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Abstract

A multi-turn dialogue always follows a specific topic thread, and topic shift at the discourse level occurs naturally as the conversation progresses, necessitating the model’s ability to capture different topics and generate topic-aware responses. Previous research has either predicted the topic first and then generated the relevant response, or simply applied the attention mechanism to all topics, ignoring the joint distribution of the topic prediction and response generation models and resulting in uncontrollable and unrelated responses. In this paper, we propose a joint framework with a topic refinement mechanism to learn these two tasks simultaneously. Specifically, we design a three-pass iteration mechanism to generate coarse response first, then predict corresponding topics, and finally generate refined response conditioned on predicted topics. Moreover, we utilize GPT2DoubleHeads and BERT for the topic prediction task respectively, aiming to investigate the effects of joint learning and the understanding ability of GPT model. Experimental results demonstrate that our proposed framework achieves new state-of-the-art performance at response generation task and the great potential understanding capability of GPT model.

Introduction

Natural Language Generation (NLG), is the task of generating language that is coherent and understandable to humans, has been applied to many downstream tasks such as text summary (Zhang et al., 2019a; Bar-Haim et al., 2020; Cho et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020; Gholipour Ghalandari and Ifrim, 2020), machine translation (Li et al., 2020; Bartzits, Haddow, and Birch, 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Zou et al., 2020), and dialogue response generation (Kadford et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2018a; Tuan, Chen, and Lee, 2019; Zhao et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020a; Wolf et al., 2019).

Recent works in dialogue response generation usually formulate this task as a sequence to sequence problem, leading to inconsistent, uncontrollable, and repetitive responses (Ram et al., 2018). Furthermore, each dialogue has its specific goal and each utterance of the dialogue may contain multiple topics, regardless it is an open-domain dialogue or task-oriented dialogue. As shown in left part of Figure 1, the patient seeks medical advice from a doctor and inform him the attributes and symptoms of the specific disease which form the topics of the conversation. Also, some open-domain dialogue systems have specific goals, such as recommendation, education, etc. For example, a conversational agent interacts with a user to recommend some interesting movies (as shown in right part of Figure 1). The entire content flow is guided by the topic thread. These various conversational scenarios propose more challenges for current multi-turn end-to-end dialogue system, necessitating the model’s capability to generate more informative and topic-related response.

Many researchers propose different methods to guide or control the generation of responses conditioned on specific topics. Some representative works consider incorporating topic information into the sequence-to-sequence framework which apply attention mechanism to all topics (Xing et al., 2017; Dziri et al., 2019). Other works cast this task as a pipeline system, predict the keywords, then capture the topic, and finally retrieve corresponding response (Tang et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2020). Another line of work focuses on single-turn topic-aware response generation conditioned on previously given topics (Feng et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2019; Huo et al., 2020). All these methods fail short in two ways. Most of these approaches either heavily rely on the non-autoregressive models like BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) to predict topics or utilize attention mechanism on all predefined topics which do not consider the effect of the historical topic path of multi-turn conversations. Besides that, these works do not model the joint distribution of attribute model $p(o|x)$ and unconditional language model $p(x)$, which is proved effective and powerful (Dathathri et al., 2019).

In this paper, we formulate this problem as a topic-aware dialogue response generation task, aiming to generate informative and topic-related responses that can engage the users. More specifically, we design a three-stage iteration mechanism for the topic-aware response generation task. We generate the coarse response given historical dialogue context and previous topics first, then we require the model to explicitly predict corresponding topics, and then we concatenate the generated coarse response at the first step and the predicted topics at the second step as input to generate a final refined topic-related response. Thus, the model is forced to learn a joint distribution of topics and related response by optimizing for these three objectives simultaneously.
We formulate a traditional response generation problem as a topic-aware generation problem and propose a joint framework that can learn topic prediction and dialogue response generation simultaneously.

We design a topic refine mechanism to control the generation of dialogue response. Our ablation study confirms it can help to generate more informative and topic-related responses, leading to better performance.

