An Annotation Scheme of A Large-scale Multi-party Dialogues Dataset for Discourse Parsing and Machine Comprehension

Jiaqi Li, Ming Liu, Bing Qin, Zihao Zheng, Ting Liu
Harbin Institute of Technology
{jqli, mliu, qinb, zhzheng, tliu}@ir.hit.edu.cn

arXiv:1911.03514v1 [cs.CL] 8 Nov 2019

Abstract

In this paper, we propose the scheme for annotating large-scale multi-party chat dialogues for discourse parsing and machine comprehension. The main goal of this project is to help understand multi-party dialogues. Our dataset is based on the Ubuntu Chat Corpus. For each multi-party dialogue, we annotate the discourse structure and question-answer pairs for dialogues. As we know, this is the first large scale corpus for multi-party dialogues discourse parsing, and we firstly propose the task for multi-party dialogues machine reading comprehension.

1 Introduction

There are more and more NLP scholars focusing on the research of multi-party dialogues, such as multi-party dialogues discourse parsing and multi-party meeting summarization (Shi and Huang, 2019; Hu et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2019; Perret et al., 2016; Afantenos et al., 2015). However, the scale of the STAC dataset has limited the research of discourse parsing for multi-party dialogues. On the other hand, as we know, there is no literature working on machine reading comprehension for multi-party dialogues. Considering the connection between the relevance between machine reading comprehension and discourse parsing, we annotate the dataset for two tasks for multi-party dialogues understanding.

Our dataset derives from the large scale multi-party dialogues dataset the Ubuntu Chat Corpus (Lowe et al., 2015). For each dialogue in the corpus, we annotate the discourse structure of the dialogue and propose three questions and find the answer span in the input dialogues. To improve the difficulty of the task, we annotate $\frac{1}{6}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ unanswerable questions and their plausible answers from dialogues.

This is a real example from the Ubuntu dataset.

Example 1

1. mjg59: Someone should suggest to Mark that the best way to get people to love you is to hire people to work on reverse-engineering closed drivers.
2. jdub: heh
3. daniels → mjg59: heh
4. daniels: HELLO
5. daniels → mjg59: your job is to entertain me so I don't fall asleep at 2pm and totally destroy my migration to AEST
6. bdale → daniels: see you next week?
7. daniels → bdale: oh, auug, right. rock.
8. daniels → bdale: just drop me an email, or call +61 403 505 896
9. bdale → daniels: I arrive Tuesday morning your time, depart Fri morning, will be staying at the Duxton

There are mainly two contributions to our corpus:

- A first large scale multi-part dialogues dataset for discourse parsing. It is a challenging task to parse the discourse structure of multi-party dialogues. Enough training data will be essential to develop more powerful models.

- We firstly propose the task of machine reading comprehension for multi-party dialogues. Different from existing machine comprehension tasks, multi-party dialogues could be more difficult which needs a graph-based model for representing the dialogues and better understanding the discourse structure in the dialogue.

In this paper, I will give a detailed description of our large scale dataset. In section 2, I will introduce Ubuntu corpus. In Section 3 and Section 4, I will introduce the annotation for discourse parsing and machine reading comprehension respectively. In Section 5, I will briefly list some related literature.

2 Ubuntu Corpus

Our dataset derives from the large scale multi-party dialogues dataset the Ubuntu Chat Corpus (Lowe et al., 2015). The Ubuntu dataset is a large scale multi-party dialogues corpus.

There are several reasons to choose the Ubuntu dataset as our raw data for annotation.

- First, Ubuntu dataset is a large multi-party dataset. Recently, (Hu et al., 2019)used Ubuntu as their dataset for learning dialogues graph representation. After some preprocessing, there are 38K sessions and 1.75M utterances. In each session, there are 3-10 utterances and 2-7interlocutors.

- Second, it is easy to annotate the Ubuntu dataset. The Ubuntu dataset already contains Response-to relations that are discourse relations between different speakers' utterances. For annotating discourse dependencies in dialogues, we only need to annotate relations between the same speaker's utterances and the specific senseofdiscourse relation.

- Third, there are many papers doing experiments on the Ubuntu dataset, and the dataset has beenwidely recognized.

The discourse dependency structure of each multi-party dialogue can be regarded as a graph. To learn better graph representation of multi-party dialogues, we adopt the dialogues with 8-15 utterances and 3-7 speakers. To simplify the task, we filter the dialogues with long sentences (more than 20 words). Finally, we obtain 52,053 dialogues and 460,358 utterances.

