

Neural models for Factual Inconsistency Classification with Explanations

Tathagata Raha¹, Mukund Choudhary¹, Abhinav Menon¹, Harshit Gupta¹,
K V Aditya Srivatsa¹, Manish Gupta^{1,2} (✉), Vasudeva Varma¹

¹IIIT-Hyderabad, India; ²Microsoft, Hyderabad, India
{tathagata.raha,mukund.choudhary,abhinav.m,harshit.g,k.v.aditya}@research.iiit.ac.in
gmanish@microsoft.com, vv@iiit.ac.in

Abstract. Factual consistency is one of the most important requirements when editing high quality documents. It is extremely important for automatic text generation systems like summarization, question answering, dialog modeling, and language modeling. Still, automated factual inconsistency detection is rather under-studied. Existing work has focused on (a) finding fake news keeping a knowledge base in context, or (b) detecting broad contradiction (as part of natural language inference literature). However, there has been no work on detecting and explaining types of factual inconsistencies in text, without any knowledge base in context. In this paper, we leverage existing work in linguistics to formally define five types of factual inconsistencies. Based on this categorization, we contribute a novel dataset, FICLE (Factual Inconsistency Classification with Explanation), with $\sim 8K$ samples where each sample consists of two sentences (claim and context) annotated with type and span of inconsistency. When the inconsistency relates to an entity type, it is labeled as well at two levels (coarse and fine-grained). Further, we leverage this dataset to train a pipeline of four neural models to predict inconsistency type with explanations, given a (claim, context) sentence pair. Explanations include inconsistent claim fact triple, inconsistent context span, inconsistent claim component, coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity types. The proposed system first predicts inconsistent spans from claim and context; and then uses them to predict inconsistency types and inconsistent entity types (when inconsistency is due to entities). We experiment with multiple Transformer-based natural language classification as well as generative models, and find that DeBERTa performs the best. Our proposed methods provide a weighted F1 of $\sim 87\%$ for inconsistency type classification across the five classes. We make the code and dataset publicly available¹.

Keywords: deep learning· factual inconsistency classification· explainability· factual inconsistency explanations

1 Introduction

Although Transformer-based natural language generation models have been shown to be state-of-the-art for several applications like summarization, dialogue gen-

¹ <https://github.com/blitzprecision/FICLE>

Claim	The Invention of Lying is <i>only a book</i> .	
Context	The Invention of Lying is <i>a 2009 American fantasy romantic comedy film</i> written and directed by Ricky Gervais and Matthew Robinson.	
	↓	
Inconsistent Claim	Source	The Invention of Lying
Fact Triple	Relation	is
	Target	<i>only a book</i>
Inconsistent Context Span	<i>a 2009 American fantasy romantic comedy film</i>	
Inconsistent Claim Component	Target Head	
Inconsistency Type	Taxonomic sisters (book vs film)	
Coarse Inconsistent Entity-Type	entertainment	
Fine-grained Inconsistent Entity-Type	entertainment_movie	

Fig. 1: Factual Inconsistency Classification with Explanation (FICLE) Example: Inputs are claim and context. Outputs include inconsistency type and explanation (inconsistent claim fact triple, inconsistent context span, inconsistent claim component, coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity types).

eration, question answering, table-to-text, and machine translation, they suffer from several drawbacks of which hallucinatory and inconsistent generation is the most critical [14]. Factual inconsistencies in generated text can lead to confusion and a lack of clarity, make the text appear unreliable and untrustworthy, and can create a sense of mistrust among readers. It can lead to inaccurate conclusions and interpretations, and diminishes the overall quality of the text. One approach to tackle this problem is to train robust neural language generation models which produce text with high fidelity and less hallucinations [14]. Another approach is to have human annotators post-check the generated text for inconsistencies. Checking all generated output manually is not scalable. Hence, automated factual inconsistency detection and explanations become crucial.

Accordingly, there have been several studies in the past which focus on detection of false or fake content. Fake content detection studies [8,31,35] typically verify facts in claims with respect to an existing knowledge base. However, keeping the knowledge base up-to-date (freshness and completeness) is difficult. Accordingly, there have been other studies in the natural language inference (or textual entailment) community [4,26,37] where the broad goal is to predict entailment, contradiction or neither. More than a decade back, De Marneffe et al. [9] proposed the problem of fine-grained contradiction detection, but (1) they proposed a tiny dataset with 131 examples, (2) they did not propose any learning method, and (3) they did not attempt explanations like localization of inconsistency spans in claim and context.

Hence, in this paper, we propose the novel problem of factual inconsistency classification with explanations (FICLE). Given a (claim, context) sentence pair, our goal is to predict inconsistency type and explanation (inconsistent claim fact triple, inconsistent context span, inconsistent claim component, coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity types). Fig. 1 shows an example of the FICLE task. Two recent studies are close to our work: e-SNLI [6] and TaxiNLI [15]. Unlike detailed structured explanation (including inconsistency localization spans in both claim and context) from our proposed system, e-SNLI [6] contains only an unstructured short sentence as an explanation. Unlike five types of inconsistencies

Dataset	#Samples	Explanations	#Classes	Inconsistency localized?
Contradiction [9]	131	No	10	No
FEVER [32]	43107	No	1	No
e-SNLI [6]	189702	Yes	1	Yes
TaxiNLI [15]	3014	No	15	No
LIAR-PLUS [1]	5669	Yes	3	No
FICLE (Ours)	8055	Yes	5	Yes

Table 1: Comparison of FICLE with other datasets. #Samples indicates number of contradictory/inconsistent samples (and not the size of full dataset).

detected along with explanations by our proposed system, TaxiNLI [15] provides a two-level categorization for the NLI task. Thus, TaxiNLI focuses on NLI and not on inconsistencies specifically. Table 1 shows a comparison of our dataset with other closely related datasets.

