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Abstract

Text generation with beam search has proven successful in a wide range of applications. The commonly-used implementation of beam decoding follows a first come, first served heuristic: it keeps a set of already completed sequences over time steps and stops when the size of this set reaches the beam size. We introduce a patience factor, a simple modification to this decoding algorithm, that generalizes the stopping criterion and provides flexibility to the depth of search. Extensive empirical results demonstrate that the patience factor improves decoding performance of strong pretrained models on news text summarization and machine translation over diverse language pairs, with a negligible inference slowdown. Our approach only modifies one line of code and can be thus readily incorporated in any implementation.\(^1\)

1 Introduction

Beam search has become a dominant inference algorithm for a wide range of language generation tasks, such as machine translation (Sutskever et al., 2014; Bahdanau et al., 2015; Vaswani et al., 2017), summarization (Nallapati et al., 2016; See et al., 2017), and image captioning (Anderson et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020). Beam decoding\(^2\) is an approximate, pruned version of breadth-first search that seeks the highest-probability sequence under an autoregressive (left-to-right) language generation model. In this work, we examine a popular implementation of beam decoding and propose a simple modification (one line of code) that improves the decoding performance of strong, neural language generation models (Fig. 1).

A widely-used implementation of beam language decoding (e.g., fairseq, Ott et al., 2019; Hugging Face’s Transformers, Wolf et al., 2020)\(^3\) follows a first come, first served (FCFS) heuristic: when a total of \(k\) finished candidates is found (\(k\) is the beam size), it returns the best one from the \(k\) candidates and discards all of the current, unfinished \(k\) sequences in the beam. Beam size \(k\) thus determines both the breadth and depth of search. We propose a patience factor (Fig. 1) that decomposes these two roles and controls how many finished candidates have to be found before

\[\text{FCFS Beam Decoding with Controlled Patience} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
1: & \quad B_0 \leftarrow \{\{0, \text{bos}\}\}, \quad F_0 \leftarrow \emptyset \\
2: & \quad \text{for } t \in \{1, \ldots, M-1\} : \\
3: & \quad H \leftarrow \emptyset, \quad F_t \leftarrow F_{t-1} \\
4: & \quad \text{for } (s, y) \in B_{t-1} : \quad \# \text{Expansion.} \\
5: & \quad \text{for } y \in V : \\
6: & \quad \quad s \leftarrow \text{score}(y \circ y), \quad H.\text{add}((s, y \circ y)) \\
7: & \quad B_t \leftarrow \emptyset, \quad F_t \leftarrow \emptyset \\
8: & \quad \text{while } |B_t| < k : \quad \# \text{Find top } k \text{ w/o eos from } H. \\
9: & \quad \quad (s, y) \leftarrow H.\text{max()} \\
10: & \quad \text{if } y.\text{last()} = \text{eos} : \\
11: & \quad \quad F_t.\text{add}((s, y)) \quad \# \text{Finished hypotheses.} \\
12: & \quad \quad \text{else } B_t.\text{add}((s, y)) \\
13: & \quad \quad \text{if } |F_t| \geq k \cdot p : \quad \# \text{Originally, } p = 1. \\
14: & \quad \quad \quad \text{return } F_t.\text{max()} \\
15: & \quad H.\text{remove}((s, y)) \\
16: & \quad \text{return } F_t.\text{max()} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 1: First come, first served (FCFS) beam decoding with patience factor \(p\). The common implementation can be considered as a special case where \(p = 1\). The highlighted line is the only modification that this work introduces for performance improvement. \(F_t\): already completed sequences; \(B_t\): beam of continuing sequences. \(H_t\): expanded hypotheses before the top-\(k\) operation. The input sequence to \text{score} is omitted.

\(^1\)Our codebase is available at https://github.com/jungokasai/beam_with_patience.

\(^2\)In this paper, we use “beam decoding” to mean beam search applied to decoding for text generation.

terminating the decoding. The patience factor generalizes the commonly-used implementation and provides flexibility in the depth of beam search by changing the stopping criteria.

