

Dynamic Planning in Open-Ended Dialogue using Reinforcement Learning

Deborah Cohen, Moonkyung Ryu, Yinlam Chow, Orgad Keller, Ido Greenberg, Avinatan Hassidim, Michael Fink, Yossi Matias, Idan Szpektor, Craig Boutilier, Gal Elidan
{debbycohen,mkryu,yinlamchow,orgad,idogreenberg,avinatan,fink,yossi,szpektor,cboutilier,elidan}@google.com
Google Research

ABSTRACT

Despite recent advances in natural language understanding and generation, and decades of research on the development of conversational bots, building automated agents that can carry on rich open-ended conversations with humans “in the wild” remains a formidable challenge. In this work we develop a real-time, open-ended dialogue system that uses reinforcement learning (RL) to power a bot’s conversational skill at scale. Our work pairs the succinct embedding of the conversation state generated using SOTA (supervised) language models with RL techniques that are particularly suited to a dynamic action space that changes as the conversation progresses. Trained using crowd-sourced data, our novel system is able to substantially exceed the (strong) baseline supervised model with respect to several metrics of interest in a live experiment with real users of the Google Assistant.

1 INTRODUCTION

With tremendous advances in AI and ML techniques to recognize speech and perform high quality natural language understanding (NLU) and generation (NLG), increased attention is being directed toward the task of carrying out real-time, rich conversations between humans and bots (e.g., [19, 32, 46]). Realistic interactions generally span complex topic spaces and are relatively open-ended, and often have an underlying goal (e.g., task completion, knowledge sharing). Thus, carrying them out effectively requires not just powerful bots that learn to generate favorable responses, but also demands that bots have the ability to plan and adapt on the fly.

The framework of *reinforcement learning (RL)* is a natural approach for this task. Indeed, research on *Markov decision processes (MDPs)* and RL for spoken-dialogue systems spans well over two decades, ranging from early work using MDPs and RL [18, 35], to methods based on partially observable MDP (POMDP) models (e.g., [42]), to more recent approaches adopting deep learning representations (e.g., [19]). Despite this, deployments of RL “in the wild” in large-scale dialogue systems, such as smart assistants like Alexa, Siri or Google Assistant, are rare (though exceptions exist, e.g., [32]; see Related Work below). Indeed, building such systems remains a formidable challenge.

Aside from the infrastructure hurdles associated with scalable, real-time systems, there are inherent modeling challenges when building open-ended conversational bots. First, the state space of such bots is massive, even within specific verticals, and care is needed to craft effective state representations for RL algorithms. Second, the action space is also in principle “unbounded,” and imposing reasonable limitations on actions comes with its own difficulties, including the fact that the set of candidate actions may vary as the

conversation progresses. Finally, the design of suitable reward functions for open-ended dialogue can be quite subtle. In this work, we rely on crowd-sourced labels.

We present a real-time, open-ended dialogue system that uses RL to power a bot’s conversational skill at scale. We address the challenges above using a novel RL construction. We first exploit powerful supervised models—specifically, RNNs and transformers—to provide a succinct embedding of the conversation state. Second, we use the fact that a relatively small set of “reasonable” *candidate actions* can be generated at each conversation turn [38]. From an RL perspective, this can be viewed as a stochastic realization of the full action space, so we use an RL approach tailored to such *stochastic action sets* [3]. We also explore the use of alternative SOTA RL techniques and training methods, including continuous-action optimization [29], conservative Q-learning [17] and novel off-policy evaluation algorithms [28].

We first evaluate our methods using offline data. We then describe the deployment of our system “in the wild” in the Google Assistant, specifically as part of the animal domain experience described by Szpektor et al. [38]. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our RL-based approach at dynamic planning and driving open-ended dialogue: relative to a SOTA non-RL (transformer) baseline, our bot substantially improves a number of key metrics, including conversation length, cooperative responses and explicit positive feedback. We perform a novel and extensive comparison of many RL architectures in real-world settings and generate unique insights into their relative performance. An example dialogue is shown in Fig. 1, showcasing the rich pivoting of our best-performing RL model vs. the supervised approach. Our model, now deployed in the Google Assistant, marks an important milestone in the use of RL for driving real-time, engaging, open-ended, conversations.

The key ingredients and insights of our approach are threefold. First, we use an effective representation of the RL state, leveraging pre-trained supervised models that encode the conversation history. Second, we limit the action space to a small set of generated candidate actions while allowing multiple actions in a single turn to compose rich bot responses. This granularity decouples content generation and dialogue planning. Finally, we adapt recent state-of-the-art RL algorithms that are well-suited to our dynamic action space to the candidate-generation decomposition we adopt here.

2 RELATED WORK

The use of RL for dialogue dates back more than two decades. Statistical research focuses on task-oriented dialogues and uses MDPs [18, 35, 36, 41] or POMDPs [42, 44]. Henderson et al. [11] introduce function approximation to reduce the resulting large slot-filling state space. Casanueva et al. [4] propose a feudal RL




Figure 1: Example conversations conducted by (a) an RL model and (b) a supervised model, previously deployed in the Google Assistant, showcasing the rich pivoting of the RL model vs. the supervised approach.

model which decomposes the decision by first selecting a subset of primitive actions, then choosing the actual action. These methods each model the state and action spaces using handcrafted semantic representations, such as slots and dialogue acts. This restricts such approaches to simple domains with limited slot-filling.

More recent work leverages deep neural networks (DNNs) to obviate the need for these so-called summary states and actions [9]. Fatemi et al. [8] consider a low-dimensional continuous-valued state space. Liu et al. [23] encode the dialogue state using an RNN but translate the representation to slot-value pairs. In both cases, the action space is restricted to a small number of dialogue acts and the approaches remain limited to specific task-based domains, with no clear extension to open-ended dialogues.

Building on advances in neural generative models, another line of work applies RL to directly learn a response generation model conditioned on the dialogue history. Actions are often defined at the word level, so the action space is the entire vocabulary [14, 19, 20, 33]. This approach suffers from several drawbacks: the action space is very large; word-level RL performs credit assignment poorly at an unnatural level for dialogue planning; and this may affect decoder performance, leading to incomprehensible utterances [45].

