

TOPIC-AWARE CHATBOT USING RECURRENT NEURAL NETWORKS AND NONNEGATIVE MATRIX FACTORIZATION

YUCHEN GUO, NICHOLAS HANOIAN, ZHEXIAO LIN, NICHOLAS LISKIJ, HANBAEK LYU, DEANNA NEEDELL, JIAHAO QU,
HENRY SOJICO, YULIANG WANG, ZHE XIONG, AND ZHENHONG ZOU

ABSTRACT. We propose a novel model for a topic-aware chatbot by combining the traditional Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) encoder-decoder model with a topic attention layer based on Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF). After learning topic vectors from an auxiliary text corpus via NMF, the decoder is trained so that it is more likely to sample response words from the most correlated topic vectors. One of the main advantages in our architecture is that the user can easily switch the NMF-learned topic vectors so that the chatbot obtains desired topic-awareness. We demonstrate our model by training on a single conversational data set which is then augmented with topic matrices learned from different auxiliary data sets. We show that our topic-aware chatbot not only outperforms the non-topic counterpart, but also that each topic-aware model qualitatively and contextually gives the most relevant answer depending on the topic of question.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, deep learning algorithms [DLH⁺13, Ben13, Den14] have demonstrated significant advancements in various areas of machine learning including image classification [KSH12], computer vision [BPL10], and voice recognition tasks [HCC⁺14, AAB⁺16], even outperforming hand selected features from experts with decades of experience.

Another area where deep learning algorithms have been successfully applied is *sequence learning*, which aims at understanding the structure of sequential data such as language, musical notes, and videos. One example of an application of deep learning in language modeling is conversational *chatbots*. A chatbot is a program that conducts a conversation with a user by simulating one side of it. Chatbots receive inputs from a user one message, or question, at a time, and then form a response that is sent back to the user. One of the most widely used machine learning techniques for sequence learning is *Recurrent Neural Networks* (RNN). In the viewpoint of statistical learning theory and generative models, sequence learning can be regarded as the problem of learning a joint probability distribution induced by a given sequence data corpus. RNNs learn such joint probability distributions by learning all conditional probability distributions through a deep learning architecture.

A complementary approach in machine learning is *topic modeling* (or *dictionary learning*),

which aims at extracting important features of a complex dataset so that one can represent the dataset in terms of a reduced number of extracted features, or topics. One of the advantages of topic modeling-based approaches is that the extracted topics are often directly interpretable, as opposed to the arbitrary abstractions of deep neural networks. Topic models have been shown to efficiently capture intrinsic structures of text data in natural language processing tasks [SG07, BCD10]. Two prominent methods of topic modeling are *Latent Dirichlet allocation* (LDA) [BNJ03] and *nonnegative matrix factorization* (NMF) [LS99], which are based on Bayesian inference and optimization, respectively.

An active area of research in machine learning is combining the generative power of deep learning algorithms with the interpretability of topic modeling. Recently, new algorithms combining deep neural networks with LDA or NMF have been proposed and studied, aiming at better performance and human interpretability in various classification tasks [TBZS16, FH17, JLZZ18, GHM⁺19].

We are interested in combining RNN-based chatbot models with topic models to enable chatbots to be aware of the topics of input questions and give more topic-oriented and context-sensible output. In fact, there are recent works which combine RNN-based chatbot architecture with LDA-powered topic modeling [XWW⁺17, SSL⁺17]. However, there has not yet been a direct attempt to incorporate the alternative topic modeling method

of NMF with chatbots. Using NMF over LDA provide many advantages including computational efficiency, ease of implementation, possibility of transfer learning, as well as the possibility of incorporating recent developments of online NMF on Markovian data [LNB19].

1.1. Our contribution. In this paper, we construct a model for a topic-aware chatbot by combining the traditional RNN encoder-decoder model with a novel topic attention layer based on NMF. Namely, after learning topic vectors from an auxiliary text corpus via NMF, each input question that is fed into the encoder is augmented with the topic vectors as well as its correlation with topic vectors. The decoder is trained so that it is more likely to sample words from the most correlated topic vectors.

We demonstrate our proposed RNN-NMF chatbot architecture by training on the same conversation data set (Cornell Movie Dialogue) but supplemented with different topic matrices learned from other corpora such as Delta Airline customer service records, Shakespeare plays, and 20 News groups articles. We show that our topic-aware chatbot not only outperforms the non-topic counterpart, but also each topic-aware model qualitatively and contextually gives the most relevant answer depending on the topic of question.

2. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORKS

There are two main approaches for building chatbots: retrieval-based methods and generative methods. A retrieval-based chatbot is one that has a predefined set of responses, and each time a question is asked, one of these pre-written responses will be returned. The advantage here is that every response is guaranteed to be fluent. Many researchers have come up with interesting ideas to build a chatbot that can extract the most important information from a question and choose the correct answer from a given set of possible responses [WWX⁺16, WLLC13]. Generative chatbots, on the other hand, have the ability to generate a new response to each given input question. These models are more suitable for ‘chatting’ with people, and they have also attracted attention from other authors [LGB⁺15, SGA⁺15, SLL15, SSB⁺16]. Chen et al. [XWW⁺17] introduced the concept of LDA-based topic attention in generative chatbots. Our

main goal is to construct an NMF-based, topic-aware generative chatbot. In this section, we provide a brief introduction to the key concepts such as the RNN encoder-decoder structure, attention, and nonnegative matrix factorization.

2.1. RNN encoder-decoder. The problem of constructing a chatbot can be formulated as follows. Let Ω be a finite set of words, and let $\Omega^\ell = \Omega \times \dots \times \Omega$ be the set of sentences of length ℓ consisting of words from Ω ¹.

Sentences of varying lengths can be represented as elements of the set Ω^ℓ by appending empty word tokens to the end of shorter sentences until the desired length is reached. Next, let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \Omega^\ell \times \Omega^\ell$ be a large corpus of sentences that consists of question-answer pairs (e.g., from movie dialogues or Reddit threads). This will induce a probability distribution p on $\Omega^\ell \times \Omega^\ell$ by

$$p(q_1, \dots, q_\ell, a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \quad (1)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{of times that the question } (q_1, \dots, q_\ell) \\ \text{and answer } (a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \text{ appears in } \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right) \quad (2)$$

The generative model’s approach for sequence learning is to learn the best approximation \hat{p} of the true joint distribution p . Once we have \hat{p} , we can build a chatbot that generates an answer $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$ for a question $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ from the approximate conditional distribution $\hat{p}(\cdot | \mathbf{q})$.

