

Taming Continuous Posteriors for Latent Variational Dialogue Policies

Marin Vlastelica^{1,2}, Patrick Ernst² and György Szarvas²

¹Autonomous Learning Group, Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen, Germany

²Amazon Development Center Germany GmbH, Berlin, Germany

¹marin.vlastelica@tuebingen.mpg.de, ²{peernst, szarvasg}@amazon.de

Abstract

Utilizing amortized variational inference for latent-action reinforcement learning (RL) has been shown to be an effective approach in Task-oriented Dialogue (ToD) systems for optimizing dialogue success. Until now, categorical posteriors have been argued to be one of the main drivers of performance.

In this work we revisit Gaussian variational posteriors for latent-action RL and show that they can yield even better performance than categorical posteriors. We achieve this by simplifying the training procedure and propose ways to regularize the latent dialogue policy to retain good response coherence. Using continuous latent representations our model achieves state of the art dialogue success rate on the MultiWOZ benchmark, and also compares well to categorical latent methods in response coherence.

1 Introduction

Task-oriented Dialogue (ToD) systems have reached a degree of maturity, which enables them to engage with human users and assist them in various tasks. They are able to steer natural-language conversations in order to complete users’ goals, such as booking restaurants, querying weather forecasts and resolving customer service issues. At their core, the behavior of these systems is controlled by a dialogue policy, which receives user inputs in the form of utterances and additional features or states.

Template-based methods (Walker et al., 2007; Inaba and Takahashi, 2016) leverage ranking or classification approaches to select the most fitting response from a pre-defined set of responses, i.e. templates. While template-based methods offer better control over the dialogue policy behavior, they are less versatile due to their dependency on template sets. Moreover, constructing comprehensive template sets is a challenge in itself (Gao et al., 2019). In retrieval-based approaches (Yan et al., 2016; Henderson et al., 2019; Tao et al., 2019) candidate responses are not predefined, but are retrieved from massive dialogue corpora, e.g. by executing ad-hoc search queries a priori.

Generative models do not require such additional inputs as prior knowledge. They enable end-to-end (E2E)

learning of dialogue policies with the potential of extrapolation to diverse responses (Serban et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2017; Gu et al., 2018). Methods based on amortized variational inference achieve this by inferring low-dimensional variational posteriors mapped from dialogue contexts, similar to variational autoencoders (VAEs) (Kingma and Welling, 2013). Even though such fully data-driven approaches offer great versatility and a faster adoption, they may exhibit degenerate behavior by generating incomprehensible utterances. This is apparent in multi-turn dialogues, which span hundreds of words, while the success signal is only observed at the end of dialogues. Reinforcement learning (RL) based approaches are able to optimize for such long-term, sparse rewards and have been applied in this setup. Previous approaches prominently applied word-level RL (Lewis et al., 2017; Kottur et al., 2017), where the action space is defined over the entire vocabulary. The response utterances are then generated auto-regressively by consecutive next-word predictions. Unfortunately, the use of large action spaces often impedes the convergence of policy learning algorithms, which makes it hard to ensure coherent responses. Prior work makes use of *latent-action RL* to address the dimensionality problem by utilizing variational inference approaches (Zhao et al., 2019; Lubis et al., 2020). These methods rely on a supervised learning stage followed by fine-tuning via reinforcement learning in the latent space.

In this paper we follow this paradigm, but extend prior work substantially by introducing the TCUP approach, which aims to *Tame ContinUous Posteriors* for latent variational dialogue policies. TCUP makes the following contributions: **(i)** A new formulation of the variational inference objective for learning continuous latent response representations without auxiliary learning objectives. **(ii)** A more robust approach for learning from offline ToD data in a RL setup, which utilizes the fact that we are dealing with expert dialogue trajectories.

We compare the performance of our proposed method to competing approaches on the MultiWOZ benchmark (Budzianowski et al., 2018). Our experimental results show that we are able to improve the state-of-the-art performance across different benchmark metrics. Apart from MultiWOZ’s context-to-text metrics, we demonstrate the benefits of TCUP’s learned latent representations quantitatively using a clustering analysis

following Lubis et al. (2020).

2 Preliminaries

Usually, latent-action reinforcement learning methods are trained in two stages: **(i)** In the first stage an encoder-decoder architecture is applied to learn latent representations from a supervised signal, i.e. latent actions, over dialogue responses. **(ii)** In the consecutive stage a RL-based policy predicts the best latent action given a particular context in order to optimize for long-term dialogue success. The trained decoder stays fixed and receives the output of the RL policy to generate the final response utterance.

Learning Latent Response Representations We denote the dialogue context as c , which contains the user input utterance and dialogue state, and the response utterance generated by the system as x . Provided a dataset of context and optimal response pairs (c, x) , we want to extract a latent representation z , representing the dialogue responses given context. Approaches based on variational inference have shown to be beneficial for learning such latent representations. This is done by optimizing the evidence lower bound (ELBO):

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(z|x, c)}[-\log p_\phi(x|z)] + D_{\text{KL}}[q_\theta(z|x, c) || p(z|c)] \quad (1)$$

Where q_θ denotes the variational posterior parametrized by θ and p_ϕ the decoder parametrized by ϕ . Arguing that the full ELBO formulation suffers from “explaining away”, Zhao et al. (2019) introduced the “lite” ELBO to mitigate this issue:

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(z|c)}[-\log p_\phi(x|z)] + D_{\text{KL}}[q_\theta(z|c) || p(z)] \quad (2)$$

The goal is to be closer to the information available during testing time, where the decoder only sees z conditionally sampled on the context $q_\theta(z|c)$.

