

# Decoder-Only or Encoder-Decoder? Interpreting Language Model as a Regularized Encoder-Decoder

Zihao Fu<sup>1</sup>, Wai Lam<sup>2</sup>, Qian Yu<sup>3</sup>, Anthony Man-Cho So<sup>2</sup>  
Shengding Hu<sup>4</sup>, Zhiyuan Liu<sup>4</sup>, Nigel Collier<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Language Technology Lab, University of Cambridge,

<sup>2</sup>The Chinese University of Hong Kong, <sup>3</sup>JD.com

<sup>4</sup>Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University  
{zf268,nhc30}@cam.ac.uk, {wlam,manchoso}@se.cuhk.edu.hk  
{hsd20, liuzy}@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, yuqian81@jd.com

## Abstract

The sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) task aims at generating the target sequence based on the given input source sequence. Traditionally, most of the seq2seq task is resolved by the Encoder-Decoder framework which requires an encoder to encode the source sequence and a decoder to generate the target text. Recently, a bunch of new approaches has emerged that apply decoder-only language models directly to the seq2seq task. Despite the significant advancements in applying language models to the seq2seq task, there is still a lack of thorough analysis on the effectiveness of the decoder-only language model architecture. This paper aims to address this gap by conducting a detailed comparison between the encoder-decoder architecture and the decoder-only language model framework through the analysis of a regularized encoder-decoder structure. This structure is designed to replicate all behaviors in the classical decoder-only language model but has an encoder and a decoder making it easier to be compared with the classical encoder-decoder structure. Based on the analysis, we unveil the attention degeneration problem in the language model, namely, as the generation step number grows, less and less attention is focused on the source sequence. To give a quantitative understanding of this problem, we conduct a theoretical sensitivity analysis of the attention output with respect to the source input. Grounded on our analysis, we propose a novel partial attention language model to solve the attention degeneration problem. Experimental results on machine translation, summarization, and data-to-text generation tasks support our analysis and demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed model.

## 1 Introduction

The sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) task (Sutskever et al., 2011, 2014; Cho et al., 2014; Klein et al., 2017; Ott et al., 2019) sees rapid growth during the past few years. It takes a source sequence as input and generates a corresponding target sequence. Several natural language generation tasks, such as translation, summarization, data-to-text generation, and story generation, naturally fall under the category of seq2seq tasks. Moreover, recently, several other non-generation tasks, including question answering, classification, and etc. (Raffel et al., 2020), have also been unified under the seq2seq paradigm. Traditionally, most of the existing seq2seq frameworks have employed the Encoder-Decoder (ED) architecture (Cho et al., 2014; Sutskever et al., 2014), where an encoder is responsible for encoding the input data into a hidden space, while a decoder is used to generate the target output text.

Recently, many promising large language models (GPT (Radford et al., 2018), GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019), GPT3 (Brown et al., 2020), InstructGPT/ChatGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022), Palm (Chowdhery et al., 2022), OPT (Zhang et al., 2022), Bloom (Scao et al., 2022), Galactica (Taylor et al., 2022), Llama (Touvron et al., 2023)) have emerged that directly employ a decoder-only Language Model (LM) (Bengio et al., 2000; Mikolov et al., 2010, 2011; Mikolov and Zweig, 2012; Vig and Belinkov, 2019) to solve the seq2seq tasks (Figure 1). It concatenates each source sequence




Figure 1: Encoder-Decoder (ED) framework and decoder-only Language Model (LM).

with the corresponding target sequence as a single one and trains the LM on this new collection of sequences. The decoder-only structure (Liu et al., 2018; Radford et al., 2019; Dong et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Ghosh et al., 2017) has many obvious advantages over the commonly used ED framework. First, it only has a decoder and thus reduces the model size significantly. Second, LM can be pre-trained on unlabeled text data which is much easier to obtain. Moreover, LM has many good properties including parameter sharing, layer-wise coordination, etc.

Despite the remarkable achievements of recent large language models, it is still unclear whether applying the LM in the seq2seq task is a promising choice regarding the performance of this task. Liu et al. (2018) show that the LM gets some gains over the ED structure in the summarization task while Radford et al. (2019); Brown et al. (2020) show that the pre-trained LMs can be applied in the unsupervised translation task. On the other hand, Raffel et al. (2020) indicate that the LMs, when directly applied in the machine translation tasks, perform worse than the classical ED structure. Deng et al. (2023) show that ED structure still performs better than decoder-only LM structure. Zhu et al. (2020) indicate that when applying the pre-trained LM to a language domain beyond the corpus for training, no significant improvement is observed. Fu et al. (2021) show that LM suffers from the repetition generation problem. Therefore, it motivates us to investigate the deployment and the performance of LMs in seq2seq tasks.

We propose to study the characteristics of LM when applied in the seq2seq task by conducting a detailed contrastive study between the LM and the ED structure. Grounded with our analysis, we unveil the attention degeneration problem and propose a novel partial attention language model to solve it. Specifically, we first propose to analyze a variant of the traditional ED structure named as **Regularized Encoder-Decoder (RED)** framework. It is designed to replicate all behaviors in classical LM while structured with an encoder and a decoder. This structure facilitates the comparison with the ED structure. By comparing with the RED framework and the ED framework, we find that some parts of the RED structure benefit the seq2seq task while some parts do not. Moreover, we find the defects of the LM applied in a seq2seq task are partially caused by the **Attention Degeneration Problem (ADP)** in its attention component. We conduct a theoretical analysis of this problem by deriving an upper bound of the attention sensitivity and we find that the sensitivity decreases as the length of the generated sequence grows in the LM. Based on this analysis, we propose a novel **Partial Attention Language Model (PALM)** which takes advantage of some LM components while avoiding other unfavorable ones. Our experimental results on machine translation, summarization, and data-to-text generation datasets support the correctness of our analysis and demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed PALM structure.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows: (1) We conduct a detailed analysis of applying the LM in the seq2seq task. (2) We conduct a theoretical analysis of the attention degeneration problem and carry out extensive experiments to support it. (3) Based on our analysis, we propose PALM to alleviate the weakness of LM, from which the recent LM-based methods in seq2seq tasks can benefit.

## 2 Related Works

Numerous works have recently proposed using LM in the seq2seq task. Liu et al. (2018) suggest using decoder-only LM to generate summaries of Wikipedia articles, whereas Raffel et al. (2020) demonstrate through extensive experiments that LMs perform worse than ED frameworks in machine translation tasks. On the other hand, several

works propose using pre-training to enhance performance. For instance, Radford et al. (2019); Brown et al. (2020) propose pre-training the GPT LM and fine-tuning it on an unsupervised seq2seq task. UniLM (Dong et al., 2019) adopts the prefix LM (Raffel et al., 2020), which uses a fully visible mask of the source sequence instead of the traditional causal mask. Additionally, Conneau and Lample (2019); Conneau et al. (2020) propose the XLM model pre-trained on a monolingual dataset. However, Zhu et al. (2020) show that when applying pre-trained LMs to a language domain beyond the training corpus, there is no significant improvement. Nevertheless, these results heavily rely on the pre-training process, and it remains unclear whether the LM structure itself is suitable for handling the seq2seq task.

Compared to the ED structure, the LM has numerous advantageous features that have been proven to enhance its performance. First, it utilizes the parameter sharing technique (Dehghani et al., 2019; Xia et al., 2019; Lan et al., 2020; Conneau and Lample, 2019) to share parameters for networks that handle both the source and target sequences. This reduces the model size and improves performance through parameter sharing. Additionally, the LM incorporates a layer-wise coordination mechanism (Belinkov et al., 2017; He et al., 2018; Peters et al., 2018) that enables the decoder to attend to each corresponding encoder layer’s output, allowing it to access various levels of source information. Finally, Dong et al. (2021) demonstrate that the attention matrix for the decoder-only is a full rank matrix since it is a triangular matrix. This is superior to the encoder-decoder attention matrix, which may not be full rank.

### 3 Contrastive Study of Language Model

In this section, we conduct a contrastive study of the Language Model (LM) and the traditional Encoder-Decoder (ED) structure. We propose to analyze a Regularized Encoder-Decoder (RED) framework which is designed to replicate all behaviors in the classical LM but with a structure of an encoder and a decoder. We give a detailed explanation of how each component in the RED framework imitates the behaviors in the LM and how it is different from the ED framework. We also illustrate how these components benefit or harm the overall performance. Afterwards, we analyze the attention degeneration problem and propose a theoretical analysis to unveil the cause.