We evaluate our model on two different datasets which consist of two application scenarios: medical auto-diagnosis and conversational recommendation, and we achieve new state-of-the-arts performance on both datasets and demonstrate that joint distribution and topic refinement are effective but the understanding ability of GPT2 still needs to be improved.

Problem Definition

Given a dialogue \( d = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, ..., u_n\} \), a corresponding speaker role path \( sr = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, ..., s_n\} \) and its corresponding topic path \( tp = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, ..., t_n\} \) where \( s \in R, t_\in T \) and \( R \) and \( T \) are pre-defined speaker set and topic set. An utterance at \( t \)th time step can be expressed by \( (u_t, s_t, t_t) \) which represents the sentence, the speaker and the topics included in this sentence. \( t \)th consists of multiple topics or zero topic and each topic is expressed by several words. The problem then can be defined as: given a \( t \)th historical dialogue context, speaker role and topic path, \( d_t = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_i\}, sr_t = \{s_1, s_2, ..., s_i\}, tp_t = \{t_1, t_2, ..., t_i\} \), find the next topic and generate relevant responses.

\[
y^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{P}(r^n, t^n|d^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}, sr^{n-1})
\tag{1}
\]

where \( r^n \) and \( t^n \) stand for the response and corresponding topics at turn \( n \) respectively. User profile information \( p = \{p_1, p_2, ..., p_k\} \) is often provided as additional input, which consists of \( k \) sentences to express personal information such as interest. Thus, the objective changes accordingly:

\[
y^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{P}(r^n, t^n|d^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, p)
\tag{2}
\]

Different from other methods, we divide the whole problem into three sub-problems (see section below). Our objective can be formulated as the following joint distribution:

\[
y^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{P}(r^n|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}) \mathcal{P}(t^n|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}) \mathcal{P}(r^n|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1})
\tag{3}
\]

where \( \mathcal{P}(r^n|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}) \) generate the relatively abbreviated response first, then \( \mathcal{P}(t^n|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}) \) predict the corresponding topics at turn \( n \) and finally the model refine the abbreviated response \( r^n \) by maximizing \( \mathcal{P}(r^n|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}) \) with the first response \( r^n \) and corresponding predicted topics \( t^n \) as additional input, which leads to more informative and topic-related response \( r^n \).

Model

Our model can be divided into three different parts: 1) Stage-One: Response Generation and 2) Topic Prediction; and 3) Stage-Two: Topic Refinement, which corresponds (a), (b), (c) shown in Figure 2 respectively. More details can be checked in following subsections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

Stage-One: Response Generation

We formulate the response generation problem using conditional language models e.g. GPT \cite{Radford2019}. Given many dialogues \( D = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, ..., d_m\} \), \( t \)th dialogue \( d_t \) contains several training samples \( (r^n_t, t^n_t|d^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}) \) from different turn \( n \), our objective here is to build a statistical model parameterized by \( \theta \) to maximize \( \mathcal{P}(r^n_t|d^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}) \). Since here we use autoregressive language models to take account of the sequential structure of the response, we need to decompose the joint probability of \( r^n_t \) using the chain rule as follows:

\[
\mathcal{P}(r^n_t|d^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}, sr^{n-1}) = \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{P}(r^n_t|r_{t-1}^{n-1}, d^{n-1}, tp^{n-1}, sr^{n-1})
\tag{4}
\]
Figure 2: TopicRefine: Joint Framework of Our Proposed Model, which consists of three different modules (a) Stage-One: Response Generation (b) Topic Prediction (c) Stage-Two: Topic Refinement. The (b) module can be implemented by two methods: BERT and GPT, we utilize Stage-One (GPT) and Stage-Two (GPT) to represents the framework with GPT as backbone for all three modules (orange dashed line), and Stage-Two (BERT) to replace GPT with BERT for (b) module (blue dashed line) in later experiment section.

where $r^m_{n,t}$ represents all tokens before $t$ at turn $n$. The objective of stage-one is performed by maximizing the log-likelihood (MLE) of the conditional probabilities in (4) over the entire training dataset:

$$L_{one} = - \sum_{m=1}^{[D]} \sum_{n=1}^{[d]} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log p(r^m_{n,t} | r_{<t}^m, \mathcal{H}_m) \quad (5)$$

where $r^m_{n,t}$ is $t$th token of $n$th response of $m$th dialogue in training dataset, $\mathcal{H}_m$ represents $(r^m, t_p^m, n, s^m, n)$ before current response.