Related approaches model actions as latent variables, inducing a latent action space, thus decoupling the discourse-level decision making from NLG [30, 45]. However, they focus on specific domains (e.g., price negotiation, slot-filling or chitchat) rather than grounded open-ended dialogues. Serban et al. [32] proposed MILABOT, as part of the Amazon Alexa Prize competition, where a DM selects a response from several generated candidates. Our approach is similar in spirit, but allows one to combine several candidates in the same bot turn to compose a richer response. This seemingly small difference is vitally important as it allows our RL model to make decisions at an effective granularity. We note that while MILABOT was restricted to an A/B testing evaluation within a competition, our RL model is deployed in the Google Assistant.

3 DYNAMIC COMPOSITION

In this work, we build on the *dynamic composition* approach introduced by Szpektor et al. [38]. This dialogue management model limits the action space using specific *content providers* to propose candidate utterances, which are dynamically selected by the *dialogue manager (DM)*. We adopt this scheme to manage action complexity in our RL approaches.

Dynamic composition decouples content (utterance) generation from selection. Given candidate utterances proposed by each of several providers, the DM scores and selects a suitable utterance as (part of) a response given the current conversation history. The bot response can be composed of several utterances, which are generated and selected sequentially and dynamically (see Fig. 2). Additional components include an NLU module and a sentence fusion module that merges the selected utterances into a coherent response. We describe each of these components in turn.

Natural Language Understanding. At each turn of the conversation, user input is analyzed by an NLU module, comprising two components: a *focus tracker* and a *user answer interpreter*. The *focus* of the conversation is the set of entities *currently* being discussed. If the last turn ended with a bot question, the *answer interpreter* classifies the user answer w.r.t. the question type. For example, the response *types* expected for yes/no questions (e.g., “Do you want to hear more about cheetahs?”), are ‘yes’ (e.g., “sure,” “I want to hear about cheetahs”), ‘no’, and ignoring the question; list selection questions (e.g., “Which animal do you want to hear about next?”)




Figure 2: Dynamic composition flow diagram. A few candidates from different providers are shown in each step and the one selected by the DM is highlighted in blue.

	Dialogue	Focus	User Answer Interp.	Dialogue Act
User	Sound of a polar bear	polar bear		
Bot	Here's a polar bear <SOUND>. Hey, do you want to hear the sound of a penguin?	polar bear penguin		Sound Focus change + Yes/no question
User	Yes	penguin	cooperation	
Bot	Great. This is a penguin <SOUND>. Which animal do you want to learn about next?	penguin penguin		Ack Sound Open question
User	Tell me about polar bears	polar bear	cooperation	
Bot	Cool. Churchillwild.com says that "Polar bears will wag their heads from side-to-side when they want to play".	polar bear polar bear		Ack Fact

Table 1: Illustration of the concepts of focus, user answer interpretation and dialog acts for a sample conversation.

and quizzes (e.g., “Can you guess which animal this is, a lion or a tiger?”) include animals as potential responses. Table 1 illustrates the concepts of focus and answer interpretation.

Content Providers. Given the conversation history and the selected utterances so far in the current turn, content providers propose candidate utterances w.r.t. this context. They rely on different sources (e.g., news, knowledge graph) to extract relevant content, which includes both structured and unstructured data. Structured providers generate text for their candidate utterances using templates, while unstructured content is quoted verbatim with attribution. Content is expressed in different forms via *dialogue acts* such as statements, preference queries, navigation questions and quizzes. Some of these, referred to as *conversational drivers*, aim to proactively increase user engagement (e.g., focus changing, questions). Examples of such dialogue acts are provided in Table 1.

Dialogue Manager. In each step of the bot composition loop, providers generate candidates for the next utterance to be appended to the response constructed so far. Given a set of candidates and the conversation context, utterance selection is performed by a learned *DM*. This step is repeated until the DM assesses that the response is a relevant and engaging bot response. In [38], the DM is implemented as an RNN encoder, trained in a supervised fashion (see Sec. 4.2). In this work, we develop DMs trained using RL.

Sentence Fusion. The output of the composition loop is a sequence of utterances, which still needs to be fused into a coherent bot response. Simple concatenation of the utterances typically results in cumbersome, unnatural, verbose responses, such as “On average,

male lions weigh 420 lbs. On average, male lions are 3.9 feet tall. That means that lions are about as tall as a piano.” *Sentence fusion* combines the selected utterances into a single cohesive response [2, 10, 25], such as “On average, male lions weigh 420 lbs and are 3.9 feet tall. That means that they’re about as tall as a piano.” This module uses the following techniques: (a) pronominalization, (b) removal of repetitive context mentions and (c) introduction of a discourse marker between sentences. Our fusion model is based on LaserTagger [24], a sequence labeling architecture in which each token in the input text is classified to be either copied as-is, deleted or substituted with a phrase taken from a small, predefined vocabulary, typically containing pronouns and connectives.

4 REINFORCEMENT LEARNING FOR THE DM

Dynamic composition is realized by Szpektor et al. [38] with supervised training of an RNN-based DM. This limits the construction of the next bot response to be *myopic*, as it is optimized for maximal *immediate* reward. However, since the main goal of the DM is to conduct complex, engaging multi-turn conversations, it should target the natural complexity of human-to-human conversations, which are typically not conducted in a myopic, turn-by-turn manner, but rather reflect some degree of look ahead and dynamic planning. For example, a conversation may comprise several steps leading to an intended goal, such as knowledge transfer; or to make a conversation more engaging, one might intersperse interesting facts throughout, or build tension towards an eventual resolution. Such capabilities require a bot be able to choose responses that lead

toward such non-myopic ends, and adapt to user responses/queries by dynamically re-planning its trajectory accordingly.

To this end, we develop an RL framework for open-ended dialogue that builds on the dynamic composition architecture, and propose a number of concrete instantiations of it. In Sec. 4.1, we formulate the underlying MDP that captures the spirit of the content-provider decomposition. In Sec. 4.2, we discuss the use of the underlying supervised model for state representation. We then propose a two-step Q-learning approach in Sec. 4.3, with algorithmic variants motivated by specific properties of the MDP and our representations. We also develop an end-to-end Q-learning method in Sec. 4.4 that does not require the language encoders for state generation.

4.1 MDP with a Stochastic Action Space

We begin with an MDP formulation of the DM problem upon which our RL methods operate. We assume a state space \mathcal{X} , action space \mathcal{A} , transition kernel P , reward function R , initial state distribution β and discount factor γ , and aim to optimize the cumulative discounted return $J(\pi) := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \mid P, R, \beta, \pi]$ which captures the long-term value of the conversation. The RL DM *policy* π is an action distribution conditioned on state $x \in \mathcal{X}$. An optimal DM π^* is found by solving $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi)$, where Π is the space of all DM policies. We discuss each of these elements in turn.

