

Instruction-Guided Bullet Point Summarization of Long Financial Earnings Call Transcripts

Subhendu Khatuya
Indian Institute of Technology
Kharagpur, India

Koushiki Sinha
Vellore Institute of Technology
Chennai, India

Niloy Ganguly
Indian Institute of Technology
Kharagpur, India

Saptarshi Ghosh
Indian Institute of Technology
Kharagpur, India

Pawan Goyal
Indian Institute of Technology
Kharagpur, India

ABSTRACT

While automatic summarization techniques have made significant advancements, their primary focus has been on summarizing short news articles or documents that have clear structural patterns like scientific articles or government reports. There has not been much exploration into developing efficient methods for summarizing financial documents, which often contain complex facts and figures. Here, we study the problem of bullet point summarization of long Earning Call Transcripts (ECTs) using the recently released ECTSum dataset. We leverage an unsupervised question-based extractive module followed by a parameter efficient instruction-tuned abstractive module to solve this task. Our proposed model FLAN-FinBPS achieves new state-of-the-art performances outperforming the strongest baseline with **14.88%** average ROUGE score gain, and is capable of generating factually consistent bullet point summaries that capture the important facts discussed in the ECTs.

KEYWORDS

LLMs, Instruction-Tuning, Summarization, Financial, ECTs

1 INTRODUCTION

Earnings calls are quarterly or annual conferences hosted by company executives to disclose and deliberate on the company’s financial activities for the specific reporting period. Earnings Call Transcripts [23], commonly known as ECTs, encapsulate detailed records of the call’s discussions, offering essential perspectives into the company’s financial progress and future strategies. These transcripts serve as pivotal reference materials for investors and analysts seeking insights into the company’s performance. ECTs are typically long unstructured documents that can be time and labour intensive to summarise by hand. Therefore development of efficient techniques for automatic ECT summarization is imperative.

Existing automatic text summarization models can perform various types of summarization, for instance: extractive summarization

Reference bullet-point Summary	Generated Questions
- q2 non-gaap earnings per share \$0.97. - sees fy revenue \$6.15 billion to \$6.21 billion. - reported sales growth 16% - 19%.	What is q2 non-gaap earnings per share ? What is the revenue of fy? What percentage of sales growth was reported?
- q2 adjusted operating loss per share \$1.11. - q2 same store sales rose 5.8 percent. - q2 net profit 64 million usd.	What is the q2 adjusted operating loss per share? What is the estimate of q2 sales rose ? What is the net profit of q2?

Table 1: Sample of generated questions from reference bullet point summaries. We have highlighted the key topics such as earnings per share, revenue, loss, sales in blue.

[22, 32], abstractive summarization [17, 29], long document summarization [3, 28] and controllable summarization [2, 21]. However, most automatic summarization models have been primarily developed for general news articles or documents with specific layouts like government reports [27] or scientific articles [1]. Financial report summarization is a fairly new area of work. Among prior works on financial document summarization, Filippova et al. [9] performed extractive summarization on a collection of financial news to extract information about company-specific events. Isonuma et al. [13] proposed a neural model for extractive summarization and applied it to financial reports. Leidner et al. [16] presented a comprehensive survey of all existing work in financial summarization till 2020. More recently, the Financial Narrative Summarization shared task [6, 7, 33] focused on extractive summarization of financial documents. Nugent et al. [23] introduced a new unsupervised heuristic approach for extractive summarization of earning call reports.

In 2022, Mukherjee et al [20] proposed the ECTBPS method designed specifically for bullet point summarization of ECT reports, and created a new benchmark dataset ECTSum¹ containing 2,425 ECT report-summary pairs. The target summaries in this dataset are extremely concise bullet-point style summaries (two examples given in the first column in Table 1), facilitating essential takeaways for analysts. ECTSum [20] is a challenging dataset for automatic bullet point summarization primarily due to the following factors: (i) it has a very high document-summary compression ratio of 103.67; (ii) ECTs, with an average document length of approx. 2.9K words, are free-form long documents as opposed to other long document

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

SIGIR '24, July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0431-4/24/07...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657948>

¹Publicly available ECTSum Dataset: <https://github.com/rajdeep345/ECTSum>




Figure 1: FLAN-FinBPS Architecture - Unsupervised Extractive module takes ECT document and a list of generated questions from reference summary as input to generate the extractive context. FLAN-T5 based Abstractive module takes task specific instruction and the extractive context to generate the bullet point summary

summarization datasets with a fixed document layout; (iii) average token count of ECTs is much more than the maximum token limit of common models such as BERT [5], T5 [25] or BART [17].