#### 3.1 Preliminary

Our analysis is based on the prevalent Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017; Ott et al., 2019). As illustrated in Figure 2, we show the main components of the models and the detailed model structure can be found in Ott et al. (2019). In a seq2seq task, we denote the input source sequence as  $s = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|s|}]$  and the target sequence as  $t = [t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{|t|}]$ , where  $|\cdot|$  is the length of the sequence and  $s_i$  is the  $i$ th source word. The positional token for  $s$  and  $t$  is denoted as  $p_s = [1, 2, \dots, |s|]$  and  $p_t = [1, 2, \dots, |t|]$ . The attention layer is denoted as  $\text{ATT}(Q, K, V)$ , and  $Z = \text{ATT}(Q, K, V) = \text{Softmax}(QW_QW_K^\top K^\top / \sqrt{d})VW_V = \text{Softmax}(QA^\top K^\top / \sqrt{d})VW_V$ , in which  $A^\top = W_QW_K^\top$  and  $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are trainable parameters that transform input matrices into another space.  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Q \times d}$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{d_K \times d}$ ,  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_V \times d}$  stand for the query, key and value matrices,  $d_Q, d_K$ , and  $d_V$  are the corresponding dimensions of the matrices while  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Q \times d}$  is the output of the attention layer. Here, the Softmax operation is applied to each row of the matrix concerned.

As shown on the left of Figure 2, ED’s encoder contains multiple Transformer encoder blocks denoted with the shaded rectangle.  $G_l^E \in \mathbb{R}^{|s| \times d}$  is the input feature matrix for the self attention layer  $\text{ATT}_l^E$  while  $H_l^E \in \mathbb{R}^{|s| \times d}$  is the output matrix of the  $l$ th encoder block.  $G_l^E$  equals to the sum of the word embedding and the positional embedding for the first block ( $l = 1$ ) and  $G_l^E$  equals to  $H_{l-1}^E$  when  $l > 1$ . In ED’s decoder, we denote  $G_l^D \in \mathbb{R}^{|t| \times d}$  as the output of the self attention layer  $\text{ATT}_l^D$ . We feed  $G_l^D$  into the encoder attention  $\text{ATT}_l^J$  and denote the output as  $Q_l^D \in \mathbb{R}^{|t| \times d}$ .  $H_l^D \in \mathbb{R}^{|t| \times d}$  is the output matrix of the  $l$ th decoder block. We denote  $\mathcal{L}^D$  as the negative log likelihood loss for the target sequence. Similarly, as shown on the right of Figure 2, the RED structure has the same definition of the matrices as that in ED. Moreover, We denote  $\mathcal{L}^E$  as the negative log likelihood loss for the source sequence and we denote the unidirectional cross attention as  $\text{ATT}_l$ . For more structural details we refer the readers to Appendix A.3 and the original papers (Vaswani et al., 2017; Ott et al., 2019).




Figure 2: Encoder-Decoder framework (left) and Regularized Encoder-Decoder framework (right).

### 3.2 Regularized Encoder-Decoder

Though the decoder-only Language Model (LM) is simply a decoder, it is still difficult to be compared with an Encoder-Decoder (ED) structure because this decoder handles both the source sequence and the target sequence together. To facilitate the comparison between the ED and LM structure, we propose to analyze a Regularized Encoder-Decoder (RED) framework as illustrated in Figure 2. It is a variant of the traditional ED framework while replicating the behaviors of an LM. Compared with the traditional ED structure, the RED framework mainly has the following different components: An unidirectional cross attention attends to both the source matrix and the target matrix simultaneously; a source auto-encoder recovers the input source; a parameter sharing mechanism shares the parameters between the encoder and the decoder; a layer-wise coordination component makes each decoder layer attending to the corresponding encoder layer output; a consecutive positional encoding utilizes a positional encoding starting from the length of the source tokens in the decoder.

**Unidirectional Cross Attention.** The main difference between the ED framework and the LM is how the input source information is merged into the decoder. As illustrated in Figure 2, the ED framework first uses multiple Transformer blocks to extract features  $H_{-1}^E$  from the source sequence  $s$ . Afterwards, it utilizes a self attention  $ATT_l^D$  to get the feature matrix  $G_t^D$ . It then uses an encoder attention  $ATT_l^E$  to take  $G_t^D$  as query and uses the encoder’s final output  $H_{-1}^E$  as the key and value to calculate  $Q_l^D$ . On the other hand, an LM uses a unidirectional attention to handle the concatenated features. To simulate this mechanism in the LM, as illustrated in Figure 2, the RED framework uses unidirectional cross attention  $ATT_l$  which attends to both the source matrix  $G_t^E$  and the target matrix  $G_t^D$  simultaneously. Since it attends to all features with one attention, the output matrix  $Q_l^D$  of the attention layer becomes less sensitive to the input source matrix  $G_t^E$  especially when it has already generated many words and  $G_t^D$  becomes relatively long. We call this the attention degeneration problem and we will analyze it in detail in Section 3.3.

**Source Auto-Encoder.** The traditional ED structure only predicts the probability for the target sequence and just takes the source sequence as features. On the contrary, an LM predicts the probability for the whole concatenated sequence including the source sequence. Therefore, in the RED framework, we adopt a Source Auto-Encoder (SAE) component to realize this mechanism. As shown in Figure 2, the overall loss is composed of the decoder loss  $\mathcal{L}^D$  and the SAE loss  $\mathcal{L}^E$ .  $\mathcal{L}^D$  is the same as that in the ED framework while  $\mathcal{L}^E$  is actually a regularizer that recovers the source sequence  $s$  to itself. Therefore, it can alleviate the overfitting problem in training and thus improve the performance.

**Parameter Sharing.** In the traditional ED framework, the encoder and the decoder have their own parameters. On the contrary, in an LM, the source and target sequences are concatenated and passed through the same network with the same parameters. To simulate this property, the RED framework shares the parameters between the encoder and the decoder. Parameter sharing techniques (Dehghani et al., 2019; Xia et al., 2019; Lan et al., 2020; Conneau and Lample, 2019) can be recognized as another regularizer that prevents the model from having too many parameters and thus alleviates the overfitting problem.

**Layer-Wise Coordination.** The traditional ED structure feeds the source sequence into the encoder and get the final source hidden representation matrix  $H_{-1}^E$ . Then, each decoder layer takes  $H_{-1}^E$  as the input matrix for the encoder attention layer  $\text{ATT}_l^J$ . On the contrary, if the source and target sequence are concatenated and feed into the LM, the attention component in each layer will take the current layer’s hidden representation instead of using the same representation matrix. To imitate this feature, the RED framework adapts the layer-wise coordination component which uses attention  $\text{ATT}_l$  in the decoder to attend to each corresponding encoder layer feature  $G_l^E$ . This method enables the decoder to access multiple levels of source information and thus improves the performance (Belinkov et al., 2017; He et al., 2018; Peters et al., 2018).

**Consecutive Positional Encoding.** In the traditional ED structure, the source sequence  $s$  and the target sequence  $t$  have their own positional encoding  $p_s$  and  $p_t$  starting both from 1 to the length of the source and target sequences. However, if the source and target sequences are concatenated and sent into the LM, the positional encoding for the target sequence will not start from 1. To realize this mechanism, the RED framework uses a Consecutive Positional Encoding (CPE) which encodes the position  $p_t$  for the target sequence  $t$  starting from  $|s| + 1$  instead of restarting from 1. It should be noted that this mechanism has been proved in many research works (He et al., 2018; Conneau and Lample, 2019) to be less effective compared with its counterpart called Separate Positional Encoding (SPE) which restarts the positional embedding for the target sentence. This is because restarting the positional embedding makes the model more aware of different languages. Moreover, we observe that the LM always has strong attention on the first element of the target sequence. This token may also be used by the model to differentiate the input source and output target. Using a fixed starting position for the target sequence makes it easier for the model to find it.

### 3.3 Attention Degeneration Problem

Since the unidirectional cross attention imposes attention on both the source sequence and the target sequence simultaneously, less and less attention will be focused on the source sequence as the target sequence length grows. This is the attention degeneration problem. To quantitatively understand why the ED structure does not have this problem and how the influence of the source sequence decreases in LM, we propose a theoretical analysis on the sensitivity of  $\text{ATT}_l$  and  $\text{ATT}_l^J$  in the RED framework and the ED framework where the source information is merged into the decoder. The sensitivity measures the influence of the source vectors to the attention layer’s output vectors. To simplify the analysis, we only analyze one head of the attention. Since we focus on analyzing the effect of concatenating the target sequence, we assume  $\text{ATT}_l$  and  $\text{ATT}_l^J$  both use the unidirectional encoding and have the same parameters to make them easier to be compared with each other.