Much RL research in dialogue management defines the state and action spaces to be the tokenized language space [1, 13, 19]. For instance, the state x is the tokenized user-agent conversation history to that point, while an action a is the DM’s output sentence (generated token by token). However, since the state and action spaces in this formulation are both combinatorial, even with a medium-sized vocabulary the corresponding tokenized spaces grow exponentially, thus making RL intractable. We handle the combinatorics of state space by leveraging state-of-the-art language models, such as RNNs or transformers, to encode conversation history x with a d -dimensional embedding $\phi_x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (see Sec. 4.2 for details), thus replacing the large discrete state space by the continuous embedding space \mathbb{R}^d .

We also differ from typical RL dialogue models in our treatment of the action space. Rather than a generative language model that directly outputs sentences, we leverage the dynamic composition framework (Sec. 3) to render the action space tractable. Specifically, at any turn, each content provider proposes a small set of utterances. This *dynamic-composition, content-provider (DCCP) action decomposition* ensures the DM policy need only score and select from a (relatively small) discrete set \mathcal{A}_x at state x , i.e. the set of candidate utterances. Note that by working at the utterance level rather than at the level of the full bot response (a fused concatenation of K such utterances), we remove the small-scale combinatorics of the action space, at the cost of extending the horizon of the RL problem. But this does not sacrifice the optimality of the policy.

Importantly, since the providers use potentially arbitrary logic to generate candidates, the realization of \mathcal{A}_x may differ with each occurrence of x . This puts us in the realm of non-standard MDPs

with *stochastic action sets* [3]. Fortunately, we consider Q-learning methods below that handle this directly.¹

The training data, further described in Sec. 4.5, is composed of crowd-sourced conversations, generated with a supervised DM. The human evaluators provide a rating for each selected utterance, which are used as rewards that measure the rater’s immediate value of the action given the conversation history. As we shall see, the RL model is able to leverage these to learn dynamic planning strategies to improve user engagement.

In the existing dialogue RL literature [6, 19, 22] most algorithms are based on policy-gradient methods [37] because (i) learning an optimal state-action value function with a combinatorial action space is intractable, and (ii) the resulting DM is a sequence-to-sequence policy model that generates bot responses. The simplification of the action space afforded by our DCCP reformulation allows us to use *value-based* Q-learning [3, 27], a relatively uncommon approach in large-scale dialogue systems.

4.2 Supervised Model as a State Encoder

To encode the conversation history into a d -dimensional embedding vector, we consider two supervised learning architectures: an improved version of the RNN model from [38] and a transformer-based approach using a pre-trained BERT model.

Supervised RNN Architecture. We modify the two-level hierarchical RNN encoder [38] by replacing the first-level gated recurrent unit (GRU), that encodes the user and bot utterances, by a pre-trained sentence embedding module [5], which is fixed during training. These provide a clear advantage over the first-level GRU, which we attribute to training on a large, general corpus. The resulting sentence embeddings are fed to a GRU along with non-textual metadata features, including: the conversation turn index, the candidate dialogue act, the number of tokens in the constructed response, whether the candidate offers to change the focus.

Supervised Transformer-based Architecture. Our second supervised model uses a transformer architecture [40]. We consider two variants: a text-only BERT model and a combined text-metadata model. In both, the input is the concatenated sequence of user and bot utterances (i.e., conversation history) and a candidate utterance to be scored. In the second, we concatenate the per-token contextual representation vectors produced by the BERT model and an embedded representation of the metadata features for the utterance of which the token is a part. The resulting concatenated vectors are fed into another small transformer. Experiments on manually annotated data show the text-only variant outperforms the second, corroborating the hypothesis that the transformer’s better use of the input text—specifically, the ability to attend to the history when processing candidates—obviates the need for additional features.

State Representation. Our state representation uses the output of the dialogue-history encoder, either the RNN hidden state or the pooled output of the last transformer layer. The state is constructed by concatenating this encoding with the sentence embedding of the last user input and context features, e.g., the conversation turn index and the composition turn step index.

¹We note that the DCCP action decomposition is related to certain hierarchical approaches to RL, such as feudal RL [4, 7], and to mixtures-of-experts [12, 16], though our DM RL methods do not influence the training of the providers.




Figure 3: Two-step Q-learning schema. The state is the concatenation of (i) the output of the dialogue history encoder, either RNN or transformer (denoted by (1)), (ii) the embedding of the last user input and (iii) context features, including the conversation turn index and the composition turn step index. The action is represented by its embedding. We consider both stochastic action and continuous action Q-learning approaches (denoted by (2)) potentially with the added CQL regularization (denoted by (3)).

4.3 The Two Step Q-model Architecture

We now develop several RL approaches for the DM which rely on Q-learning. Our first approaches use a *two-step model* in which the state is first encoded by a language model (either a pre-trained RNN or transformer) before being passed to the DM policy. Figure 3 illustrates how these building blocks come together in the two-step approach. Given a pre-trained state encoder $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a sentence encoder $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^h$, we apply two different Q-learning techniques using the encoded state space (using ϕ_x rather than x) and action space (using ψ_a rather than a).

Stochastic Action Q-learning (SAQL) [3]. Our first RL technique applies Q-learning directly to the discrete, stochastic action sets \mathcal{A}_x as determined by the DCCP decomposition. We adopt the general deep Q network (DQN) approach [27], using a DNN to represent the Q-function. Specifically, $Q_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a feed-forward DNN with parameters θ , which represents the cumulative discounted value of taking action (or bot utterance) $\psi_a \in \mathbb{R}^h$ in state (i.e., conversation history encoding) $\phi_x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We train the model using batched conversation data of the form $B = \{(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i}, r_i, \phi_{x'_i}, \mathcal{A}_{x'_i})\}_i$ (see Sec. 4.5 on data generation), where the i th data point includes: the embedded state ϕ_{x_i} and action ψ_{a_i} at some conversation turn, the observed next state $\phi_{x'_i}$, the realized reward r_i , and the set of actions $\mathcal{A}_{x'_i}$ made available by the content providers at the next state. This latter component is non-standard in DQN, but necessary due to the stochastic nature of the action sets—training the Q-function (see below) exploits maximization over the *realized* set of candidate actions generated by our providers at the next state, an approach shown to be sound in [3].

