

# SimpleStyle: An Adaptable Style Transfer Approach

Elron Bandel      Yoav Katz      Noam Slonim      Liat Ein-Dor

IBM Research

elron.bandel@ibm.com

{katz, noams, liate}@il.ibm.com

## Abstract

Attribute-controlled text rewriting, also known as text style-transfer, has a crucial role in regulating attributes and biases of textual training data and a machine generated text. In this work we present *SimpleStyle*, a minimalist yet effective approach for style-transfer composed of two simple ingredients: controlled denoising and output filtering. Despite the simplicity of our approach, which can be succinctly described with a few lines of code, it is competitive with previous state-of-the-art methods both in automatic and in human evaluation. To demonstrate the adaptability and practical value of our system beyond academic data, we apply *SimpleStyle* to transfer a wide range of text attributes appearing in real-world textual data from social networks. Additionally, we introduce a novel "soft noising" technique that further improves the performance of our system. We also show that teaching a student model to generate the output of *SimpleStyle* can result in a system that performs style transfer of equivalent quality with only a single greedy-decoded sample. Finally, we suggest our method as a remedy for the fundamental incompatible baseline issue that holds progress in the field. We offer our protocol as a simple yet strong baseline for works that wish to make incremental advancements in the field of attribute controlled text rewriting.

## 1 Introduction

Text attribute transfer is the task of automatically rewriting sentences to possess an attribute such as a specific tense, sentiment and gender, while preserving their attribute-independent content. It has recently been established that **the control of biases and aspects within texts is of paramount importance** throughout various stages of text classification and generation, **ranging from the pre-processing of training data to the regulation of output quality** (Prabhumoye et al., 2018). Due to the shortage of parallel data for attribute transfer,




Figure 1: Illustration of *SimpleStyle* sampling process.

## TRANSFER QUALITY




Figure 2: *SimpleStyle* is minimalist yet powerful in comparison to previous methods, the student of this system can be as strong with only one sample per input.

there is extensive research in developing methods for *unsupervised* attribute transfer (Lample et al., 2018) that do not rely on parallel data. The two resources that are necessary for developing unsupervised attribute transfer methods, are a **base model**

for text generation and **automatic metrics** for evaluating the style transfer quality.

The quality of both models and metrics continuously improve over time, and therefore the results reported for a method at the time of its inception soon become outdated as more advanced models and metrics are introduced. However, it is often impossible to update the baselines established by old methods using new models and metrics, as these methods often have complex dependencies and may be incompatible with the base model and metrics that are currently being used. This creates a major challenge for researchers that wish to evaluate the effectiveness of newly suggested approaches, due to the difficulty to disentangle the gain achieved by improved metrics and models from the gains achieved by the approach itself.

To address this issue, it would be desirable to develop an attribute transfer method, which can be easily applied to new base models and automatic evaluation metrics, serving as an adoptable baseline for evaluating the efficacy of a novel approach.

To achieve this goal, we introduce a minimalist approach for style transfer, that can be implemented with just a few lines of code, and relies only on the two necessary aforementioned prerequisites: a base-model and an attribute-classifier that serves as the evaluation metric.

We show that these two resources are sufficient for achieving a powerful attribute transfer system.

To provide the input base-model with attribute control capabilities with the aid of the metrics, we propose to finetune the model with a controlled version of the masked-sentence-reconstruction task (Lewis et al., 2020). To further improve the model results we suggest to use a classifier-guided sampling of the generated texts. The combination of these two simple components leads to state-of-the-art results.

Overall, our goal is to provide researchers with a reliable and easy-to-use baseline that can help them make more informed and meaningful comparisons of their own style transfer systems, by neutralizing the gains obtained as a result of the updated base model or metrics. We call style-transfer researchers and developers to adopt our minimalist approach, with the hope that it will simplify and assist the development of new style transfer methods.

## 2 Related Work

In the absence of parallel data for supervising the learning process, previous works explored unsupervised solutions for style transfer (Hu et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2022).

To establish a simple and reliable baseline for text style transfer, which can be easily retrained by future researchers, we review previous unsupervised methods based on their **stability, reproducibility, scalability, reliability** and **simplicity**.