The encoder-decoder framework was first proposed in [CVMG⁺14, SVL14] in order to address the above problem, especially for machine translation. The encoder uses an RNN to encode a given question $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ into a context vector \mathbf{c} ,

$$\mathbf{c} = f_c^{\text{enc}}(\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_\ell), \quad (3)$$

where $(\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_\ell)$ is a hidden state computed recursively from the input question \mathbf{q} as

$$\mathbf{h}_i = f_h^{\text{enc}}(q_i, \mathbf{h}_{i-1}). \quad (4)$$

Here f_c^{enc} and f_h^{enc} are nonlinear functions for computing encoder context vector and hidden states. For instance, in [SVL14], f_h^{enc} and f_c^{enc} were taken to be Long-Short Term Memory (LSTM) [HS97] and the last hidden state, respectively.

The decoder then generates a sequence of marginal probability distributions $(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell)$ over Ω so that $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ approximates the conditional distribution of the i^{th} word in the answer given the question \mathbf{q} and all previous predictions. By writing the

¹Typical parameter choices are e.g., 10,000 common english words and $\ell = 25$ for maximum word count in a sentence.

joint probability distribution as a product of ordered conditionals, the decoder then computes a conditional probability distribution $\hat{p}(\cdot|\mathbf{q})$ on Ω^ℓ for possible answers to the input question \mathbf{q} by

$$\hat{p}(a_1, \dots, a_\ell | \mathbf{q}) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \hat{p}_i(a_i) \quad (5)$$

$$\approx \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p(a_i | a_{i-1}, \dots, a_1, \mathbf{q}) \quad (6)$$

$$= p(a_1, \dots, a_\ell | \mathbf{q}). \quad (7)$$

For computation, the decoder uses another RNN that computes prediction vectors $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ recursively as

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i = f_p^{\text{dec}}(\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{i-1}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1, \mathbf{c}), \quad (8)$$

where $(\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_\ell)$ are decoder hidden states, again computed recursively, this time as

$$\mathbf{s}_i = f_h^{\text{dec}}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{i-1}, \mathbf{s}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}). \quad (9)$$

Here f_p^{dec} and f_h^{dec} are nonlinear functions for computing decoder prediction vector and hidden states.

The parameters in the nonlinear functions in $f_h^{\text{enc}}, f_c^{\text{enc}}, f_h^{\text{dec}}, f_p^{\text{dec}}$ are then learned so that the following *Kullback-Leibler divergence* [KL51] is minimized:

$$D(p \| \hat{p}) = - \sum_{(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}) \in \Omega^\ell \times \Omega^\ell} p(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}) \log \left(\frac{\hat{p}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a})}{p(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a})} \right). \quad (10)$$

A typical technique for numerically solving the above optimization problem for training the encoder-decoder is called *backpropagation through time* (BPTT), which is the usual method of backpropagation in deep feedforward neural networks applied to the ‘unfolded diagram’ of RNN (see, e.g., [RF87, Wer88, CR13]). However, as we deal with longer-range time dependencies (e.g., chatbots or machine translation), repeated multiplication causes the gradient to vanish at an exponential rate as it backpropogates through the network, which may cause deadlock in training phase. Some advanced versions of BPTT to handle this issue of the vanishing gradient problem have been developed, such as truncated BPTT with long short-term memory (LSTM) [HS97] and gated recurrent units (GRU) [Ben14].

2.2. The attention mechanism. In the encoder-decoder framework, the input question \mathbf{q} is

mapped into a single context vector \mathbf{c} by the encoder, which then is used as the initial hidden state for the decoder to generate prediction vectors $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell$. However, limiting the decoder to just a single context vector might not be the best idea. What if instead, the decoder could utilize all encoder hidden states $\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_\ell$ and apply different weights to each of these states for each step of the decoder? This is the intuition behind the attention mechanism, and the hope is that it allows the decoder to ‘focus’ on different features of the input as it creates each piece of the output.

The *attention mechanism*, first proposed for image processing, was introduced to the field of natural language processing in 2014 [PJ88, BCB14, MHGK14]. Single RNN models use hidden states to extract information to generate responses in a conversational setting. However, one problem with this structure is that sentences may be too long to be represented by a fixed-length context vector [WCB14, BCB14]. Simultaneously, attention has proven to be effective and efficient in generation tasks, since it assists the network in focusing on specific parts of past information. Many methods have been suggested, including content-based attention [GWD14], additive attention [BCB14], multiplicative attention [WPD17], located based attention [LPM15], and scaled attention [VSP⁺17].

There has been significant work done with attention mechanisms in RNN-based language models; the most relevant to our work is by Xing et al. [XWW⁺17]. By using context-based attention as well as information from past input and predictions, Xing et al. implemented a *topic attention* mechanism into the encoder-decoder model for topic-aware response generation. Their implementation utilizes the pre-trained Twitter LDA model [ZJW⁺11] to acquire topical words from the input. This model assumes that each input corresponds to one topic within the LDA model, and each word in the input is either non-topical, or is a topic word corresponding to the current topic. The topic of the input question is then used as an input to the attention mechanism, which then biases the decoder to produce the predictions $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ that have preferences to the given topic’s words.

2.3. Nonnegative matrix factorization. *Nonnegative matrix factorization* (NMF) is an algorithm for decomposing a nonnegative matrix into two

smaller matrices whose product approximates the original matrix. NMF has been recognized as an indispensable tool in text analysis, image reconstruction, medical imaging, bioinformatics, and many other scientific fields [SGH02, BB05, BBL⁺07, CWS⁺11, TN12, BMB⁺15, RPZ⁺18]. It is often used to extract features, or topics, from textual data. It aims to factor a given data matrix into nonnegative dictionary and code matrices in order to extract important topics:

$$\text{Data} \approx \text{Dictionary} \times \text{Code}. \quad (11)$$

More precisely, one seeks to factorize a data matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{d \times n}$ into a product of low-rank nonnegative dictionary $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and code $H \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ matrices by solving the following optimization problem

$$\inf_{W \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{d \times r}, H \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{r \times n}} \|X - WH\|_F^2, \quad (12)$$

where $\|A\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^2$ denotes the matrix Frobenius norm [LS99, LYC09].

Once we have the above factorization, we can represent each column of the data matrix as a nonnegative linear combination of dictionary column vectors, where the coefficients are given by the corresponding column of the code matrix. Due to the nonnegativity constraint, each column of the data matrix is then represented as a nonnegative linear combination of dictionary atoms. Hence the dictionaries must be “positive parts” of the columns of the data matrix.

Many efficient iterative algorithms for NMF are based on block optimization schemes that have been proposed and studied, including the well-known multiplicative update method by Lee and Seung [LS01] (see [Gil14] for a survey). To make the topics more localized and reduce the overlaps between the topics, one can also enforce sparseness on the code matrix [Hoy04] in the optimization problem (12). Moreover, algorithms for NMF have been extended to the online setting, where one seeks to learn dictionary atoms progressively from an input stream of data [MBPS10a, GTLY12, ZTX16]. Rigorous convergence guarantees for online NMF algorithms have been obtained in [MBPS10a] for independent and identically distributed input data. Recently, these works were extended convergence guarantees of online NMF algorithms to the Markovian setting [LNB19], ensuring further versatility of NMF based

topic modeling from input sequences generated by Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithms. Furthermore, NMF-based approaches can be extended to the settings of dynamic [KMBS11, SS12], hierarchical [CZA07], and tensor factorization [XY13, SH05].