We learn θ by minimizing the *mean squared Bellman error*:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{|B|} (Q_\theta(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i}) - r_i - \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}_{x'_i}} Q_{\theta^{\text{target}}}(\phi_{x'_i}, \psi_{a'}))^2,$$

where $Q_{\theta^{\text{target}}}$ is a *target* Q-function, used to improve training stability in DQN [26] (note the use of the realized action set $\mathcal{A}_{x'_i}$ in

the maximization). Under this loss, RL is ℓ_2 -regression of Q_θ w.r.t. target labels $r + \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}_{x'_i}} Q_{\theta^{\text{target}}}(\phi_{x'}, \psi_{a'})$, which tries to match the value function Q_θ with its Bellman backup.

We refer to this approach as *stochastic action Q-learning (SAQL)* to reflect the stochastic action sets used in training. Once SAQL converges, the DM policy is $\pi^*(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_x} Q_{\theta^*}(\phi_x, \psi_a)$. That is, at inference time, the Q-model is applied to each candidate action, and the DM responds with the action with the greatest Q-value given the current dialogue state.

Continuous Action Q-learning (CAQL) [29]. In the SAQL formulation, action maximization takes place over the discrete set of candidates \mathcal{A}_x . However, the embedding representation means that the action space can also be treated as continuous, and we can consider maximization over this wider space. Continuous-action RL problems are common in areas like robotics [15], and typically policy-gradient algorithms are used to learn a return-maximizing policy [34, 37]. However, such methods are often data-inefficient and impractical when faced with high-dimensional action spaces, both issues present in dialogue systems. Instead, we consider the use of *continuous action Q-learning (CAQL)* [29] to solve the continuous-action variant of our DM policy.

Roughly speaking, using CAQL, when faced with a next state x' while training the Q-function Q_θ , we do not restrict ourselves to maximizing over the discrete action set $\mathcal{A}(x')$, but instead maximize over the entire embedding space ψ , minimizing:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{|B|} (r_i + \gamma Q_{\theta^{\text{target}}}(\phi_{x'_i}, \arg \max_{\psi} Q_\theta(\phi_{x'_i}, \psi)) - Q_\theta(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i}))^2.$$

This approach has advantages over SAQL: one need not record the realization $\mathcal{A}_{x'}$ of the stochastic action sets in the data set, and continuous action maximization (see below) can be more effective when the set of candidate actions (utterances) is moderate or large in size. However, CAQL will generally overestimate the true value of its policy, since it hypothesizes the use of embedded actions that are never generated by any content provider. Indeed, once Q_θ is trained using CAQL, we *restrict the realized policy* to scoring (and using) only provider-generated candidate actions at inference/serving time.

When Q_θ is represented by a DNN, the inner maximization is typically differentiable and non-convex. This can be solved optimally for certain classes of DNNs using a mixed-integer program or a first-order method such as gradient ascent (GA) [29]. We use GA in this work: starting from an initial embedded action $\psi^{(0)}$, the optimal embedded action $\arg \max_{\psi} Q_\theta(\phi_{x'}, \psi)$ is computed iteratively by $\psi^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \psi^{(t)} + \epsilon_{\text{GA}} \nabla_{\psi} Q_\theta(\phi_{x'}, \psi)|_{\psi=\psi^{(t)}}$, where $\epsilon_{\text{GA}} > 0$ is a tunable step size.

Conservative Q-learning (CQL) [17]. Our DM problem is an application of *offline RL*, where a model is learned using previously collected user-bot conversation with no further (online) interaction. Offline RL is prone to overestimation errors induced by the distributional shift between the offline data and that generated by the learned policy [43]. This is especially problematic if certain bot actions are rare in the offline data, making their learned Q-values very noisy. To alleviate this, we can apply *conservative Q-learning (CQL)* [17], a regularization scheme which learns a “conservative”

Q-function that lower bounds the true Q-function. CQL can be applied to both SAQL and CAQL (we illustrate it only for SAQL).

In CQL one augments the Q-learning loss with a behavior regularizer: $\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{|B|} \alpha (\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \mu} [Q_{\theta}(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_a)] - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{\beta}} [Q_{\theta}(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_a)]) + (r_i + \gamma Q_{\theta}^{\text{target}}(\phi_{x'_i}, \arg \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}(x'_i)} Q_{\theta}(\phi_{x'_i}, \psi_{a'}) - Q_{\theta}(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i})))^2$, where π_{β} is a behavior policy (DM) that approximates the data-generation policy,² $\alpha > 0$ is a tunable regularization parameter, and μ is the target policy to be learned. Intuitively, CQL regularization minimizes the differences in Q-values of actions generated by our learned RL DM policy and the behavior (training-data generating) policy. We use target $\mu(a|x) \propto \exp(Q_{\theta}(\phi_x, \psi_a))$, which corresponds to the optimal policy of entropy-regularized Q-learning [31].

4.4 End-to-end Architecture

We now outline an end-to-end (E2E) RL approach that jointly trains the language encoder and the Q-function. In contrast to our two-step approaches, by not constraining the DM to using a pre-trained encoder, E2E RL can tune the encoder (hence its representations) to the dialogue task at hand. This approach is similar in spirit to the original DQN model [27], in which the Q-network consists of both a convolutional DNN that encodes pixel frames (states) and a feed-forward NN that learns the Q-values.

To learn the Q-function in E2E fashion, we apply DQN to $Q(x, a) = Q_{\theta}(c(x, a))$, where $c(x, a)$ is the concatenation of the conversation history and the current candidate action, and $Q_{\theta} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a trainable language encoder (e.g., a transformer *initialized* with pre-trained weights), followed by a feed-forward DNN. This Q-model jointly encodes the raw input conversation and assigns a Q-value to each candidate action. This allows us to learn the Q-function E2E, without relying on fixed pretrained language encoders. Specifically, with target network $Q_{\theta}^{\text{target}}$ updated as above, in E2E learning we train the Q_{θ} by minimizing the mean squared Bellman error. We use SAQL and formulate the inner maximization as $\max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}(x')} Q_{\theta}^{\text{target}}(x', a')$.

