

A Robust Data-Driven Approach for Dialogue State Tracking of Unseen Slot Values

Vevake Balaraman^{1,2}, Bernardo Magnini¹

¹Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Trento, Italy

²ICT Doctoral School, University of Trento, Italy

{balaraman, magnini}@fbk.eu

Abstract

A Dialogue State Tracker is a key component in dialogue systems which estimates the beliefs of possible user goals at each dialogue turn. Deep learning approaches using recurrent neural networks have shown state-of-the-art performance for the task of dialogue state tracking. Generally, these approaches assume a predefined candidate list and struggle to predict any new dialogue state values that are not seen during training. This makes extending the candidate list for a slot without model retaining infeasible and also has limitations in modelling for low resource domains where training data for slot values are expensive. In this paper, we propose a novel dialogue state tracker based on copying mechanism that can effectively track such unseen slot values without compromising performance on slot values seen during training. The proposed model is also flexible in extending the candidate list without requiring any retraining or change in the model. We evaluate the proposed model on various benchmark datasets (DSTC2, DSTC3 and WoZ2.0) and show that our approach, outperform other end-to-end data-driven approaches in tracking unseen slot values and also provides significant advantages in modelling for DST.

1 Introduction

Spoken dialogue systems (SDS), or conversational systems, are designed to interact and assist users using speech and natural language to achieve a goal (Henderson, 2015). A dialogue state tracker (DST) is a crucial component of the dialogue system that is responsible for tracking the user goals as slot-value pairs during the conversation. The goals tracked at any given turn in the dialogue is referred to as the *dialog state*. This dialog state is then used by the dialog manager (DM) to decide on the next action. Though end-to-end (E2E)

User: I would like a moderately priced restaurant in the west part of town.
goal & req: Inform(price range=moderate, area=west)

system action: request (food)

Sys: There are three moderately priced restaurants in the west part of town. Do you prefer indian, italian, or british?

User: Can I have the address and phone number of the Italian location?

goal & req: Inform(price range=moderate, area=west, food=italian), request(address, phone number)

system action: -

Sys: Prezzo is at 21-24 Northampton Road, and can be reached at 01799 521260. Can I be of further assistance?

User: That's it. Thank you, goodbye.

Figure 1: An annotated dialogue from the WoZ2.0 dataset, with each turn separated by a dashed line.

approaches for dialogue systems has attracted recent research, dialog state tracking still remains an integral part in those systems (Liu and Lane, 2017; Wen et al., 2017; Li et al., 2017) due to the fact that dialogue systems always needs to interact with backend knowledge base (KB) using the dialogue state tracked by DST.

The dialog state is typically represented as a probability distribution over the possible states. Given a set of slots S and a set of possible values V_s for each slot $s \in S$, the dialogue state estimates the distribution over the values V_s for each slot s based on the user utterance and the dialogue history. The Figure 1 shows a sample conversation with the dialog states at each turn.

Deep neural network techniques such as recurrent neural network and convolutional neural networks are the current state-of-the-art models for DST (Henderson et al., 2014c; Wen et al., 2017; Mrkšić et al., 2017; Ren et al., 2018; Zhong et al., 2018). Traditionally, the DST algorithms rely on a predefined *domain ontology* that describes a fixed candidate list for each possible slot. The DST's are trained to output distribution over these predefined slot value set and lack in flexibility to effectively predict for new values of the existing slots. This is an important aspect of DST as in real-world scenario, the slot values in the ontology requires fre-

quent updates (Henderson et al., 2014d; Xu and Hu, 2018). For example in the domain of restaurant booking, a new cuisine could be added for the slot *food* and the DST should be able to track this new slot without any retraining or change in model as it has already been trained for other such cuisines initially. Moreover, even if the new slot value was anticipated and added to the ontology, it would still require training data to train and predict for that model. This limitation is of high importance in low resource domains where obtaining data for all slot values is expensive.