In this work, based on linguistic theories, we carefully devise a taxonomic categorization with five inconsistency types: simple, gradable, set-based, negation, taxonomic relations. First, we obtain English (claim, context) sentence pairs from the FEVER dataset [32] which have been labeled as contradiction. We get them manually labeled with inconsistency types and other explanations (as shown in Fig. 1 by four annotators). Overall, the dataset contains 8055 samples labeled with five inconsistency types, 20 coarse inconsistent entity types and 60 fine-grained inconsistent entity types, whenever applicable.

We leverage the contributed dataset to train a pipeline of four neural models to predict inconsistency type with explanations: M_1 , M_2 , M_3 and M_4 . Given a (claim, context) sentence pair, M_1 predicts the inconsistent subject-relation-target fact triple $\langle S, R, T \rangle$ in the claim and also the inconsistent span in the context. M_2 uses M_1 's outputs to predict the inconsistency type and the inconsistent component (subject, relation or target) from the claim. M_3 uses the inconsistent context-span and inconsistent claim component to predict a coarse inconsistent entity type. M_4 leverages both M_3 's inputs and outputs to predict fine-grained inconsistent entity type. Overall, the intuition behind this pipeline design is to first predict inconsistent spans from claim and context; and then use them to predict inconsistency types and inconsistent entity types (when inconsistency is due to entities). Fig. 3 shows the overall system architecture for FICLE.

We investigate effectiveness of multiple standard Transformer [34]-based natural language understanding (NLU) as well as natural language generation (NLG) models as architectures for models M_1 , M_2 , M_3 and M_4 . Specifically, we experiment with models like BERT [10], RoBERTa [19] and DeBERTa [12] which are popular for NLU tasks. We also experiment with T5 [27] and BART [18] which are popular in the NLG community. DeBERTa seemed to outperform other models for most of the sub-tasks. Our results show that while inconsistency type classification is relatively easy, accurately detecting context span is still challenging.

Overall, in this work, we make the following main contributions. (1) We propose a novel problem of factual inconsistency detection with explanations given

a (claim, context) sentence pair. (2) We contribute a novel dataset, FICLE, manually annotated with inconsistency type and five other forms of explanations. We make the dataset publicly available¹. (3) We experiment with standard Transformer-based NLU and NLG models and propose a baseline pipeline for the FICLE task. (4) Our proposed pipeline provides a weighted F1 of $\sim 87\%$ for inconsistency type classification; weighted F1 of $\sim 86\%$ and $\sim 76\%$ for coarse (20-class) and fine-grained (60-class) inconsistent entity-type prediction respectively; and an IoU of $\sim 94\%$ and $\sim 65\%$ for claim and context span detection respectively.

2 Related Work

Factual Inconsistency in Natural Language Generations: Popular natural language generation models have been found to generate hallucinatory and inconsistent text [14]. Kryszynski et al. [16] and Cao et al. [7] found that around 30% of the summaries generated by state-of-the-art abstractive models were factually inconsistent. There are other summarization studies also which report factual inconsistency of generated summaries [22,23,25,36,39,41]. Similarly, several studies have pointed out semantic inaccuracy as a major problem with current natural language generation models for free-form text generation [5], data-to-text [11], question-answering [20], dialogue modeling [13,24], machine translation [40], and news generation [38]. Several statistical (like PARENT) and model-based metrics have been proposed to quantify the level of hallucination. Multiple data-related methods and modeling and inference methods have been proposed for mitigating hallucination [14], but their effectiveness is still limited. Hence, automated factual inconsistency detection is critical.

Natural Language Inference: Natural language inference (NLI) is the task of determining whether a hypothesis is true (entailment), false (contradiction), or undetermined (neutral) given a premise. NLI is a fundamental problem in natural language understanding and has many applications such as question answering, information extraction, and text summarization. Approaches used for NLI include earlier symbolic and statistical approaches to more recent deep learning approaches [3]. There are several datasets and benchmarks for evaluating NLI models, such as the Stanford Natural Language Inference (SNLI) Corpus [4], the Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference (MultiNLI) Corpus [37] and Adversarial NLI [26]. FEVER [32] is another dataset on a related problem of fact verification.

Recently there has been work on providing explanations along with the classification label for NLI. e-SNLI [6] provides a one-sentence explanation aiming to answer the question: “Why is a pair of sentences in a relation of entailment, neutrality, or contradiction?” Annotators were also asked to highlight the words that they considered essential for the label. NILE [17] is a two stage model built on e-SNLI which first generates candidate explanations and then processes explanations to infer the task label. Thorne et al. [33] evaluate LIME [28] and Anchor explanations [29] to predict token annotations that explain the entail-

ment relation in e-SNLI. LIAR-PLUS [1] contains political statements labeled as pants-fire, false, mostly-false, half-true, mostly-true, and true. The context and explanation is combined into a “extracted justification” paragraph in this dataset. Atanasova et al. [2] experiment with LIAR-PLUS dataset and find that jointly generating justification and predicting the class label together leads to best results.

