

# Aspect-Based Summarization with Self-Aspect Retrieval Enhanced Generation

Yichao Feng  
College of Computing and Data Science  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore, Singapore  
yichao.feng@ntu.edu.sg

Shuai Zhao  
College of Computing and Data Science  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore, Singapore  
shuai.zhao@ntu.edu.sg

Yueqiu Li  
School of Humanities  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore, Singapore  
LIYU0069@e.ntu.edu.sg

Luwei Xiao  
School of Computer Science and Technology  
East China Normal University  
Shanghai, China  
louisshaw@stu.ecnu.edu.cn

Xiaobao Wu  
College of Computing and Data Science  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore, Singapore  
xiaobao002@e.ntu.edu.sg

Anh Tuan Luu  
College of Computing and Data Science  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore, Singapore  
anhtuan.luu@ntu.edu.sg

**Abstract**—Aspect-based summarization aims to generate summaries tailored to specific aspects, addressing the resource constraints and limited generalizability of traditional summarization approaches. Recently, large language models have shown promise in this task without the need for training. However, they rely excessively on prompt engineering and face token limits and hallucination challenges, especially with in-context learning. To address these challenges, in this paper, we propose a novel framework for aspect-based summarization: Self-Aspect Retrieval Enhanced Summary Generation. Rather than relying solely on in-context learning, given an aspect, we employ an embedding-driven retrieval mechanism to identify its relevant text segments. This approach extracts the pertinent content while avoiding unnecessary details, thereby mitigating the challenge of token limits. Moreover, our framework optimizes token usage by deleting unrelated parts of the text and ensuring that the model generates output strictly based on the given aspect. With extensive experiments on benchmark datasets, we demonstrate that our framework not only achieves superior performance but also effectively mitigates the token limitation problem.

**Index Terms**—Summarization, Large Language Models, In-Context Learning, Long Document Analysis

## I. INTRODUCTION

Aspect-based summarization (ABS) produces concise summaries tailored to specific user needs, addressing the limitations of general summarization by focusing on targeted, nuanced information. This approach has proven particularly effective for specialized domains, such as customer sentiment analysis [1], [2], financial analysis [3], [4], legislative proposals [5], and legal documents [6]. ABS integrates seamlessly with large language models (LLMs), which have revolutionized summarization by offering significant advantages over traditional methods [7]–[11].

Research shows that LLM-generated summaries are often preferred by humans over those produced by earlier techniques [12]. The integration of ABS with LLMs offers new opportunities for improving summarization, enabling the creation of summaries that are both contextually relevant and application-specific. This synergy has the potential to

improve summarization performance in real-world applications and address the growing demand for aspect-oriented, domain-specific summarization.

However, despite their advantages, the existing LLM-based summarization approaches discussed above face several critical challenges. First, most LLMs are constrained by limited input context length [13], making it difficult to effectively summarize lengthy texts. While some models [14], [15] have been developed to handle extended inputs, they often struggle to produce accurate summaries due to the increased complexity. This constraint forces LLMs to truncate or omit critical details, especially when relying on techniques like in-context learning (ICL). Furthermore, ICL, which involves providing relevant examples or prompts within the input, reduces the available token space for the actual content, further complicating the generation of precise, aspect-focused summaries. Second, LLMs often lack the ability to apply selective attention, processing the entire input indiscriminately rather than focusing on the most relevant parts. This lack of focus exacerbates the problem of hallucination—generating content that is either irrelevant or factually incorrect—particularly when dealing with long or complex texts [16]. Unlike humans, who can synthesize information from extended inputs while maintaining accuracy, LLMs may introduce inconsistencies or fabricate details, leading to degraded performance in aspect-based summarization. Addressing these challenges is crucial to improving the reliability and utility of LLM-generated summaries.

To address these challenges, we propose a novel retrieve-and-prune method called Self-Aspect Retrieval Enhanced Summary Generation (SARESG). Instead of feeding the entire text or relying solely on prompting methods, we perform a dense retrieval task using an embedding model. This retrieval process extracts the most relevant chunks of text, focusing exclusively on sections directly related to the desired aspect of the summary. The retrieval process is recursive, continuing until the text is pruned to the desired

length. Pruning not only helps mitigate the issue of token limits but also addresses the challenge of hallucination. By eliminating irrelevant and redundant content, the model's attention is directed exclusively toward pertinent information, reducing the likelihood of generating fabricated or inaccurate details. Shorter, aspect-focused inputs help the model maintain factual consistency and produce summaries that are highly aligned with the specified aspect. In addition, this pruning process simplifies input, making it easier for the model to synthesize and process the information effectively. To further enhance the summarization process, a re-ranking mechanism is employed after the retrieval and pruning steps, helping the model better understand the context of the remaining text. By preserving valuable token space, our method allows for the integration of ICL techniques [17], such as guiding prompts or system instructions, which further refine the generation process. Ultimately, by efficiently focusing on relevant content, optimizing token usage, and reducing the risk of hallucination, our method significantly improves the precision, relevance, and reliability of LLM-generated summaries, unlocking the full potential of LLMs for ABS tasks.

