

Adapting AlignScore Metric for Factual Consistency Evaluation of Text in Russian: A Student Abstract

Mikhail Zimin, Milyausha Shamsutdinova, Georgii Andriushchenko

Innopolis University

{m.zimin, m.shamsutdinova, g.andriushchenko}@innopolis.university

Abstract

Ensuring factual consistency in generated text is crucial for reliable natural language processing applications. However, there is a lack of evaluation tools for factual consistency in Russian texts, as existing tools primarily focus on English corpora. To bridge this gap, we introduce ALIGNRUSCORE, a comprehensive adaptation of the AlignScore metric for Russian. To adapt the metric, we fine-tuned a RuBERT-based alignment model with task-specific classification and regression heads on Russian and translated English datasets. Our results demonstrate that a unified alignment metric can be successfully ported to Russian, laying the groundwork for robust multilingual factual consistency evaluation. We release the translated corpora, model checkpoints, and code to support further research.

Code

<https://github.com/MilyaushaShamsutdinova/AlignRuScore>

Data

<https://huggingface.co/collections/MilyaShams/alignscore-russian-datasets-6801082af31d0a240e4b9bb5>

Model

<https://huggingface.co/CatFr0g/ruAlignScore>

Introduction

Modern natural language generation systems are increasingly used in critical applications where factual correctness is imperative. AlignScore (Zha et al. 2023) introduced a unified alignment function that maps pairs of text (context and claim) to a factual consistency score. Since AlignScore was originally designed for English texts, applying AlignScore directly to Russian texts may be invalid. This paper proposes a strategy to adapt the AlignScore metric to Russian texts to increase its reliability when evaluating the factual consistency of text generated in Russian.

Related Work

AlignScore has emerged as a powerful metric for measuring factual consistency by unifying diverse natural language processing (NLP) tasks. See Supplementary Materials for AlignScore details. QAFactEval (Fabbri et al. 2022) and UniEval (Li et al. 2025) metrics have shown promising results but remain primarily focused on English data. As for the fact alignment datasets, there are two such datasets

in Russian. Russian Semantic Text Similarity (RuSTS) (Avekriev, Kapitanov, and Azizov 2024) is a human translation of Semantic Text Similarity Benchmark (STSB) (Cer et al. 2017). RuFact¹ is a paraphrase dataset created with various approaches for the generation of training examples.

Methodology

Our methodology adapts the original AlignScore approach to the Russian language, resulting in AlignRuScore. The process involved data collection and translation, unified model training, adaptation of the metric’s calculation strategy, and evaluation of the resulting metric.

Data Collection and Translation

We constructed a diverse Russian training corpus by translating subsets (up to 10,000 examples each, where applicable) of the English datasets used in the original AlignScore paper, covering tasks such as Natural Language Inference (NLI), Fact Verification, Paraphrasing, Question Answering (QA), and Semantic Textual Similarity (STS). Machine translation was performed using Yandex Translate². The translated datasets were supplemented with native Russian datasets such as RuFacts for paraphrase and fact verification and RuSTS benchmark. The final unified corpus comprised over 118,000 training examples spanning multiple alignment-related tasks, as shown in Table 5 of the Supplementary Materials.

Adapting AlignScore Metric to Russian

Training Unified Alignment Function on Russian Corpus

Following the original methodology of AlignScore, we employed a RuBERT-base model (Kuratov and Arkhipov 2019) as the backbone for our alignment function. The model was fine-tuned using a unified multi-task learning approach on the collected Russian corpus. It features task-specific output heads for 1) 3-way classification (predicting entailment, neutral, or contradiction); 2) binary classification (predicting whether context and claim are aligned or not-aligned); 3) regression (predicting a similarity score between 0 and 1).

¹<https://kaggle.com/competitions/internal-fact-checking-for-the-russian-language>

²<https://translate.yandex.com>

The model was trained by optimizing a combined loss function encompassing cross-entropy for classification heads and mean squared error for the regression head, allowing it to learn a generalized representation of textual alignment from the diverse data sources. Training hyperparameters are detailed in Table 1 of the Supplementary Materials.

Following AlignScore’s original formulation, we train a small feed-forward network for each type of training task (see Table 5 of Supplementary Materials for the training tasks) and learn them simultaneously, so the embedding space and the heads can properly handle alignment for all NLP tasks.

Evaluation on Russian datasets

We evaluated AlignRuScore on held-out test portions of Russian datasets corresponding to the core alignment tasks on which we trained the metric. Performance was measured using standard metrics appropriate for each task: Accuracy, Precision, Recall, F1, and ROC AUC for classifications; R^2 and Mean Squared Error (MSE) for regression.

Evaluation Results

Evaluation of Resulting Metric

Detailed evaluation results are presented in Tables 2-4, reporting results across different types of tasks and metrics.