The new slot values not seen in training referred to as *unseen slot values* are often handled by DST either using rule-based approaches or delexicalization techniques (replacing slot values in input with a generic token) (Henderson et al., 2014b,c; Wen et al., 2017). While end-to-end approaches for DST has shown state-of-the-art performance in predicting *dialog state* from predefined slot value set (*seen slot values*) (Mrkšić et al., 2017; Zhong et al., 2018), they suffer from transferring this knowledge to track any new slot values. This is due to the fact that such models are tailored to learn only for the slot values for which training data is available. Any update for the slot values requires new training data for that value and model retraining. While approaches such as (Yang et al., 2018; Yoshida et al., 2018; Xu and Hu, 2018) has tried to address this using data-driven approaches, they often make compromise in the performance of seen slot values to accommodate for the unseen slot values. Their evaluation shows that a large performance gap still persists in predicting for seen and unseen slot values.

In this paper, we focus on this important problem of tracking unseen slot values in DST which has so far relied on using hand crafted features to handle them effectively. In particular, we investigate on copying mechanism to build a robust DST that can effectively track both seen and unseen slot values without requiring any hand crafted features. Our experiments show that in-addition to learning the presence of a value in the input, the model can also learn the context at which it occur and use this information in predicting for the unseen slot values making it suitable for low resource domains as well.

The major contributions of this paper are as follows: i)we address a real-world problem in DST which is predicting for unseen slot values using

a data-driven approach without any hand-crafted features, ii)we present a novel E2E approach based on copying mechanism for DST, iii)we conduct extensive experimental study on various benchmark datasets of DST showing the effectiveness of the approach and iv)the implementation of our approach is made publicly available¹ for further research.

2 Related Work

Traditional dialogue systems consist of a spoken language understanding (SLU) component that performs slot-filling to detect slot-value pairs expressed in the input. The dialog state tracker then uses this information together with the past dialogue context and updates it belief (Wang and Lemon, 2013; Sun et al., 2014). This approach has the limitation of error propagation from the SLU model to DST, and hence the recent research has been focused on jointly modelling the SLU and DST (Henderson et al., 2014c; Wen et al., 2017). (Henderson et al., 2014c) proposed a word-based DST that jointly models SLU and DST, and directly maps from the utterances to an updated belief state. This approach relies on a semantic lexicon for the delexicalization to identify mentions of unseen slot values. (Mrkšić et al., 2017) proposed a data-driven approach for DST named neural belief tracker(NBT) which learns a vector representation for each slot-value pair and compares it with the vector representation of the user utterance to predict if the user has expressed the corresponding slot-value pair.

Global-Locally Self-Attentive Dialogue State Tracker (GLAD) was proposed by (Zhong et al., 2018) which models a single global bidirectional-LSTM (BiLSTM) for all slots and a local BiLSTM for each slot. This global and local representations are then combined using attention which then is used by a scoring module to obtain scores for each slot-value pair. Since also the slot values are encoded by the BiLSTM, this is ineffective for predicting on unseen slot-values. The StateNet proposed by (Ren et al., 2018) uses LSTM network to create a vector representation of the user utterance which is then compared against the vector representation of the slot-value candidates. This approach is extendable to new slot-value candidates provided they have a pre-trained semantic embedding vector available. This forces a constraint on

¹will be made available in final version

the vocabulary of the slot values.

The most relevant works addressing the problem of unseen slot-values are (Xu and Hu, 2018; Yang et al., 2018; Jang et al., 2016; Yoshida et al., 2018). (Xu and Hu, 2018) proposed a joint model for DST based on pointer networks which outputs a distribution over the tokens in user utterance. This approach assumes no candidate set for the values and since it can only output from the input vocabulary, a semantic lexicon is required for post-processing of output to normalize for the value. (Yang et al., 2018) proposed an hierarchical dialog state tracker (HDSTM) that consists of a detection module to identify if an unseen slot value occurs in the user utterance. Based on the detection module output, the belief state is updated using an update mechanism. Cosine similarity based DSTs were proposed by (Jang et al., 2016; Yoshida et al., 2018) based on the attention mechanism. The attention weights are used to obtain a weighted sum of input word embedding vectors which is used to estimate the probability using with each value. Since the model prediction is largely based on the similarity of the word vectors, the model struggles to learn from other features available in the input source. (Rastogi et al., 2017) proposed a a scalable multi-domain DST to address for slots for which values set is unbounded. However their system relies on an SLU to generate the candidates for a slot.