3. THE RNN-NMF CHATBOT ARCHITECTURE

In this section, we describe the architecture of our RNN-NMF chatbot. Our chatbot is based on the Encoder-Decoder structure that we described in Subsection 2.1 with two additional message and topic attention layers, illustrated in Figure 1. Our main contribution is incorporating NMF into the topic attention layer, which provides a simple and efficient way to make the encoder-decoder based chatbot topic-aware.

3.1. Obtaining topic representation with NMF. The algorithm begins with two data sets—a corpus \mathcal{D} of question-answer pairs of sentences and a corpus \mathcal{S} of documents for topic modeling. In order to learn topic vectors from \mathcal{S} , we first turn it into a Word \times Doc matrix by representing each document as a Word-dimensional column vector using a bag-of-words representation [Har54]. We use standard (or online) NMF algorithms (e.g., [LS99, MBPS10b, LNB19]) to obtain the following factorization

$$(\text{Word} \times \text{Doc}) \approx (\text{Word} \times \text{Topic}) \times (\text{Topic} \times \text{Doc}).$$

We will denote the dictionary matrix (Word \times Topic) by $W = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_r)$, where each \mathbf{w}_i denotes the i^{th} column vector of W .

Now for each question-answer pair (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}) of column vectors in the corpus \mathcal{D} , we obtain the NMF *code* of question \mathbf{q} , which we denote by $\text{Code}(\mathbf{q})$, so that we have the following approximate *topic representation* of the input question:

$$\mathbf{q} \approx W \text{Code}(\mathbf{q}). \quad (13)$$

A standard approach for finding this is solving the convex optimization problem

$$\text{Code}(\mathbf{q}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{k}} \|\mathbf{q} - W\mathbf{k}\|_F^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{k}\|_1, \quad (14)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a fixed L_1 regularization parameter. This can be computed using a number of well-known algorithms (e.g., LARS [EHJ⁺04], LASSO [Tib96], and feature-sign search [LBRN07]).

However, in order to see a diverse set of words within each column, the topic matrix W is typically learned from a large text corpus matrix whose




FIGURE 1. Illustration of the RNN-NMF chatbot structure. Input question “What is your name?” is fed into the encoder and hidden states $\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_4$ are computed recursively, which become basis for the message attention layer. On the other hand, the NMF topic representation of the input question is obtained using the pre-learned dictionary matrix, whose columns together with the last hidden state \mathbf{h}_4 become the basis for the topic attention layer. Decoder hidden states $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_4$ as well as prediction vectors $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_4$ are then computed recursively, making use of both message and topic attention vectors. When generating the output answer “My name is Han.” from the prediction vectors, the NMF-code of the input question is used to bias generation probability toward topic words.

columns are bag-of-words representations of documents, not sentences. In this case, the question vectors \mathbf{q} are too sparse to be represented as non-negative linear combinations of the dense topic vectors in W , so the sparse coding problem (14) will result in (nearly) all zero solutions for any question.

In order to overcome the above issue, we propose an alternative formula to compute $\text{Code}(\mathbf{q})$:

$$\text{Code}(\mathbf{q}) = W^T \mathbf{q}. \quad (15)$$

Namely, the contribution of the j^{th} topic vector \mathbf{w}_j in the question \mathbf{q} is computed as the inner product $\mathbf{w}_j^T \mathbf{q}$, which measures the correlation between the question and the corresponding topic vector. Hence the topic vectors obtained by NMF will act as a ‘field of correlated words’, and the coefficients in $W^T \mathbf{q}$ will tell us how much the chatbot should use each field (or topic) in generating a response. (See the last eq. in (20) below.)

3.2. Encoder. Fix a question-answer pair (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}) from the corpus \mathcal{D} and write $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$. The encoder uses an RNN to encode a question \mathbf{q} as a sequence of hidden states $(\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_\ell)$ recursively as

$$\mathbf{h}_i = f_h^{\text{enc}}(q_i, \mathbf{h}_{i-1}), \quad (16)$$

where we use the nonlinear function f_h^{enc} to be the gated recurrent unit (GRU) [Ben14]. Namely for parameter matrices $W_z, W_r, W_s, U_z, U_r, U_s$, and sigmoid function σ , we define

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z} = \sigma(W_z \mathbf{x}_t + U_z \mathbf{h}_{t-1}) \\ \mathbf{r} = \sigma(W_r \mathbf{x}_t + U_r \mathbf{h}_{t-1}) \\ \mathbf{s} = \tanh(W_s \mathbf{x}_t + U_s (\mathbf{h}_{t-1} \mathbf{r}^T)) \\ \mathbf{h}_t = (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{s}^T + \mathbf{z} \mathbf{h}_{t-1}^T. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

In addition, the Encoder finds the NMF code $\text{Code}(\mathbf{q}) = (k_1, \dots, k_r)^T$ of \mathbf{q} by solving (14).

3.3. Decoder: message and topic attention.

Once the question-answer pair (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}) is run through the encoder, we have the encoder hidden states $(\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_\ell)$ and the NMF-code $\text{Code}(\mathbf{q}) = (k_1, \dots, k_r)^T$. These are passed as inputs to the decoder. Using ℓ' to denote the maximum length of the output sentence, the decoder outputs a sequence $(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell'})$ of prediction vectors using GRU and message and topic attention. Let $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{\ell'}$ denote decoder hidden state, where we set $\mathbf{s}_0 = \mathbf{h}_\ell$, the last encoder hidden state.

We will now describe how to update the state of the decoder. First, suppose the vectors

$\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \mathbf{s}_{t-1}, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{o}_t$ have been computed by the decoder. The next decoder hidden state \mathbf{s}_t is computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_t &= f_h^{\text{dec}}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \mathbf{s}_{t-1}, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{o}_t) \\ &= \sigma(W_p^{(s)} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1} + W_s^{(s)} \mathbf{s}_{t-1} + W_c^{(s)} \mathbf{c}_t + W_o^{(s)} \mathbf{o}_t + \mathbf{b}^{(s)}) \end{aligned}$$

for sigmoid function σ , nonlinear function f_h^{dec} , and suitable parameters $W_p^{(s)}, W_s^{(s)}, W_c^{(s)}, W_o^{(s)}$, and $\mathbf{b}^{(s)}$. The superscripts of the parameters denotes what they are used to calculate, and the subscripts denotes to what they are applied.

