

AlignCheck: a Semantic Open-Domain Metric for Factual Consistency Assessment

Ahmad Aghaebrahimian

Institute of Computational Life Sciences,
Department of Life Sciences and Facility Management,
Zurich University of Applied Sciences, 8820 Waedenswil, Switzerland
Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
ahmad.aghaebrahimian@zhaw.ch

Abstract

Large Language Models have significantly advanced natural language processing tasks, but remain prone to generating incorrect or misleading but plausible arguments. This issue, known as hallucination, is particularly concerning in high-stakes domains like clinical applications, where factual inaccuracies can have severe consequences. Existing evaluation metrics fail to adequately assess factual consistency and lack interpretability, making diagnosing and mitigating errors difficult. We propose an interpretable framework for factual consistency assessment for in-domain and open-domain texts to address these limitations. Our approach decomposes text into atomic facts and introduces a flexible, schema-free methodology. Unlike previous methods with an absolute metric, we incorporate a weighted metric to enhance factual evaluation. Additionally, we propose a mechanism to control assessment complexity in intricate domains. We benchmark our approach on popular general and clinical datasets and release our code to support fact-aware model training in future research.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have revolutionized various natural language generation tasks, including question answering (Deutsch et al., 2021), text summarization (Goyal et al., 2023), and dialogue systems (Shuster et al., 2021). Despite their impressive capabilities, LLMs are prone to a phenomenon known as hallucination, where they generate incorrect or misleading arguments with high confidence. This issue is particularly critical in high-stakes domains such as clinical and medical applications, where factual inaccuracies can have severe consequences.

To mitigate these risks, it is mandatory to validate the factual consistency of LLM-generated content. Although numerous methods have been proposed to assess factual accuracy (Lee et al.,

2022; Min et al., 2023; Goodrich et al., 2019), many suffer from key limitations. Specifically, existing approaches often lack interpretability, offering only numerical (Deutsch et al., 2021) or binary (Tang et al., 2023) metrics without indicating where within the generated text errors occur. This absence of granular insight makes it difficult to diagnose and correct inaccuracies effectively. As highlighted by Luo et al. (Luo et al., 2025), current methods for factual consistency checking fall short, particularly for clinical texts. Additionally, current techniques do not provide sufficient flexibility to account for different classes of facts, such as facts about a patient’s demography or health journey, limiting their applicability in diverse real-world scenarios. This highlights the need for more robust, interpretable, and adaptable evaluation methods for factual consistency checking that align better with human judgments and task-specific requirements.

In this paper, we propose an interpretable framework for factual consistency checking on general and clinical texts, showcasing the application of the framework for summarization. Similar to earlier studies (Goyal et al., 2023), we advocate decomposing texts into atomic facts for more granular analysis. However, in contrast to most methods, which focus on the sentence-level fact assessment (Goyal et al., 2023), we adopt a general approach to broaden the scope of consistency checking to the global text, similar to Min et al. (Min et al., 2023). In contrast to Min et al. (Min et al., 2023), though, our approach is schema-free and does not depend on an external knowledge base or schema. To accommodate schema-free factuality evaluation, we introduce a weighted metric inspired by the F1 score, combined with BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020b). Furthermore, we suggest a flexible mechanism to control the complexity of factual evaluation when dealing with intricate domains.

We release the code¹ and suggest integrating the score into the objective function for training a fact-aware model in further studies.

In summary, our contribution consists of

- AlignCheck, a new F1 score formulation for factual consistency, complemented with the codebase,
- a granular algorithm for different levels of fact-checking,
- and benchmarking the factuality score for popular factual datasets.

2 Related Work

Evaluating the quality of synthetic text, such as the output of machine translation or summarization algorithms, has always been an issue due to the inherent subjectivity and complexity of language. Popular metrics such as BLEU (Bilingual Evaluation Understudy) (Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE (Recall Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation) (Lin, 2004) focus on surface-level information, such as precision and recall over n-gram overlap, thus fail to capture deeper semantic fluency and coherence in the generated text. BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020b) suggested a semantic score to address these shortcomings. However, BERTScore and other semantic-based metrics do not account for factual accuracy, meaning highly coherent text can still correspond to factually inconsistent outputs (Li et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2022).