There has also been work on detailed categorization beyond just the two classes: contradiction and entailment. Contradiction [9] is a tiny dataset with only 131 examples that provides a taxonomy of 10 contradiction types. Recently, TaxiNLI [15] dataset has been proposed with 15 classes for detailed categorization with the entailment and not the contradiction category. Continuing this line of work, in this paper, we contribute a new dataset, FICLE, which associates every (claim, context) sentence pair with (1) an inconsistency type (out of five) and (2) detailed explanations (inconsistent span in claim and context, inconsistent claim component, coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity types).

3 Inconsistency Type Classification

Factual inconsistencies in text can occur because of a number of different sentence constructions, some overt and others that are complex to discover even manually. We design a taxonomy of five inconsistency types following non-synonymous lexical relations classified by Saeed [30, p. 66–70]. The book mentions the following kinds of antonyms: simple, gradable, reverses, converses and taxonomic sisters. To this taxonomy, we added two extra categories, negation and set-based, to capture the FICLE’s complexity. Also, we expanded the definition of taxonomic sisters to more relations, and hence rename it to taxonomic relations. Further, since we did not find many examples of reverses and converses in our dataset, we merged them with the simple inconsistency category. Overall, our FICLE dataset contains these five different inconsistency types.

- Simple: A simple contradiction is a direct contradiction, where the negative of one implies the positive of the other in a pair like *pass vs. fail*. This also includes actions/ processes that can be reversed or have a reverse direction, like *come vs. go* and *fill vs. empty*. Pairs with alternate viewpoints like *employer vs. employee* and *above vs. below* are also included in this category.
- Gradable: Gradable contradictions include adjectival and relative contradictions, where the positive of one, does not imply the negative of other in a pair like *hot vs. cold*, *least vs. most*, or periods of time etc.
- Taxonomic relations: We include three kinds of relations in this type: (a) Pairs at the same taxonomic level in the language like *red vs. blue* which are placed parallel to each other under the English color adjectives hierarchy. (b) When a pair has a more general word (*hypernym*) and another more specific word which includes the meaning of the first word in the pair (*hyponym*) like *giraffe* (hypo) vs. *animal* (hyper). (c) Pairs with a part-whole relation like *nose vs. face* and *button vs. shirt*.

- Negation: This includes inconsistencies arising out of presence of explicit negation morphemes (e.g. *not*, *except*) or a finite verb negating an action (e.g. *fail to do X*, *incapable of X-ing*) etc.
- Set-based: This includes inconsistent examples where an object contrasts with a list that it is not a part of (e.g. *cat* vs. *bee*, *ant*, *wasp*).

4 The FICLE Dataset

4.1 Dataset Curation and Pre-processing

Our FICLE dataset is derived from the FEVER dataset [32] using the following processing steps. FEVER (Fact Extraction and VERification) consists of 185,445 claims generated by altering sentences extracted from Wikipedia and subsequently verified without knowledge of the sentence they were derived from. Every sample in the FEVER dataset contains the claim sentence, evidence (or context) sentence from a Wikipedia URL, a type label (‘supports’, ‘refutes’ or ‘not enough info’). Out of these, we leverage only the samples with ‘refutes’ label to build our dataset.

We propose a linguistically enriched dataset to help detect inconsistencies and explain them. To this end, the broad requirements are to locate where an inconsistency is present between a claim and a context, and to have a classification scheme for better explainability.

4.2 Annotation Details

To support detailed inconsistency explanations, we perform comprehensive annotations for each sample in the FICLE dataset. The annotations were done in two iterations. The first iteration focused on “syntactic oriented” annotations

Inconsistent Claim	Inconsistent Context Span	Inconsistent Claim Component
Prime Minister Swami Vivekananda <i>enthusiastically hoisted</i> the Indian flag.	Narendra Modi	Subject-Head
President Narendra Modi <i>enthusiastically hoisted</i> the Indian flag.	Prime Minister	Subject-Modifier
Prime Minister Narendra Modi <i>enthusiastically lowered</i> the Indian flag.	hoisted	Relation-Head
Prime Minister Narendra Modi <i>halfheartedly hoisted</i> the Indian flag.	enthusiastically	Relation-Modifier
Prime Minister Narendra Modi <i>enthusiastically hoisted</i> the Indian culture.	flag	Target-Head
Prime Minister Narendra Modi <i>enthusiastically hoisted</i> the American flag.	Indian	Target-Modifier

Table 2: Inconsistent Claim Fact Triple, Context Span and Claim Component examples for the context sentence “Prime Minister Narendra Modi enthusiastically hoisted the Indian flag.” Subject, relation and target in the claim are shown in bold, italics and underline respectively.