In this paper, we propose a novel two-stage generative framework, FLAN-FinBPS, that uses a combination of unsupervised and supervised methods to produce abstractive bullet point summaries of ECT documents. As opposed to the previous state-of-the-art method which used supervised approaches in both stages [20], we use an unsupervised question-based context generator module to produce the extractive summary in the first stage, thereby cutting down on the training time of our model. The second stage of our framework uses a supervised parameter-efficient instruction-tuned module to generate the abstractive bullet point summaries by using the extractive summary as the context. Our framework significantly improves the summarization performance over the ECTSum dataset. Our contributions can be summarized as below:

- (1) We propose FLAN-FinBPS², a novel two staged framework integrating both unsupervised and supervised methods, for more comprehensive and accurate bullet point summarization of ECT documents. The innovative unsupervised question-based extractive approach enhances the contextual understanding of the financial transcripts.
- (2) By employing an unsupervised approach in the first stage and a parameter-efficient instruction tuned Flan-T5 [4, 19] based generative method in the second stage, FLAN-FinBPS enhances training efficiency, making the summarization process more effective, practical and easily deployable.
- (3) Our model outperforms the strongest baseline, achieving a notable **14.88%** increase in average ROUGE score and a **16.36%** rise in BERTScore, signifying a major enhancement in content quality. It also generates more precise numerical values, showcasing a **2.51%** gain in Num-Prec, and produces more factually consistent summaries, demonstrating a **2.70%**

gain in SummaCONV compared to the previous state-of-the-art method.

2 METHODOLOGY

Our proposed framework is divided into two stages: an unsupervised extractive phase, and a supervised generative phase. The overall architecture is depicted in Figure 1.

2.1 Extractive Phase

Typically, each bullet point summary highlights 3-4 crucial financial aspects of the input ECT document, such as revenue, income, earnings per share, sales, profit, equity, etc. This observation motivated us to initially identify the significant *topics* present in a given ECT.

We first generate a list of *questions* for each ground truth summary (bullet point summary) in the train set using an unsupervised pre-trained T5 model [24]. For each sentence S in the ground truth summary, we generate a corresponding question q . Some example questions generated from the bullet point summaries are shown in Table 1. The generation of such questions enables a more dynamic and contextually-driven approach to information extraction.

Let the list of questions for each ECT E_i be Q_i . After removing duplicates, let the number of questions in Q_i be n . We extract the top- k matched sentences based on cosine similarity score using sentence-transformer encoder [26] from each ECT for every question in its question list. For E_i , the corresponding context will have $k * n$ sentences extracted from the ECT. This will act as input extractive context C_i for the ECT E_i to train the second phase of our model. We varied the value of k to retrieve matched sentence from ECT and $k = 3$ gave the best performance (on the validation set). Next, we identify the key *topics* from the generated questions. These topics are particularly required during the testing phase (explained in Section 2.3), where access to the reference summary would be unavailable. Processing all ground truth reference summaries present in the training set, we compile all the generated questions (after

²The code is available at <https://github.com/subhendukhatuya/FLAN-FinBPS.git>

Model	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BERTScore	Num-Prec.	SummaC _{CONV}
Unsupervised						
LexRank [8]	0.122	0.023	0.154	0.638	1.00	1.00
DSDR [11]	0.164	0.042	0.200	0.662	1.00	1.00
PacSum [31]	0.167	0.046	0.205	0.663	1.00	1.00
Extractive						
SummaRuNNer [22]	0.273	0.107	0.309	0.647	1.00	1.00
BertSumExt [31]	0.307	0.118	0.324	0.667	1.00	1.00
MatchSum [32]	0.314	0.126	0.335	0.679	1.00	1.00
Abstractive						
BART [17]	0.327	0.153	0.361	0.692	0.594	0.431
Pegasus [29]	0.334	0.185	0.375	0.708	0.783	0.444
T5 [24]	0.363	0.209	0.413	0.728	0.796	0.508
Long Document Summarizers						
BigBird [28]	0.344	0.252	0.400	0.716	0.844	0.452
LongT5 [10]	0.438	0.267	0.471	0.732	0.812	0.516
LED [3]	0.450	0.271	0.498	0.737	0.679	0.439
Bullet Point Summarizers						
ECTBPS [20]	0.467	0.307	0.514	0.764	0.916	0.518
Flan-FinBPS (Ours)	0.557	0.376	0.529	0.889	0.939	0.532
RI(%)	+19.27%	+22.47%	+2.91%	+16.36%	+2.51%	+2.70%