We apply the one-line modification to strong off-the-shelf transformer models without any change to the trained models for machine translation (Tang et al., 2021) and text summarization (Lewis et al., 2020). Our experiments demonstrate that our method outperforms the original algorithm on the CNN/Dailymail (Hermann et al., 2015) and XSUM (Narayan et al., 2018) news summarization tasks and the WMT 2020/2021 machine translation tasks (Barrault et al., 2020; Akhbardeh et al., 2021) across diverse language pairs. Further, the introduction of the patience factor only results in a negligible inference slowdown, confirming its practical advantage in downstream applications.

Our analysis shows that, while the performance gain is sensitive to hyperparameters of beam decoding (beam size and length penalty, Johnson et al., 2017), the patience factor is consistently beneficial. Moreover, we extensively compare our results with the vanilla implementation of beam search that much prior work assumes (Meister et al., 2020b; Stahlberg and Byrne, 2019, inter alia). Empirically, we found that the vanilla algorithm performs competitively with FCFS on machine translation but substantially underperforms on summarization. The FCFS beam decoding with our patience factor is thus a simple yet effective algorithm for both language generation tasks.

2 Beam Decoding with Patience

Vanilla and FCFS Implementations Beam decoding has been applied to sequence-to-sequence models (Graves, 2012; Boulanger-Lewandowski et al., 2013a,b), and it is now used in many state-of-the-art systems for language generation tasks (Zhang et al., 2020, 2021; Tran et al., 2021; Raffel et al., 2020, inter alia). Figs. 1 and 2 describe its two major implementations. They differ primarily in the treatment of finished sequences with the EOS symbol at the end: FCFS collects finished sequences in a first come, first served manner and removes them from the beam (Line 11, Fig. 1), whereas the vanilla version finds the top $k$ sequences, including both finished and unfinished sequences (Line 5 in Fig. 2). While often unspecified in the literature, our later experiments in §3.2 will show that this difference can affect the downstream performance substantially, especially on news text summarization.

Further comparing Figs. 1 and 2, we see their difference in terms of the breadth and depth of search. Given the same beam size $k$, FCFS has a wider breadth since it collects $k$ unfinished sequences at every step regardless of how many sequences are finished with the EOS symbol.\textsuperscript{5} The vanilla algo-

\textsuperscript{5}In practice, this is implemented by taking the top $2k$ sequences at every step. We find at most $k$ EOS symbols, so

```
Vanilla Beam Decoding

$k$: beam size, $M$: maximum length, $V$: Vocabulary, score(·): scoring function.
1: $B_0 \leftarrow \{\{0, \text{BOS}\}\}$
2: for $t \in \{1, \ldots, M-1\}$:
3:   for $\langle s, y \rangle \in B_{t-1}$:
4:     if $y$.last() = EOS:
5:       $H$.add($\langle s, y \rangle$)
6:       continue
7:   for $y \in V$:
8:     $s \leftarrow \text{score}(y \circ y), \ H$.add($\langle s, y \circ y \rangle$)
9:   $B_t \leftarrow \emptyset$
10:  while $|B_t| < k$:
11:    $\langle s, y \rangle \leftarrow H$.max(), $B_t$.add($\langle s, y \rangle$)
12:    $H$.remove($\langle s, y \rangle$)
13: if $y$.last() = EOS, $\forall y \in B_t$:
14:   return $B_t$.max()
15: return $B_t$.max()
```