**(1) Stability** - Early methods that utilized representation bottleneck and adversarial methods to disentangle content and style representations (Shen et al., 2017; Hu et al., 2017), or those that relied on reinforcement learning (Luo et al., 2019), can be difficult to train and suffer from instability (Tikhonov et al., 2019). **(2) Accessibility** - Some methods rely on resources that are not easily accessible, such as specialized lexicons (Xu et al., 2016; Lample et al., 2018) or output of previous systems (Luo et al., 2019), missing requirements which limits their utility. **(3) Scalability** - Some methods rely on techniques specific to a certain type of attribute (Zhang et al., 2018) or attribute-related sources (Lample et al., 2018), making them difficult to apply to new attributes. **(4) Reliability** - Some methods are simple but perform well on certain attributes while having poor performance on others (Malmi et al., 2020). **(5) Simplicity** - Some methods rely on many moving parts with complex relationships that could potentially be simplified.

**Denosing Based Methods** The use of pseudo parallel training data (Kajiwara and Komachi, 2016; Lee et al., 2019; Krishna et al., 2020) has shown potential for creating strong baselines that meet many of our requirements. One method for generating such data is to introduce noise to a sentence and train a model to translate the perturbed sentence back to the original, with the expectation that the model will also learn to rewrite unmodified input data (Prabhumoye et al., 2018).

**Noise Granularity** - Many text perturbation methods were explored as noising function, starting with the IDENTITY function (Xie et al., 2018; Dai and Le, 2015), CHARACTER LEVEL deletion (Xie et al., 2018), insertion (Xie et al., 2018) and capitalization (Wang et al., 2019)). WORD LEVEL deletions substitutions and masking (Wu et al., 2019b; Malmi et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Lample et al., 2018; Miresghallah et al., 2022). SPAN LEVEL

deletions (Li et al., 2018), substitutions from lexicon (Xu et al., 2016) or search (Li et al., 2018). SYNTACTIC LEVEL, perturbing the syntactic structure (Zhang et al., 2018). Lastly, SENTENCE LEVEL perturbations, by paraphrasing (Xu et al., 2016; Krishna et al., 2020) or back translation (Zhang et al., 2020).

We show **simple span masking is sufficient**.

**Attribute-Guided Noising** - Most of the works that utilize noise try hard to ensure their perturbation techniques alter the attribute, possibly making it a good weak supervision for attribute transfer. Some of the methods do so by relying on external resources, such as, small set of PARALLEL DATA for training attribute transferring noising model (Xie et al., 2018), or corpus of similar TEXTS WITHOUT THE ATTRIBUTE that can be used for retrieving a text that is similar to the input text but does not contain the attribute (Kajiwara and Komachi, 2016; Li et al., 2018; Jin et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2016; Yin et al., 2019), a CLASSIFIER that can be used for substituting word by word gradually increasing the attribute presence measured by the classifier (Li et al., 2020; Su et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2019a; Miresghallah et al., 2022) a DICTIONARY that can be used for replacing text spans with similar text spans without the attribute (Zhang et al., 2018; Lample et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2016; Li et al., 2018). a FEATURE ATTRIBUTION SYSTEM that is used for identifying spans associated with the attribute that then can be noised or replaced.

In this work we show that there is no need for attribute altering noise, **random noise is sufficient**.

**Model-based Noising** - One way to alter attributes without relying on external sources is to use a previously trained model, trained by others (Luo et al., 2019) or the one currently training (Li et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2018). This often enhanced through techniques such as attribute-aware decoding (Xu et al., 2016) or post decoding filtering (Li et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2018). Alternatively, reinforcement learning methods, that can also be seen as using current model for augmenting data, such as those described in (Jain et al., 2019), can be employed. These methods involve using the outputs of the current model, re-weighting them at the sentence level (Gong et al., 2019; Luo et al., 2019) or token level (Upadhyay et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2020), and training on the re-weighted data using a weighted maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) method such as REINFORCE, or a gradually fil-

tered MLE (Luo et al., 2019).

This study demonstrates the effectiveness of utilizing a predefined **non-parametric noising is sufficient**.