We conducted comprehensive experiments to evaluate the robustness and efficiency of our system. The experimental results demonstrate that our approach consistently generates more accurate, aspect-aligned summaries across diverse datasets. Moreover, it enables more efficient text pruning compared to traditional truncation methods commonly used in ABS systems, while achieving superior performance through the integration of ICL techniques.

The main contributions of this paper can be concluded as follows:

- We proposed a self-retrieval mechanism that effectively eliminates text segments irrelevant to the desired aspect of the summary. This approach enhances the precision of ABS by guiding the model's attention to the most pertinent information.
- Our method conserves a token space, enabling the use of ICL and system prompts, which improves the customization and adaptability of the summarization process.
- We conduct extensive experiments across various language models and datasets, demonstrating the strong performance of our proposed method. Detailed ablation studies further highlight the robustness of our approach and the effectiveness of incorporating ICL.

## II. RELATED WORK

*a) Aspect-based Summarization:* ABS aims to generate summaries that are organized around specific aspects or attributes of the input content [18], rather than providing a generic overview. It has been extensively studied in both structured and unstructured data contexts, including customer reviews [19], [20], legal decisions [21], and news documents [22]. The goal is to extract or generate summaries that highlight key opinions, facts, or narratives associated with predefined or inferred aspects. This task is particularly important in applications such as product review analysis, where users may

prioritize different aspects (e.g., "price," "quality," "durability"), or in domains like opinion mining on social or political topics.

Traditional ABS methods often adopt a two-step approach: first, extract relevant content and then generate a summary [23]. Some studies have also explored training Longformer models [24], leveraging their extended attention capabilities to handle long sequences.

*b) LLM-based Summarization:* The emergence of LLMs, such as Llama and ChatGPT, has revolutionized the field of natural language processing [25]–[30], including text summarization. These models are trained in vast corpora of text, enabling them to capture nuanced linguistic patterns, contextual dependencies, and domain-specific knowledge. Consequently, LLMs have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in both extractive and abstractive summarization tasks, significantly outperforming traditional and task-specific approaches [31], [32].

The current work involves two types of structures. The first structure focuses on training and tuning. Some systems employ few-shot tuning methods [33], where the model is fine-tuned on a small dataset, or parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods [34]. However, these approaches often lack generalizability and are time-consuming. The second structure involves utilizing prompting techniques. This includes crafting carefully designed prompts for specific tasks [35] or leveraging ICL for summarization tasks [36], [37].

## III. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we will introduce our SARESG system. As illustrated in Figure 1 which provides an overview of our approach. Where we utilized the power of embedding model to retrieve and prune the unrelated part of the document and generate an aspect based summary. By doing so, we ensure that the content fed into the summarization model is highly relevant to the specific aspects being analyzed. This approach allows for the generation of more precise and focused ABS.

Our method also supports the processing of longer input texts, a feature that enhances the richness and depth of the summaries. Additionally, by incorporating retrieval, we enable the use of ICL for the summarization task, making it applicable across a wide range of datasets. This adaptability is crucial for achieving high-quality summaries in diverse domains.

### A. Sentences retrieval

We begin by splitting the document  $D$  into multiple sequential chunks, represented as

$$D = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots, d_n\}, \quad (1)$$

where each chunk  $d_i$  (except for the last one) contains exactly 256 words. This fixed chunk size ensures that each  $d_i$  contains enough contextual information to enable effective extraction of relevant content. Let  $A$  denote the desired topic or aspect that we aim to extract from the document. A further analysis was conducted in Section V-B to demonstrate that the model achieves higher performance when using chunking instead of directly processing sentences.




Fig. 1: This diagram illustrates the generation process of the system. The model first evaluates the overall length of the input text. If the text is shorter than a predefined threshold, it is directly fed into the LLM for summary generation. For longer texts, the system splits the input into smaller chunks, uses an embedding model to assign relevance scores to each chunk, filters out the least relevant parts, and reconstructs the remaining content in its original order to ensure readability and coherence for the model.

