

AMR Parsing with Instruction Fine-tuned Pre-trained Language Models

Young-Suk Lee, Ramón Fernández Astudillo, Radu Florian, Tahira Naseem, Salim Roukos

{ysuklee, raduf, tnaseem, roukos}@us.ibm.com

ramon.astudillo@ibm.com

IBM Research AI

Abstract

Instruction fine-tuned language models on a collection of instruction annotated datasets (FLAN) have shown highly effective to improve model performance and generalization to unseen tasks. However, a majority of standard parsing tasks including abstract meaning representation (AMR), universal dependency (UD), semantic role labeling (SRL) has been excluded from the FLAN collections for both model training and evaluations. In this paper, we take one of such instruction fine-tuned pre-trained language models, i.e. FLAN-T5, and fine-tune them for AMR parsing. Our extensive experiments on various AMR parsing tasks including AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR indicate that FLAN-T5 fine-tuned models out-perform previous state-of-the-art models across all tasks. In addition, full fine-tuning followed by the parameter efficient fine-tuning, LoRA, further improves the model performances, setting new state-of-the-arts in Smatch on AMR2.0 (86.4), AMR3.0 (84.9) and BioAMR (82.3).

1 Introduction

Instruction fine-tuning language models on a collection of annotated datasets has proven highly effective to improve model performance and generalization to unseen tasks both in general purpose open domain setup, as in (Chung et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2021; Longpre et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022; Mishra et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Honovich et al., 2022) and specialized tasks such as conversational dialogs in (Gupta et al., 2022).

Despite its great success in the majority of natural language processing tasks, however, standard parsing tasks such as abstract meaning representation (AMR), (Banarescu et al., 2013; Bevilacqua et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021; Bai et al., 2022), universal dependency (UD), (Nivre et al., 2017), semantic role labeling (SRL), (Gildea and Jurafsky, 2002; Palmer et al., 2005), etc. have been largely

excluded from the fine-tuned language net (FLAN) collections either for model training or evaluations. And therefore it still remains to be seen whether or not instruction fine-tuned language models are as effective for standard parsing tasks as for other NLP tasks.

In this paper, we fine-tune FLAN-T5 models of Chung et al. (2022) (FLANT5Large and FLAN-T5XL) on a wide range of AMR parsing tasks including AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR. We show that fine-tuning FLAN-T5 models on AMR parsing leads to a significant improvement over the previous BART fine-tuned SoTA models by Zhou et al. (2021); Bai et al. (2022). We further explore a parameter efficient fine-tuning technique, LoRA (Low Rank Adaptation), (Hu et al., 2021). While LoRAonly finetuned models do not out-perform full fine-tuned models, full fine-tuning followed by LoRA fine-tuning significantly improve full fine-tuned models, setting new state-of-the-arts across all AMR parsing tasks.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We apply instruction fine-tuned FLAN-T5 models to AMR parsing for the first time. We show that FLAN-T5 fine-tuned AMR parsing models significantly out-perform previous BART fine-tuned SoTA models.
- We explore the parameter efficient fine-tuning technique LoRA for sequence-to-sequence tasks. Although fine-tuning FLAN-T5 models with LoRA only does not out-perform full fine-tuned models, LoRA fine-tuning of full fine-tuned models further improves model performances.
- We push the envelope of AMR parsing, by setting new SoTA in Smatch on AMR2.0 (86.4), AMR3.0 (84.9) and BioAMR (82.3).

2 AMR Parsing with FLAN-T5 Models

Flan-T5 models, (Chung et al., 2022), are obtained by instruction fine-tuning T5-LM adapted models, (Lester et al., 2021), on a collection of 1.8K instruction annotated tasks.¹ They are prefix language models² and achieve strong few-shot performance even compared to much larger models, such as PaLM 62B.

Like all models derived from T5 models, (Raffel et al., 2020), we pose AMR parsing as a text-to-text problem and train models to transfer a text to a linearized AMR graph with the task prefix **amr generation**. FLAN-T5 model size variants, all of which use 32,128 unique vocabulary, is shown in Table 1.

2.1 Pre- and Post-processing

We first remove wiki tags from the raw AMR graphs. We then serialize the AMR graph and transfer the node variable information of concepts to the concepts themselves.³ If a graph includes the same concept more than once, unique indices are appended to each concept, e.g. *thing_1*, *thing_2*, etc. Finally, we add the task prefix **amr generation** to each input text. A sample input text and the corresponding serialized AMR graph after pre-processing is shown in Figure 1.