However, we show that retraining the system on its own outputs allows for improved performance in terms of producing good output without the need for many samples and filtering.

**Simplicity-Efficiency Trade-offs** In contrast to most previous approaches, our method posits that it is possible to trade efficiency for simplicity. Specifically, during training, we intentionally introduce noise to the input text by randomly masking certain spans in the hope that the critical attributes will occasionally be masked as well. Then, at inference time, we employ an inefficient process of introducing multiple masking variations until we find one that hopefully covers the attribute in question. These strategies enable our system to achieve a high level of simplicity, allowing us to leave out many unnecessary components used by others.

Among the existing approaches, *TextSETTR* (Riley et al., 2021) bears the closest resemblance to our method, as it employs simple, random text-denosing that is conditioned on the style given by an unsupervised style embedding vector. However, we demonstrate that by conditioning on the style as predicted by a good attribute classifier, we can attain a stronger signal regarding the attribute present in the sentence, thereby enabling more accurate manipulation of the classified attribute.

### 3 The Motivation Classifier-Guided Attribute Control

Recently, it has been shown that LLMs can achieve state-of-the-art results in style transfer tasks (Reif et al., 2022). While these results are impressive, they rely on natural language instructions and cannot be applied to attributes that cannot be described in words. If for example, the attribute is defined to be whether or not an example originates from a specific corpus or whether it is a challenging example for a given model, then it cannot be easily described in words, but can still be easily defined by a classifier. Therefore, in this study, we focus on Classifier-Guided Attribute Transfer, namely the attribute is defined and the transfer is optimized with respect to a pre-defined attribute classifier. Our total reliance on the attribute classifier neutralizes the influence of the classifier’s quality, and enables us to focus only on the effectiveness of the attribute transfer

```

Train
for text, attribute in train:
    source = attribute + noise(text)
    target = text
    model(source, target).loss.backwards()

Inference
for text, attribute in test:
    highest, best = 0, ""
    for _ in range(samples):
        input = attribute + noise(text)
        output = model.generate(input)
        if score(output) > highest:
            highest, best = score(output), output
    yield best

```

Figure 3: Pseudo code of the *SimpleStyle* methodology.

system, independent of the classifier’s alignment with the true attribute values. Improvements in the quality of the attribute classifier can be directly translated into better performance of the attribute transfer system in terms of alignment with human judgments.

## 4 Method

Our method, *SimpleStyle*, begins by masking spans of the input text and simply **finetuning the model to reconstruct the text using a control token** (Figure 3) that indicates the attribute of the input sentence (as predicted by the attribute classifier).

At inference, several **masked variations** of the input sentence, concatenated **with a control token** representing the desired attribute, are fed to the fine-tuned model, aiming **to generate candidate texts with a transferred attribute**.

We then use a sentence similarity metric<sup>1</sup> and an attribute classifier to **select the best candidate**. In Section 8 we show that incorporating a student model of *SimpleStyle* can eliminate the need for multiple candidates.

## 5 Evaluation

For evaluating the performance of our system, we follow previous works (Xu et al., 2018; Riley et al., 2021) and define the main evaluation metric,  $G$ , to be the geometric mean of semantic preservation

<sup>1</sup>We use SimCSE (Gao et al., 2021) because it can be used as an unsupervised semantic similarity metric (with cosine distance), which helps maintain the unsupervised nature of the system making it scalable to new domains

and attribute level. This metric reflects the goal of the system, which is to **rewrite the sentence with the desired attribute while minimizing changes to the meaning**. The role of the geometric mean is to penalize cases where there is high success in one aspect and failure in the other. The geometric mean in such cases will be low. We turn now to describe the metrics we used in this work to measure each of the quality aspects.

**Semantic** To measure semantic preservation, we use SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) cosine similarity, which has been shown to accurately measure semantic similarity between sentences and correlates well with human judgment (Bandel et al., 2022). To measure the semantic preservation we compute the cosine similarity between the sentence embeddings of the input and the human-generated reference, under the assumption that the reference preserves the attribute-independent content of the input.