Next, we introduce an embedding model  $f(\cdot)$  that maps each chunk  $d_i$  and the aspect  $A$  to their respective embedding representations in a high-dimensional semantic space. We define the embedding of  $d_i$  as  $f(d_i)$  and the embedding of  $A$  as  $f(A)$ . For each chunk  $d_i$ , we calculate the similarity  $S_i$  between  $f(d_i)$  and  $f(A)$  using a similarity measure. Common choices include cosine similarity.

Within each chunk  $d_i$ , let  $d_i = \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, \dots, s_{i,m_i}\}$ , where  $s_{i,j}$  represents the  $j$ -th sentence in chunk  $d_i$  and  $m_i$  is the total number of sentences in  $d_i$ . For each sentence  $s_{i,j}$ , we compute the similarity score  $S_{i,j}$  with respect to  $A$ :

$$S_{i,j} = \cos(f(s_{i,j}), f(A)) = \frac{f(s_{i,j}) \cdot f(A)}{\|f(s_{i,j})\| \|f(A)\|}. \quad (2)$$

Next, we rank all sentences  $s_{i,j}$  within each chunk  $d_i$  by their similarity scores  $S_{i,j}$  in descending order. We then select the top sentences with the highest  $S_{i,j}$  values until the cumulative word count of the selected sentences reaches a predefined threshold  $W$  (total number of words). This subset of selected sentences from each chunk is denoted as  $d_i^{\text{pruned}}$ , and can be formally defined as:

$$d_i^{\text{pruned}} = \text{Top-}W\{s_{i,j} : S_{i,j}\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\text{Top-}W\{s_{i,j} : S_{i,j}\}$  returns the sentences ordered by  $S_{i,j}$  until the cumulative word count meets the word threshold  $W$  for each chunk  $d_i$ .

After selecting the most relevant sentences within each chunk, we rearrange them in their original sequential order as they appeared in  $D$  to maintain coherence. Finally, we define the pruned document  $D_{\text{pruned}}$  as the concatenation of all pruned chunks  $d_i^{\text{pruned}}$  in their original order:

$$D_{\text{pruned}} = \{d_1^{\text{pruned}}, d_2^{\text{pruned}}, \dots, d_n^{\text{pruned}}\}. \quad (4)$$

The final pruned document  $D_{\text{pruned}}$  preserves the original sequential order of sentences that have the highest relevance to the aspect  $A$ , while adhering to the predefined word limit, thereby forming a condensed, aspect-specific representation of the original document  $D$ .

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

### A. Experiment Setup

In this section, we introduce the experimental details, which include the datasets, metrics, models, and experimental detail. **Datasets** To evaluate the robustness of our method, we conducted experiments on three ABS datasets: USB [38], OASum [39], and Ma-news [40]. Each dataset differs in average text length and number of aspects, allowing us to test our approach across varied data characteristics. Due to the constrain of the computational resources, we selected the first 2000 rows of data for Ma-news and OASum. Furthermore, due to the token limit in the ICL setting, overly long demonstration examples may lead to token depletion. Therefore, we only retain samples with a length of less than 1024.

#	Method	METEOR	ROUGE			BERTSCORE		
			R1	R2	RL	Precision	Recall	F1
MA-news								
1	Original	22.91	18.21	5.63	12.38	53.64	44.04	48.06
2	Selective Context	20.45	17.01	4.24	11.34	51.33	43.54	46.87
3	SARESG	24.07	19.62	6.20	13.28	54.77	45.22	49.24
5	Truncated_ICL	25.33	23.66	7.28	15.24	62.83	46.88	53.24
6	SARESG_ICL	26.83	24.20	7.31	15.51	58.02	48.97	52.91
OASum								
1	Original	22.39	16.51	5.80	11.37	60.73	45.17	51.28
2	Selective Context	20.47	14.39	4.59	9.73	59.32	43.10	49.44
3	SARESG	23.48	18.04	6.23	12.50	60.94	45.99	51.87
5	Truncated_ICL	25.33	19.06	6.30	12.70	62.83	46.88	53.24
6	SARESG_ICL	25.56	19.72	6.22	13.08	62.53	47.45	53.46
USB								
1	Original	20.56	12.56	4.58	9.07	62.37	41.82	49.62
2	Selective Context	21.42	13.63	4.28	9.58	61.33	42.64	49.88
3	SARESG	23.69	16.36	5.85	11.78	62.58	44.45	51.41
5	Truncated_ICL	26.47	17.60	6.22	12.47	64.32	46.01	53.15
6	SARESG_ICL	27.01	18.54	6.59	12.94	64.59	46.79	53.75

TABLE I: The model’s performance with Mistral 8×7b was evaluated across three datasets using three major types of metrics. Methods 1, 2, and 3 represent the results of direct zero-shot inference, while methods 5 and 6 were obtained through ICL with one sample.