Figure 2: The vanilla version of beam decoding. The top-$k$ operation is applied over $H$, the union of the finished and continuing sequences. This is implemented, for example, in the TensorFlow Addons library (Abadi et al., 2015).\textsuperscript{4} See also Stahlberg and Byrne (2019); Meister et al. (2020b).

```
Vanilla $B$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOS</th>
<th>EOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FCFS $B$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOS</th>
<th>EOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{4}https://www.tensorflow.org/addons/api_docs/python/tfa/seq2seq/BeamSearchDecoder.
rithm decodes until all top-$k$ sequences are finished (Line 13, Fig. 2), and therefore it tends to result in deeper search. FCFS, in contrast, terminates when a total of $k$ finished sequences is found.

**Patience Factor for FCFS** Beam size $k$ in FCFS thus controls both the breadth and stopping criterion (i.e., depth) of search. We introduce the patience factor (Line 13, Fig. 1) that relaxes this assumption and separates the stopping criterion from the search breadth. Fig. 3 illustrates this patience factor as well as the difference between the FCFS and vanilla algorithms. The one-line change generalizes the FCFS algorithm ($p = 1$) and adds flexibility. We will show that this flexibility is beneficial on machine translation and summarization (§3.2).

3 Experiments

We present extensive comparisons of beam decoding variants on text summarization and machine translation over a wide range of language pairs. Our simple addition of the patience factor improves performance across the board.

3.1 Experimental Setup

We evaluate four decoding algorithms on machine translation and summarization: greedy, vanilla, FCFS, and FCFS with the patience factor. For machine translation, we use multilingual BART (Tang et al., 2021), a strong, pretrained transformer model, and WMT 2020/2021 news test data (Barrault et al., 2020; Akhbardeh et al., 2021) for four diverse language pairs (eight directions): WMT 2020 for EN→PL (Polish) and 2021 for EN→DE (German), EN→JA (Japanese), and EN→ZH (Chinese). We apply beam decoding with the same hyperparameters as Tang et al. (2021): beam size 5 and length penalty 1. We measure performance with the COMET score (Rei et al., 2020a,b), a state-of-the-art evaluation metric based on multilingual contextual representations. For summarization, we experiment with the CNN/Dailymail (CNNDM, Hermann et al., 2015) and XSUM (Narayan et al., 2018) datasets. We apply the off-the-shelf BART models (Lewis et al., 2020) that are fine-tuned on each dataset. Performance is measured with ROUGE scores (Lin, 2004). We follow the original setting in Lewis et al. (2020): beam sizes 4 and 6 and length penalty 2 and 1 for CNNDM and XSUM, respectively. More experimental details are described in Appendix §A.

Notably, the WMT 2020/2021 test data consist only of news text written in the original language, in contrast to the test data from WMT 2018 (Bojar et al., 2018) or earlier. For example, the WMT 2021 EN→DE and DE→EN test data come from completely different documents. This avoids the translationese effect that would overestimate the translation performance due to the simplicity of translated text (Graham et al., 2020). Moreover, some language pairs in the WMT 2020 and 2021 test data have multiple references per instance, which increases the correlation of automatic evaluations with human judgment (Kasai et al., 2022a).

We experiment with the same patience factor on all datasets for each task, based on our preliminary development: $p = 2$ for machine translation and $p = 0.5$ for summarization. Here we avoid additional effort and demonstrate the practical value of our simple modification. We present detailed sensitivity analysis over $p$ in §3.3.

3.2 Results

Seen in Table 1 are results from our experiments. FCFS with the patience factor outperforms the widely-used FCFS algorithm across the board; e.g., 53.0 vs. 52.1 on EN→PL. Particularly noteworthy are the performance gains on the two summarization datasets; e.g., 31.2 vs. 30.3 ROUGE-L on CNNDM. Comparing vanilla decoding and FCFS, we see that the former outperforms the latter (and is competitive with or slightly better than FCFS w/ $p$) on machine translation but underperforms substantially on summarization; e.g., 34.4 vs. 33.1 ROUGE-L on XSUM. Vanilla decoding even performs worse than greedy decoding in many cases. We suspect this performance degradation on summarization might be a reason why FCFS is used instead of vanilla decoding in popular libraries.

3.3 Analysis

Here we use the standard dev. split from the XSUM dataset and news test 2020 EN→DE and ZH→EN data. We fixed the value of $p$ for each task so far,
We evaluate with COMET for machine translation and XSUM) and the inference speed (C). The translation performance improves with larger patience factors with diminishing gains. On the other hand, summarization benefits more from patience factors smaller than the original value of 1, possibly due to issues in the scoring function (Wiseman and Rush, 2016) or ROUGE evaluations (Nenkova, 2006) and the nature of the summarization task that aims to generate concise text. Note, however, that we see consistent patterns with ROUGE from COMET (Rei et al., 2020b), which achieves the highest correlation to human judgment on CNNDM (Kasai et al., 2022a; see Table 3 in the appendix). Regardless, our patience factor provides useful flexibility for any generation task.