Claim	Context	Inconsistency Type	Coarse Inconsistent Entity Type	Fine-grained Inconsistent Entity Type
Kong: Skull Island is not a reboot .	The film is a reboot of the King Kong franchise and serves as the second film in Legendary’s MonsterVerse .	Negation	entertainment	brand
The Royal Tenenbaums only stars Emma Stone .	The film stars Danny Glover, Gene Hackman, Anjelica Huston, Bill Murray, Gwyneth Paltrow, Ben Stiller, Luke Wilson, and Owen Wilson .	Set Based	name	musician
Lindsay Lohan began her career as an adult fashion model .	Lohan began her career as a child fashion model when she was three, and was later featured on the soap opera Another World for a year when she was 10 .	Simple	time	age
Karl Malone played the shooting guard position .	He is considered one of the best power forwards in NBA history .	Taxonomic Relation	profession	sport
The Divergent Series: Insurgent is based on the third book in the Divergent trilogy.	The Divergent Series : Insurgent is a 2015 American science fiction action film directed by Robert Schwentke, based on Insurgent, the second book in the Divergent trilogy by Veronica Roth.	Gradable	quantity	ordinal

Table 3: Inconsistency Type and Coarse/Fine-grained Inconsistent Entity Type examples. Inconsistent spans are marked in bold in both claim as well as context.

while the second iteration focused on “semantic oriented” annotations. The annotations were performed using the Label Studio annotation tool² by a group of four annotators (two of which are also authors). The annotators are well versed in English and are Computer Science Bachelors students with a specialization in computational linguistics, in the age group of 20–22 years. Detailed annotation guidelines are in annotationGuidelines.pdf here¹.

Syntactic Oriented Annotations: In this annotation stage, the judges labeled the following syntactic fields per sample. Table 2 shows examples of each of these fields. (1) Inconsistent Claim Fact Triple: A claim can contain multiple facts. The annotators identified the fact that is inconsistent with the context. Further, the annotators labeled the span of source (S), relation (R) and target (T) within the claim fact. Sometimes, e.g., in case of an intransitive verb, the target was empty. Further, for each of the S, R and T, the annotators also labeled head and modifier separately. The head indicates the main noun (for S and T) or the verb phrase (for R) while the modifier is phrase that serves to modify the meaning of the noun or the verb. (2) Inconsistent Context Span: A span marked in the context sentence which is inconsistent with the claim. (3) Inconsistent Claim Component: This can take six possible values depending on the part of the claim fact triple that is inconsistent with the context: Subject-Head, Subject-Modifier, Relation-Head, Relation-Modifier, Target-Head, Target-Modifier.

² <https://labelstud.io/>

Semantic Oriented Annotations: In this annotation stage, the annotators labeled the following semantic fields per sample. Table 3 shows examples of each of these fields. (1) Inconsistency Type: Each sample is annotated with one of the five inconsistency types as discussed in Section 3. (2) Coarse Inconsistent Entity Type: When the inconsistency is because of an entity, the annotator also labeled one of the 20 coarse types for the entity causing the inconsistency. The types are action, animal, entertainment, gender, geography, identity, material, name, nationality, organization, others, politics, profession, quantity, reality, relationship, sentiment, sport, technology and time. (3) Fine-grained Inconsistent Entity Type: Further, when the inconsistency is because of an entity, the annotator also labeled one of the 60 fine-grained types for the entity causing the inconsistency.

For inconsistency entity type detection, the annotations were performed in two iterations. In the first iteration, the annotators were allowed to annotate the categories (both at coarse and fine-grained level) freely without any limited category set. This was performed on 500 samples. The annotators then discussed and de-duplicated the category names. Some rare categories were merged with frequent ones. This led to a list of 20 coarse and 60 fine-grained entity types (including “others”). In the second iteration, annotators were asked to choose one of these categories. We measured inter-annotator agreement on 500 samples. For source, relation, target and inconsistent context spans, the intersection over union (IoU) was found to be 0.91, 0.83, 0.85 and 0.76 respectively. Further, the Kappa score was found to be 0.78, 0.71 and 0.67 for the inconsistency type, coarse inconsistent entity type and fine-grained inconsistent entity type respectively.




Fig. 2: Distribution of coarse inconsistent entity types in FICLE.

		Min	Avg	Max
	Claim	3	8.04	31
	Context	5	30.73	138
Incon. Claim	Source	1	2.29	9
	Relation	1	2.17	18
	Target	0	3.39	21
	Incon. Context-Span	1	5.11	94

Table 4: Minimum, average, and maximum size (words) of various fields averaged across samples in FICLE dataset.

4.3 FICLE Dataset Statistics

The FICLE dataset consists of 8055 samples in English with five inconsistency types. The distribution across the five types is as follows: Taxonomic Relations (4842), Negation (1630), Set Based (642), Gradable (526) and Simple (415). There are six possible inconsistent claim components with distribution as follows: Target-Head (3960), Target-Modifier (1529), Relation-Head (951),




Fig. 3: FICLE: System Architecture

Relation-Modifier (1534), Source-Head (45), Source-Modifier (36). The dataset contains 20 coarse inconsistent entity types as shown in Fig. 2. Further, these are sub-divided into 60 fine-grained entity types. Table 4 shows average sizes of various fields averaged across samples in the dataset. The dataset was divided into train, valid and test splits in the ratio of 80:10:10.

5 Neural Methods for Factual Inconsistency Classification with Explanations

We leverage the FICLE dataset to train models for factual inconsistency classification with explanations. Specifically, given the claim and context sentence, our system does predictions in the following stages: (A) Predict Inconsistent Claim Fact Triple (S,R,T) and Inconsistent Context Span, (B) Predict Inconsistency Type and Inconsistent Claim Component, (C) Predict Coarse and Fine-grained Inconsistent Entity Type. Overall, the system architecture consists of a pipeline of four neural models to predict inconsistency type with explanations: M_1 , M_2 , M_3 and M_4 , and is illustrated in Fig. 3. We discuss details of the three stages and the pipeline in this section.