We denote the input source matrix for the attention layer as  $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $d$  is the vector dimension,  $N$  is the length of the source sequence. We denote the target matrix as  $Y = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{i \times d}$ , where  $i$  is the current step. We denote the encoder attention as  $Z^E = \text{ATT}(Y, X, X)$  where  $X, Y, Z^E$ , and  $\text{ATT}$  correspond to  $H_{-1}^E, G_l^D, Q_l^D$ , and  $\text{ATT}_l^J$  in the ED structure respectively (Figure 2). On the other hand, the unidirectional cross attention can be denoted as  $Z^C = \text{ATT}(Y, [X^T, Y^T]^T, [X^T, Y^T]^T)$ , where  $X, Y, Z$ , and  $\text{ATT}$  correspond to  $G_l^E, G_l^D, Q_l^D$  and  $\text{ATT}_l$  in the RED structure respectively (Figure 2).

We begin our analysis by defining a notion of sensitivity. Intuitively, given a function  $y = f(x)$ , the sensitivity of  $x$  on  $y$  can be described as how the output vector  $y$  changes ( $\Delta y$ ) when imposing a perturbation  $\Delta x$  on the input vector  $x$ . However, imposing different  $\Delta x$  leads to different  $\Delta y$ , we propose to study the upper bound on the ratio between the magnitude of  $x$  and  $y$  based on the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Given a function  $y = f(x)$  with a Jacobian matrix  $J_f$ , if we have a perturbation vector  $\Delta x$  and  $y + \Delta y = f(x + \Delta x)$ , then*

$$\frac{\|\Delta y\|}{\|\Delta x\|} \leq \|J_f\| + o(1). \quad (1)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A.1. We can observe that the ratio is upper bounded with the norm of the Jacobian matrix  $J_f$  plus  $o(1)$ . Then, we focus on  $J_f$  and define the sensitivity of the attention component as the norm of the Jacobian matrix of the  $i$ th row vector  $z_i$  of the attention output  $Z$  with respect to the  $j$ th row vector  $x_j$  in  $X$ .

**Definition 3.2** (Sensitivity). Let the vectors  $x_j$  and  $z_i$  be defined above. The sensitivity of  $z_i$  with respect to  $x_j$  is




Figure 3: PALM framework.

defined as the norm of the Jacobian matrix:

$$S_{ij} = \|J_{ij}\| = \left\| \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial x_j} \right\|. \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, if the sensitivity is high, the output vector is closely related to the input source vector. Otherwise, the output vector may not contain enough information about the input source vector and the output is likely to be generated by a simple LM. From the Section 3.1,  $Z = \text{ATT}(Y, X, X) = \text{Softmax}(Y A^\top X^\top / \sqrt{d}) X W_V = P X W_V$ , in which  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d_Y \times d_X}$  and  $d_X, d_Y$  are the first dimensions of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively. Following Kim et al. (2020), the Softmax matrix  $P$  is a stochastic matrix, namely, its entries are non-negative and its rows sum to 1. For each element  $p_{ij}$  in  $P$ ,  $p_{ij} \in [0, 1]$  and they have an equal chance of receiving attention. Therefore, we have  $\mathbb{E}(p_{ij}) = \frac{1}{d_X}$ . To compare the sensitivity between the two kinds of attention, with the above assumption, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.3.** For  $Z^E = \text{ATT}(Y, X, X)$ , where  $\|X\|, \|Y\|, \|A\|, \|W_V\|$  are bounded,  $\exists C_3 \geq 0, \delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta^2$ ,

$$\|J_{ij}^E\| \leq C_3 \left( \frac{1}{N} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right). \quad (3)$$

For  $Z^C = \text{ATT}(Y, [X^\top, Y^\top], [X^\top, Y^\top])$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta^2$ ,

$$\|J_{ij}^C\| \leq C_3 \left( \frac{1}{N+i} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right). \quad (4)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A.2. It can be directly observed that the upper bound of the Jacobian matrix norm is negatively correlated with the value sequence length. Therefore,  $\|J_{ij}^C\|$  has a smaller upper bound than  $\|J_{ij}^E\|$ , which implies that the encoder attention ( $\text{ATT}_i^E$ ) output is more likely to be sensitive to the input source vectors. As a result, if the input vector changes, the output of the encoder attention changes more significantly than that of the cross unidirectional attention. Moreover, the difference between the two upper bounds becomes even larger as the generating step number  $i$  grows. It shows that the sensitivity to the source input decreases in the unidirectional cross attention as the step number  $i$  grows. We will conduct extensive experiments to verify these observations.

## 4 Partial Attention Language Model

To overcome the defects in the LM discussed above, we propose a Partial Attention Language Model (PALM) which is shown in Figure 3. We keep the effective components and remove the unfavorable components as analyzed in the RED framework. First, we propose a novel partial attention component to alleviate the attention degeneration



problem. Besides, we designate a few adjustments according to the aforementioned analysis of defects in the LM. Specifically, we propose to use a separate positional embedding to replace the consecutive positional embedding and use bidirectional attention for the source sequence. Moreover, we add a language encoding layer and keep other components unchanged.

**Partial Attention Component.** To alleviate the attention degeneration problem, we propose the Partial Attention (PA) component. Similar to the ED framework, it adds a new attention layer  $\text{ATT}_l^P$  that only focuses on the source part of the feature matrix  $Q_l$  which is denoted as  $Q_{l[1:|s|]} \in \mathbb{R}^{|s| \times d}$  and  $[1 : |s|]$  stands for taking the first to the  $|s|$ th row vectors of  $Q_l$ . Since  $Q_{l[1:|s|]}$  is not affected as the target sequence grows, the attention degeneration problem can thus be alleviated. As shown in Figure 3,  $Q_{l[1:|s|]}$  is passed through a consecutive feedforward layer which is denoted as  $P_l = \mathcal{F}_{P,l}(Q_{l[1:|s|]})$ . Afterwards, we use another attention layer  $\text{ATT}_l^P$  to attend to each vector of  $P_l$  by each vector in  $G_l$  as  $R_l = \text{ATT}_l^P(Q_l, P_l, P_l)$ . Then,  $R_l$  is passed through a feedforward layer to get the hidden representation matrix  $H_l$  for the next layer. Since  $\text{ATT}_l^P$  takes  $P_l$  as the key and value matrix which has a fixed length and does not contain any target part, it can be concluded from Theorem 3.3 that the sensitivity upper bound will not change as the generation step grows. Therefore, it can alleviate the attention degeneration problem.

**Bidirectional Attention.** In  $\text{ATT}_l$ , we propose to set a bidirectional attention mask (Dong et al., 2019; Raffel et al., 2020) for  $G_l[1 : |s|]$  making each position in the source sequence aware of the whole source sequence.

**Separate Positional Encoding.** As discussed in Section 3.2, we adopt the separate positional encoding in PALM to help the model differentiate between the source and target parts.

**Language Embedding.** We further adopt the language embedding (Conneau and Lample, 2019; Conneau et al., 2020) to help the model differentiate between the source and target sequences.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

We conduct experiments on several tasks to show the effectiveness of our proposed method. All the experiments are conducted with a single NVIDIA(R) TITAN RTX graphics card with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4210 CPU @ 2.20GHz CPU. All the datasets used in this paper are very commonly used in corresponding tasks. The detailed license and how the datasets are made can be found in the corresponding instructions. To the best of our knowledge, no personally identifiable information or offensive content have been reported in these datasets.

**Machine Translation** task (Cho et al., 2014; Bahdanau et al., 2015; Luong et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2016; Gehring et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2017; Koehn and Knowles, 2017; Vaswani et al., 2018) is the most popular NLP task and we adopt several language pairs in the commonly used IWSLT’14 dataset (Cettolo et al., 2014) (Creative Commons License) including De-En, En-De, It-En, En-It, En-Fr, Es-En, En-Es, Ru-En, En-Ru, He-En, En-He, Ro-En, En-Ro. Both the source and target sentences are encoded by the byte-pair encoding (Sennrich et al., 2016) method with 10,000 subword units in a shared dictionary. In the ED model, we adopt the traditional Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017; Ott et al., 2019) and keep all hyperparameters setting the same as the “transformer\_iwslt\_de\_en” architecture in fairseq (Ott et al., 2019). To make a fair comparison between the models, we also keep all the transformer layer number to be 6 in all models. We use the BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) as the evaluation metric.