4.5 Training Data

The DM models are trained on crowd-sourced data, generated by human evaluators. Each evaluator converses with the bot until the dialogue details or comes to a natural end. They then rate the bot responses, assessing each utterance in the composition loop, including those selected and unselected by the DM. Although evaluators were provided with a set of guidelines for assessing bot response quality, the resulting data is noisy and some level of rater-specific subjectivity is included in the ratings.

A dozen evaluators generated $\sim 20\text{K}$ conversations with an average of 3 bot responses, each with 1 to 4 utterances, and with up to 30 candidates per utterance. For the supervised models, this results in $\sim 1.5\text{M}$ training examples, as each (selected and unselected) candidate corresponds to a training example. By contrast, RL models only use the labels on selected candidates, giving 150K labels.

Each candidate utterance is rated on a scale of -3 to 7, with no 0 rating made available. The negative ratings reflect candidates that do not reply to a user question, are out of context, or repeat content

that was already mentioned in the conversation. The positive scores correspond to candidates that fit the conversation context well.

5 INITIAL OFFLINE & ONLINE EVALUATION

Before deploying our models in live experiment, we conducted preliminary evaluation of our RL-based DM policies. We describe both (i) *off-policy* counterfactual inference [21, 39] evaluation and (ii) *on-policy* human (rater) evaluation. Off-policy evaluation can be performed on the existing datasets used to train our models (in our case, generated with the supervised DM). While often easier—hence especially useful for initial model development and tuning—it is less reliable than on-policy evaluation. So we use both methods.

DM Models. We evaluate the following variants of our SAQL and CAQL algorithms, using either the supervised RNN or transformer for state representation, with or without CQL regularization. SAQL-RNN, CAQL-RNN, SAQL-Transformer, and CAQL-Transformer are the Q-learned models trained with the two-step RL approaches SAQL and CAQL using RNN and transformer encoders, respectively. SAQL-Reg-RNN, CAQL-Reg-RNN, SAQL-Reg-Transformer, and CAQL-Reg-Transformer are the same Q-learned models trained with CQL regularization. SAQL-Reg-E2E denotes the E2E Q-learned model with CQL regularization.

The RNN architecture includes a GRU layer with 200 units. The supervised transformer model uses the publicly-available, pre-trained BERT-Medium checkpoint.³ The training regime roughly follows that for BERT.⁴ For RL models, we use a discount factor $\gamma = 0.95$ for SAQL, $\gamma = 0.9$ for CAQL and CQL Reg, and $\gamma = 0.8$ for E2E RL,⁵ and a fully connected feedforward DNN for the Q-function. Hyper-parameters are provided in the appendix.

DM Off-policy Evaluation. The main goal of off-policy evaluation is to assess the performance of our RL-based DM policy using existing conversational data. Unlike (supervised) myopic models, RL requires evaluating the reward of full trajectories. Since an RL-based DM can drive sequential conversations that follow a very different distribution than that of the training data, *off-policy correction* using propensity scoring or related methods is needed [39]. We use *DualDICE* [28] for this purpose, a recent SOTA method for off-policy estimation of RL policy values that directly estimates the *stationary distribution correction ratio*, i.e., the ratio of the steady-state probabilities of specific state-action pairs (ϕ_{x_i}, ϕ_{a_i}) generated by the RL policy π and the data-generating (or behavior) policy π_B (which can be estimated from the training data). We provide a high-level overview.

Given a batch $B = \{(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i}, r_i, \phi_{x'_i})\}_i$ of (embedded conversation history) training data and a DM policy π , DualDICE learns a feed-forward DNN $v_{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, parameterized by ρ , where $v_{\rho}(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i})$ is a proto-value function whose Bellman residuals are estimates of the required stationary distribution ratios [28]. Given a trained v_{ρ} , the value of the RL-based DM’s policy π can be estimated by $J_{\text{DD}}(\pi_{\lambda}) := \sum_{i=1}^{|B|} r_i \cdot (v_{\rho}(\phi_{x_i}, \psi_{a_i}) - \gamma \frac{\pi_{\lambda}(a'_i|x'_i)}{\pi_B(a'_i|x'_i)} v_{\rho}(\phi_{x'_i}, \psi_{a'_i}))$. Notice that this estimator assumes the knowledge of the behavior (data-generating) policy π_B (which is the supervised DM in our

³<https://github.com/google-research/bert>

⁴<https://github.com/google-research/bert/blob/master/optimization.py>

⁵The choices of these discount factors are mainly to ensure training stability.

²In our setting, the behavior policy π_{β} is simply the supervised DM model.

Model Type	Model	On-policy	Off-policy
Supervised	RNN	5.75 ± 1.99	5.28 ± 0.44
	Transformer	5.67 ± 2.18	4.55 ± 0.37
Stochastic Actions	RNN	5.17 ± 2.29	5.13 ± 0.52
	Reg-RNN	6.48 ± 1.13	5.51 ± 0.39
	Transformer	5.71 ± 2.26	4.76 ± 0.40
	Reg-Transformer	5.58 ± 2.02	4.73 ± 0.45
Continuous Actions	RNN	6.04 ± 1.63	5.49 ± 0.41
	Transformer	5.86 ± 1.79	4.91 ± 0.38
	Reg-Transformer	5.46 ± 2.25	4.78 ± 0.46
E2E	Reg-Transformer	6.53 ± 1.44	--

Table 2: Off-policy and on-policy raters evaluation results.

setting). However, since the supervised DM is trained to optimize for a myopic reward, it can be overly deterministic. This can drive large fluctuations in propensity scores π/π_B , and high variance in J_{DD} . Instead, we use a *behavior-agnostic* form of DualDICE which requires no estimation of π_B (see [28] for details).

The off-policy evaluation results generated by DualDICE are presented in Table 2 (second column). Since our use of DualDICE depends on language encoders ϕ and ψ , it cannot be used to evaluate the E2E model.⁶ Note that our off-policy value estimates of the RNN-based and the transformer-based models are generated using an RNN-based and a transformer-based behavior policy, respectively. DualDice off-policy results show that SAQL-Reg-RNN and CAQL-RNN are among the best-performing RL-based policies (this coincides with on-policy evaluation results, see below). The offline performance of RNN-based models is consistently better than that of transformer-based models. This too is somewhat corroborated by on-policy evaluation, though this performance difference may be due in part to proto-function approximation error in DualDice caused by the inherent bias of the transformer-based data.