As expected, generation slows down as \( p \) increases (Fig. 4C). The inference slowdown from around \( p = 2 \) is still negligible, again showing the practicality of our method. Fig. 5 explores the performance gains from the patience factor over varying beam sizes. The amount of improvement changes, but the patience factor is generally beneficial. We see similar trends for various values of the length penalty (see Fig. 6 in the appendix).

### 4 Further Related Work

**Stopping Criteria for Beam Decoding** The patience factor changes the stopping criterion and adds flexibility in the search depth of the common beam search algorithm. Similarly, several prior works studied stopping criteria to improve machine translation (Huang et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2019). Our machine translation experiments are consistent with their findings: stopping criteria that yield accurate search improve performance. In the case of summarization, however, we observed that less patient thus less accurate search can improve ROUGE scores.

**Breadth of Beam Decoding** Much prior work explored downstream effects of the search breadth (Koehn and Knowles, 2017; Murray and Chiang, 2018; Ott et al., 2018; Cohen and Beck, 2019;
Stahlberg and Byrne, 2019, inter alia). Beam decoding with larger beam sizes can find sequences with higher scores but lead to performance degradation (often called the beam search curse; Yang et al., 2018). Recent work (Meister et al., 2020a) argued that beam decoding with small beams introduces bias that is related to the uniform information density of human-produced text (Levy, 2005). Freitag and Al-Onaizan (2017) proposed a method to adaptively shrink the beam width based on the partial scores to speed up inference. This work focused on the stopping criteria (i.e., depth) and separated them from the breadth of the commonly-used beam decoding.

5 Conclusion

We introduced the patience factor that generalizes the widespread implementation of beam text decoding. Our extensive experiments showed that the patience factor improves the generation performance of strong, off-the-shelf models on machine translation and summarization with an insignificant slowdown in generation. As it only requires a minimal change in code, we hope that many researchers and practitioners of language generation will benefit from our simple yet effective modification.
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## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyperparameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WMT Machine Translation (All Pairs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beam size</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length penalty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CNNDM Summarization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beam size</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length penalty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max-len-b</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min-len</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no-repeat-ngram-size</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XSUM Summarization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beam size</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length penalty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max-len-b</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min-len</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no-repeat-ngram-size</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Beam decoding hyperparameters. We generally followed prior work: Tang et al. (2021) for machine translation and Lewis et al. (2020) for CNNDM and XSUM summarization.

### A Beam Decoding Hyperparameters

Table 2 shows the beam decoding hyperparameters in our experiments. We generally follow the original settings of the pretrained, off-the-shelf models (Tang et al., 2021; Lewis et al., 2020).

### B Additional Results

Table 3 reports BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and COMET (Rei et al., 2020b) scores for the machine translation and summarization experiments, respectively. We use the sacreBLEU implementation for BLEU (Post, 2018). Note that much recent work (Mathur et al., 2020a; Kasai et al., 2022a,b; Edunov et al., 2020, inter alia) found poor correlation between BLEU scores and human judgment for evaluating strong language generation models. COMET is an automatic metric for machine translation that uses crosslingual contextual representations from XLM-RoBERTa (Conneau et al., 2020), but it can be used monolingually for evaluating summarization as well (Kasai et al., 2022a).

Fig. 6 explores the performance gains from the patience factor over varying length penalty values. The beam sizes are all 5. We evaluate with COMET for machine translation and ROUGE-L for XSUM summarization.

![Figure 6: Effects of controlled patience on the dev. data over varying length penalty values. The beam sizes are all 5. We evaluate with COMET for machine translation and ROUGE-L for XSUM summarization.](image)
Table 3: We evaluate the four decoding algorithms on machine translation and summarization and report BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and COMET (Rei et al., 2020b) scores here. FCFS w/ p indicates our FCSF algorithm with the patience factor ($p = 2$ for machine translation and $p = 0.5$ for summarization). COMET is an automatic metric for machine translation that uses crosslingual contextual representations from XLM-RoBERTa (Conneau et al., 2020), but it can be used for evaluating summarization as well (Kasai et al., 2022a).