**Metrics** We evaluated the generated summaries using several widely-adopted metrics, including METEOR [41], ROUGE (ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L) [42], Precision, Recall, and F1 score with BERTScore [43].

**Experiment Details** To evaluate our approach, we experimented with two families of LLMs: Llama3 [44] and Mistral 8×7b [45], which have distinct architectures. To investigate the impact of model scale, we included two versions of Llama3: Llama3-8b and Llama3-70b. This allowed us to explore how model size influences performance, particularly in summarization tasks, with a focus on coherence and capturing nuanced aspects of the text. And the retrieval model we used were the jasper model on top of the stella A model called stella en 1.5b.

For evaluation, we conducted zero-shot and one-shot experiments. These experiments included both standard and selective context-based methods [46] to reduce the length of text to similar length. to measure the trade-offs between computational efficiency and model performance.

*a) Zero-shot Generation:* In the zero-shot setting, we evaluated three methods. The first, serving as the baseline, used the full original text as input, allowing the model to independently generate ABS. The second method, based on the Selective Context approach [46], identified and pruned redundant portions of the input text, feeding only the most relevant segments into the model to generate summaries. The third method, our own adaptation of Selective Context, utilized an embedding model to identify text chunks related to specific aspects. These pruned chunks were used for ABS. For a fair

comparison, the input length for both the second and third methods was adjusted to ensure consistency with the baseline.

*b) One-shot Generation with Selective Context:* In the one-shot setting, we included a guiding example within the input prompt. To address the token limit of 4096 tokens, we applied a truncation strategy inspired by prior work [47]–[49]. Starting with the document, we incrementally truncated words from the end until the input fit within the token limit. For longer datasets, such as USB and OAsum, we ensured fairness by selecting the guiding example from the top 20 shortest documents in the training set. This method preserved the contextual utility of the guide while balancing input length constraints.

## V. RESULTS

### A. Main Results

The experimental results for the Mistral and Llama3 models highlight the consistent performance advantage of the SARESG method across multiple datasets and metrics (Table I, Table II, and Table III).

For the Mistral model, SARESG outperformed the Original and Selective Context methods across all datasets. In the Ma-news dataset, SARESG achieved a METEOR score of 24.07, exceeding the Original’s 22.91 and Selective Context’s 20.45, with similar improvements across ROUGE and BERTScore metrics. Comparable trends were observed in the OAsum and USB datasets, where SARESG consistently delivered superior results. Additionally, SARESG\_ICL demonstrated stronger performance than Truncated, achieving

#	Method	METEOR	ROUGE			BERTSCORE		
			R1	R2	RL	Precision	Recall	F1
MA-news								
1	Original	15.86	10.81	3.44	7.60	56.36	36.19	43.70
2	Selective Context	15.42	7.99	2.09	5.39	55.73	37.70	44.78
3	SARESG	17.10	11.22	3.69	7.88	57.55	37.66	45.16
5	Truncated_ICL	28.48	25.93	8.36	16.81	59.47	50.40	54.40
6	SARESG_ICL	27.86	27.05	8.52	17.48	58.51	51.38	54.54
OAsum								
1	Original	13.27	7.17	2.23	5.20	57.03	38.86	45.74
2	Selective Context	13.62	7.51	2.06	5.43	57.69	39.08	46.22
3	SARESG	15.98	9.23	3.04	6.56	60.22	39.45	47.17
5	Truncated_ICL	24.83	21.43	6.86	14.44	59.53	46.86	52.01
6	SARESG_ICL	24.82	22.28	6.85	14.96	59.02	47.74	52.35
USB								
1	Original	11.06	5.89	2.02	4.45	58.11	34.64	42.90
2	Selective Context	13.40	6.89	1.74	5.16	57.41	37.14	44.74
3	SARESG	16.00	8.16	2.97	6.17	61.62	37.33	46.09
5	Truncated_ICL	29.74	23.70	9.51	17.22	63.28	49.29	54.86
6	SARESG_ICL	31.17	25.59	9.98	18.16	64.30	50.81	56.25

TABLE II: The model’s performance with Llama3-8b across three datasets showed that our method was able to outperform most metrics. Additionally, with ICL, the 8b model could perform on par with the 70b model.

the highest scores in METEOR, ROUGE, and BERTScore metrics(e.g., 27.01 METEOR on USB).