Learning Latent Dialogue Policies After learning to extract a compressed representation z in the supervised learning stage, the encoder $q_\phi(z|c)$ is fine-tuned via reinforcement learning to optimize the dialogue reward, where mostly directly the success metric is used. A Markov Decision Process (\mathcal{MDP}) is defined as a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, r, p)$ of state space \mathcal{S} , action space \mathcal{A} , reward function r , and transition density p . The general goal of reinforcement learning is to optimize the expected return of policy π , denoted as $\mathbb{E}[J(\pi)]$. Many works utilize a Monte-Carlo estimate of the policy gradient:

$$\nabla_\phi \mathbb{E}[J(\pi_\phi)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\nabla_\phi \sum_{(s, a) \in \tau} \log \pi_\phi(a|s) r(s, a)\right] \quad (3)$$

Where the expectation is taken over the trajectory distribution $\eta^\pi(\tau)$, i.e. distribution of sequences of (s, a) . In the context of ToD, we may cast the state s as being the underlying dialogue state which may be unobserved, in

which case the problem becomes partially observable. In our setting, the latent dialogue policy is warm-started by the parameters of the variational posterior from the first stage of training.

3 Method

In line with the general latent action RL paradigm outlined in Sec. 2, TCUP is also based on a two-stage approach. In Sec. 3.1 we describe the reformulation of the ELBO used in the supervised learning stage, which is vital to reach state-of-the performance with continuous variational posteriors. In Sec. 3.2 we discuss our reinforcement learning setup and introduce methods to address the deterioration of *latent action* based dialogue policies by regularization.

3.1 Revisiting the Full ELBO

As aforementioned prior work by Zhao et al. (2019) has introduced the “lite” ELBO (described in equation 2) to alleviate the overexposure bias that emerges when they incorporate response information in the optimization objective. Indeed, if we only optimize for samples of $q(z|c, x)$, the most information about the responses (x) is found within the responses themselves. However, not conditioning on x will reduce the expressiveness of the variational posterior, especially if responses and contexts share indicative patterns.

In this work we rely on a full ELBO and introduce a conditional prior $q_\zeta^p(z|c)$ indicated by the superscript p which is constrained by the free prior $p(z)$ and also parametrized. This leads us to the following objective:

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta, \zeta) = D_{\text{KL}}[q_\theta || q_\zeta^p] + D_{\text{KL}}[q_\zeta^p || p(z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] \quad (4)$$

We defer the full derivation of this objective to the Appendix Sec. A.

During training time, we leverage samples from both the prior and the variational posterior for reconstruction, which makes sure that the decoder doesn’t overly rely on information from x . Apart from achieving better performance as outlined in Sec. 4, this also simplifies the training procedure considerably.

3.2 Regularizing for Success and Coherence

Reinforcement learning algorithms have shown to be able to exploit weaknesses in simulators of game environments (Mnih et al., 2013) by finding high reward states which don’t align with solving the underlying task. Similarly, in the context of latent action RL for ToD, the decoder can be seen as a weak simulator that is prone to exploitation due to the nature of the success rate metric. By checking for relevant slots to be present in the response, success rate permits that long, possibly incoherent responses more easily achieve success due to higher chance of containing the correct slot tokens. Anecdotal evidence for this is presented in Table 2. When using continuous latent actions, this issue is even




Figure 1: High-level schema of the proposed supervised training stage. The encoder receives either context or both the context and the response that is to be decoded from latent z . In a sense, when samples from $q(z|c, x)$ are used for decoding, the architecture acts as a proper conditional autoencoder. We use the normal distribution family for modelling the distribution of z .

more severe, since the model is able to sample out of distribution (OOD) utterances that provide success. For measuring response coherence, we rely on the BLEU metric as specified in the MultiWOZ benchmark.

Penalizing Out of Distribution Samples

In the supervised training stage we apply variational inference and implicitly maximize the BLEU score through maximizing the ELBO (see equation 3). We denote this BLEU-maximizing policy with π^{VI} . Since we constrain our policy with an isotropic Gaussian prior in the first training stage, we can leverage this information to prevent the policy from deviating from this prior in the form of a divergence cost which can be efficiently computed. Concretely, the regularized reward function is defined as follows:

$$r(x, c) = succ(x, c) - \beta D_{KL}[\pi(z|c) || p(z)] \quad (5)$$

ToD as Offline RL

We are dealing with an offline reinforcement learning problem, since we have a dataset of optimal responses without the possibility of obtaining more samples via a simulator or users. By shifting the reinforcement learning problem to the latent space, we are implicitly creating a surrogate online problem, where we need to obtain samples from $\pi(z|c)$ and evaluate them.

We argue that one of the reasons why Gaussian latent spaces have been reported as under-performing in comparison to categorical is the biased and noisy gradient estimate based on samples from a single dialogue. Contrary to prior work (Lubis et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2019), which estimates the policy gradient over the responses from a single dialogue sample, we take advantage of a Monte Carlo policy gradient estimate across *multiple dialogues*.