DM On-policy Evaluation. We next conducted on-policy evaluation. Human evaluators were asked to conduct dialogues with our bot and rate the overall conversation experience on the same -3 to 7 scale used to collect training data. Evaluation was blind—evaluators did not know which model they were conversing with. Overall 200 dialogues for each model were rated. The results are presented in Table 2 (first column). SAQL-Reg-E2E and SAQL-Reg-RNN received the highest rating while SAQL-RNN performed worst. Notice that the models rated best by evaluators are trained with lower discount factors. We conjecture raters may be inherently biased to value myopic quality.⁷ We also note the high-variance in rater evaluations across all models (a point discussed further below).

6 LIVE EXPERIMENT

Evaluation by human raters facilitates policy assessment in controlled settings and is necessary before deployment in a user-facing commercial product. However, dedicated human evaluators typically behave differently than real users. Specifically, the impact of

⁶Extending DualDICE to evaluate E2E models requires a much more complex dual-function parameterization and will be left as future work.

⁷The RL models trained with lower discount factors behave closer to the supervised DM. Their DualDice estimates have lower variance and also tend to perform better.

conversation planning might be quite different with raters vs. real users. For example, raters might continue a conversation even after it reaches an awkward stage or they might not reflect a potential increase in user engagement after a successful focus change initiated by the bot. To gain an in-depth understanding of their impact on real users, we conducted a live experiment with our RL models. The Q-learning model that achieved the largest improvement in terms of user engagement was then fully deployed in the Google Assistant.

6.1 Experimental Setup

To conduct a live experiment, we build on the *dynamic composition* bot from [38] (Sec. 3). This bot is integrated with the Google Assistant, dubbed *the assistant* below, and interacts with users in a real-time online setting.

The experiment was conducted using an A/B testing protocol, in which a small percentage of assistant users were randomly sampled to interact with the bot using an RL-based DM while other users (same percentage) interact with the vanilla bot using a supervised DM. More precisely, the experiment was conducted with one control arm, with the transformer-based supervised model, and eight experiment arms with the architectures listed in Sec. 5. We use the supervised transformer model as a baseline as it was shown to outperform the supervised RNN in a previous live experiment.

Our experiment spanned the months of December 2021 and January 2022, during which user assignment to control/experiments remained constant. The experiment was transparent to the users, who could not distinguish between the different DMs. A conversation starts when a user triggers the experience by asking an animal related query (e.g., “how does a lion sound?”). Once initiated, a conversation with a user could end if the bot predicted that its response is not of sufficient quality (i.e., the DM score is too low), if the user issued a query outside of the animal domain (e.g., about the weather), or if the user issued a standard stop command. The last two options were handled by the assistant.

6.2 Evaluation Metrics

We measured daily user interaction with the assistant in the animal domain in both the experiment and control arms. To assess user engagement, we use several surrogate metrics that are directly measurable in the interaction logs. We define a *conversation* to be the succession of user and bot turns, starting with a triggering user turn. The *conversation length* is the number of turns (combined user and bot turns) in a conversation. We consider *followup feedback* after each bot response, where followup refers to the next query, if any, after the bot response. Specifically, we distinguish:

- *Cooperative responses* to bot questions, such as “yes” in response to a question proposing additional content (e.g., “do you want to hear more?”) or “Tell me about lions” in response to a list selection question (e.g., “which animal do you want to hear about next?”).
- *Non-cooperative responses* to bot questions, such as “no” in response to a question proposing additional content (e.g., “do you want to learn about cheetahs?”).
- *Explicit positive feedback*, which captures followup user queries with explicit gratitude, e.g., “thank you” or “wonderful”.

Table 3: Mean relative change of experiment vs. the control metrics. Here, T stands for transformer; green changes are desirable, red changes less so (to varying degrees).

Metric	SAQL-RNN	SAQL-T	CAQL-RNN	CAQL-T	SAQL-Reg-E2E
Conversation length	+30%	+23%	+14%	+18%	-0.7%
Cooperative response	+8%	-6.8%	-5.8%	-4%	-8%
Non-cooperative response	+112%	+178%	+54%	+120%	+41%
Explicit positive feedback	+32%	+9.7%	-20%	+6.8%	-6%
Explicit negative feedback	-18%	+8.6%	+1%	-14%	+27%

- *Explicit negative feedback*, reflecting followup user queries that contain negative feedback, such as “stop” or “shut up”.

For the last two metrics, we use predefined lists of positive and negative feedback phrases collected from user logs.

6.3 Main Results

The average relative change in metrics across all experiments w.r.t. the control is shown in Table 3 (for CQL variants, see Table 4 in the appendix). Interestingly, these results differ from the rater online evaluations in Table 2, demonstrating the substantial distinction between the behaviors of raters and real users. This discrepancy may be, in part, due to the high variance in rater evaluations. Surprisingly, SAQL-Reg-E2E performs worst and is slightly outperformed by the supervised baseline. The E2E model behaves quite conservatively, similar to a supervised model, avoiding pivoting to other animals and changing the type of offered content (e.g., sounds, facts, quizzes). Such conservative behavior may be caused by the lower discount factor $\gamma = 0.8$ used, making its expected trajectory horizon shorter. This might be preferred by raters who tend to evaluate bot responses more myopically; but at the same time, it provides a more boring, less engaging experience for users. The different SAQL models outperform their CAQL counterparts. A similar conclusion was drawn in [45], where discrete latent actions were deemed to be more suitable than continuous actions for dialogue agents.

Overall, we find that SAQL-RNN performs best w.r.t. our main metrics, conducting longer, more engaging conversations. It increases conversation length by 32%, while also increasing user engagement as captured by multiple metrics. We see an increase of 8% in cooperative responses to bot questions. While there is also a large increase of non-cooperative responses (112%), this is expected as the SAQL-RNN agent takes more risks by asking pivoting questions, generating many more occasions for non-cooperative user reactions. While the user may not be interested in the conversational direction proposed by the bot (e.g., pivoting to another animal), the user often continues engaging in a dialogue about animals. For example, in Fig. 1a, the user provides a non-cooperative answer in the 3rd turn. As a result, the bot modifies its plan and asks the user to choose the next conversation focus, to which the user responds positively. In addition, some followup user queries contain explicit positive or negative feedback. While an order of magnitude fewer than other followups, they offer a *direct* measure of user (dis)satisfaction. SAQL-RNN increases explicit positive feedback by 32% and reduces negative feedback by 18%.