According to recent studies (Goodrich et al., 2019; Falke et al., 2019), up to 30% of synthetic summaries contain factual consistency problems. Therefore, improving factual consistency checking has been an active field in recent years (Nori et al., 2023; Shuster et al., 2021). Several studies suggested model-based factuality evaluation where a model is trained to evaluate the consistency for generated text by formulating it as a binary classification task (Kryscinski et al., 2020), question answering (Deutsch et al., 2021), or Natural Language Inference (NLI) (Laban et al., 2022) through textual entailment assessment.

Decomposing text into constituents such as entities (Lee et al., 2022) or triples (subject, predicate, object) is exercised in several other works (Goodrich et al., 2019; Thorne et al., 2018;

Min et al., 2023) as a direct and model-free alternative to validate factual consistency of generated texts. Our approach fits in this category and is similar to (Goodrich et al., 2019); however, we do not assume a fixed schema for the task. Instead, we adopt a flexible approach by relaxing this assumption, thus broadening the domain of the application.

3 Methods and Data

We run a basic Named Entity Recognition (NER) tagger over the source (i.e., ground truth summary) and target (i.e., predicted summary) texts to get the sets of source E_s and target entities E_t . We utilized two datasets, AgreeFact (Tang et al., 2023) and MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC (Aali et al., 2024). The details of the datasets are provided below. For general texts in AgreeFact and clinical texts in MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC, we used Spacy and MedCat, respectively. The NER tagger extracts named entities with their types from both source and target texts. In general domains, these types might be Person, Time, Organization, etc, and in the clinical context, they might be Diagnosis, Prognosis, Treatment, etc. We treat the output of NER annotators as a bag of types, thus assigning TD-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency) weights to each type. Depending on the granularity of the intended factual assessment, we can decide how many top-n types T we want to include in the assessment.

Given each source text, we define F_s as the set of all facts $f_s = (s_s, p_s, o_s)$ where s_s is a subject named entity $s_s \in E_s$ whose type $s_t \in T$ and which is associated with o_s , a type-free object named entity by the schema-less predicate p_s . Likewise, we define F_t as the set of facts $f_t = (s_t, p_t, o_t)$, $s_t \in E_t$ extracted from each target text. We also define SO_s and SO_t as a set of unique (s_s, o_s) and (s_t, o_t) accordingly. Given F_s and F_t as sets of triples, we can define True Positive (TP) as shared triples between F_s and F_t , False Negatives (FN) as $F_s - (F_s \cap F_t)$ and False Positive (FP) as $F_t - (F_s \cap F_t)$.

FP and FN both negatively impact the factual consistency. While an increase in the number of FNs reduces Recall (R) and signals factual inconsistency, an increase in the number of FPs reduces Precision (P) and might signal hallucination.

The F1 score, $F1 = \frac{2PR}{P+R}$, as the harmonic mean of precision and recall, is a popular metric in many experiments with imbalanced labels. In schema-based systems (Goodrich et al., 2019), it is easy

¹<https://github.com/Soshaince/AlignCheck>

to treat F_s and F_t as atomic facts with constant named entities and predicates, thus computing the F1 score as described above is straightforward. In schema-less systems, though, there might be inconsistency in predicates, thus, a fact with the same semantics, but not matching the predicate in F_s will be considered as FN or FP. To address this issue, we use BERTScore as a means of soft similarity estimation. BERTScore computes the similarity between two strings as the sum of the cosine similarities between their token embeddings, thereby enabling paraphrase detection.

Algorithm 1 Weighted scoring algorithm

```

 $TP \leftarrow 0$ 
 $FP \leftarrow 0$ 
 $FN \leftarrow 0$ 
for  $f_s \in F_s$  do
  if  $(s_s, o_s) \notin SO_t$  then
     $FN \leftarrow FN + 1$ 
  else
    for  $f_t \in F_t$  do
      if  $s_s == s_t$  then
        if  $o_s == o_t$  then
           $TP \leftarrow TP + BERTScore(p_s, p_t)$ 
        end if
      end if
    end for
  end if
end for
for  $f_t \in F_t$  do
  if  $(s_t, o_t) \notin SO_s$  then
     $FP \leftarrow FP + 1$ 
  end if
end for

```

As indicated in the Algorithm 1, every missing (s_s, o_s) in SO_t is a full instance of FN. Conversely, each lacking instance of (s_t, o_t) in SO_s increases FP by one full unit. TP is impacted when $s_s == s_t$ and $o_s == o_t$. In this case, TP increments or decrements based on $BERTScore(p_s, p_t)$, which is in the range $(-1, 1)$. This means that as the target predicate becomes semantically closer to the source predicate, the value of TP increases and decreases as the semantic distance grows.