Next, suppose a decoder hidden state \mathbf{s}_{t-1} is given. Then three vectors are computed by the decoder: message attention \mathbf{c}_t , topic attention \mathbf{o}_t , and predicted distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_t$. The message attention \mathbf{c}_t is defined via the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \xi_{tj}^{(c)} &= \eta^{(c)}(\mathbf{s}_{t-1}, \mathbf{h}_j) \\ \alpha_{tj}^{(c)} &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \exp(\xi_{tk}^{(c)}) \right)^{-1} \exp(\xi_{tj}^{(c)}) \\ \mathbf{c}_t &= \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \alpha_{tj}^{(c)} \mathbf{h}_j, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where $\eta^{(c)}$ is a multi-layer perceptron with tanh as an activation function, t indexes the decoder hidden state, j indexes the encoder hidden state, and the superscript (c) denotes that these values relate to the message attention \mathbf{c}_t . In words, the message attention \mathbf{c}_t is a linear combination of the encoder hidden states $\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{\ell}$, where the ‘importance’ $\alpha_{tj}^{(c)}$ of the j^{th} encoder hidden state \mathbf{h}_j depends on \mathbf{h}_j itself as well as the previous decoder hidden state \mathbf{s}_{t-1} .

Similarly, the topic attention \mathbf{o}_t is computed via the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \xi_{tj}^{(o)} &= \eta^{(o)}(\mathbf{s}_{t-1}, \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{h}_{\ell}) \\ \alpha_{tj}^{(o)} &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^r \exp(\xi_{tk}^{(o)}) \right)^{-1} \exp(\xi_{tj}^{(o)}) \\ \mathbf{o}_t &= \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_{tj}^{(o)} \mathbf{w}_j, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\eta^{(o)}$ is a similar perceptron as $\eta^{(c)}$, t indexes the decoder hidden states, j indexes the r columns of the dictionary matrix W learned by NMF from the corpus \mathcal{S} (see Subsection 3.1), and the superscript (o) denote that these values relate to the topic attention \mathbf{o}_t . Notice that we only use the last encoder hidden state \mathbf{h}_{ℓ} in computing topic attention. This is because the ‘topic’ of the input question \mathbf{q} is information about the entire sentence, which should be encoded in the last hidden state

\mathbf{h}_{ℓ} . However, we do use all topic vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_r$ in calculating the topic attention.

3.4. Decoder: predicted distribution with NMF-biasing. It remains to describe how the Decoder computes the predicted distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_t$ given the decoder hidden state \mathbf{s}_t , which is a probability distribution over the set Ω of all possible vocabularies that is suppose to be a good approximation of the true conditional probability \mathbf{p}_t of the t th word in the correct response.

Recall that the NMF-dictionary matrix $W = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_r)$ is given. For each word $\omega \in \Omega$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$, we write $\mathbf{1}(\omega \in \mathbf{w}_j)$ for the indicator function which describes whether ω appears in \mathbf{w}_j . We also write \mathbf{w} for the column indicator vector of the word ω . We define the predicted distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_t$ through the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_t^{(c)}(\omega) &= \sigma(\mathbf{w}^T (W_s^{(c)} \mathbf{s}_t + W_p^{(c)} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1} + W_c^{(c)} \mathbf{c}_t + \mathbf{b}^{(c)})) \\ \Psi_t^{(o)}(\omega) &= \sigma(\mathbf{w}^T (W_s^{(o)} \mathbf{s}_t + W_p^{(o)} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1} + W_o^{(o)} \mathbf{o}_t + \mathbf{b}^{(o)})) \\ \hat{\mathbf{p}}_t(\omega) &\propto \exp(\Psi_t^{(c)}(\omega)) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{j=1}^r k_j \mathbf{1}(\omega \in \mathbf{w}_j) \right) \exp(\Psi_t^{(o)}(\omega)), \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where $W_s^{(c)}, W_p^{(c)}, W_c^{(c)}, W_s^{(o)}, W_p^{(o)}, W_o^{(o)}, \mathbf{b}^{(c)}$, and $\mathbf{b}^{(o)}$ are parameters with subscripts denoting which values they are applied to and superscripts on the Ψ function that they relate to (with (c) referring to the context attention and (o) referring to the topic attention). In addition, \propto means ‘proportional to’ in the traditional sense (the last expression is not an equation because of the unknown normalization constant).

In the traditional sequence-to-sequence model, the predicted distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_t$ for the t^{th} word in the response is proportional to the exponential of $\Psi^{(c)}$, which is the first term in the last expression in (20). In our model, we give additional bias toward topic words according to the NMF-code $\text{Code}(\mathbf{q})$ of the input sentence through the second term in the last equation in (20). Recall that due to the approximate nonnegative factorization (13), we can view the j^{th} entry k_j of $\text{Code}(\mathbf{q})$ as the importance of the j^{th} topic vector \mathbf{w}_j given by the NMF-topic matrix W . Hence if a word ω belongs to the j^{th} topic vector \mathbf{w}_j , it gets extra non-negative bias proportional to

the corresponding code k_j as well as the previous decoder state vectors through the function $\Psi^{(o)}$.

3.5. Training the model and generating response.

We train the parameters in the RNN-NMF chatbot by approximately solving the following optimization problem

$$\text{parameters} = \operatorname{argmin}_{(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell'} D(\mathbf{p}_t \| \hat{\mathbf{p}}_t), \quad (21)$$

where $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$ denotes the KL-divergence defined in (10). Recall that \mathbf{p}_t denotes the indicator vector representation (or Dirac delta mass) of the t^{th} word a_t in the correct answer \mathbf{a} , and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_t$ denotes the predicted distribution produced by the RNN-NMF chatbot. Hence (21) amounts to optimizing the parameters so that the KL-divergence (10) between the true response and the approximate joint distributions on the question-answer pairs are minimized. For numerical computation, one may use backpropagation through time algorithms [RF87, Wer88, CR13]. After the training, the chatbot generates the response $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{\ell'})$ for a given question \mathbf{q} by sequentially sampling \hat{a}_i from the predicted distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell'$.

By using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling, both for the training and the generation steps, the normalization constant of the predicted probability distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$ does not have to be computed explicitly. This improves the speed of both steps of the algorithm especially when the vocabulary space Ω is large. A standard method of constructing a Markov chain $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (see., e.g., [LP17]). This method can be used to construct a chain of words in Ω so that the distribution of X_t converges to $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$.

