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Abstract

Background and Objectives: Text summarization plays an essential role in reducing time and cost in many domains such as medicine, engineering, etc. On the other hand, manual summarization requires much time. So, we need an automated system for summarizing. How to select sentences is critical in summarizing. Summarization techniques that have been introduced in recent years are usually greedy in the choice of sentences, which leads to a decrease in the quality of the summary. In this paper, a non-greedily method for selecting essential sentences from a text is presented.

Methods: The present paper presents a method based on a generative adversarial network and attention mechanism called GAN-AM for extractive summarization. Generative adversarial networks have two generator and discriminator networks whose parameters are independent of each other. First, the features of the sentences are extracted by two traditional and embedded methods. We extract 12 traditional features. Some of these features are extracted from sentence words and others from the sentence. In addition, we use the well-known Skip-Gram model for embedding. Then, the features are entered into the generator as a condition, and the generator calculates the probability of each sentence in summary. A discriminator is used to check the generated summary of the generator and to strengthen its performance. We introduce a new loss function for discriminator training that includes generator output, real and fake summaries of each document. During training and testing, each document enters the generator with different noises. It allows the generator to see many combinations of sentences that are suitable for quality summaries.

Results: We evaluate our results on CNN/Daily Mail and Medical datasets. Summaries produced by the generator show that our model performs better than other methods compared based on the ROUGE metric. We apply different sizes of noise to the generator to check the effect of noise on our model. The results indicate that the noise-free model has poor results.

Conclusion: Unlike recent works, in our method, the generator selects sentences non-greedily. Experimental results show that the generator with noise can produce summaries that are related to the main subject.
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Introduction

Nowadays, the amount of information in different areas of the World Wide Web in various formats such as web pages, articles, emails, log files, and linked data are increasing sharply [1]. However, much of the information is less important.
On the other hand, manually identifying important information in a large text is time-consuming and practically impossible.

Therefore, we need a system that extracts vital information from the text in the shortest time and with the highest accuracy. This system is called automatic text summarization (ATS) [2]. Primary hypotheses are presented for summarization. A summary is a text produced from one or more texts and is not more than half of the whole text [3]. According to research in [4], summarization is the extraction of the most important information from a source or sources to produce a shorter version for a specific user or task. In other words, this process is one of the crucial steps in diverse cases such as extracting knowledge from text with huge information about the similarity of diseases in the OMIM dataset [5].

The text summarization methods can be categorized in a different view of points. Output-based summarization can be done as extractive or abstractive. Extractive summarization is done by selecting important sentences from different text parts [6], [7]. In abstractive summarization, the system tries to identify the text key concepts and then convert it to another form that is shorter than the original text [8], [9]. Extractive summarization ensures a semantic and grammatical rule between sentences [10]. Input-based summarization may be single-document or multi-document. In multi-document summarization, several documents with the same subject are considered input, and the final summary is the text produced from all the documents [11], [12]. Based on the content, the summary can be general or query-based. In query-based summarization, a summary is generated according to the user's query [13]. This type of summary focuses on the user query and does not consider the general index of concepts in the text. However, in a general summary, the text is produced regardless of the subject and domain. This article presents an extractive, single-document, and general approach.

Since 1950, many solutions for extractive summarization have been offered. Some methods are based on machine learning concepts such as clustering [14], [15] support vector machines [16]. Recently, optimization algorithms [17], [18] like Cuckoo [19], [20] and fuzzy methods [21] have been used for summarization. Graph-based methods are other techniques that have been selected for this purpose [22]. In these methods, each sentence is usually considered as a graph so that the nodes represent the words, and the graph edges express the interval between the words. With recent advances in deep learning, other previous machine learning methods are less commonly utilized in natural language processing tasks [23], [24], [25].

With its relatively complex structure, deep learning can learn the features of words, sentences, or documents automatically [26].

Despite the deep learning-based methods provided for summarization, many of them have not been able to solve the challenges of extractive summarization. The two main components of summarizing are scoring sentences and selecting them [27]. Most previous works suffer from a greedy choice of sentences [10], [28], [29], [30].

In other words, after choosing a high-ranking sentence, they put it aside and do not consider it in choosing the next sentences, which leads to a decrease in the quality of the summary.