**Topic Prediction**

Given the historical $\mathcal{H}_m$ of $m$th dialogue\footnote{It is noted that we do not use $r_{<t}^m$ as input information here.} we need not only to generate the suitable response but also to predict the correct topic. Some prior works solve this problem by predicting the topic first and then generating the response \cite{liu2020tg, zhou2020multi}. In this section, different from these works, we propose a framework to jointly learn this task with dialogue response generation task as shown in Figure 2.\cite{devlin2019bert} There are two methods to predict the corresponding topics: (1) BERT-Based Prediction, and (2) GPT-Based Prediction.

**BERT-Based Prediction.** Consistent with previous work in text classification \cite{chen2019bert}, we utilize the embedding $h_1$ of first token $[CLS]$ from BERT to predict the topics, followed by a $\text{softmax}$ layer.

$$f(x) = \text{softmax}(W_1 x + b) \quad (6)$$

**GPT-Based Prediction.** We adapt GPT2DoubleHeads model \cite{wolf2020huggingface} to perform the prediction followed \cite{wolf2019t5}, since there are two heads: language modeling head and the classification head in the model while the later one can be used to classify the input dialogue information. Besides that, the shared parameters of GPT may benefit both topic prediction and response generation tasks.

It is noted that there are two types of classification in topic prediction task: multi-class classification and multi-label classification, owing to the unique characteristic and differences of two dataset: MedDG (\cite{liu2020tg}) and TG-ReDial (\cite{liu2020multi}). For a multi-class classification problem, the global optimization can be reached by minimizing cross-entropy loss defined as follow:

$$L_{topic} = - \sum_{c=1}^{K} y_{c} \log(p_{c|\mathcal{H}_m}) \quad (7)$$

For a multi-label classification problem, it is usually formulated as a sequence of binary decision problems which are optimized by:

$$L_{topic} = - \sum_{c=1}^{K} y_{c} \log(p_{c|\mathcal{H}_m}) + (1 - y_{c}) \log(1 - p_{c|\mathcal{H}_m}) \quad (8)$$
Stage-Two: Topic Refinement

To generate more informative and topic-related response, we introduce the topicRefine mechanism that refines the generated response condition on the predicted topic \( \text{TopicRefine} \) as shown in Figure 2(c).

The refine decoder receives the first generated response \( r_1^n \) from the stage-one module and the predicted topic \( tw^n \) from the Topic Prediction module as input and outputs a refined response \( r_2^n \). More specifically, we utilize <topic> to indicate the position of topics, so the input can be represented as \{\[CLS], w_1, w_2, ..., w_L, <topic>, w_1, w_2, ..., w_M, <topic>\} where \( r_1^n = [w_1^n, w_2^n, ..., w_L^n] \), \( tw^n = [w_1^n, w_2^n, ..., w_L^n] \). The learning objective is formulated as:

\[
L_{\text{refine}} = - \sum_{m=1}^{|D|} \sum_{n=1}^{|d|} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log p(y_{t+m}^n | r_{t+1}^{m,n}, H_m, tw^n)
\]

(9)

where Eq 9 is similar with Eq 5 except the introduced topic information \( tw^n \) here. The parameters are shared by all three modules unless we state otherwise.