3 Copying Mechanism

In this section we briefly describe the copying mechanism introduced in COPYNET (Gu et al., 2016), which is the core of our model for tracking unseen slot values. The copying mechanism refers to the capacity to refer or copy certain segments in the input sentence into the output. This is a natural behaviour in human language communication, where the response to a certain input sentence may contain segments from the input itself. For example, in *extractive* text summarization (Gupta and Lehal, 2010), the model needs to extract sentences or phrases from an input document and to combine them into an output summary. The COPYNET model builds on top of the encoder-decoder architecture of (Bahdanau et al., 2015), by adding a copying mechanism so as to copy certain relevant input tokens into the output.

In a general sequence-to-sequence model, the encoder takes the source sentence as input x and

iteratively processes it to produce hidden states h_t at each timestep t (Sutskever et al., 2014). The decoder then takes the encoder hidden states h and uses an attention mechanism to weight these hidden states based on the previous hidden state of the decoder s_{t-1} to generate a probability distribution (using *softmax* activation function) over output tokens at timestep t of the decoder. Since this approach relies on generating output tokens only from the predefined output vocabulary, any new tokens in the source sentence can not be generated by the model.

The COPYNET mechanism builds on the same model, but the probability of generating any target word y_t is given by the combination of two probabilities, namely generate-mode and copy-mode. The score for the generate-mode is the same as the generic decoder, while the score for the copy-mode ψ_c is calculated for each word in the source input x_j as follows:

$$\psi_c(y_t = x_j) = \sigma(h_j^T W) s_t \quad (1)$$

where h_j is the hidden state for input x_j , W is the parameter learned during training and s_t is the hidden state of decoder at time t . The normalization of this copy score gives us a probability distribution over tokens present in the input X . Finally the distributions for generating the token and for copying the token from the input token are combined to yield the final distribution.

The details on how this copying mechanism is adapted for the task of dialogue state tracking are explained in the next section.

4 Proposed Model

The proposed DST is designed to predict for slot value pairs for a given turn in the dialogue and be flexible to slot value updates in the ontology. For a dialogue turn, given the user utterance U , the previous system action A and the value set V_s for slot $s \in S$, the proposed model provides a binary prediction for each value $v \in V_s$.

$$P_s = DST(U, A, V_s) \quad (2)$$

The proposed model is based on encoder-decoder architecture. The encoder module consists of a recurrent neural network (RNN) that takes as input the user utterance U and the previous system action A , and outputs a vector representation h . The decoder then receives the representation h and the slot-values $v \in V_s$ and estimates a score for each slot-value. The scores are

estimated in two stages namely *value score* and *copy score*. *Value score* helps the model in predicting the seen slot-values while *copy score* helps the model in predicting the unseen slot-values. Combining both these score in a single model helps us build a robust DST. We implement a shared encoder, the outputs of which is processed by multiple decoders (one for each slot s) to generate output predictions.

4.1 Encoder

The encoder provides a representation for each token in the input and a context vector that ideally summarizes the input. The encoder takes in the previous system action A and the current user utterance U as inputs and processes them iteratively to output a hidden representation for each token in the input as well as the context vector.