Replaying Successful Samples

Re-using encountered experience by storing it in memory (also called a replay buffer) has proved to be beneficial for sample-efficiency in reinforcement learning. However, a naive usage of the buffer has multiple caveats in the MultiWOZ setting. Firstly, since the success signal is calculated on the dialogue level, some responses that might be actually successful conditioned on the dialogue state and context, might be labelled as negative. Intuitively, the policy can start off the dialogue correctly, but fail to successfully complete it. This can lead to conflicting examples in the replay buffer, which destabilises training. Secondly, we have a many-to-one mapping from responses to success, which leads to multimodality, but also modes that might be incoherent.

If we make the observation that the response at time step t is conditionally independent of the dialogue history given the dialogue state and input utterance, we notice that we can attribute success directly to the response independent of past utterances. This motivates the storage of only successful responses in the replay buffer, which we sample as a fraction of the training batch. That way it mitigates the problem of false negative responses and ensures fewer conflicting examples in the batch. Replaying past experience also ensures that certain difficult samples are not forgotten, which both increases training stability and ensures that the current policy π stays close to π^{VI} .

In practice, we exchange a certain sample in the batch generated by the current policy with a sample from the replay buffer with probability λ . As $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ we arrive to the simple REINFORCE update, $\lambda = 1$ means that we only use replayed samples for updates.

4 Experiments

We provide a detailed evaluation of TCUP’s dialogue policy in Sec. 4.1. This includes performance on the

Table 1: Results comparison to competing methods on MultiWOZ. We have marked methods that utilize RL with †, transformer architecture with *.

Model	BLEU	Inform	Success	Av. len.	CBE	# unigrams	# trigrams
MarCo*	17.3	94.5	87.2	16.01	1.94	319	3002
HDSA	20.7	87.9	79.4	14.42	1.64	259	2019
HDNO†	17.8	93.3	83.4	14.96	0.84	103	315
SFN†	14.1	93.4	82.3	14.93	1.63	188	1218
UniConv	18.1	66.7	58.7	14.17	1.79	338	2932
LAVA†*	16.2	89.7	77.6	14.41	1.96	272	2365
LAVA†-Cat	10.8	95.9	93.5	13.28	1.27	176	708
TCUP†	10.3	96.3	95.9	15.14	1.44	210	1838
TCUP†-Cat	14.3	96.1	92.1	14.33	1.61	230	1490

Table 2: Example of successful responses where the policy was able to “game” the metric, leading to a successful dialogue but resulting in incoherent utterances and hence low BLEU score.

USER	we are staying [value_count] people for [value_count] nights starting from [value_day] . i need the reference number?
SYSTEM	[hotel_name] [hotel_name] [hotel_name] [hotel_reference] [hotel_name] [hotel_reference] [hotel_name] [hotel_name] [hotel_reference] [hotel_name] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_phone] [hotel_name] [hotel_phone] [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_phone] [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_name] -ly [hotel_name] ...
USER	just the address please
SYSTEM	[attraction_name] is located at [attraction_address], postcode [attraction_postcode]. the phone number is [attraction_phone]. [attraction_name] is located at [attraction_address], [attraction_postcode]. phone number is [attraction_phone] [attraction_name] is located at [attraction_address], [attraction_postcode]. phone number is [attraction_phone]. [attraction_name] is located at [attraction_address], [attraction_postcode]. phone

MultiWOZ benchmark; an ablation study to assess the importance of our technical contributions proposed in Sec. 3; and a qualitative analysis of response coherence. Finally, we analyze the quality of the latent representations in Sec. 4.2 and provide evidence that TCUP is able to learn representations using continuous latent variables which yield good separation and clustering of domains and actions present in MultiWOZ. We make use of a recurrent encoder-decoder architecture with dot-product attention, further details on the architecture and training procedure can be found in Appendix Sec. E.

Supervised Learning Stage (SL) Here, we learn the mapping from context to response using equation 1. In practice, we optimize the $p_\phi(x|z)$ part with a weighted cross-entropy loss that puts higher weights on slot placeholders in the response. The best model is selected based on its BLEU score.

Reinforcement Learning Stage (RL) In this stage we fix the parameters of the decoder and train only the encoder parameters via policy gradient with two

important modifications: (i) we use a batched version of the policy gradient which contains samples from multiple dialogues and hence reduces the variance of the gradient, and (ii) in each batch we sample a mix of newly generated and old experience (with which we have obtained a success signal earlier). This implicitly keeps us close to the starting policy which results in more stable training.

We have found that it is also beneficial to replace the standard $D_{KL}[q||p]$ term of the variational objective with a symmetric version of it $\frac{1}{2}(D_{KL}[q||p] + D_{KL}[p||q])$. This ensures that regions where the densities of p and q behave differently are treated equally irrespective of the ordering.

4.1 Context-to-Response Generation

We validate the proposed method on the MultiWOZ benchmark (Wang et al., 2020) in the policy learning task with ground-truth dialogue states and use the same dellexicalization approach as in Lubis et al. (2020). Table 1 shows that TCUP improves the state-of-the-art

inform- and success rate metric across all competitors. Also, it is competitive in terms of language diversity metrics. Compared to the currently best performing latent action reinforcement learning approach (LAVA), we increase all metrics except for minor decreases in the BLEU metric. The response coherence score is further discussed in Sec. 4.1.