Model Architectures We experiment with five pretrained models of which two are natural language generation (NLG) models. Specifically, we finetune Transformer [34] encoder based models like BERT [10], RoBERTa [19] and DeBERTa [12]. We also use two NLG models: BART [18] and T5 [27] which are popular in the NLG community.

BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) [10] essentially is a transformer encoder with 12 layers, 12 attention heads and 768 dimensions. We used the pre-trained model which has been trained on Books Corpus and Wikipedia using the MLM (masked language model) and the next sentence prediction (NSP) loss functions. RoBERTa [19] is a robustly optimized method for pretraining natural language processing (NLP) systems that improves on BERT. RoBERTa was trained with 160GB of text, trained for larger number of iterations up to 500K with batch sizes of 8K and a larger byte-pair encoding (BPE) vocabulary of 50K subword units, without NSP loss. DeBERTa [12] is trained using a special attention mechanism where content and position embeddings are disentangled. It also has an enhanced mask decoder which leverages

absolute word positions effectively. BART [18] is a denoising autoencoder for pre-training sequence-to-sequence models. BART is trained by (1) corrupting text with an arbitrary noising function, and (2) learning a model to reconstruct the original text. T5 [27] is also a Transformer encoder-decoder model pretrained on Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus, and models all NLP tasks in generative form.

When encoding input or output for these models, we prepend various semantic units using special tokens like $\langle \text{claim} \rangle$, $\langle \text{context} \rangle$, $\langle \text{source} \rangle$, $\langle \text{relation} \rangle$, $\langle \text{target} \rangle$, $\langle \text{contextSpan} \rangle$, $\langle \text{claimComponent} \rangle$, $\langle \text{type} \rangle$, $\langle \text{coarseEntityType} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{fineEntityType} \rangle$. NLG models (BART and T5) generate the inconsistency type and all explanations, and are trained using cross entropy loss. For NLU models (BERT, RoBERTa, DeBERTa), we prepend input with a [CLS] token and use its semantic representation from the last layer with a dense layer to predict inconsistency type, inconsistent claim component, and entity types with categorical cross entropy loss. With NLU models, source, relation, target, and context span are predicted using start and end token classifiers (using cross entropy loss) as usually done in the question answering literature [10].

Stage A: Predict Inconsistent Spans In this stage, we first train models to predict source, relation and target by passing the claim sentence as input to the models. Further, to predict inconsistent context span, we experiment with four different methods as follows. (1) Structure-ignorant: The input is claim and context sentence. The aim is to directly predict inconsistent context span ignoring the “source, relation, target” structure of the claim. (2) Two-step: First step takes claim and context sentences as input, and predicts source, relation and target (SRT). Second step augments source, relation and target to the input along with claim and context, and predicts the inconsistent context span. (3) Multi-task: The input is claim and context sentence. The goal is to jointly predict source, relation, target and inconsistent context span. (4) Oracle-structure: The input is claim and context sentence, and ground truth (source, relation and target). These are all used together to predict inconsistent context span.

Stage B: Predict Inconsistency Type and Claim Component

This stage assumes that (1) SRT from claim and (2) inconsistent context span have already been predicted. Thus, in this stage, the input is claim, context, predicted SRT and predicted inconsistent context span. Using these inputs, to predict inconsistency type and inconsistent claim component, we experiment with three different methods as follows. (1) Individual: Predict inconsistency type and inconsistent claim component separately. (2) Two-step: First step predicts inconsistent claim component. Second step augments the predicted inconsistent claim component to the input, and predicts inconsistency type. (3) Multi-task: Jointly predict inconsistency type and inconsistent claim component in a multi-task learning setup.

Stage C: Predict Inconsistent Entity Types

To find inconsistent entity types, we build several models each of which take two main inputs: inconsistent context span and the span from the claim corresponding to the inconsistent claim component. We experiment with the following different models. (1) Individual: Predict coarse and fine-grained inconsistent en-

tity type separately. (2) Two-step: First step predicts coarse inconsistent entity type. Second step augments the predicted coarse inconsistent entity type to the input, and predicts fine-grained type.

Further, we also attempt to leverage semantics from entity class names. Hence, we use the NLU models (BERT, RoBERTa, DeBERTa) to obtain embeddings for entity class names, and train NLU models to predict the class name which is most similar to semantic representation (of the [CLS] token) of the input. We use cosine embedding loss to train these models. Specifically, using class (i.e., entity type) embeddings, we train the following models. Note that we cannot train NLG models using class embeddings; thus we perform this experiment using NLU models only. (1) Individual Embedding: Predict coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity type separately using entity type embeddings. (2) Two-step Embedding: First step predicts coarse inconsistent entity type using class embeddings. Second step augments the predicted coarse inconsistent entity type to the input, and predicts fine-grained type using class embeddings. (3) Two-step Mix: First step predicts coarse inconsistent entity type using class embeddings. Second step augments the predicted coarse inconsistent entity type to the input, and predicts fine-grained type using typical multi-class classification without class embeddings.