To showcase the application of our proposed metric, we selected two datasets, AgreeFact (Tang et al., 2023) in general and MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC (Aali et al., 2024) in the clinical domain.

AgreeFact (Tang et al., 2023) is a benchmark for assessing factual consistency as a binary classification. It consists of 9 annotated factuality datasets stratified according to the deployed summarization model. We employ samples of the dataset, consisting of 2353 texts, summarized with one or more of four different summarization models, including

BART (Lewis et al., 2020), Pegasus and Pegasus-Dynamic (Zhang et al., 2020a), and T5 (Raffel et al., 2020). The dataset consists of 1726 unique samples. Since we intend to compare the factuality of different models, we ignored 1313 samples that were summarized using only one model.

MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC (Aali et al., 2024) is a dataset of Brief Hospital Course (BHC) summaries. BHCs are clinical documents that summarize a patient’s hospital stay. MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC is extracted from MIMIC-IV-Note (Johnson et al., 2023), which is a raw collection of 331,794 de-identified discharge summaries from 145,915 patients admitted to the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. To demonstrate the application of our proposed metric, we sampled 10000 BHCs for fine-tuning and 300 BHCs for testing. We finetuned an instance of Llama 3-13B with different strategies as described below.

The LM_ep2 strategy involves post-tuning the LLM on 10,000 BHCs plain texts for two epochs, while LM_ep5 extends this process to five epochs. In contrast, the Instruction_ep2 strategy uses instruct-tuning, where the LLM is trained on 10,000 BHCs along with their summaries for two epochs, and Instruction_ep5 increases the number of epochs for this instruct-tuning process to five. These strategies highlight different approaches to fine-tuning, varying both in training data usage and the number of epochs.

Employing each model, we summarized the 300 test samples using the fine-tuned models.

4 Results

We employed the AlignCheck to estimate the factual overlap between each summarization model’s prediction and the ground-truth summary text. Table 2 summarizes the number of times each model performs the best with respect to the others on the AgreeFact and MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC datasets.

Then we used the Friedman test to check if there is a difference between models characterized by the AlignCheck score. The Friedman test is a non-parametric statistical test used to detect differences in performance across more than 3 models evaluated on multiple data points, where each sample has a score for each model, and there is no normality assumption. The p-values $p = 0.000$ estimated by the Friedman test for both datasets demonstrate that the models are statistically significantly different. The Friedman test tells if there’s a difference, but

Models	BART	Pegasus	PegasusDynamic	T5
BART	1.0000	1.110223e-16	0.0000	0.0000
Pegasus	1.110223e-16	1.0000	0.0000	1.566292e-11
PegasusDynamic	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
T5	0.0000	1.566292e-11	0.0000	1.0000

Models	instruction_ep2	instruction_ep5	lm_ep2	lm_ep5
instruction_ep2	1.0	8.728525e-01	9.882236e-06	0.001026
instruction_ep5	0.872852	1.0	1.712586e-07	0.000039
lm_ep2	0.000010	1.712586e-07	1.0	0.723773
lm_ep5	0.001026	3.905937e-05	7.237732e-01	1.0

Table 1: First table: Friedman posthoc test on AgreeFact (Tang et al., 2023). Second table: Friedman post hoc test on MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC (Aali et al., 2024). p-values lower than 0.05 show a statistically significant difference.

Model (AgreeFact)	First rank
BART	93.7%
Pegasus	3.6%
PegasusDynamic	2.3%
T5	0.4%

Model (MIMIC-IV-Ext-BHC)	First rank
instruction_ep2	23.7%
instruction_ep5	26.3%
lm_ep2	37.4%
lm_ep5	12.6%

Table 2: Top ranks. Number of times each model gets the highest score on each dataset

does not say which models differ. After the Friedman test, a follow-up with post-hoc tests reported in Table 1 shows which models are statistically significantly different as expected by their number of parameters and training protocols.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In high-stakes domains such as clinical contexts, preserving critical facts, particularly of certain types, is essential when doing text processing tasks such as summarization. In this study, we introduced a novel schema-free methodology and scoring algorithm for assessing factual consistency in both in-domain and open-domain contexts. Our approach involves decomposing source and target texts into atomic facts and softly quantifying the degree of factual overlap between them. To refine this algorithm, we introduced a granular mechanism based on TF-IDF weights that adjusts the level of fact extraction based on the involved entity types. In addition to the score, which shows the semantic overall based on tangible facts, the constituents of the score, including FP and FN, pro-

vide interpretable insights of where the model went wrong by fabricating new facts enumerated in FP or ignoring necessary facts enumerated in FN.