**Data-to-Text** task can also be accomplished with Transformer. We investigate the performance on three datasets, namely the WebNLG (Perez-Beltrachini et al., 2016; Gardent et al., 2017a,b; Castro Ferreira et al., 2018; Shimorina et al., 2019) dataset (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License), E2E (Novikova et al., 2017; Dušek et al., 2019) dataset, and the WITA (Fu et al., 2020) dataset. The WebNLG is a human-annotated dataset aiming at generating text describing given knowledge base triples. The E2E is made with the Crowd Flower platform to generate restaurant comments based on their properties. The WITA dataset is an automatically generated dataset that generates Wikipedia article sentences based on input knowledge triples. We use the unannotated target sentences as the reference. We keep all the model hyperparameters the same as that in the machine translation task and evaluate the overall metrics with several

	De-En	En-De	It-En	En-It	En-Fr	Es-En	En-Es	Ru-En	En-Ru	He-En	En-He	Ro-En	En-Ro	Avg.	#Paras
ED	34.18	28.00	31.96	29.42	40.86	40.99	37.53	23.09	18.20	38.09	25.41	38.14	28.30	31.86	47.1M
LM	33.19	26.43	30.92	28.64	39.16	39.33	36.67	22.25	17.53	34.81	24.35	35.51	27.02	30.45	29.3M
LM-SPE	33.35	27.35	31.36	28.87	39.93	39.69	36.99	21.89	17.98	34.89	24.80	35.19	27.72	30.77	29.3M
LM-LE	33.58	27.46	31.38	29.03	40.14	39.87	37.05	22.24	18.08	34.80	24.31	35.76	27.96	30.90	29.3M
LM-PA	34.54	28.35	32.01	29.70	40.15	40.58	37.24	22.98	18.45	35.64	25.37	37.35	28.02	31.57	35.6M
PreLM	33.90	27.88	31.77	29.35	40.53	40.41	37.46	22.80	18.11	35.96	24.78	37.55	28.11	31.43	29.3M
PALM	34.73	28.59	32.22	29.83	40.31	40.91	37.61	23.27	18.74	37.00	25.29	37.59	28.75	31.91	35.6M
PALM w/o SAE	34.03	28.30	31.83	29.42	39.87	40.65	37.25	22.21	17.92	37.06	24.89	37.09	28.40	31.46	35.6M

Table 1: BLEU scores for models on IWSLT’14 dataset. Avg. is the average BLEU score for all language pairs while #Paras is the count of model parameters.

	Cs-En	En-Cs	Ro-En	En-Ro	Avg.
ED	21.9	15.7	29.3	20.4	21.8
LM	16.2	11.0	25.1	15.9	17.1
PALM	21.1	15.1	28.3	19.3	21.0
PALM w/o SAE	18.6	12.9	26.5	18.0	19.0

Table 2: BLEU score for WMT’16 dataset.

evaluation metrics including BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE<sub>L</sub> (Lin, 2004), METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), NIST (Doddington, 2002), and CIDEr (Vedantam et al., 2015).

**Summarization** task (Rush et al., 2015; Chopra et al., 2016; Nallapati et al., 2016; Cheng and Lapata, 2016; See et al., 2017; Paulus et al., 2018; Pilault et al., 2020) can also be implemented with a Transformer architecture. We conduct the experiments on XSUM (Narayan et al., 2018) dataset (MIT License). We take the articles as the source sequence while using the summarization as the target sequence. We keep all the model hyperparameters the same as that in the machine translation task and report the ROUGE<sub>1</sub>, ROUGE<sub>2</sub>, ROUGE<sub>L</sub> metrics.

## 5.2 Comparison Models

We compare the PALM structure against the following models.

**ED** is the traditional Encoder-Decoder framework built on Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) implemented with fairseq (Ott et al., 2019).

**LM** is the traditional Language Model built with a Transformer decoder. It concatenates the source sequence and the target sequence to train an LM. When testing, it predicts the target sequence after inputting the source sequence into the LM.

**LM-SPE** adopts the Separate Positional Encoding (Conneau and Lample, 2019; He et al., 2018) in an LM as the positional encoding. The first position for the target sequence is always set to 1.

**LM-LE** uses a Language Embedding (Conneau and Lample, 2019; Conneau et al., 2020) to help LM differentiate source and target sequence.

**LM-PA** adopts our proposed Partial Attention component in an LM. Different from PALM, it uses unidirectional attention and does not use the LE and SPE components.

**PreLM** uses a Prefix Language Model (Liu et al., 2018; Dong et al., 2019; Raffel et al., 2020) to generate target sequences. Different from LM, it uses a fully-visible masking of the input source instead of using a unidirectional causal mask. The mask enables each source word depending on the whole input sequence instead of the previous one.






Figure 4: Numerical sensitivity analysis.




Figure 5: Stepwise hallucination analysis. Lower is better.

	LM	LM-PA	PALM	ED	Gold	$\Delta L$
De-En	21.00	21.37	21.30	21.08	22.25	0.30
En-De	22.02	22.24	22.11	22.30	22.98	0.08
It-En	22.35	22.40	22.37	22.84	23.88	0.02
En-It	22.82	22.90	22.91	22.65	23.26	0.09
En-Fr	23.70	24.29	24.23	24.00	24.01	0.53
Es-En	21.16	21.46	21.35	21.88	22.48	0.19
En-Es	21.66	21.97	21.96	22.06	22.03	0.30
Ru-En	20.69	20.99	20.88	20.88	23.17	0.19
En-Ru	22.21	22.71	22.72	22.87	22.96	0.50
He-En	19.71	20.08	20.13	20.33	21.30	0.41
En-He	19.61	20.16	20.03	20.31	20.66	0.42
Ro-En	19.54	20.13	19.88	20.01	21.34	0.33
En-Ro	22.38	22.72	22.61	22.82	23.03	0.24
Avg.	21.45	21.80	21.73	21.85	22.57	0.28

Table 3: Early stop effect.  $\Delta L$  is calculated by length of PALM minus length of LM.

### 5.3 Experimental Results

**Main Results.** The experimental results for IWSLT’14 are shown in Table 1. We can draw the following conclusions. (1) Compared with the ED framework, the LM has worse performance due to the defects we discussed in Section 3.3. (2) Compared with the LM model, our proposed PALM structure achieved better performance which indicates that the attention degeneration is alleviated. (3) The PreLM improves the performance since the source text hidden representation depends on the whole source sequence instead of the previous context. (4) The LE component helps improve the performance as it provides extra language information for the model. (5) the LM-SPE model performs better than the traditional LM model using CPE. This observation verifies our analysis in Section 3.2. (6) From the ablation study, the performance decreases without the SAE component. It shows that the SAE component can alleviate the overfitting problem and thus improves the performance. (7) Compared with the ED model, LM, and our proposed PALM reduce the parameter number significantly.

**Numerical Sensitivity Analysis.** In Theorem 3.3, we prove that the upper bound of the sensitivity in the unidirectional cross attention decreases as the current step number increases. To experimentally show that the output vector becomes less and less sensitive to the source sequence as the step number grows, we conduct a numerical analysis by directly imposing a random small perturbation vector  $\Delta x_j$  on the source vector  $x_j$  of the attention layer. We take the norm of the output vector deviation  $\|\Delta z_i\|$  at the  $i$ th step divided by the input vector change norm  $\|\Delta x_j\|$ . This quantity is upper bounded by the sensitivity as shown in Proposition 3.1. The results are shown in Figure 4. It can be concluded from the results that the sensitivity of the LM decreases as the step increases which leads to the model ignoring the

	METEOR	ROUGE <sub>L</sub>	CIDEr	NIST	BLEU
ED	0.441	0.725	4.08	11.0	0.616
LM	0.452	0.732	4.24	11.2	0.629
LM w/o SAE	0.438	0.716	4.10	10.9	0.607
PALM	0.457	0.736	4.27	11.3	0.632

Table 4: Results on WebNLG dataset.

	METEOR	ROUGE <sub>L</sub>	CIDEr	NIST	BLEU
ED	0.396	0.630	1.62	8.07	0.597
LM	0.423	0.661	2.00	7.93	0.604
LM w/o SAE	0.405	0.646	1.92	7.93	0.602
PALM	0.449	0.688	2.25	8.46	0.657

Table 5: Results on E2E dataset.

input sequence gradually. It can also justify the conclusion drawn from Theorem 3.3 that the ED model does not have this problem while our proposed PALM can also alleviate this problem.

