Basic model | 86.24 | 69.58       |
| Rule 1    | 86.32 | 69.73       |
| Rule 12   | 87.25 | 71.14       |
| Rule 123  | 86.04 | 38.53       |
| Rule 1234 | 86.21 | 38.53       |
| Rule 124  | 87.44 | 71.76       |

Table 2: Viterbi-BERT and T5 analysis on our development set

| Model                  | F1  |
|------------------------|-----|
| Viterbi (Kao et al., 2020) | 0.875 |
| BARTNER (Yan et al., 2021)   | 0.7729 |
| T5_large                | 0.868 |
| T5_large_2              | 0.8741 |

The final results of our models are shown in Table 3. As can be seen from the table, our Sequence tagging models outperform T5 Sequence prediction models.

We have also tested the 2020 Fincausal winning solution (Kao et al., 2020) and BARTNER (Yan et al., 2021) as an alternative to T5. BARTNER also solves the token classification problem as a sequence classification task. T5 outperformed BARTNER, while its performance was close to BERT+Viterbi. However, we failed to replicate the results for the Viterbi model. It might be due to hyperparameter tuning or some mistake in processing. All in all, our token classification turned out to be the most successful among the ones that we have tried.

XLNet and ALBERT models have been trained using 2 Nvidia GeForce RTX 2080 TI GPUs. T5 models have been trained using GPUs provided by Google Colab Pro.

5 Error Analysis

Such a low result in T5 compared to regular token tagging is probably due to the fact that the model sometimes has difficulty in predicting perfectly all the tokens in the input text. While token tagging only works with the source text, the T5 model may mix up or miss some tokens due to its seq2seq nature. This is confirmed by the low exact match result in the table.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we describe our results for the FinCausal 2021 dataset. We have tried Sequence Classification and Sequence-to-Sequence models. Sequence classification outperformed Sequence-to-Sequence in our case. We have also tested various sequence post-processing schemes and ensembles of Transformer-based models.
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