**Accuracy** For attribute transfer measurement, we use the attribute classifier that defines the attribute, which is also used for filtering at the inference level. This may seem like cheating at first glance, but it is actually an important feature of our setup. As explained in section 3, we view the attribute classifier as the source of truth. As such, we want to make an attribute transfer system that can satisfy the classifier. What if the classifier does not reflect reality? we believe it should be the focus of the classifier developer. progress in classifier defined attribute transfer should be a combination of getting better at transferring the attributes as measured by the classifier and improving the classifier quality in parallel - strengthening the alignment of the system with reality. While it is not necessarily the case that changing the classifier’s prediction will result in an actual attribute transfer in reality, we conduct human evaluations to show that, if you have a good classifier changing the classifier’s prediction does indeed result in a satisfying attribute transfer even from a human perspective. We conduct these human evaluations using an A/B testing approach, comparing two systems at a time and asking humans which system is better at (1) transferring the attribute and (2) preserving meaning.

**Fluency** To measure how fluent the output sentence is followed by previous works (Miresghalah et al., 2022) we use the perplexity assigned by GPT2 XL as a measure of fluency and grammati-

quality.

**S-BLEU** To measure how linguistically similar the output sentence is to the original sentence we use Self-BLEU (S-BLEU) or the BLEU score between the source and the output. This score can give some information about the meaning preservation of sentence but mainly it can measure how much of the original sentence was copied by the model.

## 6 Main Results

In this section, we present the main results of our study on formality and sentiment transfer using the most commonly used benchmark datasets (Shen et al., 2017; Rao and Tetreault, 2018). Both datasets consist of non-parallel training data that is divided into groups based on attributes, as well as human-generated parallel test data. As baselines, we employed the top performing popular methods used as baselines in most recent work by Reif et al. (2022).

Our automatic evaluation results demonstrate that our system outperforms previous systems in terms of quality in all aspects (see **Semantic Accuracy** and **G** in Table 1). It is worth noting that while we believe our evaluation metrics are effective at evaluating the success of a system, previous systems were trained to optimize different, older metrics. Therefore, it is not necessarily implied that our methodology is superior, but rather that it performs reasonably well. This highlights one of the main points of our paper: without implementing previous methods with our base model and optimizing with the aid of our classifiers and metrics, it is difficult to determine which method is truly the best at learning the transfer as defined by our classifier. Moreover, replicating previous methods is often infeasible due to their complexity. Our method aims to simplify these processes and therefore can serve as a simpler baseline for future researchers. Of course this implies that future adopters of our approach will have to use their updated possibly better classifiers and metrics when training our baseline.

In addition, it is worth mentioning that the attribute-transfer automatic score in the human-annotated test data is not perfect, which might suggest that our classifiers are suboptimal. However, upon reviewing the actual human annotations, we found that our classifier is correct. A random sample exemplifying that point is attached in the appendix.




Figure 4: Illustration of the affect of the number of samples followed by filtering on the performance of *SimpleStyle* for both sentiment and formality transfer.

Human evaluation further confirmed that our method is comparable to or better than previous methods at transferring attributes as defined by human evaluators.

In the interest of advancing the field, we have made our work transparent by providing a variety of randomly sampled generations from our system in the appendix. Additionally, we have included a subset of comparisons between our method and a previous strong method, without identifying which is which, for the reader to evaluate on their own. In the following page, we will reveal the corresponding outputs for each system.

## 7 Ablation Study

In this section, we conduct an ablation study to examine the impact of various aspects of our approach on the performance of our system.

**Number of Samples** Our system is producing at any inference stage few samples from the unmasking *SimpleStyle* model then choosing the best one with the aid of the attribute classifier, firstly how many samples are necessary for achieving high quality outputs? in Figure 4 we can see that for sentiment transfer starting at 8 examples our system can achieve SOTA performance, then after 32 examples it reaches plato, while for formality transfer more samples might could improve further.

**Soft Masking vs Hard Masking** Given a masking budget of covering 0.4 of the output we can either cover words with hard mask, or we can blend their tokens representation vector with the representation vector of the mask token, ie soft masking (inspired by partial masking for synonym extraction




Figure 5: Comparison of the quality of generation of models sampled with soft and hard masking as function of number of samples. It can be seen that soft masking gets higher overall results and is more sample efficient.