Today, Generative Adversarial Networks have been used in many applications of natural language processing, including text generation [31] and question answering [32].

In this research, an extractive summarizer using generative adversarial networks and attention mechanism is presented.

According to our information, this paper presents the first method based on generative adversarial networks for extractive summarization. These networks are made up of two generator and discriminator components that compete in a process.

In this context, the generator goal is to rate each sentence of the document, while the goal of the discriminator is to distinguish the real from the fake summary, which enhances the performance of the generator.

In a non-greedy way, the generator determines the possibility of the presence of sentences in summary at once.

Other contributions to this article are as follows:

- The generator is trained with the feedback it receives from the discriminator. Therefore, if fake summaries are introduced to the discriminator, it can prevent the generator from producing poor-quality summaries. We extract some fake and real summaries from each document and utilize them for discriminator training, which leading to a new loss function for it.

- Another important characteristic of the proposed model is producing multiple summaries for each document during training and testing. During the training, each document enters the generator with different noises, which the model identifies different and appropriate combinations of sentences that produce quality summaries. During the test, we enter each document into the generator with different noises and use the voting system for the final summary.
We evaluate our proposed model on two datasets. In the first evaluation, we use the CNN/Daily Mail dataset. This dataset is a benchmark for evaluating many of the works. In the second application, we utilize the medical dataset available in PubMed Central. The evaluation results show that the proposed model can provide high-quality summaries compared to other compared methods.

**Related Work**

The two main categories of a summary are abstractive and extractive. In most abstractive methods, an Auto-Encoder is used, in which important features of the text are extracted in the Encoder. In the Decoder section, a summary is generated using the features extracted in the encoder section \[33, \,34\]. So far, many methods for extractive summarization, including graph-based \[35, \,36, \,37, \,38\] and deep learning, have been proposed. In the following, several extractive summarizations work based on deep learning methods are described.

The works presented in \[39, \,40\] use an auto-encoder to learn sentence features. The authors in \[39\] make the document word features and then calculate the scores of the sentences using the scores of its words. \[40\] uses cosine similarity between sentence and subject to score sentences. In \[27\], the authors used recurrent neural networks to rank sentences. The authors considered each sentence as a tree where the words are on the leaves, and the sentence is at the root. The score of each sentence is obtained from the leaves based on a non-linear process.

Another work in \[10\] uses reinforcement learning for summarizing.

In this work, the coherence between sentences is considered as a reward. The policy is implemented as a multilayer perceptron that assigns a score to each sentence. The authors in \[28\] introduced a model called Summarunner for extraction summarization based on RNN networks. They used two RNN layers to embed words and sentences. Then, they employed logistic regression to classify sentences.

Recently, the attention mechanism \[41\] has gained much attention in many areas, including machine translation \[42\], question answering \[43\], and text summarization. In \[29\], the authors proposed a method based on the Siamese neural network (SNN) and the attention mechanism. They utilized the attention mechanism for words and sentences to score. They estimated the features of sentences using the obtained word features. Finally, they calculated the features of the document according to its sentences and used a classifier for the similarity of the summary and the document. \[30\] uses the hierarchical structure self-attention method to embed sentences and documents. The proposed method model’s summarization as a classification problem in which it calculates sentence-summary probability.

Recently, Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) \[44\] has revolutionized the processing of natural languages. BERT is a pre-trained language model \[24\] for textual data. In \[45\], a simple version of BERT called BERTSUM is provided for extractive summarization.

In another example in \[46\], a method is presented for abstractive and extractive summarization. The proposed method can obtain document semantics using the BERT model.
The Proposed Model

In this research, we use adversarial generating networks for extractive summarization. We employ this network to improve the problems of previous methods, including greed. We will first have a description of this network, and then the proposed model is presented.