Let the user utterance at time t be denoted as $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$ with k words and A denote the previous system action. The system action A is converted into a sequence of tokens that include the *action*, *slot* and *value* (e.g. *confirm(food=italian)* \rightarrow confirm food Italian) and is denoted as $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l\}$. In case of multiple actions expressed by the system, we concatenate them together. The user utterance U and system action A are then concatenated forming the input X to the encoder.

$$X = [a_1, \dots, a_l; u_1, \dots, u_k] = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$$

where $[;]$ denotes concatenation. Each input tokens in $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ are then represented as a vector $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ by an embedding matrix $E \in \mathbb{R}^{|v| \times d}$ where $|v|$ is the vocabulary size and d is the embedding dimension. This representation is then input to the bidirectional-LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) that processes the input in both forward and backward directions to yield the hidden representation as follows,

$$\vec{h}_t = LSTM_f(\vec{h}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t) \quad (3)$$

$$\overleftarrow{h}_t = LSTM_b(\overleftarrow{h}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_t) \quad (4)$$

where $LSTM_f(\cdot)$, $LSTM_b(\cdot)$ are forward and backward LSTMs. \vec{h}_t and \overleftarrow{h}_t are the corresponding hidden states of forward and backward LSTMs at time t . The representations h_t for each token in the input and the overall input representation h_L

are then obtained as follows,

$$h_t = [\vec{h}_t; \overleftarrow{h}_t] \quad (5)$$

$$h_L = [\vec{h}_n; \overleftarrow{h}_1] \quad (6)$$

Since our model uses a shared encoder for all slots, the outputs of the encoder h_t and h_L are used by slot specific decoders for prediction on corresponding slots.

4.2 Decoder

The decoder of the model is a classifier that predicts the probability for each of the possible values $v \in V_s$ of a given slot $s \in S$. It takes in the hidden representations h_t and h_L of the encoder, and the set of possible values V_s for a given slot s and computes the probability for each value being expressed as a constraint. Initially, each of the slot-values are represented by a vector v using the same embedding matrix E of the encoder. For slot-values with multiple tokens, their corresponding embeddings are summed together to yield a single vector. The embeddings are then transformed as following to obtain a representation of the slot values.

$$Z_s = W_s \mathbf{V}_s^T \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{V}_s = \{v_1, v_2, \dots\}$ for slot s and W_s is the parameter learned during training. The encoder hidden state h_L is then transformed to obtain a slot specific representation of the user utterance as follows,

$$S = \tanh(W_h h_L) \quad (8)$$

The slot-value representations Z_s , slot specific input representation S and the hidden states of the input tokens h_t are then used to obtain the probability for each slot-value $p(\text{slot} = v)$.

$$p(\text{slot} = v) = \sigma(\psi_p(v) + \psi_c(v)) \quad (9)$$

where ψ_p is the value score and ψ_c is the copy score.

4.2.1 Copy score

To address the ability of the model to predict for the unseen slot-values, the copy mechanism is incorporated into this model. Initially an attention score a_i is calculated for each of the input tokens x_i based on its hidden representation h_i of the encoder. We use a similar attention approach of (Bahdanau et al., 2015) to compute the scores for

each h_i . Finally, for all tokens in a slot-value v , the corresponding attention scores in the input are combined to yield the copy score $\psi_c(v)$ for value v . Formally,

$$a_i = \tanh(W_c[S; h_i]) \quad (10)$$

$$\psi_c(v) = \sum_t a_t \quad : x_t \in v \quad (11)$$

where a_i is the attention score, \tanh is a non-linear activation function and W_c is model parameter learned in training.

4.2.2 Value score

The value score $\psi_p(v)$ helps the model in predicting for the value v based on the context and semantics of the source sentence. The hidden representations h_i of the encoder are weighted based on the normalized attention score a to yield a context vector C . Finally, the dot product of the context vector C and the slot-value vectors Z_s provides the value score for each value v . Formally,

$$\alpha = \text{Softmax}(a) \quad (12)$$

$$C = \sum_i \alpha_i h_i \quad (13)$$

$$\psi_p = C \cdot Z_s \quad (14)$$

Since Z_s is computed using the slot values V_s , the *value score* can be computed for any number for slot values. This enables the model to update slot values when needed and predict for new values without the need for retraining it.