**Stepwise Hallucination Analysis.** As implied by Theorem 3.3 and the above experiments, the sensitivity decreases as the step number increases in LM. But how does the sensitivity affect the generating performance? We conduct the stepwise hallucination analysis to answer this question. Generation models prone to generate unrelated content beyond the input data and this phenomenon has been recognized as the hallucination problem (Tian et al., 2019; Nie et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2021; Rebuffel et al., 2021) in many recent research works. Intuitively, the attention degeneration problem is likely to exacerbate the hallucination problem when the generation step grows. This is because less and less attention is focused on the input data and the models are more likely to generate text groundlessly. As shown in Figure 5, we conduct an experiment to analyze the hallucination problem at different generation steps. Similar to (Rebuffel et al., 2021), we use the Hallucination Ratio (HR) to measure the hallucination problem. HR measures the proportion of the hallucination content. The HR for the  $i$ th position is defined as  $H_i = 1 - \sum_j^T \max(\mathbb{1}(t_{ji} \in r_j), C[s_{j1}, t_{ji}], \dots, C[s_{j|s_j|}, t_{ji}]) / \sum_j^T \mathbb{1}(|t_j| \geq i)$ , where  $T$  is the target sentence count.  $s_{ji}$  and  $t_{ji}$  are the  $i$ th word in the  $j$ th source and generated sentence respectively.  $|t_j|$  is the length of the  $j$ th generated sentence.  $r_j$  is the  $j$ th gold standard sentence.  $C[p, q] = \text{Sigmoid}((\sum_j^T \mathbb{1}(p \in s_j) \cdot \mathbb{1}(q \in t_j) - \alpha) / \beta)$  is the normalized alignment score of the  $p$ th and  $q$ th words in the dictionary, where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are sigmoid shape parameters. High HR indicates the hallucination problem is prone to occur. It can be observed that (1) HR changes moderately between 5% and 7% as  $i$  grows in all models. (2) LM has the highest (worst) HR score especially when  $i$  grows larger. When  $i > 50$ , LM has a significant high HR score than other models which implies that the hallucination problem gets worse. (3) Simply adding the PA component on LM can alleviate the hallucination problem and lower the HR score. It indicates that the attention degeneration problem exacerbates the hallucination problem and it can be alleviated with our proposed PA component. (4) Our proposed PALM achieves a low HR score close to the ED model. It performs well even  $i$  is large.

**Early Stop Effect.** To further study how the attention degeneration problem affects the performance, we conduct a statistical analysis on the output length of the generated sequence. The results are shown in Table 3. It can be concluded from the results that (1) The LM usually generates shorter sentences compared with the ED model and PALM structure while simply adding the PA component in LM alleviates the early stop phenomenon. It shows that the attention degeneration problem causes the early stop phenomenon and it can be alleviated by our proposed PA component. Due to the attention degeneration problem, the sensitivity on the input source vectors decreases as the step number grows. The model becomes less and less sensitive to the source sequence and it tends to stop generating because it gets less and less information about what to say. (2) On the other hand, our proposed PALM structure alleviates this problem. The average length of the PALM structure output is longer than the LM model and close to the ED model showing that it alleviates the attention degeneration problem and thus overcomes the early stop effect.

**Data-to-Text Generation.** To show that our analysis and the proposed method are also applicable in other seq2seq

	METEOR	ROUGE <sub>L</sub>	CIDEr	NIST	BLEU		ROUGE <sub>1</sub>	ROUGE <sub>2</sub>	ROUGE <sub>L</sub>
ED	0.347	0.636	3.64	9.08	0.427	ED	0.284	0.0877	0.245
LM	0.352	0.648	3.77	7.83	0.382	LM	0.279	0.0711	0.251
PALM	0.364	0.662	4.03	8.9	0.437	PALM	0.317	0.0953	0.282

Table 6: Results on WITA dataset.

Table 7: Results on XSUM dataset.

tasks, we conduct experiments on the data-to-text generation tasks. The results on WebNLG, E2E, and WITA datasets are shown in Table 4, 5, and 6 respectively. It can be observed that (1) our proposed PALM outperforms the LM model which shows the effectiveness of the partial attention component. (2) The LM model outperforms the ED model with the help of SAE component. Different from the translation task, the input sequence of this task shares the same language as the target sequence. Therefore, LM’s SAE component trains the model to recover source sequences and can thus alleviate the overfitting problem. This can be directly verified with the results of the LM w/o SAE model. When the SAE component is removed, the performance is worse than the LM model in all three datasets.

**WMT’16 Results.** We conduct our experiments on WMT’16 (Bojar et al., 2016) dataset which is larger than IWSLT’14. The performance is shown in Table 2. It can be concluded from the results that (1) our proposed PALM also outperforms LM’s results and is close the ED’s performance which shows PALM’s effectiveness in alleviating the attention degeneration problem; (2) interestingly, removing the SAE component improves the performance and closes the gap to the performance of ED. This may be because the dataset is larger and the overfitting problem is not serious.

**Summarization.** We conduct experiments on the summarization dataset XSUM to further verify our analysis and the results are shown in Table 7. It can be concluded from the results that (1) the ED model outperforms the LM model in ROUGE<sub>1</sub> and ROUGE<sub>2</sub>. This is because the input sequence is much longer than the target sequence, the attention degeneration problem becomes the dominant problem. This result is consistent with the analysis we discussed in Section 3.3; (2) our PALM structure still outperforms the LM model which is also consistent with the previous analysis;

**Stepwise Precision Analysis.** As implied by Theorem 3.3 and the above experiments, the sensitivity decreases as the step number increases in LM. We further conduct the stepwise precision analysis to show that the sensitivity directly affect the generating performance. We calculate the average word precision for the  $i$ th position as  $A_i = \frac{\sum_j^S \mathbb{1}(s_{ji} \in r_j)}{\sum_j^S \mathbb{1}(|s_j| \geq i)}$ , where  $s_j$  in the  $j$ th generated sentence and  $s_{ji}$  is the  $i$ th word in sentence  $s_j$ .  $r_j$  is the  $j$ th reference sentence and there are  $S$  sentences in total. The results are shown in Figure 6. We have three observations. (1)  $A_i$  changes moderately between 0.64 and 0.67 as  $i$  grows which is determined by the word distribution. (2)  $A_i$  for the LM model is slightly better than the ED framework when the step number is small. This is because when the step number is small, the attention degeneration problem is not the dominant factor for the performance and the LE, SAE, and other components play as the key role to make the performance better. (3) Contrastingly,  $A_i$  for the LM model becomes worse as the step size gets larger when compared with the ED model. This observation shows that as the step number increases, the sensitivity decreases, and thus the model is likely to generate wrong words. (4) Our proposed PALM structure alleviates the attention degeneration problem and the precision distribution is similar to the ED model.

## 6 Conclusions

We propose a detailed comparison between the Encoder-Decoder (ED) framework and the Language Model (LM) in the sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) generation task. We propose to analyze a Regularized Encoder-Decoder (RED) framework that is equivalent to an LM but has an encoder and a decoder. We analyze the attention degeneration problem and conduct a theoretical analysis. Based on the analysis, we propose a novel partial attention language model. The experimental results validate our analysis and demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed model.




Figure 6: Stepwise precision analysis.  $x$ -axis is the generation step number and  $y$ -axis is the average word precision.

## 7 Limitations

It should be noted that in Theorem 3.3, we utilize the PAC theory framework which holds with high probability. Unfortunately, it cannot guarantee all the cases satisfy the bound which means in some extreme cases, the bound will not be valid. This is a common short back for the PAC analysis and we use extensive experimental results to empirically show the effectiveness of the analysis.

## 8 Broader Impact Statement

This paper focuses on comparing different architectures of the existing language model which does not explicitly involve any enthetic concerns. We do not make any new dataset and all used datasets are properly cited. This work does not cause any kind of safety or security concerns while it also does not raise any human rights concerns or environmental concerns. Therefore, there will be no negative societal impact on our work.