For testing, the decoder first generates serialized graphs, which is then de-serialized to restore the concept variables including re-ifications. We finally restore wiki tags using deterministic algorithms.

2.2 Full Fine-tuning

For full fine-tuning, we call the huggingface transformers⁴ class `T5ForConditionalGeneration` and `T5Tokenizer`. We train all models on 2 NVIDIA A100 80GB machines for 24 hours.

For both FLAN-T5-large and FLAN-T5-XL models, we set the maximum source and target lengths to 512. Learning rate is set to 5e-5. We utilize sentence based batching for mini batches. Batch size is 8 for FLAN-T5-large and 4 FLAN-T5-XL, distributed over 2 GPUs.

We run the validation data set after each epoch and choose the model with the highest validation set Smatch score as the final best model for testing.

¹https://github.com/google-research/FLAN/blob/main/flan/v2/flan_collection_info.csv

²Given natural text prefix as input, the model must produce the natural text continuation as output.

³https://github.com/IBM/graph_ensemble_learning

⁴<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

Input: Statistics also revealed that Taiwanese business investments in the mainland is tending to increase

AMR graph:

```
(r / reveal-01
 :ARG0 (s / statistic)
 :ARG1 (t / tend-02
       :ARG1 (t2 / thing
             :ARG1-of (i / invest-01
                     :ARG0 (c / country
                             :wiki "Taiwan"
                             :name (n / name
                                     :op1 "Taiwan")))
             :ARG2 (m / mainland)
             :mod (b / business)))
 :ARG2 (i2 / increase-01
       :ARG1 t2))
 :mod (a / also))
```

Serialized AMR graph:

```
( reveal-01 :ARG0 ( statistic ) :ARG1
 ( tend-02 :ARG1 ( thing :ARG1-of ( invest-01
 :ARG0 ( country :name ( name :op1 "Taiwan" ) )
 :ARG2 ( mainland ) :mod ( business ) ) )
 :ARG2 ( increase-01 :ARG1 thing ) ) :mod
 ( also ) )
```

Input text with the task prefix:

```
amr generation ; Statistics also revealed
that Taiwanese business investments in the
mainland is tending to increase
```

Figure 1: Serialization of AMR graphs and addition of the task prefix **amr generation** to the input text. In the serialized graph, the variables corresponding to each concept in the original AMR graph is removed while the parentheses indicating the concept spans are retained. The input text with the task prefix and the serialized AMR graphs are used for model training.

2.3 LoRA Fine-tuning

We experiment with the low rank adaptation LoRA⁵ for AMR parsing, a sequence-to-sequence task using an encoder-decoder architecture.

Largely following the recommended setup of adapting only the q (query) and v (value) projections in the transformer, we explore the LoRA configurations between rank=8, alpha=32 and rank=16, alpha=64 while fixing task_type to SEQ_2_SEQ_LM. We call `model.eval()` to merge LoRA parameters with the corresponding pre-trained ones after each parameter update and for inferencing and `model.train()` to split the LoRA parameters from the pre-trained ones for updating only LoRA parameters. Unlike full fine-tuning for which learning rate is 5e-5, we use learning rate 4e-1 for LoRA fine-tuning. We have found that LoRA fine-tuning requires a higher learning rate than full

⁵<https://github.com/huggingface/peft>

Models	# parameters	# layers	d_{model}	d_{ff}	d_{kv}	# heads
Flan-T5-Small	77M	8	512	1024	64	6
Flan-T5-Base	250M	12	768	2048	64	12
Flan-T5-Large	780M	24	1024	2816	64	16
Flan-T5-XL	3B	24	2048	5120	64	32
Flan-T5-XXL	11B	24	4096	10240	64	64

Table 1: Flan-T5 model size variants obtained from each model configuration file of <https://huggingface.co/models>. We fine-tune Flan-T5-Large and Flan-T5-XL for our AMR experiments.

fine-tuning for optimal performances, which is not surprising given the much fewer number of parameters to update with LoRA fine-tuning compared with full fine-tuning.

We experiment with two different modes of LoRA fine-tuning. First, apply LoRA fine-tuning to the pretrained language model (PLM) directly. Second, apply full fine-tuning to the PLM, and then apply LoRA fine-tuning to the full fine-tuned models. LoRA fine-tuning on PLM directly does not seem to improve the performances over full fine-tuned models.⁶ However, LoRA fine-tuning on full fine-tuned models improve the full fine-tuned models across various AMR parsing tasks and model configurations.