5 Experiments

5.1 Datasets

We experiment our model on the datasets of dialogue state tracking challenges (DSTC2, DSTC3) and Wizard-of-Oz (WoZ2.0). The DSTC2 and WoZ2.0 are used to evaluate the models performance in predicting the seen slot values while the modified DSTC2 (explained in 5.1.1) and DSTC3 datasets are used to evaluate the models performance in predicting also the unseen slot values.

5.1.1 DSTC2

The DSTC2 (Henderson et al., 2014a) is a human-machine conversation dialogue dataset collected using Amazon Mechanical Turk consisting of dialogues in restaurants domain. It is the standard benchmark dataset used for the task of dialogue

Slot	#Values	Seen	Unseen
Area	20	6	14
Food	87	75	12
Price	5	4	1
	112	85	27

Table 1: Statistics of seen and unseen values for each slot in DSTC3 dataset (excluding *None* value).

state tracking. DSTC2 consists of labels for tracking both informable slots and requestable slots at each turn. We are interested in tracking the slot values for informable slots. DSTC2 is a spoken dataset consisting of ASR hypotheses and turn-level semantic labels along with the transcriptions. It consists of 1612 dialogues for training, 506 dialogues for development and 1117 dialogues for testing. The possible values for slots in the ontology are the same for both train and testset.

Since DSTC2 dataset does not have any unseen slot values in the testset, we also create a modified version of this dataset using the same approach as in (Xu and Hu, 2018). In particular, we randomly select 35% of values (26 out of 74) for the slot *food* and create a modified training data discarding any instance that contain one of the randomly selected value as the truth value for *food* slot. We use the top ASR hypotheses for both training and evaluation.

5.1.2 DSTC3

The DSTC3 (Henderson et al., 2014b) dataset is a human-machine conversation dialogue dataset collected using Amazon Mechanical Turk consisting of dialogues in tourist domain. DSTC3 was released to address the problems of unseen slot values and adaptability of a DST to a new domain. It consists of 2265 dialogues for test with no specific dataset for train. Since this dataset is an extension to the DSTC2 dataset, we use the DSTC2 dataset for training the model. In particular, we combine the train and test sets of DSTC2 together yielding 2729 (1612+1117) training dialogues and use the same development set of DSTC2. Though DSTC3 consists of new slots compared to DSTC2, we focus on predicting the unseen values for a given slot. Therefore we predict only on the slots *area*, *food* and *price* which are common in both DSTC2 and DSTC3. The statistics of unseen values for each of these slot is shown in Table 1. We use the top ASR hypotheses for both training and evaluation.

5.1.3 WoZ2.0

The WoZ2.0 (Mrkšić et al., 2017) dataset, collected using the Wizard of Oz framework, consists of written text conversations. Each turn in the dialogue was contributed by different users who had to review all previous turns in that dialogue before contributing to the turn. WoZ2.0 consists of a total of 1200 dialogues, out of which 600 for training, 200 for development and 400 for testing.

5.2 Evaluation metrics

We evaluate our model using the standard metrics for dialogue state tracking namely, *accuracy* and *joint goal*. In particular, *accuracy* is used to evaluate the model in tracking each slot separately, while *joint goal* is used to evaluate the overall performance of the model in tracking the dialogue state.

1. **Accuracy** is the ratio of number of turns where the slot is predicted correctly over the total number of turns and is calculated for each slot separately. We follow the *Scheme A* and *Schedule 1* evaluation scheme defined in the DSTC2 (Henderson et al., 2014a) challenge.
2. **Joint Goal** indicates the performance of the model in correctly tracking the goal constraints over a dialogue. The joint goal is the set of accumulated turn level goals up to a given turn.

The objective of our work is to model a data-driven approach that is able to perform consistently in predicting both the seen and unseen slot-values. Thus our goal is not to outperform any of the previous DST systems but rather address the weakness of existing system in predicting unseen slot values.