Latent Representations While prior latent-action reinforcement learning approaches (Lubis et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2019) favor categorical latent distributions with modified attention mechanisms in the decoder, our results demonstrate that relying on isotropic Gaussian latents is advantageous, even if we only use simple dot-product attention in the decoder. In particular, if we base TCUP on categorical latent distributions (coined TCUP-Categorical in Table 1) we observe competitive results in terms of inform and success rate compared to prior work, but inferior performance compared to TCUP with continuous latents.

Using categoricals limits us in the sense that we don’t make full use of the nonlinearity in the decoder to decode diverse responses, which manifests itself with poor results in the diversity metrics (Table 1). By using a continuous latent distribution, we are able to improve the diversity of the generated responses compared to those two competitors.

Ablation Study Fig. 2 presents an ablation study of different parts of TCUP. In general, optimal replay (*rep*) and the constrained rewards with the additional KL penalty (*KL*) lead to higher success rate and BLEU, with optimal replay being the superior choice between the two, especially in the BLEU metric. Further gains can be achieved by utilizing both. Not using optimal replay introduced higher variance across runs. During the first training stage, utilizing prior and posterior shuffling (*sl shuff*) enables a better fit in terms of BLEU scores. Histograms of further metrics used in the MultiWOZ benchmark can be found in Appendix Sec. B. In summary, these results (*shuff kl rep*) validate the benefits of the proposed variational inference objective and regularization.

Response Coherence

We have observed that it is possible to maximize the dialogue success rate at the cost of lower coherence in terms of BLEU scores. In Fig. 4 we show that we achieve state-of-the-art success rates, whilst achieving a BLEU score of effectively 0. This is an artifact of the success rate metric in that it disregards coherence of responses and only checks if the correct slot values have been addressed by the dialogue policy.

In Fig. 3 we see different runs of our method with different strength of regularization in terms of KL penalty and optimal replay fraction. Depending on the strength




Figure 2: Ablation study. All TCUP configurations are averaged over three random seeds. *sl* denotes supervised training, *sl+r* supervised training followed by reinforcement learning, *ctxp* usage of contextual prior, but without any prior on it, *kl* the addition of KL penalty term to identity covariance Gaussian, *larl* the approach proposed by Zhao et al. (2019), *shuff* prior and posterior shuffling in the supervised stage, *pp* identity covariance Gaussian prior on the contextual prior, *rep* usage of replay buffer

of regularization they form a Pareto front. This further shows the multi-objective trade-off between success rates and BLEU scores. The BLEU collapse is to be expected when using latent-action reinforcement learning, since longer and more diverse answers have positive impact on the dialogue success, which leads to the policy selecting degenerate responses. Furthermore, if no additional regularization is used, the latent policy learns to sample outliers in terms of the prior over z . We argue that it is not realistic to expect the policy resulting from the reinforcement learning stage to outperform the response coherence of the supervised learning stage in terms of BLEU (as long as the primary purpose of the RL stage is to improve dialogue success metrics). Instead, we show that through regularization and optimal replay, the BLEU score can be kept from deterioration through the RL stage while we optimize dialogue level metrics. An alternative approach to alleviating degenerate policies would be to simply make the BLEU score or other coherence metrics part of the reward function. For example, the final comparison of models in (Budzianowski et al., 2018) is done by comparing $\frac{success+inform}{2} + BLEU$. However, we suggest

*Results taken for best runs, mean performance is actually lower, additional commentary available in Appendix Sec. C




Figure 3: Each point depicts a training run and the line is a 2nd degree polynomial fit of the runs illustrating the Pareto front.

that there are multiple problems with the approach of maximizing such a hybrid metric directly. First of all, constructing reliable metrics is challenging (Jiang et al., 2021; Mehri and Eskenazi, 2020) in itself. More importantly, as soon as the coherence metric is part of the reward, we encounter the problem of adequate scaling in comparison to the success rate.

Impact of Regularization When introducing regularization in the form of optimal replay sampling and the KL penalty term, we are able to achieve state-of-the-art performance in terms of success rate without lowering the BLEU score significantly. As depicted in Fig. 4 our method using optimal replay buffer sampling is more stable during training in comparison to the naive application of the policy gradient. Also, we observe that the BLEU deterioration is kept at bay and roughly deteriorates linearly over time. By increasing the replay fraction λ too much we are over-constraining the latent dialogue policy to the initial experience, which leads to biased updates and hurts exploration. Nevertheless, as shown in the ablation study (Fig. 2) optimal replay and the KL penalty term have shown to be essential for preventing the BLEU score from deteriorating too rapidly. In this work we aimed to retain a BLEU score that is competitive to that reported by LAVA (Lubis et al., 2020), while improving overall dialogue success. A sensitivity analysis over the weights of the penalty term and the replay fraction λ is described in Appendix Fig. 8.

4.2 Latent Space Analysis

Fig. 5 depicts a UMAP(McInnes et al., 2018) projection of the learned latent samples z for the Gaussian case. We observe similar behavior to Lubis et al. (2020). In the supervised learning stage there is apparent clustering in terms of domain labels (Fig. 5a). The reinforcement learning stage with regularization leads to specialization of the clusters (Fig. 5c). In comparison, a good cluster separation is lost (Fig. 5b) without applying regularization in the RL stage. This can be explained by the fact that the z samples are degenerate samples that lie in low-support regions of $q_C^p(z|c)$.