Training Objective

The learning objective of our model is the sum of three parts, jointly trained using the “teacher-forcing” algorithm. During training, we feed the ground-truth response only in stage-one and stage-two and minimize the following objective.

\[
L_{\text{model}} = L_{\text{one}} + L_{\text{topic}} + L_{\text{refine}}
\]

(10)

At test time, we choose the predicted word by \( y^* = \arg\max_x p(y|x) \) at each time step, and we use greedy search to generate both the response and refined response.

Experiment

In this section, we will introduce datasets and baselines first, and then present implementation details and evaluation metrics of our proposed framework.

Datasets

MedDG (Liu et al., 2020a) A large-scale high-quality medical dialogue dataset which contains 12 types of common diseases, more than 17k conversation, 160 different topics consisting of symptoms and attributes. Noted the topic-prediction task here is a multi-label classification problem.

TG-ReDial (Zhou et al., 2020) consists of 10000 two-party dialogues between the user and a recommender in the movie domain which explicitly incorporates topic paths to enforce natural semantic transitions towards recommendation scenario. For topic-prediction task here, it is a multi-class classification problem. The details of these two datasets can be found in Table 1.

Table 1: Statistics of Two Datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>MedDG</th>
<th>TG-ReDial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Domain</td>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification Type</td>
<td>Multi-Label</td>
<td>Multi-Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Domain</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Movie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Dialogues</td>
<td>17864</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Utterances</td>
<td>385951</td>
<td>129392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Topics</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baselines

Seq2Seq. (Sutskever, Vinyals, and Le, 2014) is a classical attention-based sequence to sequence model which build on top of vanilla RNN encoder and decoder.

HRKD. (Serban et al., 2016) extends the traditional RNN encoder by stacking two RNNs in a hierarchical way: one at word level and one at the utterance level. It is frequently used as a dialogue encoder.

GPT2. (Radford et al., 2019) is a strong baseline for response generation task which demonstrates powerful performance in many related works. It is noted all three methods mentioned above can utilize topic information as additional input which concatenate with utterance in the dialogue. We use Seq2Seq-Topic, HRED-Topic and GPT-Topic to represent these methods respectively.

Redial (Li et al., 2018) is proposed specially for conversational recommendation systems by utilizing an auto-encoder for recommendation.

KBRD (Chen et al., 2019) stands for Knowledge-Based Recommender Dialog System, which combines the advantages of recommendation system and dialogue generation system.

Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) applies a Transformer-based encoder-decoder framework to generate proper responses.

TG-RG (Zhou et al., 2020) is state-of-the-art method comes with the release of dataset. It predicts the topic first and then generates the response.

Variants of Our Framework

GPT2DH. The method removes the refinement stage from our framework and jointly train the response generation and topic prediction tasks (i.e. a and b module in Figure 2) based on the GPT2DoubleHeads model. In this way, the training objective changes to \( L_{\text{model}} = L_{\text{one}} + L_{\text{topic}} \) without \( L_{\text{refine}} \). We called this method GPT2DH to represent GPT2DoubleHeads (Wolf et al., 2020) which have two heads for classification and generation respectively.

Stage-One (GPT) and Stage-Two (GPT). As shown in Figure 2 this variant represents all three components are implemented by GPT2DoubleHeads model, while Stage-One (GPT) represents the first generated response \( r_1^n \) and Stage-Two (GPT) represents the refined response \( r_2^n \) in Equation (3).

Stage-Two (BERT). We replace GPT with BERT only for (b) module in Figure 2. The variant is designed for poor understanding capability of GPT model which leads to noisy predicted topic.
Implementation Details
We use the same settings for these two datasets. The learning rate is set as 1.5e-4, repetition penalty as 1.0, batch size as 4, warmup steps as 2000, except max context length as 500, max decode length as 50, epochs as 20 for TG-ReDial, max context length as 600, max decode length as 100, epochs as 10 for MedDG. We use ADAMW [Loshchilov and Hutter 2019] to train the model. We emphasize that the role path information is missing in the test data of MedDG. Thus we only use dialogue and topic information in the experiment to keep consistent with test data. It is important to note that our methods do not pre-train on any other big corpus, we just load the parameters provided by [Wolf et al. 2020] and directly fine-tune on the target dataset.