5.3 Implementation

We use pytorch² library to implement our model. The encoder of the model is shared across all slots and a separate decoder is defined for each slot. For the embeddings, we use the pre-trained Paragram-SL999 vectors (Wieting et al., 2015) of dimensions 300 learned using the Paraphrase Database (PPDB) (Ganitkevitch et al., 2013), and pre-trained character n -gram embeddings (Hashimoto et al., 2017) of dimension 100. Both embeddings

²<https://pytorch.org/>

are concatenated resulting in an embedding of size 400 for each token and are fixed during training. The number of hidden units in LSTM is set to 200 and a dropout of 0.2 is applied between different layers.

Since our DST is modeled as binary prediction for each value v , it can be used to track for domains where multiple values are possible for a single slot. For the considered datasets, since a slot can take only a single value at a given turn, we use the top prediction. The turn-level predictions are accumulated forward through the dialogue and the goal for slot s is *None* until it is predicted as value v by the model. The implemented model is experimented on 5 different random initializations for each dataset and the scores reported are the average of those experiments.

5.4 Results

The joint goal performance of the model on both the DSTC2 dataset and WoZ2.0 dataset is shown in Table 2. The delexicalisation-based (DB) model, as reported in (Mrkšić et al., 2017), is based on (Henderson, 2015) for the DSTC2 dataset and on (Wen et al., 2017) for the WoZ2.0 dataset. The DB model relies on a semantic lexicon to replace slot names in the input to generic delexicalised token while all other approaches in Table 2 (including our approach) are data-driven. The approaches of neural belief tracker (NBT) (Mrkšić et al., 2017), GLAD (Zhong et al., 2018) and StateNet_PSI (Ren et al., 2018) are focused on modelling the seen slot-values, while HDSTM (Yang et al., 2018), multi-domain DST (Rastogi et al., 2017) and Pointer Net (Xu and Hu, 2018) addresses the problem of unseen slot values in some aspect. We can see from the results that our approach significantly improves on the NBT and Pointer Net on both DSTC2 and WoZ2.0 datasets proving its ability in performing state-of-the-art in predicting the seen slot-values.

Though StateNet_PSI model claim to be able to predict for unseen slot-values, they force a hard constraint on the presence of a pretrained semantic embedding for any unseen slot-values. This is not ideal for slots such as *area*, *food* or *location* which usually contain names that do not have pre-trained embedding. Our approach is flexible in this aspect since the copy mechanism can point the relevant token in the input and make appropriate prediction without requiring pretrained em-

Model	Joint Goal	
	DSTC2	WoZ2.0
Delexicalisation-Based (DB) Model(Mrkšić et al., 2017)	69.1	70.8
HDSTM (Yang et al., 2018)	68.4	84.5
Scalable multi-domain DST (Rastogi et al., 2017)	70.3	-
Pointer Net (Xu and Hu, 2018)	72.1	-
Neural Belief Tracker (NBT) - DNN (Mrkšić et al., 2017)	72.6	84.4
Neural Belief Tracker (NBT) - CNN (Mrkšić et al., 2017)	73.4	84.2
GLAD (Zhong et al., 2018)	74.5	88.1
StateNet_PSI (Ren et al., 2018)	75.5	88.9
Our approach	73.8	87.5

Table 2: Dialogue state tracking performance on the testset of DSTC2 and WoZ2.0 datasets.




Figure 2: Accuracy of food slot on modified DSTC2 dataset.

bedding. The GLAD model on the other hand uses an encoder with LSTM nodes to represent the slot-values which makes it unsuitable to effectively predict for unseen slot-values.

We show the performance of our model in predicting unseen slot values on the modified DSTC2 dataset in Figure 2. We can see that the Pointer Net (Xu and Hu, 2018) approach though performs well on seen slot-values, drops in performance on unseen slot-values. This could be due to the hybrid architecture employed in Pointer Net where prediction of a slot value is done in two stages (i.e predict if the value is *None* or *dontcare* or *other* and if *other*, then predict the location of slot value in the input source). Since this approach points to the location of slot value in the input source, the training data should contain the location of the reference slot value and it also requires an additional post-processing step to normalize for the value. Our approach does not provide any such constraints and shows a consistent performance on both seen and

unseen slot-values.