3 Experimental Results

We experiment on 3 AMR tasks, AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR, and 2 model training configurations, FLAN-T5-large and FLAN-T5-XL. Training and test corpora statistics are shown in Table 2. Silver training corpus is annotated with the MBSE ensemble distillation technique presented in (Lee et al., 2022).

Experimental results are shown in Table 3. As a point of reference, we include the highest Structured BART scores from Lee et al. (2022). FFT denotes full fine-tuning and LoRA, LoRA fine-tuning. All FLAN-T5-Large-FFT-LoRA and FLAN-T5-Large-FFT-LoRA scores are an average of two distinct model scores, one trained with $lora_rank=8$, $lora_alpha=32$ and the other, with $lora_rank=16$, $lora_alpha=64$.

Across all tasks and training corpus sizes, full fine-tuned (FFT) FLAN-T5-Large models out-perform Structured BART, except for AMR2.0 with silver training data for which FLAN-T5-Large is 0.1 Smatch lower than Structured BART. Full

⁶We have not explored the full range of adjustable parameters of LoRA, e.g. k and o projections in addition to q and v projections, or values other than 8 and 16 for LoRA rank and 32 and 64 for LoRA alpha.

Dataset	Split	Sents	Tokens
AMR2.0	Train ^h	36,521	653K
	Test	1,371	30K
AMR3.0	Train ^h	55,635	1M
	Test	1,898	39K
Bio AMR	Train ^h	5,452	231K
	Test	500	22K
PropBank	Silver ^{std}	20K	386K
SQuAD2.0-C	Silver ^{std}	70K	2M
Ontonotes5.0	Silver ^{std}	59K	1.1M
WikiText-103	Silver ^{std}	70K	2M
BioNLP-ST-2011	Silver ^{bio}	15K	460K
CRAFT	Silver ^{bio}	27K	740K
PubMed	Silver ^{bio}	26K	750K

Table 2: Corpus statistics for the standard benchmark experiments on AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR test sets. In corpus split, Train^h indicates human annotated treebank. Silver^{std} indicates the unlabeled data for silver training of AMR2.0 and AMR3.0. Silver^{bio} indicates the unlabeled data for silver training of BioAMR. Silver training corpus is annotated with the MBSE ensemble distillation technique in (Lee et al., 2022).

fine-tuned FLAN-T5-XL models out-perform all corresponding Structured BART models. LoRA fine-tuning lags behind full fine-tuning in performance when comparing FLAN-T5-Large-LoRA with FLAN-T5-Large-FFT. Full fine-tuning followed by LoRA fine-tuning (FFT-LoRA), however, always out-performs full fine-tuning only except for BioAMR with silver training corpus, for which full fine-tuned model score is the same as that of full fine-tuning followed by LoRA fine-tuning.

The fact that full fine-tuning followed by LoRA fine-tuning improves the scores of full fine-tuned models is somewhat unexpected and this training setup does not seem to have been explored elsewhere, (Xu et al., 2032; Valipour et al., 2022; Lialin et al., 2023). We conjecture that the low rank adaptation by LoRA prevents the model from over-fitting the training data especially when the

Training Corpora Models	Human Annotations			Human & Silver Annotations		
	AMR2.0	AMR3.0	BioAMR	AMR2.0	AMR3.0	BioAMR
(Lee et al., 2022)	84.2	82.3	79.8	85.9	84.3	81.3
FLAN-T5-Large-LoRA	82.3	81.7	79.1	84.6	83.0	80.4
FLAN-T5-Large-FFT	84.6	83.2	81.0	85.8	84.6	82.1
FLAN-T5-Large-FFT-LoRA	84.8±0.1	83.3±0.0	81.2±0.1	86.1±0.0	84.7±0.1	82.2±0.1
FLAN-T5-XL-FFT	84.6	83.4	80.9	86.1	84.6	82.3
FLAN-T5-XL-FFT-LoRA	84.8±0.0	83.9±0.1	81.6±0.0	86.4±0.1	84.9±0.0	82.3±0.2

Table 3: Performance of FLAN-T5 fine-tuned models trained on human annotations only (left) and human and silver annotations (right). FFT denotes full fine-tuning. The numbers prefixed by \pm indicate the standard deviation of Smatch scores across 2 seeds with different LoRA configurations.