Figure 4: Influence of optimal replay on success rate and BLEU score over multiple epochs

Table 3: Caliński-Harabasz scores (higher is better).

Model	SL		RL	
	Domain	Action	Domain	Action
LaRL*	93.19	23.20	121.15	17.5
LAVA*	104.92	25.28	158.00	41.75
TCUP	345.48	80.76	329.39	78.95

We have calculated the Caliński-Harabasz index (Caliński and Harabasz, 1974), otherwise known as Variance Ratio Criterion, to evaluate the clusterings in the latent space with respect to domain and action type labelings taken from DAMD (Zhang et al., 2020). In comparison to the results reported by Lubis et al. (2020), our model is able to obtain high scores in the supervised stage of training already. The scores drop slightly after RL fine-tuning, but generally remain at a much higher level than those reported for categorical latents. It’s important to note that the scores for LaRL* and LAVA* were computed with categorical latent variables, whereas our scores are based on Gaussian latents, which are continuous and unbounded.

Consequently, the purpose of Table 3 is to demonstrate the value in using continuous latent representations, rather than to make direct numeric comparisons.

*Here we take the best scores of each method obtained by Lubis et al. (2020)




Figure 5: UMAP embeddings of latent representations. Figures a-c show domain labeled embeddings for the SL, SL+RL and SL+RL with replay sampling, respectively. In the bottom row we find the same embeddings labeled by response type. Naively executing the RL stage of the training results in representations that are difficult to separate (b and e). When applying replay sampling we obtain higher specialization in the clusters (c and f).

5 Related Work

Supervised Learning The majority of prior work applies some form of Supervised Learning. For an extensive overview we refer to Gao et al. (2018) and focus on the state-of-the-art competitors HDSA (Chen et al., 2019) as well as UniConv (Le et al., 2020). Both approaches demonstrate the benefits of jointly training multiple dialogue tasks at once, such as predicting dialogue acts and states.

Variational Inference Several works employ variational inference for learning conditional response distributions. VHRED (Serban et al., 2017) is a variational hierarchical RNN architecture for modelling the dependencies between words and utterances. Stochastic latent variables are introduced to generate the next utterance in a conversation. To avoid the problem of collapsing posteriors Zhao et al. (2017) aim to learn better response representation using an auxiliary task introducing a bag of words prediction loss. Shen et al. (2018) improves the stability of VHRED by splitting the training process into two parts, where first text is auto-encoded into continuous embeddings, which serve as starting point for learning general latent representations by reconstructing the encoded embedding. To address the degeneration

problem, Variational Hierarchical Conversation RNNs (VHCR) (Park et al., 2018) exploits an utterance drop regularization. DialogWAE (Gu et al., 2018) represents the prior distribution as Gaussian mixture and adapts WGAN (Arjovsky et al., 2017) for training.

Combined Supervised- & Reinforcement Learning Henderson et al. (2008) was the first work to combine Reinforcement and Supervised Learning introducing a value function, which relies on SL for predicting the expected future reward of states not covered by the data directly. Williams et al. (2017) prevent high variance by performing a SL gradient update, if the RL policy output deviates from the training data. Fatemi et al. (2016); Su et al. (2017) apply two-stage approaches, where they pretrain a dialogue policy supervised, which is then further optimized by RL. HappyBot (Shin et al., 2019) relies on a weighted combination of a maximum likelihood and a REINFORCE objective. Saleh et al. (2020) uses REINFORCE-based policy gradients to update the prior probability distribution of the latent variational model trained using supervised learning. Structured Fusion Networks (SFNs) (Mehri et al., 2019) apply RL to fuse dialogue modules, where each module serves a different purpose (NLU, NLG, etc.) and is pretrained in individual supervised stages. Apart from

task-oriented dialogues a combination of SL and RL has also been applied for generating responses for open-domain dialogues (Xu et al., 2018). The aforementioned approaches are based on word-level RL, suffering from huge action-spaces covering the entire input vocabulary. Due to this, ensuring coherent responses is challenging (Lewis et al., 2017; Kottur et al., 2017), especially in multi-turn dialogs spanning hundreds of words. LaRL (Zhao et al., 2019) and LAVA (Lubis et al., 2020) address this problem by learning a low-dimensional latent representation with amortized variational inference followed by a RL fine-tuning stage where the decoder parameters are frozen and the encoder is fine-tuned.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we showed that with appropriate modifications to the reinforcement learning procedure and the latent space structure, it is possible to obtain state-of-the-art results in task-oriented dialogue with simple Gaussian latent distributions. The problem of coherence deterioration when optimizing for success rate points to the fact that better metrics are needed for developing efficient dialogue policies - we were able to alleviate this with optimal replay and KL regularization.

Although TCUP has shown promising results in the policy learning setting with access to ground-truth dialogue state, it would be of interest to see how TCUP compares in the end-to-end learning setting. Furthermore, the deterioration of the BLEU score is tightly connected to the capacity of the model to achieve good likelihood fits in the supervised learning stage. Our experiments also hint that this variational formulation can benefit from higher-capacity models. Along these lines, increasing capacity and making use of the transformer architecture is a promising future research direction.