Generative adversarial networks (GANs) were first proposed by Goodfellow et al. [47]. These networks consist of two separate networks that are similarly trained: the generator and discriminator networks. The purpose of the generator is to produce data such as images, text, etc., which are structurally similar to real data but are fake. On the other hand, the task of the discriminator network is to strengthen the generator. These two networks play a two-player min-max game with a value function \( V(D,G) \) as follows [47]:

\[
\min_{G} \max_{D} V(D,G) = E_{x \sim p_{data}(x)}[\log(D(x))] + E_{z \sim p_{z}(z)}[\log(1 - D(G(z)))]
\]  

where \( x \) and \( z \) are input data and noise, respectively. \( G \) and \( D \) mean the generator and discriminator, respectively. \( p_{data}(x) \) and \( p_{z}(z) \) represent the input data distribution and the noise distribution, respectively. \( E \) is mathematical expectation. Generative adversarial networks can be extended to a conditional model if condition \( y \) is added to the generator and discriminator input. The value function, in this case, changes as follows [48]:

\[
\min_{G} \max_{D} V(D,G) = E_{x \sim p_{data}(x)}[\log(D(x|y))] + E_{z \sim p_{z}(z)}[\log(1 - D(G(z|y)))]
\]  

The proposed generator and discriminator model are shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, respectively. We use sentence features as a condition in the generator and discriminator. Let \( D = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N\} \) represents the document, where the \( s_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is the extracted features of the \( i-th \) sentence. \( N \) is the length of document \( D \), which is equal to the number of restricted sentences in each document.

The attention mechanism calculates the representation vector of the document in the generator and the discriminator according to the following equations:

\[
d_G = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i \left[ \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i \right]
\]

\[
d_D = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i \left[ \tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_i \right]
\]

where \( \tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \tilde{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}, \tilde{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2} \) are the output of step \( i \) in BLSTM. \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_i \) are the coefficients of attention for the \( i-th \) sentence in the generator and the discriminator, respectively, which are formulated as follows:
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\[ \alpha_i = \frac{e^{u_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{u_i}} \quad (5) \]

\[ \beta_i = \frac{e^{v_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{v_i}} \quad (6) \]

\[ u_i = \tanh(W_u[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i; \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i] + b_u) \quad (7) \]

\[ v_i = \tanh(W_v[\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i; \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i] + b_v) \quad (8) \]

where \( W_u \in \mathbb{R}^{2d_1}, b_u \in \mathbb{R}, W_v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d_2}, \) and \( b_v \in \mathbb{R} \) are the parameters of the attention mechanism for documents.

In Fig. 1, the representation vector of the document is connected to the noise vector and enters a feed-forward neural network. The last layer of this network calculates the probability of the presence of each sentence. Noise causes the generator to produce different outputs. Each document enters the generator to be summarized in different iterations with different noises. The generator tries to produce different summaries of almost the same quality for each document. It allows the generator to identify different combinations of sentences that are appropriate for the summary. Therefore, sentences that may not be useful for the summary alone can lead to a quality summary by being placed next to other sentences.

In the discriminator network, the probability vector of sentences is contacted with the representation vector of the document (see Fig. 2). In this context, the probability vector of sentences is the vector of the number of sentences in a document, and each element is zero or one.

A. The Target Vector

In the general generative adversarial network, the generator output is used as fake data for discriminator training. In addition, a real target is extracted for each sample. In this research, in order to introduce quality summaries to the discriminator, more than one summary is extracted from each document, which is similar in terms of quality. On the other hand, we produce several poor-quality summaries for the document. The real summaries of each document are text and cannot be employed as a target. Therefore, we need a method to express the presence or absence of each sentence in summary as a number. For this
purpose, a vector is defined with \( N \) element for each document, where \( N \) is the number of sentences. Each element of this vector has a value of zero or one. The value of one indicates the presence of a sentence in summary.

We employ a greedy method according to Fig. 3 to produce this vector. First, we get a vector with length \( D \) and \( M \) number one, where \( M \) is the number of sentences in summary. The values of one are randomly arranged in the vector. The sentences corresponding to the value of one are put together in this vector to produce a summary, and the ROUGE metric measures their quality.

After that, a randomly chosen one is converted to zero, and a randomly chosen zero to one, and the Rouge value is recalculated. If its value is better than the previous one, it will be replaced. This process is repeated for \( Itr \) times, and the best vector during the process is considered the output. Note that in order to produce any real target, the algorithm must be executed from the beginning. The process of making a fake target is similar to a real target, except that the vector will replace the previous one if the Rouge score is lower. The length of all documents is limited to \( N \) sentences. Documents longer than \( N \) sentences are cut, and smaller documents are zero-padding.