For the Llama3 models, SARESG maintained its advantage. In the Llama3-8b model, SARESG consistently outperformed baselines, achieving a METEOR score of 17.10 in the Ma-news data set versus 15.86 (original) and 15.42 (selective context). Similar improvements were observed in the OAsum and USB datasets. The trend continued with the Llama3-70b model, where SARESG excelled, particularly in the SARESG\_ICL setting, achieving METEOR scores of 30.41 (Ma-news) and 32.65 (USB), alongside superior ROUGE and BERTScore values.

These results highlight SARESG’s adaptability and effectiveness in generating high-quality, contextually relevant summaries, consistently outperforming baselines across diverse datasets and model configurations.

#### B. Influence of sentence retrieval

We first evaluated the performance of our retrieval system by removing the chunk-based approach and instead retrieving text at the sentence level, using the OAsum dataset. Summaries were generated using the Llama3-70b model. As shown in Table IV, sentence-level retrieval yielded ROUGE-1 (R1), ROUGE-2 (R2), and ROUGE-L (RL) scores of 22.37, 6.53, and 15.06, respectively. While this approach outperformed the direct prompt method, it performed slightly worse than the chunk-based retrieval method. This discrepancy is likely because LLMs require more context to form a comprehensive understanding, and the aspects mentioned in the sentences were often difficult to identify at the sentence level. For example, if the aspect pertains to a certain man’s final years, it would be a challenging task for the retrieval model to determine whether individual sentences are relevant to this aspect.

#### C. Influence of chunk size

To further analyze the impact of chunk size on model performance, we conducted additional experiments using the Llama3-70b model with the Ma-news dataset. Our results indicate that when the chunk size exceeds 256 words, the model is only able to retrieve two or three chunks of text. This limitation causes the retrieved content to be overly concentrated in a specific section of the text, reducing the likelihood of capturing diverse details about other aspects. Conversely, smaller chunk sizes result in overly fragmented retrieval, making it difficult for the model to identify patterns or maintain coherence.

To visualize this relationship, we created a chart illustrating the ROUGE scores for various chunk sizes. As shown in the figure, there is a clear performance gap between smaller chunk sizes and the optimal chunk size of 256 words. With a chunk size of 256, the model achieves more aspect-aligned retrieval, enabling it to generate coherent and relevant summaries. On the other hand, smaller chunk sizes lead to fragmented retrieval, which hampers the embedding model’s ability to capture meaningful relationships across the text.

This analysis highlights the trade-offs between chunk size and information granularity. Larger chunks enhance coherence and relevance but may overlook broader aspects, whereas smaller chunks increase coverage at the expense of cohesion. By identifying the optimal chunk size, we aim to strike a balance between these trade-offs, ultimately improving the model’s performance in text retrieval and summarization tasks.

#### D. ICL sample

As observed in the results presented in the Table I, ICL generally outperformed zero-shot approaches in most cases.

#	Method	METEOR	ROUGE			BERTSCORE		
			R1	R2	RL	Precision	Recall	F1
MA-news								
1	Original	22.16	21.67	5.96	13.99	52.80	47.14	49.50
2	Selective Context	22.33	20.44	4.83	12.77	54.32	46.06	49.68
3	SARESG	24.18	22.95	6.34	14.76	55.26	47.97	51.16
5	Truncated_ICL	30.78	28.32	9.81	18.44	61.14	51.67	55.85
6	SARESG_ICL	30.41	29.69	10.19	19.39	60.45	53.07	56.36
OAsum								
1	Original	24.34	21.52	6.54	14.61	58.34	48.30	52.32
2	Selective Context	23.66	19.76	5.36	13.31	59.19	47.50	52.29
3	SARESG	25.38	22.83	6.92	15.56	60.38	49.66	54.04
5	Truncated_ICL	24.18	20.81	6.80	13.84	59.19	44.55	50.43
6	SARESG_ICL	23.72	21.00	6.51	13.94	58.48	44.98	50.43
USB								
1	Original	26.74	19.22	6.73	13.60	61.10	45.83	51.81
2	Selective Context	23.75	17.05	4.47	11.63	60.60	45.54	51.64
3	SARESG	29.87	23.20	8.45	16.29	64.64	49.79	55.81
5	Truncated_ICL	30.95	24.81	10.32	17.84	63.82	48.61	54.70
6	SARESG_ICL	32.65	26.73	11.04	19.10	65.46	50.78	56.73

TABLE III: The model’s performance with Llama3-70b across three datasets shows that our method still outperforms most metrics.