Zhou et al. (2019)). Our results show that for the same masking budgets soft masking is better, and achieve overall better performance (see Figure 5). The fact the soft masking does not cover the word completely it allows the model better access to covered tokens and can replace them while preserving some of their meaning.

**Controlled Finetuned Model VS Vanilla Pre-trained** how critical is it for the model to be finetuned with the control tokens? could we just sample from vanilla pretrained BART and achieve the same behavior? Recently Mireshghallah et al. (2022) suggested to perform style transfer by filtered sampling from pretrained model, however, our results show, as can be seen in figure 6, that, in our setup with our metrics, without quality controlled tokens even with extended budget we cannot reach the quality of the baselines, therefore, **the training scheme we suggest is crucial for high performance end for sample efficiency.**

## 8 Eliminating the Need for Sampling and Filtering with Student Model

Sampling the model many times for creating different optional outputs then filtering and choosing the best can be expensive process that is also relying on constant access to the attribute classifier. In order to eliminate the need for this process we took the entire training data and made predictions with our previously proposed system sampled 32 times for every input. Then we trained a student model to produce the predictions of the first system. Our results show that this simple text to text training




Figure 6: The finetuning with control tokens is necessary for achieving performance higher than top previous system. Any unmasking method without it will not reach that. With as little as 8 samples the performance is already better then previous top methods indicating on better sample efficiency.




Figure 7: Student model achieves with single sample better geometric mean scores of transfer quality metrics (G Score) better then top previous system. With 2 samples and filtering the student model is as good as its teacher, and with 4 samples the student is even better then its teacher.

over the outputs of the original model can create a strong style transfer model. Not only that, this model does not need masking and many samples in order to produce good outputs, with only one sample the model has better performance than the baselines (see Table 1). more interestingly, with 2 samples and filtering this model is as good as its teacher model, and with 4 samples is even better, suggesting an iterative approach can increase performance even further (see Figure 7). We also tried to use the teacher as base model for the student but found it is better to initiate this model from vanilla bart.




Figure 8: Student model sample efficiency is heavily impacted by the teacher efficiency. Student the learned from better teacher will more likely to be better.

## 9 Scaling Out

In the last part of this paper we wish to test the effectiveness of our system on real world data taken from social media. This section is crucial for showing the effectiveness of our system when scaled out to other attributes and to harder data distributions that might reflect the relevancy for other researchers. For this purpose we utilize the *TweetEval* dataset (Barbieri et al., 2020) that contain many data for training classifiers of different attributes such as: emotions, irony and hate. *TweetEval* allowed us to experiment with different classifiers trained on data curated carefully. For the classifiers we finetune the large version DeBERTa-v3 model (He et al., 2021) that to the best of our knowledge is the state of the art for classification tasks. Our trained classifiers indeed has the best accuracy based on the online *TweetEval* benchmark, full results are in the appendix. Then we use Twitter dump of two million tweets augmented with the classifiers predictions for training our system. Our results show that the our approach succeeded in creating attribute transfer system that can transfer the attribute with high accuracy while still maintain the meaning. For example in the case of offensiveness transfer our system achieve attribute transfer accuracy of 0.94 while achieving 0.76 SBERT cosine similarity that reflect decent level of meaning preservation. We think that those results should inspire other researchers to use our approach as baseline for their work even if it is complicated attributed and messy real world data.

## 10 Conclusions

In this work, we discuss the importance of having a baseline that is trained with the same base model and optimized with the same metrics as the developed system. The baseline serves as a reference for comparison. We show that with these two basic ingredients - the base model and evaluation metrics - we can develop an extremely simple system that is state-of-the-art. In the ablation study, we demonstrate that each of the components we used was necessary for the success of our system. We also show that when training a student model to replicate the predictions of our system, we can make a style transfer model that is successful with greedy decoding in the first sample. Lastly, we show that our approach can be applied to more attributes with just a corpus of unannotated data and an attribute classifier used for evaluation. Our results suggest that this method will be effective in other scenarios and can serve as the simplest, most accessible, yet powerful baseline for other researchers.