After experimenting with various model choices for the three stages described in this section, we find that the configuration described in Fig. 3 provides best results. We also attempted other designs like (1) predicting all outputs (inconsistency type and all explanations) jointly as a 6-task setting using just claim and context as input, (2) identifying claim component only as S, R or T rather than heads versus modifiers. However, these alternate designs did not lead to better results.

6 Experiments and Results

For prediction of spans like source, relation, target, and inconsistent context span, we use exact match (EM) and intersection over union (IoU) metrics. EM is a number from 0 to 1 that specifies the amount of overlap between the predicted and ground truth span in terms of tokens. If the characters of the model’s prediction exactly match the characters of ground truth span, $EM = 1$, otherwise $EM = 0$. Similarly, IoU measures intersection over union in terms of tokens. For classification tasks like inconsistency type prediction as well as coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity type prediction, we use metrics like accuracy and weighted F1.

Since factual inconsistency classification is a novel task, there are no existing baseline methods to compare with.

Source, Relation, Target and Inconsistent Context Span Prediction: Table 5 shows results for source, relation and target prediction from claim sentences. The table shows that T5 works best except for prediction of relation and target using the exact match metric. Further, Table 6 shows that surprisingly structure ignorant method is slightly better than the two-step method.

Model	Exact Match			IoU		
	Source	Relation	Target	Source	Relation	Target
BERT	0.919	0.840	0.877	0.934	0.876	0.895
RoBERTa	0.921	0.865	0.871	0.936	0.883	0.885
DeBERTa	0.918	0.857	0.864	0.932	0.874	0.893
BART	0.981	0.786	0.741	0.986	0.873	0.842
T5	0.983	0.816	0.765	0.988	0.945	0.894

Table 5: Source, Relation and Target Prediction from Claim Sentence

Model	Exact Match			IoU		
	Structure-ignorant	Two-step	Oracle-structure	Structure-ignorant	Two-step	Oracle-structure
BERT	0.483	0.499	0.519	0.561	0.541	0.589
RoBERTa	0.542	0.534	0.545	0.589	0.584	0.632
DeBERTa	0.538	0.540	0.569	0.591	0.587	0.637
BART	0.427	0.292	0.361	0.533	0.404	0.486
T5	0.396	0.301	0.352	0.517	0.416	0.499

Table 6: Inconsistent Context Span Prediction

Model	Exact Match				IoU			
	Source	Relation	Target	Context Span	Source	Relation	Target	Context Span
BERT	0.769	0.665	0.752	0.524	0.801	0.708	0.804	0.566
RoBERTa	0.759	0.686	0.780	0.572	0.828	0.745	0.836	0.617
DeBERTa	0.788	0.704	0.819	0.604	0.843	0.768	0.844	0.650
BART	0.973	0.816	0.836	0.501	0.979	0.874	0.895	0.549
T5	0.981	0.764	0.717	0.570	0.988	0.870	0.842	0.602

Table 7: Joint Prediction of Source, Relation and Target Prediction from Claim Sentence and Inconsistent Context Span using Multi-Task Setting

Oracle method with DeBERTa expectedly is the best. NLG models (BART and T5) perform much worse compared to NLU models for context span prediction. Lastly, we show results of jointly predicting source, relation, target and inconsistent context span in Table 7. The table shows while T5 and BART are better at predicting source, relation and target, DeBERTa is a clear winner in predicting the inconsistent context span.

Inconsistency Type and Inconsistent Claim Component Prediction:

Tables 8 and 9 show the results for the inconsistency type and inconsistent claim component prediction. Note that the two problems are 5-class and 6-class classification respectively. We observe that joint multi-task model outperforms the other two methods. Also, DeBERTa is the best model across all settings. For this best model, the F1 scores for the inconsistency types are as follows: Taxonomic Relations (0.92), Negation (0.86), Set Based (0.65), Gradable (0.78) and Simple (0.81).

Inconsistent Entity Type Prediction: Tables 10 and 11 show accuracy and weighted F1 for coarse and fine-grained inconsistent entity type prediction respectively. We make the following observations from these tables: (1) DeBERTa outperforms all other models for both the predictions. (2) For coarse inconsistent entity type prediction, the embedding based approach works better than

Model	Accuracy			Weighted F1		
	Individual	Two-step	Multi-task	Individual	Two-step	Multi-task
BERT	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.86	0.86
RoBERTa	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.87
DeBERTa	0.86	0.85	0.87	0.86	0.87	0.87
BART	0.57	0.60	0.73	0.59	0.64	0.74
T5	0.53	0.61	0.74	0.58	0.66	0.74

Table 8: Inconsistency Type Prediction

Model	Accuracy		Weighted F1	
	Individual	Multi-task	Individual	Multi-task
BERT	0.83	0.88	0.83	0.88
RoBERTa	0.85	0.89	0.85	0.89
DeBERTa	0.88	0.89	0.89	0.89
BART	0.80	0.75	0.81	0.76
T5	0.81	0.75	0.81	0.75

Table 9: Inconsistent Claim Component Prediction (6-class classification)

the typical classification approach. This is because there are rich semantics in the entity class names that are effectively leveraged by the embedding based approach. (3) For fine-grained inconsistent entity type prediction, two-step method is better than individual method both with and without embeddings. (4) The two-step mix method where we use embeddings based method to predict coarse inconsistent entity type and then usual 60-class classification for fine-grained types performs the best.