The overall slot-wise accuracy of our model on the DSTC2 and DSTC3 datasets are shown in Table 3. The DSTC2 dataset consists only of seen slot values while DSTC3 has both seen and unseen slot-values. The *Focus Baseline* and *RNN with rules* are the results from the official DSTC2 and DSTC3 challenge (Henderson et al., 2014a,b). The *focus baseline* is a rule based approach that uses SLU results to track the dialogue state while *RNN with rules* uses recurrent neural network using delexicalisation approach. *RNN with rules* showed the best accuracy in DSTC3 in the official challenge. Since these two models require external features such as SLU or a semantic lexicon, their scalability to real world applications are very poor and require significant feature modelling for each domain. The *Cos with Sentinel* (Yoshida et al., 2018) is a data-driven approach which uses cosine similarity between the slot value and the inputs, and makes prediction using a sentinel mixture model. We can see that a complete data-driven approach such as *Cos with sentinel*, that is modelled to predict both seen slots and unseen slot values suffers from lower performance also on seen slot values. However our approach is able to achieve better performance on DSTC3 dataset (consisting unseen slot-values) while performing close to state-of-the-art in DSTC2 dataset. The performance of the models on predicting only the unseen slot values in DSTC3 dataset is shown in Table 4.

5.5 Discussion

From the results shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4, we can infer that using copy mechanism for the task of dialogue state tracking provides a more robust

Model	DSTC2			DSTC3		
	Area	Food	Price	Area	Food	Price
Focus Baseline	90.8	83.7	92.9	81.1	90.5	88.4
RNN with rules	92.4	85.6	93.0	88.5	91.0	93.2
Cos with Sentinel (Yoshida et al., 2018)	84.7	84.4	83.7	80.6	79.6	66.9
Our approach	91.0	81.5	92.4	78.0	84.0	91.5

Table 3: Overall accuracy of the model on both DSTC2 and DSTC3 datasets.

Model	DSTC3		
	Area	Food	Price
Focus Baseline	67.8	88.1	87.6
RNN with rules	85.3	82.3	92.3
Cos with Sentinel (Yoshida et al., 2018)	71.5	59.5	52.7
Our approach	68.5	77.9	85.0

Table 4: Accuracy on model in predicting the unseen slot values in DSTC3 dataset.

model. While previous approaches either rely on semantic lexicon, delexicalization or rules to predict the unseen slot-values, our approach takes a complete data-driven path to address this problem. Though we use semantic embeddings as part of our word embedding, our model is also able to handle tokens for which no semantic embedding exist. This can be seen in the accuracy performance of *area* and *food* slots in DSTC3 dataset, where the unseen slot values are typically proper names for which the semantic embedding did not exist. The copy mechanism combined with the n -gram embedding helps the model in handling such scenarios. While our approach is used to predict from on a pre-defined set (categorical) of slot-values in this work, it can also be adopted to scenarios where the slot-value is unbounded. This provides advantage in modelling for a schema-based DST, where the datatype of a slot can either be categorical or free-form.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we addressed the problem of unseen slot values for the task of dialogue state tracking and proposed a novel E2E data-driven approach based on copying mechanism that is robust in tracking for both seen and unseen slot values. The proposed approach offers advantage in being flexible for slot value updates in the ontology without relying on either SLU or handcrafted features. Our evaluations demonstrate that the pro-

posed approach provides considerable advantage in being able to track unseen slot values effectively with state-of-the-art performance. In future works we would like to investigate our approach targeting the applicability of the model in multi-domain dialogue state tracking.