References

- Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. 2017. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 214–223. PMLR.
- Paweł Budzianowski, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Inigo Casanueva, Stefan Ultes, Osman Ramadan, and Milica Gašić. 2018. Multiwoz—a large-scale multi-domain wizard-of-oz dataset for task-oriented dialogue modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00278*.
- Tadeusz Caliński and Jerzy Harabasz. 1974. A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communications in Statistics-theory and Methods*, 3(1):1–27.
- Wenhu Chen, Jianshu Chen, Pengda Qin, Xifeng Yan, and William Yang Wang. 2019. Semantically conditioned dialog response generation via hierarchical disentangled self-attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12866*.
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder–decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1724–1734.
- Mehdi Fatemi, Layla El Asri, Hannes Schulz, Jing He, and Kaheer Suleman. 2016. Policy networks with two-stage training for dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.03152*.
- Jianfeng Gao, Michel Galley, and Lihong Li. 2018. Neural approaches to conversational ai. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1371–1374.
- Jianfeng Gao, Michel Galley, and Lihong Li. 2019. now. [link].
- Xiaodong Gu, Kyunghyun Cho, Jung-Woo Ha, and Sunghun Kim. 2018. Dialogwae: Multimodal response generation with conditional wasserstein auto-encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.12352*.
- James Henderson, Oliver Lemon, and Kallirroi Georgila. 2008. Hybrid reinforcement/supervised learning of dialogue policies from fixed data sets. *Computational Linguistics*, 34(4):487–511.
- Matthew Henderson, Ivan Vulić, Daniela Gerz, Iñigo Casanueva, Paweł Budzianowski, Sam Coope, Georgios Spithourakis, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Nikola Mrkšić, and Pei-Hao Su. 2019. Training neural response selection for task-oriented dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01543*.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Michimasa Inaba and Kenichi Takahashi. 2016. Neural utterance ranking model for conversational dialogue systems. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 393–403.
- Haoming Jiang, Bo Dai, Mengjiao Yang, Tuo Zhao, and Wei Wei. 2021. Towards automatic evaluation of dialog systems: A model-free off-policy evaluation approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.10242*.
- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. 2013. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*.
- Satwik Kottur, José MF Moura, Stefan Lee, and Dhruv Batra. 2017. Natural language does not emerge ‘naturally’ in multi-agent dialog. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08502*.
- Hung Le, Doyen Sahoo, Chenghao Liu, Nancy F Chen, and Steven CH Hoi. 2020. Uniconv: A unified conversational neural architecture for multi-domain task-oriented dialogues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14307*.

- Hwaran Lee, Seokhwan Jo, Hyungjun Kim, Sangkeun Jung, and Tae-Yoon Kim. 2021. Sumbt+ larl: Effective multi-domain end-to-end neural task-oriented dialog system. *IEEE Access*, 9:116133–116146.
- Mike Lewis, Denis Yarats, Yann N Dauphin, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. 2017. Deal or no deal? end-to-end learning for negotiation dialogues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05125*.
- SHIYANG LI, Semih Yavuz, Kazuma Hashimoto, Jia Li, Tong Niu, Nazneen Rajani, Xifeng Yan, Yingbo Zhou, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Coco: Controllable counterfactuals for evaluating dialogue state trackers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Nurul Lubis, Christian Geishauser, Michael Heck, Hsien-Chin Lin, Marco Moresi, Carel van Niekerk, and Milica Gasic. 2020. LAVA: latent action spaces via variational auto-encoding for dialogue policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2020, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 8-13, 2020*, pages 465–479. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. 2018. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426*.
- Shikib Mehri and Maxine Eskenazi. 2020. Unsupervised evaluation of interactive dialog with dialogpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.12719*.
- Shikib Mehri, Tejas Srinivasan, and Maxine Eskenazi. 2019. Structured fusion networks for dialog. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10016*.
- Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. 2013. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*.
- Yookoon Park, Jaemin Cho, and Gunhee Kim. 2018. A hierarchical latent structure for variational conversation modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03424*.
- Abdelrhman Saleh, Natasha Jaques, Asma Ghandeharioun, Judy Shen, and Rosalind Picard. 2020. Hierarchical reinforcement learning for open-domain dialog. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8741–8748.
- Iulian Serban, Alessandro Sordani, Ryan Lowe, Laurent Charlin, Joelle Pineau, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. A hierarchical latent variable encoder-decoder model for generating dialogues. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31.
- Xiaoyu Shen, Hui Su, Shuzi Niu, and Vera Demberg. 2018. Improving variational encoder-decoders in dialogue generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32.
- Jamin Shin, Peng Xu, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2019. Happybot: Generating empathetic dialogue responses by improving user experience look-ahead. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08487*.
- Pei-Hao Su, Pawel Budzianowski, Stefan Ultes, Milica Gasic, and Steve Young. 2017. Sample-efficient actor-critic reinforcement learning with supervised data for dialogue management. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.00130*.
- Chongyang Tao, Wei Wu, Can Xu, Wenpeng Hu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2019. Multi-representation fusion network for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots. In *Proceedings of the twelfth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, pages 267–275.
- Marilyn A Walker, Amanda Stent, François Mairesse, and Rashmi Prasad. 2007. Individual and domain adaptation in sentence planning for dialogue. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 30:413–456.
- Kai Wang, Junfeng Tian, Rui Wang, Xiaojun Quan, and Jianxing Yu. 2020. Multi-domain dialogue acts and response co-generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12363*.
- Jason D Williams, Kavosh Asadi, and Geoffrey Zweig. 2017. Hybrid code networks: practical and efficient end-to-end dialog control with supervised and reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.03274*.
- Can Xu, Wei Wu, and Yu Wu. 2018. Towards explainable and controllable open domain dialogue generation with dialogue acts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.07255*.
- Rui Yan, Yiping Song, and Hua Wu. 2016. Learning to respond with deep neural networks for retrieval-based human-computer conversation system. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 55–64.
- Yichi Zhang, Zhijian Ou, and Zhou Yu. 2020. Task-oriented dialog systems that consider multiple appropriate responses under the same context. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 9604–9611.
- Tiancheng Zhao, Kaige Xie, and Maxine Eskenazi. 2019. Rethinking action spaces for reinforcement learning in end-to-end dialog agents with latent variable models. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 1208–1218, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tiancheng Zhao, Ran Zhao, and Maxine Eskenazi. 2017. Learning discourse-level diversity for neural dialog models using conditional variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.10960*.