Qualitative Analysis To further understand where our model goes wrong, we show the confusion matrix for inconsistency type prediction for our best model in Table 12. We observe that the model labels many set-based examples as ‘taxonomic relations’ leading to poor F1 for the set-based class. In general most of the confusion is between ‘taxonomic relations’ and other classes.

Amongst the coarse entity types, we found the F1 to be highest for time, action, quantity, nationality and geography entity types, and lowest for animal, relationship, gender, sentiment and technology entity types.

Further, for inconsistency spans in the context, we observe that the average length of accurate predictions (3.16) is much smaller than inaccurate predictions (8.54), comparing the lengths of ground truth spans. Further, for inaccurate predictions, we observe that as the length of the inconsistency span increases, the

Model	Accuracy		Weighted F1	
	Individual	Individual Embedding	Individual	Individual Embedding
BERT	0.82	0.84	0.78	0.84
RoBERTa	0.83	0.86	0.80	0.85
DeBERTa	0.85	0.87	0.81	0.86
BART	0.73	-	0.71	-
T5	0.74	-	0.73	-

Table 10: Coarse Inconsistent Entity Type Prediction. Note that embedding based methods don’t work with NLG models.

Model	Individual	Two-step	Individual Embedding	Two-step Embedding	Two-step Mix
BERT	0.65/0.59	0.74/0.71	0.64/0.62	0.72/0.70	0.75/0.71
RoBERTa	0.69/0.65	0.75/0.73	0.72/0.68	0.76/0.73	0.76/0.75
DeBERTa	0.70/0.67	0.77/0.74	0.73/0.70	0.76/0.73	0.78/0.76
BART	0.50/0.44	0.64/0.59	-	-	-
T5	0.56/0.48	0.67/0.62	-	-	-

Table 11: Accuracy/Weighted F1 for Fine-grained Inconsistent Entity Type Prediction. Note that embedding based methods do not work with NLG models.

		Predicted				
		Taxonomic Relations	Negation	Set Based	Gradable	Simple
Actual	Taxonomic Relations	456	16	4	17	9
	Negation	11	123	3	0	4
	Set Based	17	4	22	1	1
	Gradable	16	1	2	51	0
	Simple	6	2	2	2	36

Table 12: Confusion matrix for inconsistency type prediction. We observe a high correlation between actual and predicted values, indicating our model is effective.

coverage of ground truth tokens by the predicted tokens, decreases on an average. Further, we categorized inaccurate span predictions into 4 buckets (additive, reordered, changed and subtractive). Additive implies more terms compared to ground truth, reordered means same terms but reordered, changed means some new terms were generated by the model, and subtractive means misses out on terms compared to ground truth. We found that ~ 91 were of subtractive type, indicating that our inconsistency span predictor model is too terse and can be improved by reducing sampling probability for end of sequence token.

Hyper-parameters for Reproducibility: The experiments were run on a machine with four GEFORCE RTX 2080 Ti GPUs. We used a batch size of 16 and the AdamW optimizer [21] and trained for 5 epochs for all models. We used the following models: bert-base-uncased, roberta-base, microsoft/deberta-base, facebook/bart-base, and t5-small. Learning rate was set to $1e-4$ for BART and T5, and to $1e-5$ for other models. More details are available in the code¹.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we investigated the problem of detecting and explaining types of factual inconsistencies in text. We contributed a new dataset, FICLE, with $\sim 8K$ samples with detailed inconsistency labels for (claim, context) pairs. We experimented with multiple natural language understanding and generation models towards the problem. We found that a pipeline of four models which predict inconsistency spans in claim and context followed by inconsistency type prediction and finally inconsistent entity type prediction works the best. Also, we observed that DeBERTa led to the best results. In the future, we plan to extend this work to multi-lingual scenarios. We also plan to extend this work to perform inconsistency detection and localization across multiple sentences given a paragraph.

8 Ethical Statement

In this work, we derived a dataset from FEVER dataset³. Data annotations in FEVER incorporate material from Wikipedia, which is licensed pursuant to the Wikipedia Copyright Policy. These annotations are made available under the license terms described on the applicable Wikipedia article pages, or, where Wikipedia license terms are unavailable, under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License (version 3.0), available at this link: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>. Thus, we made use of the dataset in accordance with its appropriate usage terms.

The FICLE dataset does not contain any personally identifiable information. Details of the manual annotations are explained in Section 4 as well as in annotationGuidelines.pdf at <https://github.com/blitzprecision/FICLE>.

References

1. Alhindi, T., Petridis, S., Muresan, S.: Where is your evidence: Improving fact-checking by justification modeling. In: Proceedings of the first workshop on fact extraction and verification (FEVER). pp. 85–90 (2018)
2. Atanasova, P., Simonsen, J.G., Lioma, C., Augenstein, I.: Generating fact checking explanations. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 7352–7364 (2020)
3. Bowman, S.R., Angeli, G., Potts, C., Manning, C.D.: A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In: Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2015. pp. 632–642. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL) (2015)
4. Bowman, S.R., Angeli, G., Potts, C., Manning, C.D.: A large, annotated corpus for learning natural language inference; 2015. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.05326> Accessed June 21 (2021)
5. Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al.: Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020)
6. Camburu, O.M., Rocktäschel, T., Lukasiewicz, T., Blunsom, P.: e-snli: Natural language inference with natural language explanations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31**, 9539–9549 (2018)
7. Cao, Z., Wei, F., Li, W., Li, S.: Faithful to the original: Fact aware neural abstractive summarization. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. vol. 32 (2018)
8. Ciampaglia, G.L., Shiralkar, P., Rocha, L.M., Bollen, J., Menczer, F., Flammini, A.: Computational fact checking from knowledge networks. *PloS one* **10**(6), e0128193 (2015)
9. De Marneffe, M.C., Rafferty, A.N., Manning, C.D.: Finding contradictions in text. In: Proceedings of ACL-08: HLT. pp. 1039–1047 (2008)
10. Devlin, J., Chang, M., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 (2018)