Evaluation Metrics
For the sake of fair comparison, we adopt the same evaluation metrics as the original two papers (Liu et al. [2020a] and Zhou et al. [2020]). For MedDG, we report BLEU-1, BLEU-4, and Topic-F1 for response generation task, and Precision, Recall, and F1 score for the topic prediction task. For TG-ReDial, we calculate BLEU-1, BLEU2, and BLEU3 for generation and Hit@1, Hit@3, Hit@5 for prediction. It is noted that Topic-F1 requires the topic words appears exactly in the generated response at MedDG dataset.

Result and Analysis
In this section, we evaluated the proposed TopicRefine framework at two datasets MedDG and TG-ReDial respectively. And then we further investigate the effects of different response length and provide analysis of human evaluation for dialogue response generation task. At the last, we also investigate the understanding capability of GPT model at these two datasets.

Main Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>BLEU-1</th>
<th>BLEU-4</th>
<th>Topic-F1</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seq2Seq</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>17.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq2Seq-Topic</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>23.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRED</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRED-Topic</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>25.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPT2</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>17.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPT2-Topic</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-Two (GPT)</td>
<td>45.12</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>26.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-Two (BERT)</td>
<td>44.49</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>26.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-One (GPT)</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>26.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPT2DH</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>26.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Dialogue response generation at MedDG dataset. It is notes that “-Topic” methods use the ground truth topic information in the dataset.

Table 3: Recommendation Response Generation at TG-ReDial dataset. It is notes that “-Topic” methods use the ground truth topic information in the dataset.

Ablation Study
To further investigate the effectiveness of our proposed framework, we add some variants of our proposed framework (i.e. Stage-One (GPT) and GPT2DH) as ablation study. As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, Stage-One (GPT) and GPT2DH achieve comparable results. On the one hand, compared with previous state-of-the-art models, GPT2DH demonstrate more powerful capability which shows the effectiveness of joint learning by incorporating topic prediction. Besides, any Stage-Two model reaches higher BLEU scores than GPT2DH which demonstrate the effectiveness of refine mechanism (i.e. $L_{refine}$). On the other hand, Stage-Two (GPT) outperforms Stage-One (GPT) in BLEU score (45.12 vs 43.86) but Topic-F1 score (5.40 vs 11.36). We argue that the model tends to generate more topic-related words instead of a specific topic word in the response. This is reasonable since the model is optimized to generate a more informative and topic-related response rather than a specific word.

Effects of Response Length
To evaluate the impact of different ground-truth response length, we compare the average BLEU score between our model and previous state-of-the-art model (i.e. GPT2-Topic and TG-RG) in MedDG and TG-ReDial respectively. As shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, our model reaches better performance when the length of golden response is greater than 20 (occupies about 47.6% and 81.9% of test set respectively). As the golden length increases, our improvements also get boosted, which is more obvious at TG-ReDial.
Stage-One

Table 4: Generated Response Samples with Corresponding Topics for MedDG and TG-ReDial respectively. Stage-One and Stage-Two represent Stage-One (GPT) and Stage-Two (GPT) respectively.

dataset.

Figure 3: Average BLEU score of MedDG for different golden length

Generated Sample

Table 4 given some generated response at both datasets. To summarize, our generated result has the following features:

- For MedDG, since we drop the information of speaker role path during training and the dialogue between the doctor and the patient is not alternate, some generated responses may represent the perspective of the patient.
- For TG-ReDial, there are some meaningless repeated characters in the result of Stage-One. For example, “” and “this movie” (this movie) appears twice in response generated by Stage-One. Stage-Two can alleviate this problem by incorporating topic refinement.
- Our Stage-Two model can generates more informative responses conditioned on given topics. Taking the sample of TG-ReDial in Table 4 as an example. For the topic of “memories”, the response of ground truth is just a rhetorical question, while the response of our model not only grasps this topic, but also recommends one specific movie name related to this topic, which suggests that our model is able to ground multi-turn dialogue generation to some specific topics and tends to be more informative with respect to context.