B. Loss Function

The Loss function is calculated based on the discriminator output for the generator as follows [47]:

\[
\text{Loss}_G = E_{i-\text{Dataset}} \left[ E_{z-p(z)} \left[ \log \left( 1 - D(G(z|y_i)) \right) \right] \right]
\]

where \( \text{Dataset} \) is a set of documents, \( y_i \) is features of sentences in document \( i \), and \( E \) is the mathematical expectation.

The Loss function for the discriminator is computed based on the generator output, real and fake summaries as follows:

\[
\text{Loss}_D = E_{i-\text{Dataset}} \left[ E_{z-p(z)} \left[ \log \left( 1 - D(G(z|y_i)) \right) \right] \right] + E_{k-p_{\text{Fake}_i}} \left[ \log \left( 1 - D(k|y_i)) \right) \right] + E_{k-p_{\text{Real}_i}} \left[ \log \left( D(l|y_i)) \right) \right]
\]

where \( p_{\text{Real}_i} \) and \( p_{\text{Fake}_i} \) show the distribution of real and fake summaries for the document \( i \). Equation (10) forces the discriminator to learn a set of high-quality and low-quality summaries.

On the other hand, be sensitive to the summaries produced by the generator and force the generator to produce a high-quality summary.

C. Summarization

At the time of testing, only the generator is used to generate the summary. By applying different noises in the generator, multiple summaries can be generated for each document, and the quality of these summaries or ROUGE summaries is very close to each other. We consider the voting system to generate a single summary for the document. To do this, the probability of the presence of sentences in summary is calculated for different noises. After that, the sentences are ranked based on their number of selections, and finally, the sentences with the highest rank are selected.

Results and Discussion

A. Feature Extraction

One of the important components of deep learning is feature extraction. There are many ways to do this. In this research, we use two methods to select features. In the first method, we use 12 traditional features. The list of these features is given in Table 1.

Some of these features are at the word level, and some of them at the sentence level. All features are scaled to \([0,1]\).

An important feature of deep models is the automatic learning of features. Sentence features are used as a condition in the model and cannot be changed during training. We use Skip-Gram [49] to embed words. Finally, by averaging word embedding, we extract sentence embedding.

Table 1: Traditional features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Word</td>
<td>The number of occurrences ( N ) common words in the dataset, divided by the sentence length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>The position of the sentence. Supposing there are ( N ) sentences in the document, for ( j ) the sentence, the position is computed as ( 1 - (j - 1)/(N - 1) ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>The number of words in the sentence, divided by the length of the largest sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Ratio</td>
<td>The number of digits, divided by the sentence length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named entity ratio</td>
<td>The number of named entities, divided by the sentence length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tf/Isf</td>
<td>Term frequency over the sentence, divided by the largest term frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity Sentence</td>
<td>The number of occurrences of words in the sentence with the highest Tf/Isf in the sentence divided by the length of the sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None phrase</td>
<td>The number of None phrases, divided by the sentence length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos Ratio</td>
<td>A four-dimensional vector containing the number of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Each vector cell is divided by the sentence length.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Dataset

We use two known datasets for our evaluations: CNN/Daily Mail and PubMed. The first dataset combines two datasets designed for comprehension, extractive, and abstractive tasks. The datasets have come to the attention of researchers in recent years for automated summarization. This dataset contains 287,226 documents for training, 13,368 for validation and 11,490 for testing. The average number of sentences per document in training data is 28 sentences. The average reference summary of each document is 3-4 sentences, and the average number of words per document in training data is 802 words. More details are available in Table 2.

This dataset consists of two versions. In the first version, all entities are replaced with specific words, while the second version is the original data. We adopt the second version for our model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Statistics of the CNN/Daily Mail dataset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pairs of data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article length</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Length</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second collection is PubMed, which contains many articles in the field of medicine.
The number of these articles is increasing every day. For this purpose, we have randomly downloaded 1000 articles. The dataset was divided into 1334 documents for training, 288 documents for validation, and 378 documents for testing.