³ <https://fever.ai/dataset/fever.html>

11. Dušek, O., Kasner, Z.: Evaluating semantic accuracy of data-to-text generation with natural language inference. In: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Natural Language Generation. pp. 131–137 (2020)
12. He, P., Liu, X., Gao, J., Chen, W.: Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654 (2020)
13. Honovich, O., Choshen, L., Aharoni, R., Neeman, E., Szpektor, I., Abend, O.: q^2 : Evaluating factual consistency in knowledge-grounded dialogues via question generation and question answering. arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08202 (2021)
14. Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y., Madotto, A., Fung, P.: Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. ACM Computing Surveys p. To appear (Nov 2022)
15. Joshi, P., Aditya, S., Sathe, A., Choudhury, M.: Taxinli: Taking a ride up the nlu hill. In: Proceedings of the 24th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning. pp. 41–55 (2020)
16. Kryściński, W., Keskar, N.S., McCann, B., Xiong, C., Socher, R.: Neural text summarization: A critical evaluation. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP). pp. 540–551 (2019)
17. Kumar, S., Talukdar, P.: Nile: Natural language inference with faithful natural language explanations. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 8730–8742 (2020)
18. Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., Stoyanov, V., Zettlemoyer, L.: Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 7871–7880 (2020)
19. Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., Levy, O., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V.: Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692 (2019)
20. Longpre, S., Perisetla, K., Chen, A., Ramesh, N., DuBois, C., Singh, S.: Entity-based knowledge conflicts in question answering. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 7052–7063 (2021)
21. Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F.: Decoupled weight decay regularization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101 (2017)
22. Mao, Y., Ren, X., Ji, H., Han, J.: Constrained abstractive summarization: Preserving factual consistency with constrained generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12723 (2020)
23. Maynez, J., Narayan, S., Bohnet, B., McDonald, R.: On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 1906–1919 (2020)
24. Mesgar, M., Simpson, E., Gurevych, I.: Improving factual consistency between a response and persona facts. In: Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume. pp. 549–562 (2021)
25. Nan, F., Nallapati, R., Wang, Z., dos Santos, C., Zhu, H., Zhang, D., McKeown, K., Xiang, B.: Entity-level factual consistency of abstractive text summarization. In: Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume. pp. 2727–2733 (2021)

26. Nie, Y., Williams, A., Dinan, E., Bansal, M., Weston, J., Kiela, D.: Adversarial nli: A new benchmark for natural language understanding. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 4885–4901 (2020)
27. Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., Liu, P.J.: Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21**(1), 5485–5551 (2020)
28. Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S., Guestrin, C.: ” why should i trust you?” explaining the predictions of any classifier. In: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining. pp. 1135–1144 (2016)
29. Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S., Guestrin, C.: Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. vol. 32 (2018)
30. Saeed, J.: *Semantics. Introducing Linguistics*, Wiley (2011)
31. Shi, B., Weninger, T.: Discriminative predicate path mining for fact checking in knowledge graphs. *Knowledge-based systems* **104**, 123–133 (2016)
32. Thorne, J., Vlachos, A., Christodoulopoulos, C., Mittal, A.: Fever: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and verification. In: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers). pp. 809–819 (2018)
33. Thorne, J., Vlachos, A., Christodoulopoulos, C., Mittal, A.: Generating token-level explanations for natural language inference. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers). pp. 963–969 (2019)
34. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need. In: NIPS. pp. 5998–6008 (2017)
35. Vedula, N., Parthasarathy, S.: Face-keg: Fact checking explained using knowledge graphs. In: Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining. pp. 526–534 (2021)
36. Wang, A., Cho, K., Lewis, M.: Asking and answering questions to evaluate the factual consistency of summaries. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 5008–5020 (2020)
37. Williams, A., Nangia, N., Bowman, S.: A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers). pp. 1112–1122. Association for Computational Linguistics, New Orleans, Louisiana (Jun 2018). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1101>, <https://aclanthology.org/N18-1101>
38. Zellers, R., Holtzman, A., Rashkin, H., Bisk, Y., Farhadi, A., Roesner, F., Choi, Y.: Defending against neural fake news. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **32** (2019)
39. Zhang, S., Niu, J., Wei, C.: Fine-grained factual consistency assessment for abstractive summarization models. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 107–116 (2021)
40. Zhou, C., Neubig, G., Gu, J., Diab, M., Guzmán, F., Zettlemoyer, L., Ghazvininejad, M.: Detecting hallucinated content in conditional neural sequence generation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021. pp. 1393–1404 (2021)

41. Zhu, C., Hinthorn, W., Xu, R., Zeng, Q., Zeng, M., Huang, X., Jiang, M.: Enhancing factual consistency of abstractive summarization. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. pp. 718–733 (2021)