## 11 Ethical Considerations

Attribute controlled text rewriting has the potential to be a powerful tool for editing and regulating the content of text. However, it is important to consider the ethical implications of this technology. While attribute controlled text rewriting can be used to add or remove specific attributes from text, such as hate speech or offensive language, it is crucial to recognize the potential for misuse or abuse. In particular, care should be taken to avoid using attribute controlled text rewriting to amplify or perpetuate hate or harmful messages. At the same time, attribute controlled text rewriting can also be used to reduce hate and promote more positive and inclusive messaging. As researchers and users of attribute controlled text rewriting, it is our responsibility to consider these ethical issues and to act in a way that promotes the responsible and respectful use of this technology.

Formality					
Method	Fluency↓	S-BLEU↑	Accuracy↑	Semantic ↑	G ↑
Copy	103.93	100.00	0.07	0.79	0.14
Reference	102.01	22.69	0.91	1.00	0.94
Human1	183.08	19.01	0.87	0.72	0.77
Human2	227.00	19.86	0.88	0.73	0.78
Human3	168.35	19.23	0.88	0.73	0.77
DualRL (Luo et al., 2019)	5417.17	16.33	0.50	0.28	0.17
UnsupervisedMT (Prabhumoye et al., 2018)	253.47	12.51	0.50	0.26	0.18
<i>SimpleStyle</i> (Ours)	<u>65.59</u>	50.60	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<i>SimpleStyle</i> Student (Single Sample)	<b>53.77</b>	46.41	<u>0.84</u>	<u>0.68</u>	<u>0.73</u>
Sentiment					
Method	Fluency↓	S-BLEU↑	Accuracy↑	Semantic ↑	G ↑
Copy	266.23	100.00	0.02	0.63	0.05
Reference	394.11	29.52	0.81	1.00	0.84
Back Translation (Prabhumoye et al., 2018)	329.47	8.07	0.95	0.29	0.50
Delete Generate (Sudhakar et al., 2019)	677.16	42.41	0.78	0.62	0.64
Constrained Posterior VAE (Xu et al., 2020)	387.30	47.87	0.56	0.52	0.42
Cross Alignment (Shen et al., 2017)	682.73	22.10	0.74	0.39	0.47
Delete Only (Li et al., 2018)	496.96	33.20	0.84	0.52	0.61
Delete Retrieve (Li et al., 2018)	746.53	34.01	0.89	0.52	0.64
Multi-Decoder (Fu et al., 2018)	1513.17	42.55	0.48	0.41	0.30
Retrieve Only (Li et al., 2018)	290.22	5.72	0.94	0.30	0.50
Style Embedding (Fu et al., 2018)	812.44	70.87	0.09	0.50	0.08
Template Base (Li et al., 2018)	1281.28	47.54	0.83	0.57	0.63
Cycled RL (Xu et al., 2018)	2206.34	43.36	0.50	0.43	0.34
MixMatch (Mireshghallah et al., 2022)	411.31	52.38	0.85	0.62	0.69
DualRL (Luo et al., 2019)	884.17	55.02	0.88	0.66	0.72
UnsupervisedMT (Prabhumoye et al., 2018)	717.58	42.27	<u>0.94</u>	0.60	0.73
<i>SimpleStyle</i> (Ours)	<u>126.86</u>	50.51	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<i>SimpleStyle</i> Student (Single Sample)	<b>113.80</b>	45.01	0.89	<u>0.67</u>	<u>0.75</u>

Table 1: The results of the different systems compared to our system. As explained thoroughly in the paper, those results does not imply our system is better, but that it is doing reasonably good. The best score at each category is in bold, and second best is in underline

Attribute	Fluency↓	S-BLEU↑	Accuracy↑	Semantic ↑	G ↑
Emotion	654.47	23.41	0.87	0.64	0.73
Hate	714.96	35.11	0.92	0.71	0.80
Irony	1686.44	28.18	0.90	0.70	0.78
Offense	1699.69	45.30	0.94	0.76	0.84
Sentiment	1942.88	30.62	0.85	0.67	0.74

Table 2: The results of *SimpleStyle* on transferring *TweetEval* (Barbieri et al., 2020) attributes.