This work represents a step toward enabling generative models to produce more fact-aware outputs. As a next step, we aim to integrate our scoring method into training pipelines, allowing models to better adhere to factual content. One potential direction is to incorporate the score as a soft constraint within the objective function. Alternatively, we may leverage TNs and FPs as negative samples, and TPs as positive samples, and use them to train a contrastive learning algorithm. We plan to further explore these directions in future work.

Limitations

While our proposed methodology provides a novel framework for assessing factual consistency, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, our evaluation primarily focused on controlled datasets, and the robustness of the scoring algorithm in highly noisy, real-world clinical or open-domain scenarios remains to be validated. Second, although the TF-IDF-based weighting mechanism allows for some granularity, it may not fully capture the nuanced importance of domain-specific entity types, especially in contexts where subtle distinctions carry significant implications (e.g., between similar medical conditions or treatments). Third, the decomposition of text into atomic facts, while useful for consistency measurement, can introduce subjectivity or error depending on the quality of the fact extraction process. Finally, our approach has not yet been integrated into end-to-end generative model training, and thus its impact on actual model outputs and downstream task performance remains to be empirically demonstrated.

References

- Asad Aali, Dave Van Veen, Yamin Ishraq Arefeen, Jason Hom, Christian Bluethgen, Eduardo Pontes Reis, Sergios Gatidis, Namuun Clifford, Joseph Daws, Arash S Tehrani, Jangwon Kim, and Akshay S Chaudhari. 2024. [A dataset and benchmark for hospital course summarization with adapted large language models](#). *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 32(3):470–479.
- Daniel Deutsch, Tania Bedrax-Weiss, and Dan Roth. 2021. [Towards question-answering as an automatic metric for evaluating the content quality of a summary](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:774–789.
- Tobias Falke, Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Prasetya Ajie Utama, Ido Dagan, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Ranking generated summaries by correctness: An interesting but challenging application for natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2214–2220, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ben Goodrich, Vinay Rao, Peter J. Liu, and Mohammad Saleh. 2019. [Assessing the factual accuracy of generated text](#). In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, KDD '19, page 166–175, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Tanya Goyal, Junyi Jessy Li, and Greg Durrett. 2023. [News summarization and evaluation in the era of gpt-3](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2209.12356.
- Alistair E. W. Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Lu Shen, Alvin Gayles, Ayad Shammout, Steven Horng, Tom J. Pollard, Sicheng Hao, Benjamin Moody, Brian Gow, Li wei H. Lehman, Leo A. Celi, and Roger G. Mark. 2023. [Mimic-iv, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset](#). *Scientific Data*, 10(1):1.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. [Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9332–9346, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N. Bennett, and Marti A. Hearst. 2022. [SummaC: Re-visiting NLI-based models for inconsistency detection in summarization](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:163–177.
- Nayeon Lee, Wei Ping, Peng Xu, Mostofa Patwary, Pascale Fung, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2022. [Factuality enhanced language models for open-ended text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS '22, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [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*, pages 7871–7880. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Li, Xiaohan Xu, Tao Shen, Can Xu, Jia-Chen Gu, Yuxuan Lai, Chongyang Tao, and Shuai Ma. 2024. [Leveraging large language models for NLG evaluation: Advances and challenges](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16028–16045, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheheng Luo, Qianqian Xie, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2025. [Factual consistency evaluation of summarization in the era of large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.13758.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxu Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [FActScore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12076–12100, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harsha Nori, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. 2023. [Capabilities of gpt-4 on medical challenge problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.13375.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(1).
- Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2021. [Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 3784–3803, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Liyan Tang, Tanya Goyal, Alex Fabbri, Philippe Laban, Jiacheng Xu, Semih Yavuz, Wojciech Kryscinski, Justin Rousseau, and Greg Durrett. 2023. [Understanding factual errors in summarization: Errors, summarizers, datasets, error detectors](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11626–11644, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. [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)*, pages 809–819, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J. Liu. 2020a. Pegasus: pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’20*. JMLR.org.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020b. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1904.09675.
- Kaitlyn Zhou, Su Lin Blodgett, Adam Trischler, Hal Daumé III, Kaheer Suleman, and Alexandra Olteanu. 2022. [Deconstructing NLG evaluation: Evaluation practices, assumptions, and their implications](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 314–324, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.