C. Detail of Model

In this research, Python language and PyTorch library have been used for implementation. Jupyter has been employed to implement project codes. Another library used in this research is the NLTK library. This library provides classes and methods for processing natural languages in Python. This library can perform a wide range of natural language processing operations.

We employ a two-layer bidirectional LSTM. In generative adversarial networks, the discriminator converges to the optimum point sooner, which causes the generator cannot converge. For this reason, we train the discriminator once for every 15 generator training. In addition, due to the connection of vectors in the two networks, we use batch normalization before the data enters the feed-forward neural network. Table 3 shows the values of the other parameters.

Table 3: The parameters of the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>CNN/Daily Mail</th>
<th>Medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch size</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embedding dim</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max sentence length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real summary per document</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fake summary per document</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activation fun(lstm &amp; dense)</td>
<td>relu</td>
<td>relu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dense hidden layer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Metrics

We employ the ROUGE (Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation) package [51] as an evaluation metric in our experiments.

This metric calculates the similarity between the generated summary and the reference summary by counting the number of common units. Roug-

e- recall between an extracted summary and a reference summary is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Rouge-n} = \frac{\sum_{e \in \text{ref sum}} \sum_{\text{gram}_n \in e \text{Countmatch (gram}_n)} } { \sum_{e \in \text{ref sum}} \sum_{\text{gram}_n \in e \text{Count (gram}_n)} } \tag{11}
\]

where \(n\) stands for the length of n-gram, \(\text{Countmatch (gram}_n)\) is the maximum number of n-gram co-occurring in the extracted summary and the reference summary. Rouge-1 and Rouge-2 are special cases of Rouge-\(n\) in which \(n = 1\) or \(n = 2\). R-L calculates the length of the longest common subsequence between the reference summary and the extracted summary. Based on previous works, Rouge-1(R-1), Rouge-2(R-2) and, Rouge-L(L-R-L) are most widely used in summarization. For this reason, we use these three metrics in all our experiments.

Table 4: Numerical comparison of the proposed method and other methods on the CNN/Daily Mail dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGSumm [35]</td>
<td>33.27</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>31.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TextRank [38]</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>29.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SummaRunner [28]</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENS with Coherence [10]</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA-NN [29]</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSAS [30]</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>37.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM + traditional features</td>
<td>44.36</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>39.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM without fake summary + embedding features</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>38.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM without noise + embedding features</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>39.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM + embedding features</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>40.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Experimental Results and Analysis

We consider two techniques for preprocessing in all our experiments: 1- Stop word removal, 2- Stemming.

Our project uses a 64-bit Windows operating system with 64 GB of RAM and GPU. The best model was obtained for the CNN/Daily Mail dataset after 50 epochs, while [29] obtained the best model after 70 epochs. The whole process of our training took 5 hours. The best model for the Medical dataset was obtained after 30 epochs. This process took 1.5 hours.

Table 5: Numerical comparison of the proposed method and other methods on the medical dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGSumm [35]</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>36.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TextRank [38]</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>33.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SummaRunner [28]</td>
<td>44.82</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>39.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENS with Coherence [10]</td>
<td>46.39</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>41.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA-NN [29]</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>37.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSAS [30]</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>41.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM + traditional features</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>43.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM without fake summary + embedding features</td>
<td>47.29</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>41.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM without noise + embedding features</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>43.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN-AM + embedding features</td>
<td>51.26</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>44.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed method is compared with two graph-based methods BGSumm [35], TextRank [38], four deep learning methods SummaRunner [28], RENS with Coherence [10], SHA-NN [29], HSSAS [30] and one basic method LSTM. The LSTM model uses only our generator part. The evaluation results of the proposed system for the two datasets are shown in Table 4 and Table 5. For the CNN/Daily Mail dataset, the results reported for the SummaRunner, RENS with Coherence, SHA-NN methods in [28], [10], and [29] are given in Table 4. BGSumm, TextRank, and HSSAS methods were obtained in the experimentation we did in our laboratory. The total results of Table 5 have been obtained in our laboratory.