Given the word $X_t = \omega$ at iteration t , the next word X_{t+1} is obtained as follows:

- (i) Sample a word $\omega' \in \Omega$ according to the marginal distribution $p^{(i)}$ of the i^{th} word in response from the joint distribution p induced by the corpus \mathcal{D} .
- (ii) Denote $\psi(\cdot)$ for the right hand side of the last equation of (20). Compute the acceptance probability

$$\lambda = \min \left(\frac{\psi(\omega')}{\psi(\omega)} \frac{p^{(i)}(\omega)}{p^{(i)}(\omega')}, 1 \right). \quad (22)$$

- (iii) Sample $X_{t+1} = \omega'$ with probability λ and ω with probability $1 - \lambda$.

Once we have the above chain $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ converging to $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$, we can run this chain for several steps to approximately sample the response word a_i from $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$. During training, the empirical distribution of the chain gives an approximation of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i$, which we may use for approximately computing the KL-divergence $D(\mathbf{p}_i \| \hat{\mathbf{p}}_i)$.

3.6. Dimension reduction by word embedding.

We will now discuss a technical point in formulating the language modeling task more efficiently by using a word embedding.

In the most basic representation, we can represent each word ω as the indicator vector (or one-hot encoding) $\mathbf{1}(\omega)$ that has a one at the entry corresponding to ω and zeros at all entries. However, this method is extremely memory-inefficient and it becomes a problem when the maximum sequence length and vocabulary size are large enough. In addition, the input layer of a neural network needs to be extremely large in order to have an input node that corresponds to every single word in the vocabulary. The number of weights to train in that first layer alone will be the product of the vocabulary size and the size of the first hidden layer. This makes training extremely slow.

A widely used approach to solve the above problem is to encode each word as a lower-dimensional vector with multiple non-zero entries as opposed to an indicator vector. This enables us to reduce the dimension of our word encoding. A good way of accomplishing this is to embed words in a space that preserves some of the relationships between different words. One widely-used word embedding is called GloVe, and it combines both global matrix factorization and local context window methods in order to produce a meaningful embedding [PSM14]. This is what we will use below.

4. EXPERIMENT

In this section, we present the empirical results of our RNN-NMF chatbot model. We train three different topic-aware chatbots, each using their own topic matrices built from different datasets: 1) DeltaAir (Delta Airline customer support records) [ldu18], 2) Shakespeare (all lines in all of Shakespeare's plays) [Lar16], and 3) 20NewsGroups (20 News groups articles) [Lan95]. Using each of these

topic matrices, we train our RNN-NMF chatbot on the Cornell Movie Dialogue dataset [DNML11]. We also train an additional non-topic model that does not use a topic matrix and will serve as a baseline model for comparison.

4.1. Obtaining topic matrices by NMF. In order to learn topic matrices using NMF, we first convert each document in the corpus into a single string of words. Each string is then encoded into a bag-of-words model which we aggregate into a matrix where each column represents a document. A term frequency—inverse document frequency transformer [LRU14] is then applied to this matrix to give more significant words more weight. A standard NMF algorithm is then used to learn 10 topic vectors.

Below we list the top 10 highest-weighted words in the NMF dictionaries for arbitrarily chosen five of the topics for each of the three data sets.

Topics learned from DeltaAir

- Topic #1: thank, welcome, flying, feedback, appreciate, great, delta, loyalty, sharing, day
- Topic #2: flight, delayed, delay, sorry, time, crew, gate, hours, hi, hear
- Topic #3: seat delta upgrade seats comfort middle available class hi economy
- Topic #4: let, know, assistance, need, sorry, amv, rebooking, assist, delay, apologies
- Topic #5: bag, baggage, check, claim, airport, bags, lost, checked, luggage, team

Topics learned from Shakespeare

- Topic #1: enter, messenger, king, attendants, servant, gloucester, lords, duke, queen, henry
- Topic #2: lord, good, ay, know, noble, say, tis, king, gracious, did
- Topic #3: exit, servant, falstaff, messenger, gentleman, body, lucius, boy, gloucester, cassio
- Topic #4: thy, hand, father, heart, hath, love, life, let, master, face
- Topic #5: sir, good, know, ay, pray, john, man, say, did, marry

Topics learned from 20NewsGroups

- Topic #1: card, video, monitor, drivers, cards, bus, vga, driver, color, ram
- Topic #2: god, jesus, bible, christ, faith, believe, christian, christians, church, sin
- Topic #3: game, team, year, games, season, players, play, hockey, win, player

Topic #4: car, new, 00, sale, 10, price, offer, condition, shipping, 20

Topic #5: edu, soon, cs, university, com, email, internet, article, ftp, send

4.2. Training the RNN-NMF chatbot. With the three topic matrices obtained by NMF in the previous subsection, we now train our RNN-NMF chatbot on the Cornell Movie Dialogue data set, which is a classical data set for training RNN based chatbot. We note that training on a much larger data set such as Reddit or Twitter data would likely improve the performance of the chatbot, but training on the smaller Cornell data set suffices for our goal of comparing the performance of non-topic and various topic versions of the chatbot. Moreover, in order to speed up the training process, we restrict our model to the 18,000 most commonly used English words and mask all the other words by replacing them with a special token that denotes unknown words.

Our training uses a single NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1660 Ti GPU. We use the Adagrad optimizer, the batch size is 64, the dropout rate is 0.1, the hidden size for the word embedding is 500, and the total number of training iterations is 64,000 (87 epochs). We also use teacher forcing [WZ89] to accelerate the training, with a teacher forcing rate of 1.

4.3. Comparison and analysis. In this subsection, we present output from the four chatbot models (Non-topic, DeltaAir, Shakespeare, and 20NewsGroups). Recall that all chatbot models have been trained on the same Cornell Movie Dialogue, but the use of different topic matrices influence the training via topic attention and topic-biasing in computing the predicted probability distribution (20). In some sense, each topic matrix learned by NMF from different data sets provide a priori ‘filter’ or ‘bias’ in choosing words in response. In this sense, we will refer to each topic matrix used in training the chatbot as its *NMF-topic filter*.

For a quantitative comparison, in Table 1 we provide the training loss (i.e., the KL-divergence between the true and predicted distribution in (10)) of each of the four chatbots at the end of training. Lower training loss indicates that the model has learned the desired joint distribution on the question and answer pairs from the Cornell data

	Non-topic	DeltaAir	Shakespeare	20NewsGroups
Training loss	0.2847	0.1937	0.1708	0.2061

TABLE 1. Training loss of the four chatbot models trained on the Cornell Movie Dialogue dataset. Lower training loss is better and indicates that the model has learned the desired joint distribution on the question-answer pairs.