Table 2: Performance comparison of summarizers against evaluation metrics. Best scores are bold-ed. For Num-Prec. and SummaC_{CONV}, best scores among *abstractive* methods are considered (reasons in Section 3). Flan-FinBPS score the highest on both content quality and factual consistency. The last row RI(%) gives the relative improvement of our method (Flan-FinBPS) over the best-performing baseline (ECTBPS). The baseline results are reproduced from [20].

removing duplicates) into one master list of 3,960 questions. Then we apply LDA [14] topic modelling on this list and choose the top- m ($m = 30$) topics, and then categorise the questions according to the topic keywords. The value of m is chosen to cover the most important financial aspects. Figure 2 represents the distribution of questions across the topics. Each topic may have multiple questions under it. A question is categorised under a topic if at least one keyword associated with that topic is present in it (refer Table 1 where the topic-words are highlighted). Note that a question may be present under more than one category. This approach provides a more nuanced understanding of the underlying content.




Figure 2: Distribution of questions across key topics. Revenue, earnings per Share, and sales together encompass nearly 45% of all topics.

2.2 Abstractive Phase

In the next phase, given the extractive context C_i , we instruction tune FLAN-T5 [4, 19] with carefully-curated task-specific instructions as shown in Figure 1, considering the bullet point summary as the target. The model is trained to condition on the modified input (i.e., extractive context with instruction) to generate the target answer one token at a time using auto-regressive decoding minimizing cross-entropy loss. Our choice for FLAN-T5 is based on the observation that FLAN-T5 models are pre-trained (using instruction tuning) on more than 1.8K tasks, and hence can significantly reduce the amount of fine-tuning steps required if adopted as starting checkpoints for learning new tasks. Specifically, we instruction tune FLAN-T5-Large version with LoRA [12] technique which requires only 0.08% of model parameters to be updated.

2.3 Testing Phase

During testing phase (refer to the right side of Figure 1), where reference summaries cannot be utilized, we prepare the extractive context using the following approach.

We determine which *topics* are covered by a given test ECT based on the presence of specific topic-related words. Subsequently, we employ the sentence transformer [26] embeddings to identify the top-matched questions for each topic through cosine similarity, creating a list of potential questions for the given test ECT. To construct a comprehensive context for each test ECT, we extract the top- k ($k = 3$) most relevant sentences from the ECT, employing a similar approach for each identified question. This extractive summary serves as the final output of the unsupervised extractive phase, which is then passed on to the trained and instruction-tuned abstractive module for generating the final bullet-point summary.

3 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Baseline methods: We assess and compare the performance of various summarization techniques, spanning from unsupervised and extractive supervised methods to abstractive supervised models, long document summarizers, and ECTBPS [20] that has been designed specifically for this task. Names of the baseline methods that we considered are in Table 2.

Dataset: We use the ECTSum dataset [20] containing 2,425 ECT report-summary pairs. The dataset is split into train-val-test sets in the ratio of 7:1:2. All supervised methods are trained/fine-tuned over the train set, and all methods are evaluated over the test set.

Experimental Setup: We instruction tune FLAN-T5-Large³ model with LoRA for 10 epochs, setting *rank* for the trainable decomposition as 2 with a learning rate of $5e-4$ (training time: 15 minutes/epoch, inference time: 2 minutes/sample). The input length was limited to 128, and the output to be generated was set to 60 (hyper-parameters chosen based on validation set).

Evaluation Metrics: To evaluate the content quality of model generated summaries, we consider ROUGE [18], and BERTScore [30]. We report the F-1 scores corresponding to ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L. Accurate reporting of monetary figures is vital in the financial domain to ensure transparency, trust, and informed decision-making among stakeholders. To gauge factual accuracy, we employ *SummaCONV* [15], a newly developed NLI-based model for detecting factual inconsistencies. Additionally, we report *Num-Prec* [20] to evaluate the precision and correctness of numerical values in the summaries.

Results: All our experimental results are detailed in Table 2.

The best scores have been highlighted in bold. Note that the Num-Prec. and SummaCONV scores for all extractive summarizers are always 1.00 because the summary sentences are taken verbatim from the source documents. In general, the performance of the unsupervised methods when applied on their own are very poor. This signifies the domain specific nature of the ECTSum dataset and highlights the need to implement supervised methods. The methods which utilised supervised training have performed significantly better. Interestingly, Pegasus and BART, despite being initialized with weights pretrained on financial data, were outperformed by T5. Both T5 and long T5 models have very good factual scores.