Human Evaluation

To perform human evaluation, we randomly select 50 examples from the outputs of previous sota model, and our Stage-One (GPT) and State-Two (GPT) method. The annotators are required to assign two scores for each sentence according to two criteria: (1) information and (2) fluency, ranging from 0 to 10. Information measures which sentence contains more information (e.g. less repetition). Fluency measures which sentence is more proper as a response to a given
### Understanding of GPT Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>20.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-Two (GPT)</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Result of topic prediction task (multi-label classification) at MedDG dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Hit@1</th>
<th>Hit@3</th>
<th>Hit@5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT</td>
<td>0.7651</td>
<td>0.8023</td>
<td>0.8189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage-Two (GPT)</td>
<td>0.5640</td>
<td>0.7931</td>
<td>0.8122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Result of topic prediction task (multi-class classification) at TG-ReDial dataset

Table 5 demonstrates the result of human evaluation. The baseline represents previous sota model GPT2-Topic and TG-RG in MedDG and TG-ReDial dataset respectively. One represents Stage-One (GPT) and Two represents Stage-Two (GPT). Dialogue context. The evaluation results are calculated by average these two scores of all sentences.

Table 5 demonstrates the result of human evaluation. Generally, the score at TG-ReDial dataset is relatively higher than score in MedDG dataset. We attribute this to the MedDG dataset necessitates more expert knowledge and contains many terminologies. Besides that, there is still a large gap between generated response and human response, especially at fluency criteria. In detail, the Stage-One (GPT) perform better than baseline models at information but worse at fluency. Stage-Two (GPT) model gets better scores in both information and fluency criteria than Stage-One (GPT) model and baseline.

### Related Work

**Data-driven, knowledge-grounded dialogue system**

Most of previous works for topic-aware dialogue system (Xing et al., 2017; Dziri et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019; Huo et al., 2020) utilize attention mechanism on all topics at the decode stage to bias the generation probability. Most of previous works for topic-aware dialogue system (Xing et al., 2017; Dziri et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019; Huo et al., 2020) utilize attention mechanism on all topics at the decode stage to bias the generation probability. Most of previous works for topic-aware dialogue system (Xing et al., 2017; Dziri et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019; Huo et al., 2020) utilize attention mechanism on all topics at the decode stage to bias the generation probability.

**Refine Mechanism**

Refine mechanism has been proved to be a effective and compelling technique in both natural language understanding and generation tasks (Zhang et al., 2019a; Wu et al., 2020; Song et al., 2021). For natural language understanding, Wu et al. (2020) design a novel two-pass iteration mechanism to handle the uncoordinated slots problem caused by conditional independence of non-autoregressive model, in which the model utilizes B-label output from first phase as input at second phase. For natural language generation, Zhang et al. (2019a) use refine mechanism to generate refined summary which firstly applies BERT as decoder. Recently, a novel BERT-over-BERT (BoB) model is proposed to solve response generation task and consistency understanding simultaneously (Song et al., 2021). In this paper, we utilize topicRefine framework to build a topic-aware multi-turn end-to-end dialogue system, aiming to generate informative and topic-related dialogue response.

**Conclusion and Future Work**

In this paper, we propose a joint framework with a topic refinement mechanism to solve topic-aware multi-turn end-to-end dialogue generation problem based on the autoregressive language model – GPT2 (Wolf et al., 2020). More specifically, we design a three-pass mechanism to jointly learn topic predication and dialogue response generation tasks, aiming to generate informative and topic-related response to engage user. Comprehensive experiments demonstrate that our method outperforms previous state-of-the-art model on both MedDG (Liu et al., 2020a) and TG-ReDial (Liu et al., 2020b) datasets, which verifies that the effectiveness of joint learning and refinement mechanism. We will investigate more refine techniques in our future work.
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