Non-topic	DeltaAir	Shakespeare	20NewsGroups
Q: I really really love you Bot: Sure...	Q: I really really love you Bot: That's great! I love you.	Q: I really really love you Bot: As much as they say to me.	Q: I really really love you Bot: Do you love me? who is this?
Q: I lost something at the airport Bot: go on...	Q: I lost something at the airport Bot: Take to check the monitor. Matthew.	Q: I lost something at the airport Bot: What are you talking about? What?	Q: I lost something at the airport Bot: But what is it?
Q: Is he good enough to marry her Bot: Yes. I don't know...	Q: Is he good enough to marry her Bot: He knows the woman. He'll be there.	Q: Is he good enough to marry her Bot: I guess he is a very good man.	Q: Is he good enough to marry her Bot: I wanna say good..
Q: I love your new car Bot: I suppose that's my car	Q: I love your new car Bot: So I've got a car	Q: I love your new car Bot: Really good car. Thank you.	Q: I love your new car Bot: Four years car but that's all new

TABLE 2. Examples of conversation with chatbots with different NMF-topic filters. A bold response by the chatbot indicates that we find it to be a reasonable, non-generic response to the input.

set. Indeed, training loss of all of the three topic-aware chatbot models are comparably lower than that of the non-topic model.

For qualitative comparison, we give examples of conversation with the four models in Table 2. We observe that in general, topic-aware chatbots give more non-generic and context-dependent responses to various input questions. Moreover, when we ask questions closely related to each topic matrix (DeltaAir, Shakespeare, and 20NewsGroups), we observe that the chatbot with the corresponding NMF-topic filter gives the most appropriate answer using relevant topic words more frequently. Namely, for the question “I lost something at the airport”, the words “lost” and “airport” belong to Topic #5 of the DeltaAir data and the related topic word “check” does appear in the corresponding chatbot’s response. Also, for the question, “Is he good enough to marry her”, “good” and “marry” belong to Shakespeare’s Topic #5, and the corresponding chatbot’s answer contains associated topic words “good” and “man”. Lastly, for the question “I love your new car”, the words “car” and “new” belong to Topic #4 of the

20NewsGroups data, and both of them as well as additional topic word “years” from the same topic vector appear in the corresponding chatbot’s response.

We will now discuss the topic-awareness of the chatbot in relation to the conversation and topic vocabularies. Recall that we train our RNN-NMF chatbot model on the Cornell Movie Dialogue with masking all but the 18,000 most commonly used English words. Some of the topic words that we learn by NMF from different data sets (e.g., ‘ay’, ‘thy’, and ‘exeunt’ from Shakespeare) are not necessarily contained in this list of 18,000 words or frequently appear in the movie dialogue. Since the training minimizes the divergence between the predicted and true output probability distributions, any response using topic words that do not appear in the actual responses in the conversation data set will be suppressed during the training process. Indeed, the responses in Table 2 all consist of very generic and commonly used words. Hence, if we train our RNN-NMF chatbot model on a large enough conversation data that contains most of the topic words, the chatbots will likely give more

topic-oriented responses. As this requires more powerful computational resources, we leave it for our future work.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we have constructed a model for a topic-aware chatbot by combining several existing text-generation models that utilize RNN structures with NMF-based topic modeling. Before we train the chatbot on a conversation data set, a topic matrix is obtained by NMF from a separate data set of different kinds. For a given input question, its correlation with the learned topic vectors is computed and then fed into the decoder so that it learns to prefer relevant topic words over more generic ones. We demonstrated our RNN-NMF chatbot architecture using four variants: Non-topic, DeltaAir, Shakespeare, and 20NewsGroups. Not only do the topic-aware chatbots achieve comparably lower training loss on the data set than the non-topic one, they qualitatively and contextually give the most relevant answer depending on the topic of question.

Our work serves as the first proof of concept for using NMF-based topic modeling to create a topic-aware, RNN-based chatbot. This opens up a number of future research possibilities, which build on recent developments in the literature of NMF. Below we discuss three possibilities.

5.1. Learning topics from MCMC trajectories.

Suppose we have to learn the topic vectors from documents sampled using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. For instance, say we would like to make our chatbot aware of trending topics from Twitter or the internet in general. Since it is not possible to collect or process the entirety of Twitter or the internet, we may use a Markov chain-based sampling algorithm to obtain a sequence of samples of the texts and tweets (e.g., Google’s PageRank or random walk based exploration algorithm). Recent work guarantees convergence of an online NMF algorithm on a Markovian sequence of

data [LNB19]. Therefore, our current architecture can easily be extended to such a setting. Namely, we learn the NMF-topic matrix by using the Markovian NMF algorithm in [LNB19] from an MCMC trajectory exploring the text sample space. We can then proceed by training our chatbot with this learned topic matrix.

5.2. Transfer learning. In our RNN-NMF chatbot architecture, the use of the NMF-topic filter is hard-coded in the sense that the NMF topic matrix of choice is used in the training step. Hence, if we wanted to apply a different topic filter to the chatbot, we would need to train the entire model from the beginning. However, if we were able to use an existing general language model instead of the RNN structure, we would be able to switch topic filters by merely fine-tuning the parameters of the NMF-topic layer. One possibility is to use BERT [DCLT18] as the general language model, and add a NMF-topic layer so that the predicted probability distribution is computed in a similar way to (20).

5.3. Dynamic topic-awareness. One of the main advantages in using NMF-based topic modeling instead of LDA is that the topic matrix can be very easily learned from a new or even a time-varying data set. Hence we can make our RNN-NMF chatbot architecture ‘online’, so that the underlying online NMF algorithms (e.g., [MBPS10b, LNB19]) can constantly learn new topics from a time-varying data set (e.g., collective chat history of users). Then, the RNN can retrain the parameters in the topic-layer on the fly in order to adapt to current topics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work has been partially supported by NSF DMS grant 1659676, NSF CAREER DMS #1348721, and NSF BIGDATA #1740325. The authors are grateful for Andrea Bertozzi for the generous support and Blake Hunter for helpful and inspiring discussions.

REFERENCES

- [AAB⁺16] Dario Amodei, Rishita Anubhai, Eric Battenberg, Carl Case, Jared Casper, Bryan Catanzaro, Jingdong Chen, Mike Chrzanowski, Adam Coates, Greg Diamos, et al., *End to end speech recognition in english and mandarin*.