<b>Input Text</b>	<b><i>SimpleStyle</i> Generated Output</b>
totally will come back next time i 'm in town .	totally will not return next time i'm in town.
you can not judge people based on appearance .	you can tell they care about the people based on appearance.
i looked around and there were still customers .	i love the location and the fact that there are still customers.
the garlic bread was bland and cold .	the garlic bread was bland and cold and the bread was delicious!
now it is not so thin and taste like any other pizza place .	now it is not so thin and i love it like any other pizza place.
i would n't go back there again .	i would definitely go back there again.
even their steamed veggies are amazing .	even their steamed veggies are.
the charge did include miso soup and a small salad .	the charge did include miso soup which was very good as well.
we will spend our money elsewhere .	we will definitely be spending our money here again!
friendly folks , delicious authentic bagels , tasty cream cheese .	friendly folks, delicious authentic bagels, but very poor service.

Table 3: Outputs of the *SimpleStyle* system for sentiment transfer.

## References

- Elron Bandel, Ranit Aharonov, Michal Shmueli-Scheuer, Ilya Shnayderman, Noam Slonim, and Liat Ein-Dor. 2022. [Quality controlled paraphrase generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 596–609, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Francesco Barbieri, Jose Camacho-Collados, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Leonardo Neves. 2020. [TweetEval: Unified benchmark and comparative evaluation for tweet classification](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1644–1650, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrew M Dai and Quoc V Le. 2015. [Semi-supervised sequence learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Zhenxin Fu, Xiaoye Tan, Nanyun Peng, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2018. [Style transfer in text: Exploration and evaluation](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1).
- Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. 2021. [SimCSE: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6894–6910, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongyu Gong, Suma Bhat, Lingfei Wu, JinJun Xiong, and Wen-mei Hwu. 2019. [Reinforcement learning based text style transfer without parallel training corpus](#). 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)*, pages 3168–3180, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing](#).
- Zhiqiang Hu, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, and Charu C. Aggarwal. 2020. [Text style transfer: A review and experiment evaluation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2010.12742.
- Zhiting Hu, Zichao Yang, Xiaodan Liang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Eric P. Xing. 2017. [Toward controlled generation of text](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML’17*, page 1587–1596. JMLR.org.
- Parag Jain, Abhijit Mishra, Amar Prakash Azad, and Karthik Sankaranarayanan. 2019. [Unsupervised controllable text formalization](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI’19/IAAI’19/EAAI’19*. AAAI Press.
- Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Zhiting Hu, Olga Vechtomova, and Rada Mihalcea. 2022. [Deep learning for text style transfer: A survey](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 48(1):155–205.
- Zhijing Jin, Di Jin, Jonas Mueller, Nicholas Matthews, and Enrico Santus. 2019. [IMaT: Unsupervised text attribute transfer via iterative matching and translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3097–3109, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomoyuki Kajiwara and Mamoru Komachi. 2016. [Building a monolingual parallel corpus for text simplification using sentence similarity based on alignment between word embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 1147–1158, Osaka, Japan. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee.
- Kalpesh Krishna, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. [Reformulating unsupervised style transfer as paraphrase generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 737–762, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2018. [Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Joseph Lee, Ziang Xie, Cindy Wang, Max Drach, Dan Jurafsky, and Andrew Ng. 2019. [Neural text style transfer via denoising and reranking](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Methods for Optimizing and Evaluating Neural Language Generation*, pages 74–81, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jingjing Li, Zichao Li, Lili Mou, Xin Jiang, Michael R. Lyu, and Irwin King. 2020. [Unsupervised text generation by learning from search](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’20*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.