References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. [Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Juri Ganitkevitch, Benjamin Van Durme, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2013. [Ppdb: The paraphrase database](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 758–764. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiatao Gu, Zhengdong Lu, Hang Li, and Victor O.K. Li. 2016. [Incorporating copying mechanism in sequence-to-sequence learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1631–1640. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vishal Gupta and Gurpreet Singh Lehal. 2010. A survey of text summarization extractive techniques. *Journal of emerging technologies in web intelligence*, 2(3):258–268.
- Kazuma Hashimoto, caiming xiong, Yoshimasa Tsuruoka, and Richard Socher. 2017. [A joint many-task model: Growing a neural network for multiple nlp tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1923–1933. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew Henderson. 2015. Machine learning for dialog state tracking: A review. In *The First International Workshop on Machine Learning in Spoken Language Processing*.
- Matthew Henderson, Blaise Thomson, and Jason D Williams. 2014a. The second dialog state tracking

- challenge. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue (SIGDIAL)*, pages 263–272.
- Matthew Henderson, Blaise Thomson, and Jason D Williams. 2014b. The third dialog state tracking challenge. In *2014 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 324–329. IEEE.
- Matthew Henderson, Blaise Thomson, and Steve Young. 2014c. [Word-based dialog state tracking with recurrent neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue (SIGDIAL)*, pages 292–299. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew Henderson, Blaise Thomson, and Steve J. Young. 2014d. Robust dialog state tracking using delexicalised recurrent neural networks and unsupervised adaptation. *2014 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 360–365.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Y. Jang, J. Ham, B. Lee, Y. Chang, and K. Kim. 2016. [Neural dialog state tracker for large ontologies by attention mechanism](#). In *2016 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 531–537.
- Xiujun Li, Yun-Nung Chen, Lihong Li, Jianfeng Gao, and Asli Celikyilmaz. 2017. [End-to-end task-completion neural dialogue systems](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 733–743, Taipei, Taiwan. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.
- Bing Liu and Ian Lane. 2017. An end-to-end trainable neural network model with belief tracking for task-oriented dialog. In *Interspeech 2017*.
- Nikola Mrkšić, Diarmuid Ó Séaghdha, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Blaise Thomson, and Steve Young. 2017. [Neural belief tracker: Data-driven dialogue state tracking](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1777–1788. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abhinav Rastogi, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, and Larry Heck. 2017. Scalable multi-domain dialogue state tracking. In *2017 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 561–568. IEEE.
- Liliang Ren, Kaige Xie, Lu Chen, and Kai Yu. 2018. [Towards universal dialogue state tracking](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2780–2786. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- K. Sun, L. Chen, S. Zhu, and K. Yu. 2014. [A generalized rule based tracker for dialogue state tracking](#). In *2014 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 330–335.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3104–3112.
- Zhuoran Wang and Oliver Lemon. 2013. [A simple and generic belief tracking mechanism for the dialog state tracking challenge: On the believability of observed information](#). In *Proceedings of the SIGDIAL 2013 Conference*, pages 423–432. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tsung-Hsien Wen, David Vandyke, Nikola Mrkšić, Milica Gasic, Lina M. Rojas Barahona, Pei-Hao Su, Stefan Ultes, and Steve Young. 2017. [A network-based end-to-end trainable task-oriented dialogue system](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 438–449, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Wieting, Mohit Bansal, Kevin Gimpel, and Karen Livescu. 2015. [From paraphrase database to compositional paraphrase model and back](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3(1):345–358.
- Puyang Xu and Qi Hu. 2018. [An end-to-end approach for handling unknown slot values in dialogue state tracking](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1448–1457. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guohua Yang, Xiaojie Wang, and Caixia Yuan. 2018. [Hierarchical dialog state tracking with unknown slot values](#). *Neural Processing Letters*.
- Takami Yoshida, Kenji Iwata, Hiroshi Fujimura, and Masami Akamine. 2018. Dialog state tracking for unseen values using an extended attention mechanism. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop Spoken Dialogue Systems Technology (IWSDS 2018)*.
- Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2018. [Global-locally self-attentive encoder for dialogue state tracking](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1458–1467. Association for Computational Linguistics.