Models	PLM	Silver	AMR2.0	AMR3.0	BioAMR
SPRING (Bevilacqua et al., 2021)	BART-large	-	84.5	83.0	79.9
SPRING (Bevilacqua et al., 2021)	BART-large	200K	84.3	83.0	59.5
StructBART-vanilla (Zhou et al., 2021)	BART-large	90K	84.7	82.7	-
BARTAMR (Bai et al., 2022)	BART-large	200K	85.4	84.2	63.2
StructBART-MBSE (Lee et al., 2022)	BART-large	219K	85.9	84.3	81.3
FLAN-T5-Large-FFT-LoRA (Ours)	FLAN-T5-Large	219K	86.1	84.7 \ddagger	82.2 \ddagger
FLAN-T5-XL-FFT-LoRA (Ours)	FLAN-T5-XL	219K	86.4\ddagger	84.9\ddagger	82.3\ddagger

Table 4: Comparison of AMR parsing models for AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR test sets. We compare the current FLAN-T5 fine-tuned models (Ours) against those BART-large fine-tuned models. Boldface indicates the best model scores. \ddagger indicates that the model is statistically significantly better than all of the previous models at $p=0.05$ according to randomized bootstrap statistical significance tests.

supervised training corpus size is large as in our AMR parsing setup, which in turn leads to better generalization capabilities on unseen test sets. We leave this topic for future research for now.

We compare the performances of our best models with previous SoTA models in Table 4. We restrict the comparisons only with models that fine-tune PLMs, i.e. BART-large. The model scores with \ddagger indicates that the models are significantly better than all of the previous models at $p=0.05$ according to randomized bootstrap statistical significance tests.⁷ We see that FLAN-T5 fine-tuned models out-perform the previous SoTA models across all training conditions and model configurations.

We show the detailed scores of our best models both with and without silver training corpus in Table 5. BioAMR wiki scores are 0.0 because we do not apply wikification to BioAMR parsing outputs. Overall, concept scores are the highest and negation/re-entrancy are the lowest among all categories. Negation scores are lower than re-entrancy scores for AMR3.0-mbse, AMR3.0-base and AMR2.0-base whereas for all others, re-

entrancy scores are lower than negation scores. Named entity detection (NER) does not seem to be an issue even with BioAMR, which should be attributed to the fact that the training corpus includes 5K human annotated BioAMR graphs.

4 Conclusion and Future Work

We presented AMR parsing with instruction fine-tuned FLAN-T5 models, first parsing results with FLAN-T5 models to the best of our knowledge. The experimental results indicate that FLAN-T5 fine-tuned AMR parsing models significantly out-perform previous SoTA models, which were also fine-tuned with another PLM, BART-large. We also explore parameter efficient fine-tuning LoRA. While LoRA fine-tuned models under-perform full fine-tuned models, LoRA tuning applied to full fine-tuned models further improves the Smatch scores of fine-tuned models across all training conditions. We push the envelope of AMR parsing, by setting new SoTA in Smatch on AMR2.0 (86.4), AMR3.0 (84.9) and BioAMR (82.5), which is even higher than 7 model graphene ensemble results presented in Tables 2 and 3 of (Hoang et al., 2021).

While full fine-tuning followed by LoRA fine-

⁷https://github.com/IBM/transition-amr-parser/blob/master/scripts/smatch_aligner.py

Test Data	Smatch	Unlabel	NoWSD	Concepts	NER	Neg.	Wiki	Reentrancy	SRL
AMR2.0-mbse	86.4	89.2	86.7	92.0	93.0	79.0	81.0	78.0	85.0
AMR3.0-mbse	84.9	87.8	85.3	91.0	90.0	75.0	78.0	77.0	84.0
BioAMR-mbse	82.5	85.1	82.4	89.0	81.0	80.0	0.0	74.0	83.0
AMR2.0-base	84.8	87.8	85.2	91.0	93.0	75.0	78.0	76.0	83.0
AMR3.0-base	83.9	86.8	84.3	90.0	89.0	74.0	72.0	76.0	83.0
BioAMR-base	81.6	84.1	81.5	88.0	82.0	80.0	0.0	72.0	81.0

Table 5: Fine-grained F1 scores of FLAN-T5-XL-FFT-LoRA models on test data sets. AMR2.0-mbse, AMR3.0-mbse, BioAMR-mbse indicate AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR test sets are evaluated on models trained with the combination of human annotated and silver training data discussed in (Lee et al., 2022). AMR2.0-base, AMR3.0-base and BioAMR-base indicate AMR2.0, AMR3.0 and BioAMR test sets are evaluated on models trained with human annotated data only.

tuning improves the model performances significantly, compared with the models with full fine-tuning only, we do not yet understand exactly why this should be the case, which we leave this for future research.