3 Annotation for discourse parsing in multi-party dialogues

This section will explain how to annotate discourse structure in multi-party dialogues.

The task of discourse parsing for multi-party dialogues aims to detect discourse relations among utterances. The discourse structure of a multi-party dialogue is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). In the process of annotation of discourse parsing for multi-party dialogues, there are two parts: edges annotation between utterances and specific sense type of discourse relations.

The discourse structure of Example 1 is shown in Figure 1. There are four speakers and nine utterances in the sample dialogue. The left part shows the speakers and their utterances and the right part shows the discourse dependency relation arcs. The discourse structure can be seen as a discourse dependency graph. We adopt the same sense hierarchy with the STAC dataset which contains sixteen discourse relations.

3.1 Edges between utterances

The edge between two utterances represents that there is the discourse dependency relations between these two utterances. The direction of the edge represents the direction of discourse dependency. In this subsection, what we need to do is to confirm whether two utterances have discourse relation. Like PDTB (Prasad et al., 2008), we call two utterances as Arg1 and Arg2 respectively. The front utterance is Arg1 and the back utterance is Arg2.

For example, there is a multi-party dialogue with 9 utterances in Example 1, utterances 1-9 respectively. The utterance 3 depends on utterance 1, we can draw an edge from utterance 1 to utterance 3. Otherwise, if utterance 1 depends on utterance 2, we can draw an edge from utterance 2 to utterance 1. In most cases, the direction of discourse relations in multi-party dialogues is from the front to the back.




Figure 1: The discourse dependency structure and relations for **Example 1**.

The biggest difference between discourse parsing for well-written document and dialogues is that discourse relations can exist on two nonadjacent utterances in dialogues. When we annotate dialogues, we should read dialogues from begin to the end. For each utterance, we should find its one parent node at least from all its previous utterances. We assume that the discourse structure is a connected graph and no utterance is isolated.

3.2 Sense of discourse relations

When we find the discourse relation between two utterances, we need continue to confirm the specific relation sense. We adopt the same senses hierarchy with the STAC dataset.

There are sixteen discourse relations in the STAC. All relations are listed as follows: Comment, Clarification_question, Elaboration, Acknowledgement, Continuation, Explanation, Conditional, Question-answer_pair, Alternation, Q-Elab, Result, Background, Narration, Correction, Parallel, Contrast.

4 Annotation for machine reading comprehension in multi-party dialogues

The task of reading comprehension for multi-party dialogues aims to be beneficial for understanding multi-party dialogues. Different from existing machine reading comprehension tasks, the input of this task is a multi-party dialogue, and we should to answer some questions given the dialogue.

We propose three questions for eache dialogue and annotate the span of answers in the input dialogue. As we know, our dataset is the first corpus for multi-party dialogues reading comprehension.

We construct following questions and answers for the dialogue in **Example 1**:

- Q1: When does Bdale leave?
- A1: Fri morning
- Q2: How to get people love Mark in Mjg59's opinion.
- A2: Hire people to work on reverse-engineering closed drivers.

On the other hand, to improve the difficulty of the task, we propose $\frac{1}{6}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ unanswerable questions in our dataset. We annotate unanswerable questions and their plausible answers (PA). Each plausible answer comes from the input dialogue, but is not the answer for the plausible question.

- Q1: Whis is the email of daniels?
- PA: +61 403 505 896

5 Related work

In this section, I will introduce several existing multi-party dialogues datasets, and explain why we need to annotated a new dataset.

5.1 Discourse parsing for multi-party dialogues

There is an only corpus of discourse parsing on multi-party chat dialogues: STAC (Asher et al., 2016). The corpus derives from online game *The Settlers of Catan*. The game *Settlers* is a multi-party, win-lose game. As mentioned above, an example in STAC is shown in Figure 1. More details for STAC corpus are described in (Asher et al., 2016).

The overview of the STAC is shown in Table 1. From Table 1 we can know that there are about more 10K EDUs and relations and most of EDUs are weakly connected. Each EDU can be regarded as a message or sentence in the dialogues.

	Total	**Training**	**Testing**
Dialogues	1091	968	123
EDUs	10677	9545	1132
Relations	11348	10158	1190

Table 1: Overview of STAC corpus.

There are sixteen types of discourse dependency relations in STAC as shown in Section 3.2.

5.2 Machine reading comprehension

Machine reading comprehension is a popular task which aims to help the machine better understand natural language. There are several types of datasets for machine comprehension, including extractive datasets (Joshi et al., 2017; Trischler et al., 2017), answer sentence selection datasets (Wang et al., 2007; Yang et al., 2015) and multiple choice datasets (Richardson et al., 2013; Lai et al., 2017). I will briefly introduce two datasets QuAC (Choi et al., 2018)and CoQA (Reddy et al., 2019).