	R1	R2	RL
Sentence Retrieval	22.37	6.53	15.06
Chunk Retrieval	<b>22.83</b>	<b>6.92</b>	<b>15.56</b>

TABLE IV: Result comparison for retrieval by sentence and retrieval by chunk for dataset OAsum and generated with Llama3-70b.




Fig. 2: Experiment results for three different chunk sizes on MA-news dataset. Results generated with Llama3-70b.


However, for the OAsum dataset, we observed an opposite trend: the ICL scenarios, including both truncated and SARESG approaches, achieved lower scores compared to the zero-shot cases. Upon further investigation, we identified the primary reason for this discrepancy. The randomly chosen sample used for the ICL experiments was a special case where the entire sentence consisted of only a single word followed by a colon(":"), with no sentences related to any specific aspect included in the sample. This peculiar structure likely disrupted

the model’s ability to effectively utilize the provided context, leading to the observed performance drop. To address this issue and ensure that ICL is also effective for the OAsum dataset, we conducted additional experiments using different samples. These new experiments were designed to include more representative and diverse examples, allowing us to evaluate whether the ICL paradigm could generalize effectively across varying data scenarios. The results of these additional experiments provided a more comprehensive understanding of the applicability and limitations of ICL in this specific dataset, thereby strengthening the robustness of our analysis.


To further investigate the impact of sample selection on ICL performance, we conducted additional research to determine whether using a specific sample related to a particular aspect would lead to improved results. For this analysis, we designed an experiment using ICL samples drawn from six different aspects, tested with the Llama3-8b model on the Ma-news dataset. The results of this experiment are visualized in the radar charts (Figure 3).

The findings reveal that the aspect of the selected sample does influence the model’s performance to some extent. However, this effect is not the primary determining factor in overall performance. While certain aspects provide slightly better results, the observed variations suggest that other factors, such as the inherent structure and relevance of the input sample, likely play a more significant role. These results underline the complexity of ICL and highlight the need for careful sample selection to optimize model outcomes.


This analysis provides valuable insights into the nuanced relationship between sample aspects and performance in ICL scenarios, paving the way for future research to systematically explore and quantify these dynamics. Further studies could




(a) Health




(b) News




(c) Science



(d) Sport



(e) Travel



(f) Entertainment

Fig. 3: Radar charts were created for all ICL samples tested on the MA-news dataset, with results generated using the Llama3-8b model. Blue is representing R1, orange is representing R2, and green is representing RI. The captions represent the aspects of the samples, with six points on each chart corresponding to the aspects of the testing set.

examine larger-scale datasets or develop methods to identify optimal samples for diverse tasks, enhancing the generalizability and robustness of ICL approaches.

## VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose Self-Aspect Retrieval Summary Generation, a novel framework for aspect-based summarization. Through the new retrieval mechanism, we can steer the language model away from unrelated information and save token space for ICL. This enables our framework to generate more aspect aligned summaries. As the table above shows, most of the ICL were able to have a significantly higher score than the zero-shot cases, especially for smaller models, with ICL, smaller 8b model will achieve similar result with larger model like Llama3-70b with zero-shot. This might due to the reason that the larger models carries better performance and already able to generate a more precise answer, what we noticed from the smaller model is that it will generate some sentences repeatedly. While a sample was offered, the model will be more careful with the sentence they generated and have a clearer guidance.

Yet in the Table III, OAsum remains as the only exception here. This is because the randomly chosen samples for the OAsum are rather special. It was a sample without any related sentences in the document. As the Figure 3, with an alternative sample, the ICL case will still perform better than the zero shot cases with Llama3-70b model.

## LIMITATIONS

Despite all efforts, there are still a few more constraints to the method. The first is that the ICL is highly unstable. second is that the best pruning parameters will be varied as the length of articles varied. third is that the retrieval model takes up GPU spaces for computing the similarities. And a better model requires more resources.

## REFERENCES

- [1] X. Zhang, R. Mao, and E. Cambria, "Senticvec: Toward robust and human-centric neurosymbolic sentiment analysis," *ACL Findings*, 2024.
- [2] L. Xiao, R. Mao, X. Zhang, L. He, and E. Cambria, "Vanessa: Visual connotation and aesthetic attributes understanding network for multimodal aspect-based sentiment analysis," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 11 486–11 500.
- [3] R. Mao, K. Du, Y. Ma, L. Zhu, and E. Cambria, "Discovering the cognition behind language: Financial metaphor analysis with metapro," in *2023 ICDM*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1211–1216.
- [4] K. Du, F. Xing, R. Mao, and E. Cambria, "An evaluation of reasoning capabilities of large language models in financial sentiment analysis," in *IEEE Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IEEE CAI)*, Singapore, 2024.
- [5] J. Gesnoui, Y. Tannier, C. G. Da Silva, H. Tapory, C. Brier, H. Simon, R. Rozenberg, H. Woehrel, M. E. Yakaabi, T. Binder *et al.*, "Llamandement: Large language models for summarization of french legislative proposals," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16182*, 2024.
- [6] D. Jain, M. D. Borah, and A. Biswas, "A sentence is known by the company it keeps: Improving legal document summarization using deep clustering," *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 165–200, 2024.
- [7] R. Mao, Q. Liu, K. He, W. Li, and E. Cambria, "The biases of pre-trained language models: An empirical study on prompt-based sentiment analysis and emotion detection," *IEEE transactions on affective computing*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1743–1753, 2022.