Our CQL variants of the different models indeed behave more “conservatively,” closer to supervised model behavior. This translates into smaller changes in conversation length and user feedback

metrics (see appendix). Interestingly, using the transformer (vs. RNN) state encoding does not improve SAQL performance, unlike in the supervised setting, where transformer-based candidate selection is superior: the RNN state representation seems sufficient for RL. For this reason, we focus our analysis on SAQL-RNN below.

6.4 Qualitative Analysis of the RL DM

To improve user engagement while conducting longer conversations, SAQL-RNN uses several planning strategies. First, it ends 20% more turns in questions relative to the control, prompting the user to choose additional content (e.g., learn more animal facts, hear another animal sound). While we observe an increase in cooperative responses, the *cooperation rate* to bot questions drops by 9.5%. Although this may seem problematic, this is actually a result of a favorable policy learned by our bot: by taking more risks in eliciting a user’s preference for the next steps, SAQL-RNN achieves an overall improved user experience, as measured via increased conversation length, combined with a noticeable increase in explicit positive feedback and a decrease in negative feedback.

A second planning strategy is to better exploit content diversity, including facts, sounds, quizzes, yes/no questions, open questions, etc. On average, SAQL-RNN uses 26% more unique providers per conversation than the supervised transformer-based model.

Two additional planning strategies are related to the existence of two sub-dialogues with different characteristics. Dialogues around animal sounds are poorer in content and exhibit entity pivoting at every turn (after playing the sound of a given animal, we can either suggest the sound of a different animal or quiz the user about other animal sounds). In contrast, dialogues around animal facts typically contain richer content and a greater conversation depth. We observe that SAQL-RNN favors the richer experience of the latter, selecting 31% more fact-related content.

Lastly, we observe that the average conversation breadth of dialogues conducted by SAQL-RNN is lower (it generates 13% fewer focus-pivoting turns). This is a consequence of fact dialogues having less breadth. However, when restricting analysis to fact dialogues, SAQL-RNN exhibits 60% more focus-pivoting turns.

Some of these strategies are exemplified by the sample conversation in Fig. 1a, generated by the SAQL-RNN model, which we contrast with Fig. 1b, conducted by the supervised transformer. Both conversations start with the same 2 turns. In the 3rd turn, after a non-cooperative user response, the transformer pivots back to sounds to maximize “immediate” user interest. By contrast, the RL model tries to pivot to facts for a richer conversational experience, suggesting that the user choose the next animal. We also observe

that the RL conversation includes more types of content, such as sounds, facts, quizzes, yes/no and open questions.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work we tackled the formidable task of building a rich, open-ended conversational bot that is deployed in the challenging setting of a real-time, global commercial assistant. Our approach relies on the framework of reinforcement learning, using a novel state representation based on the succinct embedding of a supervised language model and an RL algorithm that allows for a dynamic action space at each stage of the conversation. Ours is one of the few examples of RL-based conversational systems deployed in the wild at scale, and the substantial advantages demonstrated over the SOTA supervised model validates the decades-long premise that the dynamic planning ability of RL is a natural fit for the design of rich dialogue agents.