- [BB05] Michael W Berry and Murray Browne, *Email surveillance using non-negative matrix factorization*, Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory **11** (2005), no. 3, 249–264.
- [BBL⁺07] Michael W Berry, Murray Browne, Amy N Langville, V Paul Pauca, and Robert J Plemmons, *Algorithms and applications for approximate nonnegative matrix factorization*, Computational statistics & data analysis **52** (2007), no. 1, 155–173.
- [BCB14] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio, *Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473 (2014).
- [BCD10] David Blei, Lawrence Carin, and David Dunson, *Probabilistic topic models: A focus on graphical model design and applications to document and image analysis*, IEEE signal processing magazine **27** (2010), no. 6, 55.
- [Ben13] Yoshua Bengio, *Deep learning of representations: Looking forward*, International Conference on Statistical Language and Speech Processing, Springer, 2013, pp. 1–37.
- [Ben14] Junyoung Chung Caglar Gulcehre KyungHyun Cho Yoshua Bengio, *Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3555v1 (2014).
- [BMB⁺15] Rostyslav Boutchko, Debasis Mitra, Suzanne L Baker, William J Jagust, and Grant T Gullberg, *Clustering-initiated factor analysis application for tissue classification in dynamic brain positron emission tomography*, Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism **35** (2015), no. 7, 1104–1111.
- [BNJ03] David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan, *Latent dirichlet allocation*, Journal of machine Learning research **3** (2003), no. Jan, 993–1022.
- [BPL10] Y-Lan Boureau, Jean Ponce, and Yann LeCun, *A theoretical analysis of feature pooling in visual recognition*, Proceedings of the 27th international conference on machine learning (ICML-10), 2010, pp. 111–118.
- [CR13] Yves Chauvin and David E Rumelhart, *Backpropagation: theory, architectures, and applications*, Psychology Press, 2013.
- [CVMG⁺14] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio, *Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078 (2014).
- [CWS⁺11] Yang Chen, Xiao Wang, Cong Shi, Eng Keong Lua, Xiaoming Fu, Beixing Deng, and Xing Li, *Phoenix: A weight-based network coordinate system using matrix factorization*, IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management **8** (2011), no. 4, 334–347.
- [CZA07] Andrzej Cichocki, Rafal Zdunek, and Shun-ichi Amari, *Hierarchical als algorithms for nonnegative matrix and 3d tensor factorization*, International Conference on Independent Component Analysis and Signal Separation, Springer, 2007, pp. 169–176.
- [DCLT18] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, *Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 (2018). (2018).
- [Den14] Li Deng, *A tutorial survey of architectures, algorithms, and applications for deep learning*, APSIPA Transactions on Signal and Information Processing **3** (2014).
- [DLH⁺13] Li Deng, Jinyu Li, Jui-Ting Huang, Kaisheng Yao, Dong Yu, Frank Seide, Michael Seltzer, Geoff Zweig, Xiaodong He, Jason Williams, et al., *Recent advances in deep learning for speech research at microsoft*, 2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, IEEE, 2013, pp. 8604–8608.
- [DNML11] Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil and Lillian Lee, *Chameleons in imagined conversations: A new approach to understanding coordination of linguistic style in dialogs.*, Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics, ACL 2011, 2011.
- [EHJ⁺04] Bradley Efron, Trevor Hastie, Iain Johnstone, Robert Tibshirani, et al., *Least angle regression*, The Annals of statistics **32** (2004), no. 2, 407–499.
- [FH17] Jennifer Flenner and Blake Hunter, *A deep non-negative matrix factorization neural network*.
- [GHM⁺19] M. Gao, J. Haddock, D. Molitor, D. Needell, E. Sadovnik, T. Will, and R. Zhang, *Neural nonnegative matrix factorization for hierarchical multilayer topic modeling*, Submitted.
- [Gil14] Nicolas Gillis, *The why and how of nonnegative matrix factorization*, Regularization, Optimization, Kernels, and Support Vector Machines **12** (2014), no. 257.
- [GTLY12] Naiyang Guan, Dacheng Tao, Zhigang Luo, and Bo Yuan, *Online nonnegative matrix factorization with robust stochastic approximation*, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems **23** (2012), no. 7, 1087–1099.

- [GWD14] Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, and Ivo Danihelka, *Neural turing machines*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5401 (2014).
- [Har54] Zellig S Harris, *Distributional structure*, Word **10** (1954), no. 2-3, 146–162.
- [HCC⁺14] Awni Hannun, Carl Case, Jared Casper, Bryan Catanzaro, Greg Diamos, Erich Elsen, Ryan Prenger, Sanjeev Satheesh, Shubho Sengupta, Adam Coates, et al., *Deep speech: Scaling up end-to-end speech recognition*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5567 (2014).
- [Hoy04] Patrik O Hoyer, *Non-negative matrix factorization with sparseness constraints*, Journal of machine learning research **5** (2004), no. Nov, 1457–1469.
- [HS97] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber, *Long short-term memory*, Neural computation **9** (1997), no. 8, 1735–1780.
- [JLZZ18] Mingmin Jin, Xin Luo, Huiling Zhu, and Hankz Hankui Zhuo, *Combining deep learning and topic modeling for review understanding in context-aware recommendation*, Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers), 2018, pp. 1605–1614.
- [KL51] Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler, *On information and sufficiency*, The annals of mathematical statistics **22** (1951), no. 1, 79–86.
- [KMBS11] Shiva Prasad Kasiviswanathan, Prem Melville, Arindam Banerjee, and Vikas Sindhwani, *Emerging topic detection using dictionary learning*, Proceedings of the 20th ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management, ACM, 2011, pp. 745–754.
- [KSH12] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton, *Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2012, pp. 1097–1105.
- [Lan95] Ken Lang, *20 news groups data set*, Retrieved from <http://qwone.com/~jason/20Newsgroups/> (1995).
- [Lar16] Liam Larsen, *All of shakespeare's plays*, Retrieved from <https://www.kaggle.com/kingburrito666/shakespeare-plays#alllines.txt> (2016).
- [LBRN07] Honglak Lee, Alexis Battle, Rajat Raina, and Andrew Y Ng, *Efficient sparse coding algorithms*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2007, pp. 801–808.
- [ldu18] Idulcic, *Delta airline customer support records*, Retrieved from <https://github.com/ldulcic/chatbot> (2018).
- [LGB⁺15] Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan, *A diversity-promoting objective function for neural conversation models*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.03055 (2015).
- [LNB19] Hanbaek Lyu, Deana Needell, and Laura Balzano, *Online matrix factorization for markovian data and applications to network dictionary learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01931 (2019).
- [LP17] David A Levin and Yuval Peres, *Markov chains and mixing times*, vol. 107, American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
- [LPM15] Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning, *Effective Approaches to Attention-based Neural Machine Translation*, Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2015, pp. 1412–1421.
- [LRU14] Jure Leskovec, Anand Rajaraman, and Jeffrey David Ullman, *Mining of massive datasets*, Cambridge university press, 2014.
- [LS99] Daniel D Lee and H Sebastian Seung, *Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization*, Nature **401** (1999), no. 6755, 788.
- [LS01] ———, *Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2001, pp. 556–562.
- [LYC09] Hyekyoung Lee, Jiho Yoo, and Seungjin Choi, *Semi-supervised nonnegative matrix factorization*, IEEE Signal Processing Letters **17** (2009), no. 1, 4–7.
- [MBPS10a] Julien Mairal, Francis Bach, Jean Ponce, and Guillermo Sapiro, *Online learning for matrix factorization and sparse coding*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **11** (2010), no. Jan, 19–60.
- [MBPS10b] ———, *Online learning for matrix factorization and sparse coding*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **11** (2010), no. Jan, 19–60.
- [MHGK14] Volodymyr Mnih, Nicolas Heess, Alex Graves, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, *Recurrent models of visual attention.*, NIPS (Zoubin Ghahramani, Max Welling, Corinna Cortes, Neil D. Lawrence, and Kilian Q. Weinberger, eds.), 2014, pp. 2204–2212.
- [PJ88] P.J.Burt, *Attention Mechanism for Vision in Dynamic World*, 9th International Conference on Pattern Recognition, 1988, pp. 977–987.

