# **Applications of Deep Learning in Spoken Dialogue Systems**

# Steve Young



*Dialogue Systems Group*  Engineering Department **Trumpington Street** *Cambridge University Engineering Department*  Cambridge, UK *Cambridge, UK sjy@eng.cam.ac.uk*



Apple Europe Limited 90 Hills Road Cambridge, UK *[steve\\_young@apple.com](mailto:steve_young@apple.com)*



# Dialog System Architecture





#### Understanding: ASR -> Beliefs





Henderson, M., et al. (2014). Word-Based Dialog State Tracking with Recurrent Neural Networks. SigDial 2014, Philadelphia, PA. Rojas-Barahona, L., et al. (2016). Exploiting Sentence and Context Representations in Deep Neural Models for Spoken Language Understanding. Coling, Osaka, Japan. Mrksic, N., et al. (2016) Neural Belief Tracker: Data-Driven Dialogue State Tracking. arXiv:1606.03777



### Generation: actions -> words

Need to convert abstract system actions to natural language e.g.



Solution: delexicalise the training data, and train a conditional LSTM

inform(name=<name>, food=<food>) "<name> serves <food> food"





## Generation: actions -> words

Need to convert abstract system actions to natural language e.g.

inform(name="The Peking", food="chinese")  $\qquad \qquad$  "The Peking serves chinese food"

Solution: delexicalise the training data, and train a conditional LSTM

At runtime, condition with system action and prime with start symbol …

… then re-lexicalise.

**SC-LSTM** <s> <name> … Feedback word-by-word inform(name=<name>, food=<food>) "<name> serves <food> food"

inform(<name>, <food>)

T-H. Wen et al (2015). "Semantically Conditioned LSTM-based Natural Language Generation for Spoken Dialogue Systems." EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal.



Dialog Manager





- 1. Belief state **b** encodes the state of the dialog, including all relevant history.
- 2. Belief state is updated every turn of the dialog.
- 3. The policy  $\pi$  determines the best action to make at each turn via a mapping from the belief state **b** to actions *a*.
- 4. Every dialog ends with a reward: +ve for success, -ve for failure. Plus a weak -ve reward for every turn to encourage brevity.
- 5. Reinforcement Learning is used to find the best policy.



Reinforcement Learning Policy:  $\pi(\mathbf{b},a): \mathbb{R}^n \times A \rightarrow [0,1]$  $R = \sum r(\mathbf{b}_{\tau}, a_{\tau})$  $\tau = 1$ *T* Reward:  $R = \sum$  $Q_{\pi}(\mathbf{b}_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left| \sum_{\tau} r(\mathbf{b}_\tau, a_\tau) \right|$  $\tau = t+1$ *T* ∑  $\lceil$ ⎣  $\left[\sum_{\tau}^{T} r(\mathbf{b}_{\tau}, a_{\tau})\right]$ ⎦ Value:  $Q_{\pi}(\mathbf{b}_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left| \sum_{\tau} r(\mathbf{b}_{\tau}, a_{\tau}) \right|$ 

Problem:

 $\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi}$ Find optimal policy  $\qquad \pi^* = \frac{\arg\max}{\pi} \left\{ E[R | \pi] \right\}$  $Q_{\pi}^{*}(\mathbf{b}_{t}, a_{t}) = r_{t+1} + \frac{max}{a}$ Solve  $Q_{\pi}^{*}(\mathbf{b}_{t}, a_{t}) = r_{t+1} + \max_{a} \{Q_{\pi}^{*}(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}, a)\}\$ or



#### Implementation Algorithms

#### **Policy Gradient Value Iteration**

Advantage Actor Critic (A2C)

Trust Region Actor Critic (TRACER)

Natural Actor Critic (eNACER)

Deep Q Network (DQN)

[ Gaussian Process (GP) ]

Y. Li (2017). "Deep Reinforcement Learning: An Overview." arXiv:1701.07274v2. See also David Silver's 2016 ICML Tutorial.



#### Typical Early Learning





P.-H. Su, P. Budzianowski, S. Ultes, M. Gasic and S. Young (2017). "Sample-efficient Actor-Critic Reinforcement Learning with Supervised Data for Dialogue Management." SigDial, Saarbrucken, Germany.



## The Labelling Problem



So can we train End-To-End using just  $\langle u_t, m_t, r_t \rangle$ ?



#### Sequence to Sequence models



Good for chatbots, but no explicit knowledge base and no planning

Sutskever, O. Vinyals and V. Le (2014). "Sutskever, Ilya, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. "Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks." NIPS. O. Vinyals and Q. Le (2015). "A Neural Conversational Model." ICML Deep Learning Workshop.



# Multicomponent System End-To-End Training





The action  $a_t$  is now a discrete latent variable

$$
p(m_t | u_t) = \sum_a g(m_t | a) \pi(a | u_t)
$$

Unfortunately, there is no tractable way to compute this inference and Monte Carlo methods are too slow.



Maximise the variational lower bound

 $L(m, u, \theta_1, \theta_2, \phi) = \mathbb{E}_q[log g(m_t | a_t)] - \lambda D_{KL}(q(a_t) | \pi(a_t | .))$ 

Mnih and K. Gregor (2014). "Neural Variational Inference and Learning in Belief Networks." ICML, Beijing, China.



## NVI Optimisation



1) Randomly sample a minibatch of training data

$$
\mathbb{D} = \langle u_1, m_1 \rangle \dots \langle u_N, m_N \rangle
$$

2) For each  $\langle u_i, m_i \rangle$ , generate N samples from inference net  $a_i^{(1)} \dots a_i^{(N)} \sim q_{\phi}(a \mid u_i, m_i)$ 

3) Compute gradients  $\nabla_{\theta}L$  and  $\nabla_{\phi}L$  using Monte Carlo integration to estimate expectations.

#### 4) Update parameters

Note that  $\nabla_{\phi} L$  is very noisy and variance reduction techniques are required in practice



## Latent Intention Dialogue Model





# Training the LIDM

In practice, learning latent actions in a completely unsupervised manner is extremely difficult. Hence, a multi-stage approach was taken for training the full end-to-end dialogue system:

- the SLU Component was pre-trained on labelled data
- Part of the training corpus was clustered to provide a subset of automatically labelled actions
- Variational lower bound maximisation was interleaved with supervised learning on the automatically labelled data
- Reinforcement learning was used to fine tune policy parameters

T.-H. Wen, Y. Miao, P. Blunsom and S. Young (2017). "Latent Intention Dialogue Models." ICML, Sydney.



#### Sample Dialogue



actual outputs selected in dialogue shown in bold



# Summary

- DNNs provide a flexible building block for all stages of the dialogue system pipeline, though training is rarely as straightforward as research papers suggest!
- Labelled data is expensive and each stage of a multi-component pipeline requires its own labelled data set.
- "End-2-End" multi-component training has potential to reduce labelled data requirement and potentially avoid hand-crafting internal interfaces.
- $\cdot$  Users can provide feedback for free but the feedback signal is weak and noisy. Reinforcement Learning provides a framework for exploiting this mostly untapped resource.





### **Credits**

#### All members of the Cambridge Dialogue Systems Group Past and Present:

Milica Gasic Catherine Breslin Pawel Budzianowski Matt Henderson Filip Jurcicek Simon Keizer Dongho Kim Fabrice Lefevre Francois Mairesse Nikola Mrksic Lina Rojas Barahona Jost Schatzmann

Matt Stuttle Martin Szummer Eddy Su Blaise Thomson Pirros Tsiakoulis Stefan Ultes David Vandyke Karl Weilhammer Shawn Wen Jason Williams Hui Ye Kai Yu