## References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*. 7
- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, pages 65–72, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics. 8
- Yonatan Belinkov, Nadir Durrani, Fahim Dalvi, Hassan Sajjad, and James Glass. 2017. What do neural machine translation models learn about morphology? In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 861–872, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3, 5
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, and Pascal Vincent. 2000. A neural probabilistic language model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 13, Papers from Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) 2000, Denver, CO, USA*, pages 932–938. MIT Press. 1
- Ondřej Bojar, Rajen Chatterjee, Christian Federmann, Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, Matthias Huck, Antonio Jimeno Yepes, Philipp Koehn, Varvara Logacheva, Christof Monz, Matteo Negri, Aurélie Névéol, Mariana Neves, Martin Popel, Matt Post, Raphael Rubino, Carolina Scarton, Lucia Specia, Marco Turchi, Karin Verspoor, and

- Marcos Zamperini. 2016. Findings of the 2016 conference on machine translation. In *Proceedings of the First Conference on Machine Translation: Volume 2, Shared Task Papers*, pages 131–198, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics. [11](#)
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- Thiago Castro Ferreira, Diego Moussallem, Emiel Krahmer, and Sander Wubben. 2018. Enriching the WebNLG corpus. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 171–176, Tilburg University, The Netherlands. Association for Computational Linguistics. [7](#)
- Mauro Cettolo, J Niehues, S Stüker, Luisa Bentivogli, and Marcello Federico. 2014. Report on the 11th iwslt evaluation campaign, iwslt 2014. In *IWSLT-International Workshop on Spoken Language Processing*, pages 2–17. Marcello Federico, Sebastian Stüker, François Yvon. [7](#)
- Jianpeng Cheng and Mirella Lapata. 2016. Neural summarization by extracting sentences and words. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 484–494, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics. [8](#)
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder–decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1724–1734, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics. [1](#), [7](#)
- Sumit Chopra, Michael Auli, and Alexander M. Rush. 2016. Abstractive sentence summarization with attentive recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 93–98, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics. [8](#)
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*. [1](#)
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2020. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. [3](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- Alexis Conneau and Guillaume Lample. 2019. Cross-lingual language model pretraining. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 7057–7067. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- Mostafa Dehghani, Stephan Gouws, Oriol Vinyals, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Lukasz Kaiser. 2019. Universal transformers. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net. [3](#), [4](#)
- Jiawen Deng, Hao Sun, Zhixin Zhang, Jiale Cheng, and Minlie Huang. 2023. Recent advances towards safe, responsible, and moral dialogue systems: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09270*. [2](#)
- George Doddington. 2002. Automatic evaluation of machine translation quality using n-gram co-occurrence statistics. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Human Language Technology Research*, pages 138–145. [8](#)

- Li Dong, Nan Yang, Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. 2019. Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 13042–13054. 2, 3, 7, 8
- Yihe Dong, Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, and Andreas Loukas. 2021. Attention is not all you need: Pure attention loses rank doubly exponentially with depth. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2793–2803. PMLR. 3
- Ondřej Dušek, David M. Howcroft, and Verena Rieser. 2019. Semantic noise matters for neural natural language generation. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 421–426, Tokyo, Japan. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Zihao Fu, Wai Lam, Anthony Man-Cho So, and Bei Shi. 2021. A theoretical analysis of the repetition problem in text generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 12848–12856. 2
- Zihao Fu, Bei Shi, Wai Lam, Lidong Bing, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2020. Partially-aligned data-to-text generation with distant supervision. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9183–9193, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Claire Gardent, Anastasia Shimorina, Shashi Narayan, and Laura Perez-Beltrachini. 2017a. Creating training corpora for NLG micro-planners. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 179–188, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Claire Gardent, Anastasia Shimorina, Shashi Narayan, and Laura Perez-Beltrachini. 2017b. The WebNLG challenge: Generating text from RDF data. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 124–133, Santiago de Compostela, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Jonas Gehring, Michael Auli, David Grangier, Denis Yarats, and Yann N. Dauphin. 2017. Convolutional sequence to sequence learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1243–1252. PMLR. 7
- Sayan Ghosh, Mathieu Chollet, Eugene Laksana, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Stefan Scherer. 2017. Affect-LM: A neural language model for customizable affective text generation. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 634–642, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- Tianyu He, Xu Tan, Yingce Xia, Di He, Tao Qin, Zhibo Chen, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2018. Layer-wise coordination between encoder and decoder for neural machine translation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 7955–7965. 3, 5, 8
- Melvin Johnson, Mike Schuster, Quoc V. Le, Maxim Krikun, Yonghui Wu, Zhifeng Chen, Nikhil Thorat, Fernanda Viégas, Martin Wattenberg, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2017. Google’s multilingual neural machine translation system: Enabling zero-shot translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:339–351. 7
- Hyunjik Kim, George Papamakarios, and Andriy Mnih. 2020. The lipschitz constant of self-attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04710*. 6, 19
- Guillaume Klein, Yoon Kim, Yuntian Deng, Jean Senellart, and Alexander Rush. 2017. OpenNMT: Open-source toolkit for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2017, System Demonstrations*, pages 67–72, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- Philipp Koehn and Rebecca Knowles. 2017. Six challenges for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation*, pages 28–39, Vancouver. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7



- Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2020. ALBERT: A lite BERT for self-supervised learning of language representations. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net. 3, 4
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics. 8
- Peter J. Liu, Mohammad Saleh, Etienne Pot, Ben Goodrich, Ryan Sepassi, Lukasz Kaiser, and Noam Shazeer. 2018. Generating wikipedia by summarizing long sequences. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net. 2, 8
- Tianyu Liu, Yizhe Zhang, Chris Brockett, Yi Mao, Zhifang Sui, Weizhu Chen, and Bill Dolan. 2021. A token-level reference-free hallucination detection benchmark for free-form text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08704*. 10
- Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1412–1421, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Tomáš Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukáš Burget, Jan Černocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Eleventh annual conference of the international speech communication association*. 1
- Tomáš Mikolov, Stefan Kombrink, Lukáš Burget, Jan Černocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2011. Extensions of recurrent neural network language model. In *2011 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5528–5531. IEEE. 1
- Tomas Mikolov and Geoffrey Zweig. 2012. Context dependent recurrent neural network language model. In *2012 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 234–239. 1
- Ramesh Nallapati, Bowen Zhou, Cicero dos Santos, Çağlar Gulçehre, and Bing Xiang. 2016. Abstractive text summarization using sequence-to-sequence RNNs and beyond. In *Proceedings of The 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 280–290, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics. 8
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don’t give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1797–1807, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics. 8
- Feng Nie, Jin-Ge Yao, Jinpeng Wang, Rong Pan, and Chin-Yew Lin. 2019. A simple recipe towards reducing hallucination in neural surface realisation. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2673–2679, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics. 10
- Jekaterina Novikova, Ondřej Dušek, and Verena Rieser. 2017. The E2E dataset: New challenges for end-to-end generation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 201–206, Saarbrücken, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations)*, pages 48–53, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1, 3, 7, 8
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744. 1

- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7, 8
- Romain Paulus, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2018. A deep reinforced model for abstractive summarization. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net. 8
- Laura Perez-Beltrachini, Rania Sayed, and Claire Gardent. 2016. Building RDF content for data-to-text generation. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 1493–1502, Osaka, Japan. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee. 7
- Matthew Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. 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 2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3, 5
- Jonathan Pilault, Raymond Li, Sandeep Subramanian, and Christopher Pal. 2020. On extractive and abstractive neural document summarization with transformer language models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9308–9319. 8
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 1
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 1, 2, 3
- 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. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8
- Clément Rebuffel, Marco Roberti, Laure Soulier, Geoffrey Scoutheeten, Rossella Cancelliere, and Patrick Gallinari. 2021. Controlling hallucinations at word level in data-to-text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.02810*. 10
- Alexander M. Rush, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. A neural attention model for abstractive sentence summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 379–389, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics. 8
- Tevan Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. 2022. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*. 1
- Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1073–1083, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics. 8
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Controlling politeness in neural machine translation via side constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 35–40, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Anastasia Shimorina, Elena Khasanova, and Claire Gardent. 2019. Creating a corpus for Russian data-to-text generation using neural machine translation and post-editing. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Balto-Slavic Natural Language Processing*, pages 44–49, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics. 7
- Ilya Sutskever, James Martens, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2011. Generating text with recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2011, Bellevue, Washington, USA, June 28 - July 2, 2011*, pages 1017–1024. Omnipress. 1

- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2014, December 8-13 2014, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 3104–3112. 1
- Ross Taylor, Marcin Kardas, Guillem Cucurull, Thomas Scialom, Anthony Hartshorn, Elvis Saravia, Andrew Poulton, Viktor Kerkez, and Robert Stojnic. 2022. Galactica: A large language model for science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09085*. 1
- Ran Tian, Shashi Narayan, Thibault Sellam, and Ankur P Parikh. 2019. Sticking to the facts: Confident decoding for faithful data-to-text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.08684*. 10
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*. 1
- Ashish Vaswani, Samy Bengio, Eugene Brevdo, Francois Chollet, Aidan Gomez, Stephan Gouws, Llion Jones, Łukasz Kaiser, Nal Kalchbrenner, Niki Parmar, Ryan Sepassi, Noam Shazeer, and Jakob Uszkoreit. 2018. Tensor2Tensor for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas (Volume 1: Research Track)*, pages 193–199, Boston, MA. Association for Machine Translation in the Americas. 7
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008. 3, 7, 8
- Ramakrishna Vedantam, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2015, Boston, MA, USA, June 7-12, 2015*, pages 4566–4575. IEEE Computer Society. 8
- Jesse Vig and Yonatan Belinkov. 2019. Analyzing the structure of attention in a transformer language model. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 63–76, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, et al. 2016. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144*. 7
- Yingce Xia, Tianyu He, Xu Tan, Fei Tian, Di He, and Tao Qin. 2019. Tied transformers: Neural machine translation with shared encoder and decoder. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 5466–5473. 3, 4
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*. 1
- Jinhua Zhu, Yingce Xia, Lijun Wu, Di He, Tao Qin, Wengang Zhou, Houqiang Li, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. Incorporating BERT into neural machine translation. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net. 2, 3

## Appendix. Supplementary Material

### A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

**Proposition A.1.1.** 3.1 Given a function  $y = f(x)$  with a Jacobian matrix  $J_f$ , if we have a perturbation vector  $\Delta x$  and  $y + \Delta y = f(x + \Delta x)$ , then

$$\frac{\|\Delta y\|}{\|\Delta x\|} \leq \|J_f\| + o(1). \quad (5)$$

*Proof.* Let  $y = f(x)$  be given, in which  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We denote the output of  $f$  when  $x$  is perturbed by a vector  $\Delta x$  as  $f(x + \Delta x)$ . Since for the Jacobian matrix, we have  $f(x + \Delta x) - f(x) = J_f \Delta x + o(\|\Delta x\|)$ , it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x + \Delta x) - f(x) &= J_f \Delta x + o(\|\Delta x\|) \\ \|f(x + \Delta x) - f(x)\| &= \|J_f \Delta x + o(\|\Delta x\|)\| \\ \|f(x + \Delta x) - f(x)\| &\leq \|J_f \Delta x\| + \|o(\|\Delta x\|)\| \\ \|f(x + \Delta x) - f(x)\| &\leq \|J_f\| \|\Delta x\| + \|o(\|\Delta x\|)\| \\ \|\Delta y\| &\leq \|J_f\| \|\Delta x\| + \|o(\|\Delta x\|)\| \\ \frac{\|\Delta y\|}{\|\Delta x\|} &\leq \|J_f\| + \frac{o(\|\Delta x\|)}{\|\Delta x\|} \\ \frac{\|\Delta y\|}{\|\Delta x\|} &\leq \|J_f\| + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

□

### A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

**Lemma A.2.1.** Let  $Z = \text{Softmax}(YA^\top X^\top)XW$ ,  $z_i^\top$  be the  $i$ th row of  $Z$  and  $x_j^\top$  be the  $j$ th row of  $X$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ij} &= \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial x_j} \\ &= W^\top (X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) \cdot (e_{ji} Y A^\top) + I p_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

in which  $P = \text{Softmax}(YA^\top X^\top)$ ,  $p_i^\top$  is the  $i$ th row of  $P$ ,  $e_{ji}$  is a binary matrix with zeros exerywhere except the  $(i, j)$ th entry,  $N$  is the row number of  $X$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} z_i &= (PXW)_i^\top = \sum_{k=1}^N W^\top x_k p_{ik} \\ J_{ij} &= \frac{\partial \sum_{k=1}^N W^\top x_k p_{ik}}{\partial x_j} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N W^\top x_k \frac{\partial p_{ik}}{\partial x_j} + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\partial W^\top x_k}{\partial x_j} p_{ik} \\ &= W^\top [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial p_{i1}}{\partial x_j} \\ \frac{\partial p_{i2}}{\partial x_j} \\ \frac{\partial p_{i3}}{\partial x_j} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial p_{iN}}{\partial x_j} \end{bmatrix} + \frac{\partial W^\top x_j}{\partial x_j} p_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= W^\top X^\top \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x_j} + W^\top p_{ij} \\
&= W^\top (X^\top \frac{\partial \text{Softmax}((YA^\top X^\top)_i^\top)}{\partial x_j} + Ip_{ij}) \\
&= W^\top (X^\top \text{Softmax}'((YA^\top X^\top)_i^\top)) \frac{\partial (XAy_i)}{\partial x_j} + Ip_{ij}) \\
&= W^\top (X^\top \text{Softmax}'((YA^\top X^\top)_i^\top)) \cdot \\
&\quad \frac{\partial ([x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]^\top Ay_i)}{\partial x_j} + Ip_{ij}) \\
&= W^\top (X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) \cdot \\
&\quad ([\frac{\partial x_1^\top Ay_i}{\partial x_j}, \frac{\partial x_2^\top Ay_i}{\partial x_j}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_N^\top Ay_i}{\partial x_j}]^\top) + Ip_{ij}) \\
&= W^\top (X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) \cdot \\
&\quad ([0, \dots, \underbrace{Ay_i}_{j^{\text{th col}}}, \dots, 0]^\top) + Ip_{ij}) \\
&= W^\top (X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) \cdot (e_{ji} Y A^\top) + Ip_{ij})
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma A.2.2.** Let  $Z = \text{Softmax}(QA^\top Q^\top)QW$ ,  $z_i^\top$  be the  $i$ th row of  $Z$  and  $q_j^\top$  be the  $j$ th row of  $Q$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{ij} &= \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial q_j} \\
&= W^\top (Q^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) \cdot (e_{ji} Q A^\top + Q A \delta_{ij}) + Ip_{ij}),
\end{aligned}$$

in which  $P = \text{Softmax}(QA^\top Q^\top)$ ,  $\delta_{ij}$  is a scalar equals to 1 if  $i = j$  and equals to 0 otherwise.

The detailed proof can be found in [Kim et al. \(2020\)](#). To prove Theorem 3.3, we follow the observation of [Kim et al. \(2020\)](#) that the Softmax matrix  $P$  is a stochastic matrix, namely, its entries are non-negative and its rows sum to 1. For each element  $p_{ij}$  in  $P$ ,  $p_{ij} \in [0, 1]$  and they have an equal chance of receiving attention. Therefore, we have  $\mathbb{E}(p_{ij}) = \frac{1}{d_x}$ .

**Theorem A.2.3.** 3.3 For  $Z^E = \text{ATT}(Y, X, X)$ , where  $\|X\|, \|Y\|, \|A\|, \|W_V\|$  are bounded,  $\exists C_3 \geq 0, \delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta^2$ ,

$$\|J_{ij}^E\| \leq C_3 \left( \frac{1}{N} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

For  $Z^C = \text{ATT}(Y, [X^\top, Y^\top], [X^\top, Y^\top])$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta^2$ ,

$$\|J_{ij}^C\| \leq C_3 \left( \frac{1}{N+i} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