A Revisiting the Full ELBO

Further we use shorthand q for $q(z|x, c)$. Firstly we define our optimization problem:

$$\min_q D_{\text{KL}}[q||p(z|x, c)]$$




Figure 6: Probabilistic model of dependencies between c , z and x

Lemma 1. *Given the probabilistic model diagram 6:*

$$D_{\text{KL}}[q||p(z|x, c)] \leq \mathbb{E}_q[\log q] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(z|c)]$$

Proof. We expand the KL divergence of equation 6.

$$D_{\text{KL}}[q||p(z|x, c)] = \mathbb{E}_q[\log q - \log p(z|x, c)] \quad (6)$$

We first expand the $p(z|x, c)$ by Bayes rule and make use of independence between x and c :

$$\begin{aligned} p(z|x, c) &= \frac{p(x, c|z)p(z)}{p(x, c)} \\ &= \frac{p(x|z)p(c|z)p(z)}{p(x, c)}, \quad x \perp\!\!\!\perp c|z \\ &= \frac{p(x|z)p(z|c)p(c)}{p(x, c)} \end{aligned}$$

Putting back these terms into equation 6:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}[q||p(z|x, c)] &= \mathbb{E}_q[\log q] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(z|c)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(c)] + \mathbb{E}[\log p(x, c)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_q[\log q] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(z|c)] \\ &\quad - \log p(c) + \log p(x, c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_q[\log q] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x|z)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(z|c)] p(c) \geq p(x, c) \end{aligned}$$

□

In practice, we don't have access to $p(z|c)$ and hence we estimate it with $q_\theta^p(z|c)$, which results in an arg min operation within the expectation.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_q[\log q] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(z|c)] &= \\ \mathbb{E}_q[\log q] - \mathbb{E}_q[\log \arg \min_{q^p} D_{\text{KL}}[q^p||p(z|c)]] &= \\ - \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x|z)] \end{aligned}$$

The new KL term within the expectation can be expanded to obtain the traditional evidence lower-bound, ie. bound on the objective:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}[q^p||p(z|c)] &\leq D_{\text{KL}}[q_\zeta^p||p(z)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[p(c|z)] \end{aligned}$$

In the end, this is our objective function, but we want to get rid of $p_\phi(c|z)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta, \zeta) &= D_{\text{KL}}[q_\theta||q_\zeta^p] + D_{\text{KL}}[q_\zeta^p||p(z)] - \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[\log p(c|z)] \end{aligned}$$

The current formulation would require us to approximate $p(c|z)$.

Remark. *The KL term $D_{\text{KL}}[p(z|c)||p(z|x, c)]$ is zero iff x doesn't provide any additional information about z .*

We further simplify the problem by replacing $p(c|z)$ with $p_\phi(x|z)$. By applying Bayes rule, we arrive to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta, \zeta) &= D_{\text{KL}}[q_\theta||q_\zeta^p] + D_{\text{KL}}[q_\zeta^p||p(z)] - \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[\log \frac{p(c|z)}{p_\theta(x|z)}] \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2. $p(z|x, c) \approx E_{p(c)}[p(z|x, c)]$ implies that $p(c|z) \approx \frac{p(c)}{p(x)}p(x|z)$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} p(z|x, c) &\approx E_{p(c)}[p(z|x, c)] \\ p(c|z) &= p(z|c)p(c)/p(z) \\ p(x|z) &= p(z|x)p(x)/p(z) \\ \frac{p(c|z)}{p(x|z)} &\approx \frac{p(c)p(z|c, x)}{p(x)\mathbb{E}_{p(c)}[p(z|x, c)]} \\ \frac{p(c|z)}{p(x|z)} &\approx \frac{p(c)}{p(x)} \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 1. *From the above it follows that for the optimization problem $\min_q D_{\text{KL}}[q||p(z|x, c)]$ it suffices to optimize the following objective:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta, \zeta) &= D_{\text{KL}}[q_\theta||q_\zeta^p] + D_{\text{KL}}[q_\zeta^p||p(z)] - \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[\log p_\phi(x|z)] + C \end{aligned}$$

How accurate the approximation is depends highly on the relationship between $p(z|x)$ and $p(z|c)$.