- Juncen Li, Robin Jia, He He, and Percy Liang. 2018. [Delete, retrieve, generate: a simple approach to sentiment and style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1865–1874, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ruibo Liu, Chongyang Gao, Chenyan Jia, Guangxuan Xu, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2022. [Non-parallel text style transfer with self-parallel supervision](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Fuli Luo, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, Pengcheng Yang, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, and Zhifang Sui. 2019. [A dual reinforcement learning framework for unsupervised text style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 5116–5122. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.
- Eric Malmi, Aliaksei Severyn, and Sascha Rothe. 2020. [Unsupervised text style transfer with padded masked language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8671–8680, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fatemehsadat Miresghallah, Kartik Goyal, and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. 2022. [Mix and match: Learning-free controllable text generation using energy language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 401–415, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yulia Tsvetkov, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Alan W Black. 2018. [Style transfer through back-translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 866–876, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sudha Rao and Joel Tetreault. 2018. [Dear sir or madam, may I introduce the GYAFC dataset: Corpus, benchmarks and metrics for formality style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 129–140, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emily Reif, Daphne Ippolito, Ann Yuan, Andy Coenen, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jason Wei. 2022. [A recipe for arbitrary text style transfer with large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 837–848, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Parker Riley, Noah Constant, Mandy Guo, Girish Kumar, David Uthus, and Zarana Parekh. 2021. [TextSETTR: Few-shot text style extraction and tunable targeted restyling](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3786–3800, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tianxiao Shen, Tao Lei, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2017. [Style transfer from non-parallel text by cross-alignment](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Jinyue Su, Jiacheng Xu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2018. [Incorporating discriminator in sentence generation: a gibbs sampling method](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1).
- Akhilesh Sudhakar, Bhargav Upadhyay, and Arjun Maheswaran. 2019. [“transforming” delete, retrieve, generate approach for controlled text style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3269–3279, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexey Tikhonov, Viacheslav Shibaev, Aleksander Nagaev, Aigul Nugmanova, and Ivan P. Yamshchikov. 2019. [Style transfer for texts: Retrain, report errors, compare with rewrites](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3936–3945, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bhargav Upadhyay, Akhilesh Sudhakar, and Arjun Maheswaran. 2022. [Efficient reinforcement learning for unsupervised controlled text generation](#).
- Yunli Wang, Yu Wu, Lili Mou, Zhoujun Li, and Wenhan Chao. 2019. [Harnessing pre-trained neural networks with rules for formality style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3573–3578, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Chen Wu, Xuancheng Ren, Fuli Luo, and Xu Sun. 2019a. [A hierarchical reinforced sequence operation method for unsupervised text style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4873–4883, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xing Wu, Tao Zhang, Liangjun Zang, Jizhong Han, and Songlin Hu. 2019b. [Mask and infill: Applying masked language model for sentiment transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 5271–5277. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.
- Ziang Xie, Guillaume Genthial, Stanley Xie, Andrew Ng, and Dan Jurafsky. 2018. [Noising and denoising natural language: Diverse backtranslation for grammar correction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 619–628, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jingjing Xu, Xu Sun, Qi Zeng, Xiaodong Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Houfeng Wang, and Wenjie Li. 2018. [Unpaired sentiment-to-sentiment translation: A cycled reinforcement learning approach](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 979–988, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peng Xu, Jackie Chi Kit Cheung, and Yanshuai Cao. 2020. On variational learning of controllable representations for text without supervision. In *The 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2020)*. PMLR.
- Wei Xu, Courtney Napoles, Ellie Pavlick, Quanze Chen, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2016. [Optimizing statistical machine translation for text simplification](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:401–415.
- Di Yin, Shujian Huang, Xin-Yu Dai, and Jiajun Chen. 2019. [Utilizing non-parallel text for style transfer by making partial comparisons](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 5379–5386. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.
- Yi Zhang, Tao Ge, and Xu Sun. 2020. [Parallel data augmentation for formality style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3221–3228, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhirui Zhang, Shuo Ren, Shujie Liu, Jianyong Wang, Peng Chen, Mu Li, Ming Zhou, and Enhong Chen. 2018. [Style transfer as unsupervised machine translation](#). Chulun Zhou, Liangyu Chen, Jiachen Liu, Xinyan Xiao, Jinsong Su, Sheng Guo, and Hua Wu. 2020. [Exploring contextual word-level style relevance for unsupervised style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7135–7144, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wangchunshu Zhou, Tao Ge, Ke Xu, Furu Wei, and Ming Zhou. 2019. [BERT-based lexical substitution](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3368–3373, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Appendix