Evaluating LLMs using Resulting Metric

To further validate the applicability of AlignRuScore, we conducted an evaluation of the Gemini 1.5-Flash³ model on a held-out subset of 200 examples. The model’s outputs were scored using our adapted metric, yielding a mean factual-consistency score of 0.7285 ± 0.0639 .

Discussion of Results

The evaluation results demonstrate strong results of AlignRuScore on NLI, fact verification, and entailment detection tasks. In paraphrase detection, the model shows a robust behavior on well-structured question pairs.

However, claim verification under terse or noisy contexts remains an issue. In question answering, there is a tendency to over-generate candidate answers. In information retrieval, precision is improved, but still remains below paraphrase and inference levels. It highlights the need for more precise answer extraction.

Conclusion

In this work, we presented ALIGNRUSCORE, a Russian-language adaptation of the unified factual consistency metric AlignScore. By translating and augmenting a diverse set of English benchmarks—spanning natural language inference, fact verification, paraphrase detection, semantic textual similarity, question answering, and information retrieval—and fine-tuning a RuBERT-based alignment model, we obtained a single alignment function capable of handling the nuances of Russian morphology and syntax.

³<https://deepmind.google/models/gemini/flash/>

Future Work

Looking ahead, we plan to (1) incorporate additional Russian-native datasets—particularly for summarization and dialogue consistency; (2) explore architecture variants, such as multilingual transformer backbones and task-adaptive adapters; and (3) evaluate ALIGNRUSCORE in downstream applications, including automated fact-checking and evaluation of Russian-language generative models. We release our code, translated corpora, and trained checkpoints to facilitate further research in Russian NLP.

References

- Avekriev, S.; Kapitanov, A.; and Azizov, S. 2024. Russian Semantic Textual Similarity Benchmark. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/ai-forever/ru-stsbenchmark-sts>.
- Bowman, S. R.; Angeli, G.; Potts, C.; and Manning, C. D. 2015. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In Mårquez, L.; Callison-Burch, C.; and Su, J., eds., *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 632–642. Lisbon, Portugal: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cer, D.; Diab, M.; Agirre, E.; Lopez-Gazpio, I.; and Specia, L. 2017. SemEval-2017 Task 1: Semantic Textual Similarity Multilingual and Crosslingual Focused Evaluation. In Bethard, S.; Carpuat, M.; Apidianaki, M.; Mohammad, S. M.; Cer, D.; and Jurgens, D., eds., *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, 1–14. Vancouver, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Csernai, K. 2017. First Quora Dataset Release: Question Pairs. <https://quoradata.quora.com/First-Quora-Dataset-Release-Question-Pairs>.
- Fabbri, A.; Wu, C.-S.; Liu, W.; and Xiong, C. 2022. QAFactEval: Improved QA-Based Factual Consistency Evaluation for Summarization. In Carpuat, M.; de Marnette, M.-C.; and Meza Ruiz, I. V., eds., *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2587–2601. Seattle, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kozlova, A. 2023. RuFacts: Internal Fact-checking for the Russian language. <https://www.kaggle.com/competitions/internal-fact-checking-for-the-russian-language>.
- Kuratov, Y.; and Arkhipov, M. 2019. Adaptation of Deep Bidirectional Multilingual Transformers for Russian Language. arXiv:1905.07213.
- Lai, G.; Xie, Q.; Liu, H.; Yang, Y.; and Hovy, E. 2017. RACE: Large-scale Reading Comprehension Dataset From Examinations. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 785–794. Copenhagen, Denmark: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Li, Y.; Wang, H.; Zhang, Q.; Xiao, B.; Hu, C.; Wang, H.; and Li, X. 2025. Unieval: Unified holistic evaluation for unified multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.10483*.

- Marelli, M.; Bentivogli, L.; Baroni, M.; Bernardi, R.; Menini, S.; and Zamparelli, R. 2014. Semeval-2014 task 1: Evaluation of compositional distributional semantic models on full sentences through semantic relatedness and textual entailment. In *Proceedings of the 8th international workshop on semantic evaluation (SemEval 2014)*, 1–8.
- Nguyen, T.; Rosenberg, M.; Song, X.; Gao, J.; Tiwary, S.; Majumder, R.; and Deng, L. 2016. Ms marco: A human-generated machine reading comprehension dataset.
- Nie, Y.; Chen, H.; and Bansal, M. 2019. Combining fact extraction and verification with neural semantic matching networks. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI’19/IAAI’19/EAAI’19*. AAAI Press. ISBN 978-1-57735-809-1.
- Nie, Y.; Williams, A.; Dinan, E.; Bansal, M.; Weston, J.; and Kiela, D. 2020. Adversarial NLI: A New Benchmark for Natural Language Understanding. In Jurafsky, D.; Chai, J.; Schluter, N.; and Tetreault, J., eds., *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4885–4901. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Schuster, T.; Fisch, A.; and Barzilay, R. 2021. Get Your Vitamin C! Robust Fact Verification with Contrastive Evidence. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 624–643. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Williams, A.; Nangia, N.; and Bowman, S. 2018. A Broad-Coverage Challenge Corpus for Sentence Understanding through Inference. In Walker, M.; Ji, H.; and Stent, A., eds., *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, 1112–1122. New Orleans, Louisiana: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yin, W.; Radev, D.; and Xiong, C. 2021. DocNLI: A Large-scale Dataset for Document-level Natural Language Inference. In Zong, C.; Xia, F.; Li, W.; and Navigli, R., eds., *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, 4913–4922. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zha, Y.; Yang, Y.; Li, R.; and Hu, Z. 2023. AlignScore: Evaluating Factual Consistency with A Unified Alignment Function. In Rogers, A.; Boyd-Graber, J.; and Okazaki, N., eds., *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 11328–11348. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhang, Y.; Baldridge, J.; and He, L. 2019. PAWS: Paraphrase Adversaries from Word Scrambling. In Burstein, J.; Doran, C.; and Solorio, T., eds., *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)*, 1298–1308. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Supplementary Materials