With the advent of very powerful instruction fine-tuned language models with human feedback such as ChatGPT and GPT-4, many natural language processing tasks, including classification and detection, achieve very high zero-shot performances. Nonetheless, given the unique label vocabulary and the hidden structure present in most parsing representations, zero shot parsing on a new parsing task does not seem easily achievable. Instruction fine-tuning on a collection of annotated natural language parsing tasks, along the lines what has been done for dialog tasks in Gupta et al. (2022), might lead to high performing few-shot or zero-shot learning of new parsing tasks.

References

- Xuefeng Bai, Yulong Chen, and Yue Zhang. 2022. Graph pre-training for AMR parsing and generation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- Laura Banarescu, Claire Bonial, Shu Cai, Madalina Georgescu, Kira Griffitt, Ulf Hermjakob, Kevin Knight, Philipp Koehn, Martha Palmer, and Nathan Schneider. 2013. [Abstract Meaning Representation for sembanking](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th Linguistic Annotation Workshop and Interoperability with Discourse*, pages 178–186, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michele Bevilacqua, Rexhina Blloshmi, and Roberto Navigli. 2021. One spring to rule them both: Symmetric amr semantic parsing and generation without a complex pipeline. In *AAAI Technical Track on Speech and Natural Language Processing I, Vol. 35 No. 14*, pages 12564–12573.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Le, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Daniel Gildea and Daniel Jurafsky. 2002. Automatic labeling of semantic roles. *Computational Linguistics, Volume 28, Number 3, September 2002*.
- Prakhar Gupta, Cathy Jiao, Yi-Ting Yeh, Shikib Mehri, Maxine Eskenazi, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. 2022. Instructdial: Improving zero and few-shot generalization in dialogue through instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 505–525.
- Thanh Lam Hoang, Gabriele Picco, Yufang Hou, Young-Suk Lee, Lam M. Nguyen, Dzung T. Phan, Vanessa López, and Ramon Fernandez Astudillo. 2021. Ensembling graph prediction for amr parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.09131*.
- Or Honovich, Thomas Scialom, Omer Levy, and Timo Schick. 2022. Unnatural instructions: Tuning language models with (almost) no human labor. *arXiv:2212.09689*.
- Edward Hu, Yelong Shen, Phil Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#).
- Young-Suk Lee, Ramón Fernandez Astudillo, Thanh Lam Hoang, Tahira Naseem, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2022. Maximum bayes smatch ensemble distillation for amr parsing. In

- Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5379–5392.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3045–3059.
- Vladislav Lialin, Vijeta Deshpande, and Anna Rumshisky. 2023. Scaling down to scale up: A guide to parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv:2303.15647*.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. 2023. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. Cross-task generalization via natural language crowdsourcing instructions. In *ACL*.
- Joakim Nivre, Daniel Zeman, Filip Ginter, and Francis Tyers. 2017. Universal dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155*.
- Martha Palmer, Dan Gildea, and Paul Kingsbury. 2005. The proposition bank: A corpus annotated with semantic roles. *Computational Linguistics Journal*, 31:1, 2005.
- 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 (2020) 1-67.
- Mojtaba Valipour, Mehdi Rezagholizadeh, Ivan Kobyzev, and Ali Ghodsi. 2022. Dylora: Parameter efficient tuning of pre-trained models using dynamic search-free low rank adaptation. *arXiv: 2210.07558*.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoor-molabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Anjana Arunkumar, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Atharva Naik, David Stap, et al. 2022. Super-naturalinstructions: generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ tasks. In *EMNLP*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Canwen Xu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, and Julian McAuley. 2022. Baize: An open-source chat model with parameter-efficient tuning on self-chat data. *arXiv: 2304.01196*.
- Jiawei Zhou, Tahira Naseem, Ramon Fernandez Astudillo, Young-Suk Lee, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2021. Structure-aware fine-tuning of sequence-to-sequence transformers for transition-based amr parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6279–6290.