Lemma 3. *In the case where $p(z|x) = p(z|c)$, the approximation from 2 holds with equality.*

Proof. This can be easily seen by replacing the $p(z|x)$ and $p(z|c)$ in the proof of Lemma 2, we arrive to the same result without making the approximation step. □

Intuitively, $p(z|x)$ and $p(z|c)$ in the ideal case would be equal, i.e. knowing either x or c would be enough to obtain all the information about z , which allows for good information compression.

In our approach, we optimize $\mathbb{E}_{q_\zeta^p}[p_\phi(x|z)]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{q_\theta}[p_\phi(x|z)]$ by interchangeably sampling from p_ϕ and q_ζ^p based on a fair coin flip, ie Bernoulli distribution and assume an identity covariance Gaussian prior $p(z)$.

B Evaluation Histograms

In Fig. 7 we show histograms of different evaluation metrics for the MultiWOZ 2.1 dataset and different approaches. We ran 3 seeds for each of the methods. Most notably, we notice that we are able to obtain the highest BLEU score in the supervised learning stage by utilizing prior and posterior shuffling, denoted as *sl shuff*, with the result slightly increasing when using an additional identity covariance Gaussian prior on the prior (*sl pp shuff*).

C LAVA Gauss Results

To obtain scores with the newest evaluation method for MultiWOZ, we ran the code available at <https://gitlab.cs.uni-duesseldorf.de/general/dsml/lava-public>. We didn't make any modification to the hyperparameters and ran the reinforcement learning stage for 10 epochs. Notably, the LAVA method with continuous latent exhibits high variance in the success scores, with a standard deviation of 3.32 and mean success rate 73.33 across 3 runs, it is able to keep the BLEU score high since it's under-optimizing the success metric and is trained for few epochs which prevents divergence. In fact, TCUP can obtain the same BLEU score by sacrificing a bit on the success rate side, see Fig. 3.

D Regularization Sensitivity

In Fig. 8 we do a regularization sensitivity analysis for different scales of KL regularization and fraction of optimal replay in the reinforcement learning training stage. We do the same for the categorical latent variable case in Fig. 9.

E Model and Training Setup

We make use of the Long-Short Term Memory (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) with a dot-product attention mechanism for the decoder architecture and Gated Recurrent Unit (Cho et al., 2014) for the encoder architecture. In both cases, we use a hidden size of 300 and a latent embedding vector of size 200. Note that in the case of prior-posterior shuffling, there are shared parameters for p_ϕ and q_ζ^p through the encoder, the hidden state is mapped to the appropriate mean and variance by independent neural networks. Under the context c we assume access to the ground-truth dialogue state, this can be easily replaced by the predictions of a dialogue state-tracker (LI et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2021).

During training we choose the best models by keeping track of validation success rate and BLEU score and evaluate the best performing checkpoint on the test set. As discussed, the training of TCUP is separated into two stages.




Figure 7: Here we show results for different metrics on MultiWOZ 2.1 for different approaches denoted on the x-axis. *sl* denotes supervised training, *sl+rl* denotes supervised training followed by reinforcement learning, *ctp* usage of contextual prior, but without any prior on it, *kl* the addition of KL penalty to identity covariance Gaussian, *larl* the approach proposed by Zhao et al. (2019), *shuff* prior and posterior shuffling in the supervised stage, *pp* identity covariance Gaussian prior on the contextual prior, *rep* usage of replay buffer for the reinforcement fine-tuning stage of training.




Figure 8: Regularization sensitivity 400 epochs.




Figure 9: Sensitivity analysis for the categorical latent case with 10 30-dimensional categoricals in the latent.

USER	hi . i was wondering if there are any eastern [value_food] type restaurant -s in the [value_area] part of the city?
SYSTEM	[restaurant_name] is a [value_food] restaurant in the [value_area] of town . it is [value_pricerange] -ly priced and located at [restaurant_address]. would you like to book a table?
USER	i am looking for an [value_pricerange] eastern [value_food] place in the [value_area]
SYSTEM	[restaurant_name] is a [value_pricerange] [value_food] restaurant in the [value_area] of town . would you like me to book a table for you?
USER	how about a [value_food] restaurant?
SYSTEM	i have [value_count] [value_pricerange] [value_food] restaurant -s in the [value_area] [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name], [restaurant_name]
USER	i would like a reservation for [value_count] to the [restaurant_name] restaurant.
SYSTEM	i have booked you a table for [value_count] at [restaurant_name] on [value_day] at [value_time]. your reference number is [restaurant_reference].
USER	i would like to make a reservation for [value_day] at [value_time] . and there has been a change in plans , i will be dining alone.
SYSTEM	your booking was successful . the table will be reserved for [value_count] minutes . reference number is [restaurant_reference].
USER	can i get the reference number for that reservation ?
SYSTEM	your booking was successful . the table will be reserved for [value_count] minutes . reference number is [restaurant_reference].
USER	excellent . that is everything!
SYSTEM	you are welcome . have a great day!

Table 4: Example of resulting delexicalized dialogue outputted by learned dialogue policy learned with optimal replay.