- [8] X. Wu, C. Li, Y. Zhu, and Y. Miao, "Short text topic modeling with topic distribution quantization and negative sampling decoder," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Nov. 2020.
- [9] X. Wu, A. T. Luu, and X. Dong, "Mitigating data sparsity for short text topic modeling by topic-semantic contrastive learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12878*, 2022.
- [10] X. Wu, T. Nguyen, D. C. Zhang, W. Y. Wang, and A. T. Luu, "Fastopic: A fast, adaptive, stable, and transferable topic modeling paradigm," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17978*, 2024.
- [11] X. Wu, T. Nguyen, and A. T. Luu, "A survey on neural topic models: methods, applications, and challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15351*, 2024.
- [12] T. Zhang, F. Ladhak, E. Durmus, P. Liang, K. McKeown, and T. B. Hashimoto, "Benchmarking large language models for news summarization," *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 12, pp. 39–57, 2024.
- [13] F. Xue, Y. Fu, W. Zhou, Z. Zheng, and Y. You, "To repeat or not to repeat: Insights from scaling llm under token-crisis," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [14] Y. Chen, S. Qian, H. Tang, X. Lai, Z. Liu, S. Han, and J. Jia, "Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12307*, 2023.
- [15] X. Zhang, Y. Chen, S. Hu, Z. Xu, J. Chen, M. Hao, X. Han, Z. Thai, S. Wang, Z. Liu *et al.*, "Bench: Extending long context evaluation beyond 100k tokens," in *ACL*, 2024, pp. 15 262–15 277.
- [16] L. Huang, W. Yu, W. Ma, W. Zhong, Z. Feng, H. Wang, Q. Chen, W. Peng, X. Feng, B. Qin *et al.*, "A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions," *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 2023.
- [17] Q. Dong, L. Li, D. Dai, C. Zheng, J. Ma, R. Li, H. Xia, J. Xu, Z. Wu, B. Chang, X. Sun, L. Li, and Z. Sui, "A survey on in-context learning," in *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Y. Al-Onaizan, M. Bansal, and Y.-N. Chen, Eds., Miami, Florida, USA, Nov. 2024, pp. 1107–1128.
- [18] L. Frermann and A. Klementiev, "Inducing document structure for aspect-based summarization," in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019, pp. 6263–6273.
- [19] R. Mao and X. Li, "Bridging towers of multi-task learning with a gating mechanism for aspect-based sentiment analysis and sequential metaphor identification," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 15, 2021, pp. 13 534–13 542.
- [20] L. Xiao, X. Wu, J. Xu, W. Li, C. Jin, and L. He, "Atlantis: Aesthetic-oriented multiple granularities fusion network for joint multimodal aspect-based sentiment analysis," *Information Fusion*, vol. 106, p. 102304, 2024.
- [21] T. Santosh, M. Aly, and M. Grabmair, "Lexabsumm: Aspect-based summarization of legal decisions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00594*, 2024.
- [22] O. Ahuja, J. Xu, A. Gupta, K. Horecka, and G. Durrett, "Aspectnews: Aspect-oriented summarization of news documents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08296*, 2021.
- [23] M. Zhong, P. Liu, Y. Chen, D. Wang, X. Qiu, and X. Huang, "Extractive summarization as text matching," in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, D. Jurafsky, J. Chai, N. Schluter, and J. Tetreault, Eds., Jul. 2020, pp. 6197–6208.
- [24] I. Beltagy, M. E. Peters, and A. Cohan, "Longformer: The long-document transformer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- [25] S. Zhao, J. Tian, J. Fu, J. Chen, and J. Wen, "Feamix: Feature mix with memory batch based on self-consistency learning for code generation and code translation," *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, 2024.
- [26] S. Zhao, L. A. Tuan, J. Fu, J. Wen, and W. Luo, "Exploring clean label backdoor attacks and defense in language models," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 2024.
- [27] X. Wu, L. Pan, W. Y. Wang, and A. T. Luu, "Updating language models with unstructured facts: Towards practical knowledge editing," 2024.
- [28] X. Wu, L. Pan, Y. Xie, R. Zhou, S. Zhao, Y. Ma, M. Du, R. Mao, A. T. Luu, and W. Y. Wang, "Antileak-bench: Preventing data contamination by automatically constructing benchmarks with updated real-world knowledge," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13670*, 2024.