- [PSM14] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning, *Glove: Global vectors for word representation*, Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP) (Doha, Qatar), Association for Computational Linguistics, October 2014, pp. 1532–1543.
- [RF87] AJ Robinson and Frank Fallside, *The utility driven dynamic error propagation network*, University of Cambridge Department of Engineering Cambridge, 1987.
- [RPZ⁺18] Bin Ren, Laurent Pueyo, Guangtun Ben Zhu, John Debes, and Gaspard Duchêne, *Non-negative matrix factorization: robust extraction of extended structures*, The Astrophysical Journal **852** (2018), no. 2, 104.
- [SG07] Mark Steyvers and Tom Griffiths, *Probabilistic topic models*, Handbook of latent semantic analysis **427** (2007), no. 7, 424–440.
- [SGA⁺15] Alessandro Sordoni, Michel Galley, Michael Auli, Chris Brockett, Yangfeng Ji, Margaret Mitchell, Jian-Yun Nie, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan, *A neural network approach to context-sensitive generation of conversational responses*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.06714 (2015).
- [SGH02] Arkadiusz Sitek, Grant T Gullberg, and Ronald H Huesman, *Correction for ambiguous solutions in factor analysis using a penalized least squares objective*, IEEE transactions on medical imaging **21** (2002), no. 3, 216–225.
- [SH05] Amnon Shashua and Tamir Hazan, *Non-negative tensor factorization with applications to statistics and computer vision*, Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning, ACM, 2005, pp. 792–799.
- [SLL15] Lifeng Shang, Zhengdong Lu, and Hang Li, *Neural responding machine for short-text conversation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02364 (2015).
- [SS12] Ankan Saha and Vikas Sindhwani, *Learning evolving and emerging topics in social media: a dynamic nmf approach with temporal regularization*, Proceedings of the fifth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining, ACM, 2012, pp. 693–702.
- [SSB⁺16] Iulian V Serban, Alessandro Sordoni, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Joelle Pineau, *Building end-to-end dialogue systems using generative hierarchical neural network models*, Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2016.
- [SSL⁺17] Iulian Vlad Serban, Alessandro Sordoni, Ryan Lowe, Laurent Charlin, Joelle Pineau, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio, *A hierarchical latent variable encoder-decoder model for generating dialogues*, Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2017.
- [SVL14] Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V Le, *Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 2014, pp. 3104–3112.
- [TBZS16] George Trigeorgis, Konstantinos Bousmalis, Stefanos Zafeiriou, and Björn W Schuller, *A deep matrix factorization method for learning attribute representations*, IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence **39** (2016), no. 3, 417–429.
- [Tib96] Robert Tibshirani, *Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological) **58** (1996), no. 1, 267–288.
- [TN12] Leo Taslaman and Björn Nilsson, *A framework for regularized non-negative matrix factorization, with application to the analysis of gene expression data*, PloS one **7** (2012), no. 11, e46331.
- [VSP⁺17] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin, *Attention is all you need*, 2017, cite arxiv:1706.03762Comment: 15 pages, 5 figures.
- [WCB14] Jason Weston, Sumit Chopra, and Antoine Bordes, *Memory Networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.3916 (2014).
- [Wer88] Paul J Werbos, *Generalization of backpropagation with application to a recurrent gas market model*, Neural networks **1** (1988), no. 4, 339–356.
- [WLLC13] Hao Wang, Zhengdong Lu, Hang Li, and Enhong Chen, *A dataset for research on short-text conversations*, Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2013, pp. 935–945.
- [WPD17] Wenya Wang, Sinno Jialin Pan, and Daniel Dahlmeier, *Coupled Attentions for Category-specific Aspect and Opinion Terms Co-extraction*, 2017, pp. 3316–3322.
- [WWX⁺16] Yu Wu, Wei Wu, Chen Xing, Ming Zhou, and Zhoujun Li, *Sequential matching network: A new architecture for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.01627 (2016).

- [WZ89] Ronald J Williams and David Zipser, *A learning algorithm for continually running fully recurrent neural networks*, Neural computation **1** (1989), no. 2, 270–280.
- [XWW⁺17] Chen Xing, Wei Wu, Yu Wu, Jie Liu, Yalou Huang, Ming Zhou, and Wei-Ying Ma, *Topic aware neural response generation*, Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2017.
- [XY13] Yangyang Xu and Wotao Yin, *A block coordinate descent method for regularized multiconvex optimization with applications to nonnegative tensor factorization and completion*, SIAM Journal on imaging sciences **6** (2013), no. 3, 1758–1789.
- [ZJW⁺11] Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Jiang, Jianshu Weng, Jing He, Ee-Peng Lim, Hongfei Yan, and Xiaoming Li, *Comparing twitter and traditional media using topic models*, European conference on information retrieval, Springer, 2011, pp. 338–349.
- [ZTX16] Renbo Zhao, Vincent YF Tan, and Huan Xu, *Online nonnegative matrix factorization with general divergences*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00075 (2016).

YUCHEN GUO, HUNAN UNIVERSITY, CHANGSHA, HUNAN, 410082, CHINA

E-mail address: guoyuchen1228@vip.qq.com

NICHOLAS HANOIAN, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT, BURLINGTON, VT 05405, USA

E-mail address: nhanoian@uvm.edu

ZHEXIAO LIN, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU, ZHEJIANG, 310058, CHINA

E-mail address: zhexiaolin0926@gmail.com

NICHOLAS LISKIJ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, USA

E-mail address: nicholas.liskij@gmail.com

HANBAEK LYU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, USA

E-mail address: hlyu@math.ucla.edu

DEANNA NEEDELL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, USA

E-mail address: deanna@math.ucla.edu

JIAHAO QU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, USA

E-mail address: jiahaoucla@gmail.com

HENRY SOJICO, HARVEY MUDD COLLEGE, CLAREMOUNT, CA 91711, USA

E-mail address: hsojico@hmc.edu

YULIANG WANG, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200240, CHINA

E-mail address: 2215429764@qq.com

ZHE XIONG, SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200240, CHINA

E-mail address: aristotle-x@sjtu.edu.cn

ZHENHONG ZOU, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100083, CHINA

E-mail address: joebuuaa2016@gmail.com