Our model (Flan-FinBPS) demonstrates a substantial improvement over the strongest baseline ECTBPS, achieving 19.2%, 22.4% and 2.9% increase in ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L scores, respectively and an impressive 16.36% increase in BERTScore. These advancements represent a significant leap in content quality, surpassing the current methods. Notably, our model excels in generating more precise numerical values, resulting in a 2.51% increase in Num-Prec. Additionally, it delivers more factually consistent summaries, showcasing a 2.70% gain in SummaCONV when compared to the previous best baseline ECTBPS.

Qualitative analysis of summaries: A qualitative analysis of summaries generated by the strongest baseline (ECTBPS) and our proposed model is presented in Table 3. We see that FLAN-FinBPS is mostly able to correctly capture the numerical values and the desired financial aspects (better content quality) as opposed to

Reference Summary: q4 ffo per share \$0.41
q4 earnings per share \$0.05.
FLAN-FinBPS Summary: **ffo per share \$0.41. q4 2020 per share \$0.05.**
ECTBPS Summary: q4 ffo per share **\$0.45.**
qtrly net interest expense increase by approximately \$0.03 per share

Reference Summary: reports q1 sales of \$455 million.
q1 adjusted earnings per share \$0.52 from continuing operations.
FLAN-FinBPS Summary: **q1 sales \$455 million. q1 earnings per share \$0.52 from continuing operations.**
ECTBPS Summary: **q3** adjusted earnings per share \$0.52 from continuing operations. **qtrly adjusted gross profit margin of 16.1% versus 12.1%.**

Reference Summary: q3 ffo per share \$0.32.
q3 adjusted ffo per share \$0.32.
FLAN-FinBPS Summary: **q3 ffo per share \$0.32. q3 revenue earnings ffo per share \$0.32.**
ECTBPS Summary: **q3 ffo per share \$0.32. qtrly rent collection rate improved to 97% in september sees 2021 new supply decline of 2% to 4% in new supply. qtrly adjusted earnings per share \$1.00.**

Reference Summary: q2 adjusted earnings per share \$1.97.
q2 earnings per share \$2.19.
FLAN-FinBPS Summary: **q2 adjusted earnings per share \$2.28. q2 earnings per share \$2.19.**
ECTBPS Summary: **qtrly net sales rose 29 percent to \$348 million. q2 earnings per share \$2.19. qtrly industrial sales rose 27 percent to \$231 million.**

Table 3: Qualitative analysis of summaries from ECTBPS and FLAN-FinBPS. Examples show the difference between reference summary and model-generated summaries. Blue and red colour is used to indicate correct and incorrect content respectively. ECTBPS either fails to produce accurate numerical data or generates irrelevant content in most of the cases.

ECTBPS. Table 3 presents a few instances where our model also falls short in generating the correct summary, resulting in a few hallucinated values. Occasionally, the model accurately predicts financial figures but assigns them incorrectly to a different financial topic. Note that the closest baseline ECTBPS tends to exhibit a higher frequency of hallucinations than our proposed model, as also suggested by a superior Num-Prec metric for FLAN-FinBPS.

4 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose FLAN-FinBPS for summarising earnings call transcripts into bullet point style. We showcase the effectiveness of an unsupervised, question-based extractive module, coupled with a parameter-efficient instruction-tuned generative module. This approach significantly reduces the model’s training time while also attaining new state-of-the-art performance levels, surpassing the strongest baseline across all evaluation metrics. While our current application focuses on the financial domain, we aim to expand this method to other domains in our future work.