As expected, for both datasets, deep learning methods are superior to graph-based methods. Although BGSumm has been tested on a medical dataset, it has failed deep learning methods even in the medical dataset. In general, deep learning-based models are weaker than our model in the two datasets. The RENS with Coherence method is less accurate than our model, although it considers coherence between sentences.

Table 7: Effect of noise on the proposed model for the CNN/Daily Mail dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Size</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>39.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>39.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>39.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>39.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>40.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>40.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>40.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>40.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.89</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>39.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the embedding features perform better than the traditional features on our model. By comparing the LSTM model with the GAN-AM method, the importance of the discriminator is seen in our model. As we can see, our method has a relatively strong weakness compared to other models when it does not use a discriminator. In addition, in another experiment, we examined the importance of fake summaries for discriminator training. GAN-AM without fake summary + embedding features shows this model. The difference between the results of this model and our best model for both datasets is noticeable. The superiority of the presented model can be considered in the way the generator scoring of sentences. The generator assigns scores to each sentence, taking into account the rest of the sentences. Another reason that can be mentioned is the voting system used. However, the discriminator has not been ineffective in producing a summary by the generator. To better understanding of results, the evaluation results are shown schematically in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. To check the time of the algorithms, we selected 10 test documents from the CNN/Daily Mail dataset. The production time of the summary by each method is shown in Table 6. As we can see, graph-based methods take less time than deep learning methods due to less computation. The GAN-AM method consists of an LSTM network and a feed-forward network, so it is expected to take some time to calculate. However, other methods take time to calculate embedding.

Table 8: Effect of noise on the proposed model for medical dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Size</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>43.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>43.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>43.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>44.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.26</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>44.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>51.03</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>44.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>44.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>43.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>48.61</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>43.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>42.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, a discriminator. In addition, in another experiment, we examined the importance of fake summaries for discriminator training. GAN-AM without fake summary + embedding features shows this model. The difference between the results of this model and our best model for both datasets is noticeable. The superiority of the presented model can be considered in the way the generator scoring of sentences. The generator assigns scores to each sentence, taking into account the rest of the sentences. Another reason that can be mentioned is the voting system used. However, the discriminator has not been ineffective in producing a summary by the generator. To better understanding of results, the evaluation results are shown schematically in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. To check the time of the algorithms, we selected 10 test documents from the CNN/Daily Mail dataset. The production time of the summary by each method is shown in Table 6. As we can see, graph-based methods take less time than deep learning methods due to less computation. The GAN-AM method consists of an LSTM network and a feed-forward network, so it is expected to take some time to calculate. However, other methods take time to calculate embedding.
We performed other experiments to determine the effect of noise on the generator. For this purpose, we apply noise of different sizes to the generator. The results R-1, R-2, and R-L for the two datasets are shown in Table 7 and Table 8. For the CNN / Daily Mail dataset, increasing the noise size to 60 raises the R-1, R-2, and R-L criteria, but we have a downturn from 60 to 100. In this database, the best size for noise is 60. For the Medical dataset, we have an uptrend from 0 to 40 and then a downturn. For this data set, the noise size is set to 40. As we can see, the proposed model has better performance with noise. For a better understanding, the results for the two datasets are shown in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7.

As an example of the generator output, the three sentences extracted from a document in the Medical dataset by the generator along with its reference summary are shown in Fig. 8. Common words between each sentence and reference are highlighted. As we can see, the sentences that have more in common with the reference summary are given higher scores.

Conclusion and Future Work

In this study, a method based on the generative adversarial network for extractive summarization was proposed in which sentence features were considered a condition in this network. Sentence features were extracted based on traditional and embedding methods. The generator utilized sentence features to calculate the probabilities of their presence. In addition, due to the use of noise in the generator, several summaries were generated for each document. We set up a new loss function for the discriminator. Experiments have shown that this function can be effective in generating summaries.

In future work, we will consider the coherence between sentences in our model. As a solution, we can consider coherence when constructing the target or as a loss in the generator.

Fig. 6: Results of the proposed model for different noises on the CNN / Daily Mail dataset.

Fig. 7: Three extracted sentences by the generator of the Medical dataset.

Fig. 8: Results of the proposed model for different noises on the Medical dataset.
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