- [29] F. Pan, X. Wu, Z. Li, and A. T. Luu, "Are LLMs good zero-shot fallacy classifiers?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15050*, 2024.
- [30] M. Chen, R. Jin, W. Deng, Y. Chen, Z. Huang, H. Yu, and X. Li, "Can textual gradient work in federated learning?" in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [31] K. He, R. Mao, Q. Lin, Y. Ruan, X. Lan, M. Feng, and E. Cambria, "A survey of large language models for healthcare: from data, technology, and applications to accountability and ethics," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05694*, 2023.
- [32] R. Mao, M. Ge, S. Han, W. Li, K. He, L. Zhu, and E. Cambria, "A survey on pragmatic processing techniques," *Information Fusion*, vol. 114, p. 102712, 2025.
- [33] D. F. Navarro, M. Dras, and S. Berkovsky, "Few-shot fine-tuning sota summarization models for medical dialogues," in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Student Research Workshop*, 2022, pp. 254–266.
- [34] Z. Han, C. Gao, J. Liu, J. Zhang, and S. Q. Zhang, "Parameter-efficient fine-tuning for large models: A comprehensive survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14608*, 2024.
- [35] J. White, Q. Fu, S. Hays, M. Sandborn, C. Olea, H. Gilbert, A. Elnashar, J. Spencer-Smith, and D. C. Schmidt, "A prompt pattern catalog to enhance prompt engineering with chatgpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11382*, 2023.
- [36] S. Jain, V. Keshava, S. M. Sathyendra, P. Fernandes, P. Liu, G. Neubig, and C. Zhou, "Multi-dimensional evaluation of text summarization with in-context learning," in *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- [37] S. Zhao, Q. Li, Y. Yang, J. Wen, and W. Luo, "From softmax to nucleusmax: A novel sparse language model for chinese radiology report summarization," *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*, pp. 1–21, 2023.
- [38] K. Krishna, P. Gupta, S. Ramprasad, B. C. Wallace, J. P. Bigham, and Z. C. Lipton, "Usb: A unified summarization benchmark across tasks and domains," in *Findings of EMNLP*, 2023, pp. 8826–8845.
- [39] X. Yang, K. Song, S. Cho, X. Wang, X. Pan, L. Petzold, and D. Yu, "Oasum: Large-scale open domain aspect-based summarization," in *Findings of ACL*, 2023, pp. 4381–4401.
- [40] L. Frermann and A. Klementiev, "Inducing document structure for aspect-based summarization," in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, A. Korhonen, D. Traum, and L. Marquez, Eds. Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2019, pp. 6263–6273.
- [41] S. Banerjee and A. Lavie, "Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments," in *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, 2005, pp. 65–72.
- [42] C.-Y. Lin, "ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries," in *Text Summarization Branches Out*. Barcelona, Spain: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2004, pp. 74–81.
- [43] T. Zhang, V. Kishore, F. Wu, K. Q. Weinberger, and Y. Artzi, "Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019.
- [44] A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, A. Pandey, A. Kadian, A. Al-Dahle, A. Letman, A. Mathur, A. Schelten, A. Yang, A. Fan *et al.*, "The llama 3 herd of models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [45] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Roux, A. Mensch, B. Savary, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. l. Casas, E. B. Hanna, F. Bressand *et al.*, "Mixtral of experts," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [46] Y. Li, B. Dong, F. Guerin, and C. Lin, "Compressing context to enhance inference efficiency of large language models," in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, H. Bouamor, J. Pino, and K. Bali, Eds. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2023, pp. 6342–6353.
- [47] M. Ravaut, A. Sun, N. Chen, and S. Joty, "On context utilization in summarization with large language models," in *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2024, pp. 2764–2781.
- [48] X. Yang, Y. Li, X. Zhang, H. Chen, and W. Cheng, "Exploring the limits of chatgpt for query or aspect-based text summarization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08081*, 2023.
- [49] J. Li, Y. Xia, X. Cheng, D. Zhao, and R. Yan, "Learning disentangled representation via domain adaptation for dialogue summarization," in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, 2023, pp. 1693–1702.