Factual Consistency Evaluation with AlignRuScore

To evaluate the factual consistency between a given Russian context and claim, AlignRuScore utilizes the trained alignment function combined with the context/claim splitting and aggregation strategy using the following steps:

1. The potentially long context is segmented into overlapping chunks of approximately 350 tokens at sentence boundaries.
2. The claim is split into individual sentences.
3. Each claim sentence is evaluated against every context chunk using the alignment model’s 3-way classification head. The probability assigned to the ‘aligned’ (entailment) class is used as the alignment score.
4. For each claim sentence, the maximum alignment score across all context chunks is selected, representing the strongest support found in the context for that specific sentence.
5. The final AlignRuScore is the average of these maximum scores across all sentences in the claim.

This chunking and aggregation approach allows the metric to handle long contexts effectively while producing a fine-grained score sensitive to inconsistencies at the sentence level within the claim.

Datasets

The detailed description and statistics of the data used for training and testing are provided in Table 5.

Alignment Model Training Hyperparameters

Hyperparameter	AlignRuScore-base
Base Model	RuBERT-base
Parameters	180M
Batch Size	12
Epochs	3
Optimizer	AdamW
Learning Rate	1e-5
Weight Decay	0.1
Adam ϵ	1e-6
Warmup Ratio	0.06
Random Seed	2025
GPU	A100
GPU Memory	20 GB
Time (hours)	4

Table 1: The hyperparameters used to train the alignment model.

Evaluation Results

Dataset	Precision	Recall	micro F1	Accuracy
SNLI	0.743	0.743	0.743	0.743
MultiNLI	0.674	0.674	0.674	0.674
ANLI	0.692	0.692	0.692	0.692
FEVER	0.814	0.814	0.814	0.814
Vitamin C	0.596	0.596	0.596	0.596

Table 2: Results on 3-way classification

Dataset	Precision	Recall	F1	ROC AUC
RuFact	0.591	0.908	0.716	0.732
QQP	0.707	0.841	0.768	0.879
PAWS	0.613	0.896	0.728	0.766
DocNLI	0.762	0.954	0.847	0.897
RACE	0.250	0.998	0.400	0.524
MS MARCO	0.201	0.520	0.289	0.703

Table 3: Results on binary classification

Dataset	MSE	R^2
SICK	0.228	0.857
RuSTS	0.954	0.557

Table 4: Results on regression

Natural Lanugage Processing Task	Dataset	Training Task	Size, 10³
<i>Natural Language Inference</i>	SNLI (Bowman et al. 2015)	3-way classification	10
	MultiNLI (Williams, Nangia, and Bowman 2018)	3-way classification	10
	Adversarial NLI (Nie et al. 2020)	3-way classification	10
	DocNLI (Yin, Radev, and Xiong 2021)	binary classification	10
<i>Fact Verification</i>	NLI-style FEVER (Nie, Chen, and Bansal 2019)	3-way classification	10
	Vitamin C (Schuster, Fisch, and Barzilay 2021)	3-way classification	10
<i>Paraphrase</i>	QQP (Csernai 2017)	binary classification	10
	PAWS (Zhang, Baldrige, and He 2019)	binary classification	10
	RuFacts* (Kozlova 2023)	binary classification	6.7
<i>Semantic Text Similarity</i>	SICK (Marelli et al. 2014)	regression	4.4
	RuSTS* (Avekriev, Kapitanov, and Azizov 2024)	regression	7.8
<i>Question Answering</i>	RACE (Lai et al. 2017)	binary classification	10
<i>Information Retrieval</i>	MS MARCO (Nguyen et al. 2016)	binary classification	10
Total			118.9

Table 5: The training datasets of our alignment model. Datasets marked with a * were already translated or created in Russian. The other datasets were translated as a part of our work.