*Proof.* We first prove the upper bound for  $J_{ij}^E$ . From Lemma A.2.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{ij}^E &= W^\top (X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) \cdot (e_{ji} Y A^\top) + I p_{ij}) \\
\|J_{ij}^E\| &= \|W^\top (X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) e_{ji} Y A^\top + I p_{ij})\| \\
&\leq \|W^\top\| \|X^\top (\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) e_{ji} Y A^\top\| + \|I p_{ij}\| \\
&\leq \|W^\top\| (\|X^\top\| \|(\text{Diag}(p_i) - p_i p_i^\top) e_{ji}\| \cdot \|Y A^\top\| + \|I p_{ij}\|) \\
&\leq (\|X^\top\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & -p_{i1} p_{ij} & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & -p_{i2} p_{ij} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & p_{ij} - p_{ij} p_{ij} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & -p_{iN} p_{ij} & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \cdot \|Y A^\top\| + \|I p_{ij}\|) \|W^\top\| \\
&= (\|X^\top\| \|p_{ij}\| \| [p_{i1}, p_{i2}, \dots, 1 - p_{ij}, \dots, p_{iN}]^\top \| \cdot \|Y A^\top\| + \|I p_{ij}\|) \|W^\top\| \\
&\leq C_1 p_{ij} \sqrt{p_{i1}^2 + p_{i2}^2 + \dots + 1 + p_{ij}^2 - 2p_{ij} + \dots + p_{iN}^2} + C_2 p_{ij} \\
&\leq C_1 p_{ij} \sqrt{1 + \|p_i\|^2} + C_2 p_{ij} \\
&\leq C_1 p_{ij} \sqrt{1 + \|p_i\|_1^2} + C_2 p_{ij} \\
&= C_1 \sqrt{2} p_{ij} + C_2 p_{ij} \\
&= C_3 p_{ij},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1 \geq 0, C_2 \geq 1, C_3 \geq 1$ . Since we assume  $p_{ij} \in [0, 1]$  and  $\mathbb{E}(p_{ij}) = \frac{1}{N}$ , Therefore, with Hoeffding inequality, for  $p_{ij}$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(p_{ij} \geq \frac{1}{N} + t) &\leq e^{-2t^2} \\
\Pr(p_{ij} \geq \frac{1}{N} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}) &\leq \delta^2 \\
\Pr(p_{ij} \leq \frac{1}{N} - \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}) &\leq 1 - \delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta^2$

$$\|J_{ij}\| \leq C_3 \left( \frac{1}{N} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right)$$

Next, we prove the upper bound for  $J_{ij}^C$ . We denote  $Q$  as  $Q = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix}$ . Then,  $J_{ij}^C$  is the Jacobian matrix for  $\partial q_{N+i} / \partial q_j$ . From Lemma A.2.2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{ij}^C &= W^\top (Q^\top (\text{Diag}(p_{N+i}) - p_{N+i} p_{N+i}^\top) \cdot \\
&\quad (e_{j, N+i} Q A^\top + Q A \delta_{N+i, j}) + I p_{N+i, j}) \\
\|J_{ij}^C\| &= \|W^\top (Q^\top (\text{Diag}(p_{N+i}) - p_{N+i} p_{N+i}^\top) \cdot \\
&\quad (e_{j, N+i} Q A^\top + Q A \delta_{N+i, j}) + I p_{N+i, j})\| \\
&= \|W^\top (Q^\top (\text{Diag}(p_{N+i}) - p_{N+i} p_{N+i}^\top) \cdot \\
&\quad (e_{j, N+i} Q A^\top) + I p_{N+i, j})\| \\
&\leq C_3 p_{N+i, j},
\end{aligned}$$



where  $C_1 \geq 0, C_3 \geq 1$ . Since we assume  $p_{N+i,j} \in [0, 1]$  and  $\mathbb{E}(p_{N+i,j}) = \frac{1}{N+i}$ , Therefore, with Hoeffding inequality, for  $p_{N+i,j}$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(p_{N+i,j} \geq \frac{1}{N+i} + t) &\leq e^{-2t^2} \\ \Pr(p_{N+i,j} \geq \frac{1}{N+i} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}) &\leq \delta^2 \\ \Pr(p_{N+i,j} \leq \frac{1}{N+i} - \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}) &\leq 1 - \delta^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability at least  $1 - \delta^2$

$$\|J_{ij}^C\| \leq C_3(\frac{1}{N+i} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}})$$

□

### A.3 Detailed Model Structure

In this section, we provide a more detailed description of each model including LM (Table 8), ED (Table 10), RED (Table 9) and PALM (Table 11). We denote  $\mathcal{F}_l$  as the feedforward layer in the  $l$ th block. The positional embedding is denoted as  $E_p = \text{Emb}_p(p_s)$  while the word embedding layer is denoted as  $E_w = \text{Emb}_w(s)$ .  $E_w, E_p \in \mathbb{R}^{|s| \times d}$  and  $d$  is the dimension size.

Language Model
$a = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{ s }, \Rightarrow, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{ t }]$
$p_a = [1, 2, \dots,  s  +  t ]$
$E_p = \text{Emb}_p(p_a); E_w = \text{Emb}_w(a)$
$G_1 = E_p + E_w$
for $l$ in $[1, \dots, 6]$ :
$Q_l = \text{ATT}_l(G_l, G_l, G_l)$
$G_{l+1} = H_l = \mathcal{F}_l(Q_l)$
$L = \mathcal{L}(H_{-1}, a)$

Table 8: Language model framework.

Regularized Encoder Decoder	
Encoder	Decoder
$p_s = [1, 2, \dots,  s ]$	$p_t = [ s  + 1, \dots,  s  +  t  + 1]$
$E_p^E = \text{Emb}_p(p_s)$	$E_p^D = \text{Emb}_p(p_t)$
$E_w^E = \text{Emb}_w(s)$	$E_w^D = \text{Emb}_w(\cdot \Rightarrow \cdot + t)$
$G_1^E = E_p^E + E_w^E$	$G_1^D = E_p^D + E_w^D$
for $l$ in $[1, \dots, 6]$ :	for $l$ in $[1, \dots, 6]$ :
$Q_l^E = \text{ATT}_l(G_l^E, G_l^E, G_l^E)$	$Q_l^D = \text{ATT}_i(G_l^D, \begin{bmatrix} G_l^E \\ G_l^D \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} G_l^E \\ G_l^D \end{bmatrix})$
$G_{l+1}^E = H_l^E = \mathcal{F}_l(Q_l^E)$	$G_{l+1}^D = H_l^D = \mathcal{F}_l(G_l^D)$
$L = \mathcal{L}(H_{-1}^E, s) + \mathcal{L}(H_{-1}^D, t)$	

Table 9: Regularized encoder decoder framework.

Here, for the feedforward layer  $\mathcal{F}_{P,l}$  in Table 11, it can be interpreted as:

$$\begin{aligned}P_{l1} &= \text{Dropout}(\tanh(G_{l[1:|s|]} W_{P,l1} + \mathbf{1} b_{P,l1}^\top)) \\ P_{l2} &= \text{Dropout}(P_{l1} W_{P,l2} + \mathbf{1} b_{P,l2}^\top) \\ P_l &= P_{l2} + P_{l1},\end{aligned}$$

Encoder-Decoder	
Encoder	Decoder
$p_s = [1, 2, \dots,  s ]$ $E_p^E = \text{Emb}_p^E(p_s)$ $E_w^E = \text{Emb}_w^E(s)$ $G_1^E = E_p^E + E_w^E$ for $l$ in $[1, \dots, 6]$ : $Q_l^E = \text{ATT}_l^E(G_l^E, G_l^E, G_l^E)$ $G_{l+1}^E = H_l^E = \mathcal{F}_l^E(G_l^E)$	$p_t = [1, 2, \dots,  t ]$ $E_p^D = \text{Emb}_p^D(p_t)$ $E_w^D = \text{Emb}_w^D(t)$ $G_1^D = E_p^D + E_w^D$ for $l$ in $[1, \dots, 6]$ : $G_l^D = \text{ATT}_l^D(G_l^D, G_l^D, G_l^D)$ $Q_l^D = \text{ATT}_l^D(G_l^D, G_l^E, G_l^E)$ $G_{l+1}^D = H_{l+1}^D = \mathcal{F}_l^D(Q_l^D)$
$L = \mathcal{L}(H_{-1}^D, t)$	

Table 10: Encoder-decoder framework.

Partial Attention Language Model
$a = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{ s }, \Rightarrow, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{ t }]$ $p_a = [1, 2, \dots,  s , 1, 2, \dots,  t  + 1]$ $l_a = [0, 0, \dots, 0, 1, 1, \dots, 1]$ $E_p = \text{Emb}_p(p_a); E_w = \text{Emb}_w(a); E_l = \text{Emb}_l(l_a)$ $G_1 = E_p + E_w + E_l$ for $l$ in $[1, \dots, 6]$ : $Q_l = \text{ATT}_l(G_l, G_l, G_l)$ $P_l = \mathcal{F}_{P,l}(Q_{l[1: s ]}); R_l = \text{ATT}_l^P(Q_l, P_l, P_l)$ $G_{l+1} = H_l = \mathcal{F}_l(R_l)$ $L = \mathcal{L}(H_{-1}, a)$

Table 11: Partial attention language model framework.

where  $W_{P,l1}, W_{P,l2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $b_{P,l1}, b_{P,l2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are trainable parameters,  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{|s| \times 1}$  is a vector with all elements equal to 1.