QuAC : Question Answering in Context is a two-party dialogues dataset for machine reading comprehension (Choi et al., 2018). The dataset for Question Answering in Context that contains 14K information-seeking QA dialogs (100K questions in total). The dialogs involve two crowd workers: (1) a student who poses a sequence of freeform questions to learn as much as possible about a hidden Wikipedia text, and (2) a teacher who answers the questions by providing short excerpts from the text.

CoQA is a large dataset for building conversation question answering systems (Reddy et al., 2019).

6 Conclusion

We propose the scheme for annotating large scale multi-party chat dialogues for discourse parsing and machine comprehension. The main goal of this project is to be beneficial for understanding multi-party dialogues. Our corpus are based on the Ubuntu Chat Corpus. For each multi-party dialogue, we annotate discourse structure and question-answer pairs for the dialogue. As we know, this would be the first large-scale corpus for multi-party dialogues discourse parsing, and we firstly propose the task for multi-party dialogues machine reading comprehension.

References

[Afantenos et al.2015] Stergos Afantenos, Eric Kow, Nicholas Asher, and Jérémy Perret. 2015. Discourse parsing for multi-party chat dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 928–937. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[Asher et al.2016] Nicholas Asher, Julie Hunter, Mathieu Morey, Farah Benamara, and Stergos Afantenos. 2016. Discourse structure and dialogue acts in multiparty dialogue: The stac corpus.

[Choi et al.2018] Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wen-tau Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Quac: Question answering in context. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2174–2184.

[Hu et al.2019] Wenpeng Hu, Zhangming Chan, Bing Liu, Dongyan Zhao, Jinwen Ma, and Rui Yan. 2019. Gsn: A graph-structured network for multi-party dialogues. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint*

Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19, pages 5010–5016. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 7.

[Joshi et al.2017] Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611.

[Lai et al.2017] Guokun Lai, Qizhe Xie, Hanxiao Liu, Yiming Yang, and Eduard Hovy. 2017. Race: Large-scale reading comprehension dataset from examinations. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 785–794.

[Li et al.2019] Manling Li, Lingyu Zhang, Heng Ji, and Richard J. Radke. 2019. Keep meeting summaries on topic: Abstractive multi-modal meeting summarization. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2190–2196, Florence, Italy, July. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[Lowe et al.2015] Ryan Lowe, Nissan Pow, Iulian Serban, and Joelle Pineau. 2015. The ubuntu dialogue corpus: A large dataset for research in unstructured multi-turn dialogue systems. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 285–294.

[Perret et al.2016] Jérémy Perret, Stergos Afantenos, Nicholas Asher, and Mathieu Morey. 2016. Integer linear programming for discourse parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 99–109. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[Prasad et al.2008] Rashmi Prasad, Nikhil Dinesh, Alan Lee, Eleni Miltsakaki, Livio Robaldo, Aravind K Joshi, and Bonnie L Webber. 2008. The penn discourse treebank 2.0. In *LREC*. Citeseer.

[Reddy et al.2019] Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. CoQA: A conversational question answering challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:249–266, March.

[Richardson et al.2013] Matthew Richardson, Christopher J.C. Burges, and Erin Renshaw. 2013. MCTest: A challenge dataset for the open-domain machine comprehension of text. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 193–203, Seattle, Washington, USA, October. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[Shi and Huang2019] Zhouxing Shi and Minlie Huang. 2019. A deep sequential model for discourse parsing on multi-party dialogues. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 7007–7014.

[Trischler et al.2017] Adam Trischler, Tong Wang, Xingdi Yuan, Justin Harris, Alessandro Sordoni, Philip Bachman, and Kaheer Suleman. 2017. Newsqa: A machine comprehension dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, pages 191–200.

[Wang et al.2007] Mengqiu Wang, Noah A Smith, and Teruko Mitamura. 2007. What is the jeopardy model? a quasi-synchronous grammar for qa. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pages 22–32.

[Yang et al.2015] Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. Wikiqa: A challenge dataset for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2013–2018.

[Zhao et al.2019] Zhou Zhao, Haojie Pan, Changjie Fan, Yan Liu, Linlin Li, and Min Yang. 2019. Abstractive meeting summarization via hierarchical adaptive segmental network learning. In *The World Wide Web Conference*, pages 3455–3461. ACM.