³<https://huggingface.co/google/flan-t5-large>

REFERENCES

- [1] Nouf Ibrahim Altmami and Mohamed El Bachir Menai. 2022. Automatic summarization of scientific articles: A survey. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences* 34, 4 (2022), 1011–1028.
- [2] Reinald Kim Amplayo, Stefanos Angelidis, and Mirella Lapata. 2021. Aspect-controllable opinion summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03171* (2021).
- [3] Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150* (2020).
- [4] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416* (2022).
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
- [6] Mahmoud El-Haj, Marina Litvak, Nikiforos Pittaras, George Giannakopoulos, et al. 2020. The financial narrative summarisation shared task (FNS 2020). In *Proceedings of the 1st Joint Workshop on Financial Narrative Processing and MultiLing Financial Summarisation*, 1–12.
- [7] Mahmoud El-Haj, Nadhem Zmandar, Paul Rayson, Ahmed AbuRa’ed, Marina Litvak, Nikiforos Pittaras, George Giannakopoulos, Aris Kosmopoulos, Blanca Carbajo-Coronado, and Antonio Moreno-Sandoval. 2022. The Financial Narrative Summarisation Shared Task (FNS 2022). In *Proceedings of the 4th Financial Narrative Processing Workshop @LREC2022*. European Language Resources Association, Marseille, France, 43–52. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.fnpp-1.6>
- [8] Günes Erkan and Dragomir R Radev. 2004. Lexrank: Graph-based lexical centrality as salience in text summarization. *Journal of artificial intelligence research* 22 (2004), 457–479.
- [9] Katja Filippova, Mihai Surdeanu, Massimiliano Ciaramita, and Hugo Zaragoza. 2009. Company-Oriented Extractive Summarization of Financial News. In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference of the European Chapter of the ACL (EACL 2009)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Athens, Greece, 246–254. <https://aclanthology.org/E09-1029>
- [10] Mandy Guo, Joshua Ainslie, David Uthus, Santiago Ontanon, Jianmo Ni, Yun-Hsuan Sung, and Yinfei Yang. 2021. LongT5: Efficient text-to-text transformer for long sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07916* (2021).
- [11] Zhanying He, Chun Chen, Jiajun Bu, Can Wang, Lijun Zhang, Deng Cai, and Xiaofei He. 2012. Document summarization based on data reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 26. 620–626.
- [12] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685* (2021).
- [13] Masaru Isonuma, Toru Fujino, Junichiro Mori, Yutaka Matsuo, and Ichiro Sakata. 2017. Extractive summarization using multi-task learning with document classification. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, 2101–2110.
- [14] Hamed Jelodar, Yongli Wang, Chi Yuan, Xia Feng, Xiahui Jiang, Yanchao Li, and Liang Zhao. 2019. Latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) and topic modeling: models, applications, a survey. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 78 (2019), 15169–15211.
- [15] Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N Bennett, and Marti A Hearst. 2022. SummaC: Re-visiting NLI-based models for inconsistency detection in summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), 163–177.
- [16] Jochen L Leidner. 2020. Summarization in the financial and regulatory domain. In *Trends and Applications of Text Summarization Techniques*. IGI Global, 187–215.
- [17] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461* (2019).
- [18] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*. 74–81.
- [19] Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, and Adam Roberts. 2023. The Flan Collection: Designing Data and Methods for Effective Instruction Tuning. *arXiv:2301.13688* [cs.AI]
- [20] Rajdeep Mukherjee, Abhinav Bohra, Akash Banerjee, Soumya Sharma, Manjunath Hegde, Afreen Shaikh, Shivani Shrivastava, Koustuv Dasgupta, Niloy Ganguly, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Pawan Goyal. 2022. ECTSum: A New Benchmark Dataset For Bullet Point Summarization of Long Earnings Call Transcripts. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 10893–10906. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.748>
- [21] Rajdeep Mukherjee, Hari Chandana Peruri, Uppada Vishnu, Pawan Goyal, Sourangshu Bhattacharya, and Niloy Ganguly. 2020. Read what you need: Controllable aspect-based opinion summarization of tourist reviews. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 1825–1828.
- [22] Ramesh Nallapati, Feifei Zhai, and Bowen Zhou. 2017. Summarunner: A recurrent neural network based sequence model for extractive summarization of documents. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 31.
- [23] Tim Nugent, George Gkotsis, and Jochen L Leidner. 2023. Extractive Summarization of Financial Earnings Call Transcripts: Or: When GREP Beat BERT. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer, 3–15.
- [24] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21, 1 (2020), 5485–5551.
- [25] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2023. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *arXiv:1910.10683* [cs.LG]
- [26] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084* (2019).
- [27] Yanni Yang, Yiting Tan, Jintao Min, and Zhengwei Huang. 2023. Automatic text summarization for government news reports based on multiple features. *The Journal of Supercomputing* (2023), 1–17.
- [28] Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontanon, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, et al. 2020. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 17283–17297.
- [29] Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. 2020. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 11328–11339.
- [30] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675* (2019).
- [31] Hao Zheng and Mirella Lapata. 2019. Sentence centrality revisited for unsupervised summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03508* (2019).
- [32] Ming Zhong, Pengfei Liu, Yiran Chen, Danqing Wang, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuan-jing Huang. 2020. Extractive summarization as text matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08795* (2020).
- [33] Nadhem Zmandar, Mahmoud El-Haj, Paul Rayson, Marina Litvak, George Giannakopoulos, Nikiforos Pittaras, et al. 2021. The financial narrative summarisation shared task FNS 2021. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Financial Narrative Processing Workshop*. 120–125.