An interesting insight from our live experiment highlights the power of RL to take counter-intuitive actions: an increase in non-cooperative responses, a seemingly negative phenomenon, is simply a tool with which the agent may elicit a user’s preference for the next phase of the conversation. This leads to a positive conversational experience on average, with a measurable increase both in conversation length and positive feedback. We hope to discover other dialogue strategies that drive “great” conversations as we shift to learning models directly from rich user signals.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Asadi and J. D. Williams. 2016. Sample-efficient deep reinforcement learning for dialog control. *arXiv:1612.06000* (2016).
- [2] R. Barzilay and K. R. McKeown. 2005. Sentence fusion for multidomain news summarization. *Comp. Linguistics* 31, 3 (2005), 297–328.
- [3] C. Boutilier, A. Cohen, A. Hassidim, Y. Mansour, O. Meshi, M. Mladenov, and D. Schuurmans. 2018. Planning and learning with stochastic action sets. In *Proc. of the 27th International Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*. 4674–4682.
- [4] I. Casanueva, P. Budzianowski, S. Ultes, F. Kreyssig, B.-H. Tseng, Y.-C. Wu, and M. Gasic. 2018. Feudal dialogue management with jointly learned feature extractors. In *Proc. of the 19th Annual SIGDIAL Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*. 332–337.
- [5] D. Cer, Y. Yang, S. Kong, N. Hua, N. Limtiaco, R. S. John, N. Constant, M. Guajardo-Cespedes, S. Yuan, C. Tar, Y. Sung, B. Strope, and R. Kurzweil. 2018. Universal Sentence Encoder. *arXiv:1803.11175* (2018).
- [6] S. Chandramohan, M. Geist, and O. Pietquin. 2010. Sparse approximate dynamic programming for dialog management. In *Proc. of the SIGDIAL 2010 Conf.* 107–115.
- [7] P. Dayan and G. E. Hinton. 1996. Varieties of Helmholtz machine. *Neural Networks* 9, 8 (1996), 1385–1403.
- [8] M. Fatemi, L. E. Asri, H. Schulz, J. He, and K. Suleman. 2016. Policy networks with two-stage training for dialogue systems. *arXiv:1606.03152* (2016).
- [9] M. Gašić, F. Jurčićek, B. Thomson, K. Yu, and S. Young. 2011. On-line policy optimisation of spoken dialogue systems via live interaction with human subjects. In *IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition & Understanding*. 312–317.
- [10] M. Geva, E. Malmi, I. Szepkator, and J. Berant. 2019. DiscoFuse: A Large-Scale Dataset for Discourse-Based Sentence Fusion. In *Proc. of the 2019 Conf. of the North American Chapter of the Association for Comp. Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 3443–3455.
- [11] J. Henderson, O. Lemon, and K. Georgila. 2008. Hybrid reinforcement/supervised learning of dialogue policies from fixed data sets. *Comp. Linguistics* 34, 4 (2008), 487–511.
- [12] R. A. Jacobs, M. I. Jordan, S. J. Nowlan, and G. E. Hinton. 1991. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural computation* 3, 1 (1991), 79–87.
- [13] N. Jaques, A. Ghandeharioun, J. H. Shen, C. Ferguson, A. Lapedriza, N. Jones, S. Gu, and R. Picard. 2019. Way off-policy batch deep reinforcement learning of implicit human preferences in dialog. *arXiv:1907.00456* (2019).
- [14] N. Jaques, J. H. Shen, A. Ghandeharioun, C. Ferguson, A. Lapedriza, N. Jones, S. S. Gu, and R. Picard. 2020. Human-centric dialog training via offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv:2010.05848* (2020).
- [15] J. Kober and J. Peters. 2011. Policy search for motor primitives in robotics. *Machine learning* 84, 1 (2011), 171–203.
- [16] S. Kotsiantis and P. Pintelas. 2003. Mixture of expert agents for handling imbalanced data sets. *Annals of Math., Comp. & Teleinformatics* 1, 1 (2003), 46–55.
- [17] A. Kumar, A. Zhou, G. Tucker, and S. Levine. 2020. Conservative Q-Learning for Offline Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1179–1191.
- [18] E. Levin, R. Pieraccini, and W. Eckert. 1997. Learning dialogue strategies within the Markov decision process framework. In *1997 IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Proc.* 72–79.
- [19] J. Li, W. Monroe, A. Ritter, M. Galley, J. Gao, and D. Jurafsky. 2016. Deep reinforcement learning for dialogue generation. *arXiv:1606.01541* (2016).
- [20] J. Li, W. Monroe, T. Shi, S. Jean, A. Ritter, and D. Jurafsky. 2017. Adversarial learning for neural dialogue generation. *arXiv:1701.06547* (2017).
- [21] L. Li, W. Chu, J. Langford, T. Moon, and X. Wang. 2012. An unbiased offline evaluation of contextual bandit algorithms with generalized linear models. In *Proc. of the Workshop on On-line Trading of Exploration and Exploitation 2*. 19–36.
- [22] L. Li, J. D. Williams, and S. Balakrishnan. 2009. Reinforcement learning for dialog management using least-squares policy iteration and fast feature selection. In *10th Annual Conf. of the International Speech Communication Association*.
- [23] B. Liu, G. Tur, D. Hakkani-Tur, P. Shah, and L. Heck. 2018. Dialogue learning with human teaching and feedback in end-to-end trainable task-oriented dialogue systems. *arXiv:1804.06512* (2018).
- [24] E. Malmi, S. Krause, S. Rothe, D. Mirylenka, and A. Severyn. 2019. Encode, Tag, Realize: High-Precision Text Editing. In *Proc. of the 2019 Conf. on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conf. on Natural Language Processing*. Association for Comp. Linguistics, 5053–5064.
- [25] E. Marsi and E. Krahmer. 2005. Explorations in Sentence Fusion. In *Proc. of the Tenth European Workshop on Natural Language Generation*.
- [26] V. Mnih, A. P. Badia, M. Mirza, A. Graves, T. Lillicrap, T. Harley, D. Silver, and K. Kavukcuoglu. 2016. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conf. on machine learning*. PMLR, 1928–1937.
- [27] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. Graves, I. Antonoglou, D. Wierstra, and M. Riedmiller. 2013. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv:1312.5602* (2013).
- [28] O. Nachum, Y. Chow, B. Dai, and L. Li. 2019. Dualdice: Behavior-agnostic estimation of discounted stationary distribution corrections. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [29] M. Ryu, Y. Chow, R. Anderson, C. Tjandraatmadja, and C. Boutilier. 2019. CAQL: Continuous Action Q-Learning. In *International Conf. on Learning Representations*.
- [30] A. Saleh, N. Jaques, A. Ghandeharioun, J. Shen, and R. Picard. 2020. Hierarchical reinforcement learning for open-domain dialog. In *Proc. of the AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 8741–8748.
- [31] J. Schulman, X. Chen, and P. Abbeel. 2017. Equivalence between policy gradients and soft q-learning. *arXiv:1704.06440* (2017).
- [32] I. V. Serban, C. Sankar, M. Germain, S. Zhang, Z. Lin, S. Subramanian, T. Kim, M. Pieper, S. Chandar, N. R. Ke, S. Mudumba, A. de Brébisson, J. Sotelo, D. Suhubdy, V. Michalski, A. Nguyen, J. Pineau, and Y. Bengio. 2017. A Deep Reinforcement Learning Chatbot. *arXiv:1709.02349* (2017).
- [33] J. Shin, P. Xu, A. Madotto, and P. Fung. 2020. Generating empathetic responses by looking ahead the user’s sentiment. In *IEEE International Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 7989–7993.
- [34] D. Silver, G. Lever, N. Heess, T. Degris, D. Wierstra, and M. Riedmiller. 2014. Deterministic policy gradient algorithms. In *Conf. on machine learning*.
- [35] S. Singh, M. Kearns, D. Litman, and M. Walker. 1999. Reinforcement Learning for Spoken Dialogue Systems. In *Proc. of the 12th International Conf. on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS’99)*. MIT Press, 956–962.
- [36] S. Singh, D. Litman, M. Kearns, and M. Walker. 2002. Optimizing dialogue management with reinforcement learning: Experiments with the NJFun system. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 16 (2002), 105–133.
- [37] R. S. Sutton, D. McAllester, S. Singh, and Y. Mansour. 1999. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 12 (1999).
- [38] I. Szepkator, D. Cohen, G. Elidan, M. Fink, A. Hassidim, O. Keller, S. Kulkarni, E. Ofek, S. Pudinsky, A. Revach, et al. 2020. Dynamic composition for conversational domain exploration. In *Proc. of The Web Conf. 2020*. 872–883.
- [39] P. Thomas, G. Theoharous, and M. Ghavamzadeh. 2015. High-confidence off-policy evaluation. In *Proc. of the AAAI Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 29.
- [40] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30. 5998–6008.
- [41] M. A. Walker. 2000. An application of reinforcement learning to dialogue strategy selection in a spoken dialogue system for email. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 12 (2000), 387–416.
- [42] J. D. Williams and S. Young. 2007. Partially observable Markov decision processes for spoken dialog systems. *Computer Speech & Language* 21, 2 (2007), 393–422.
- [43] Y. Wu, G. Tucker, and O. Nachum. 2019. Behavior regularized offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv:1911.11361* (2019).

- [44] S. Young, M. Gašić, S. Keizer, F. Mairesse, J. Schatzmann, B. Thomson, and K. Yu. 2010. The hidden information state model: A practical framework for POMDP-based spoken dialogue management. *Computer Speech & Language* (2010).
- [45] T. Zhao, K. Xie, and M. Eskenazi. 2019. Rethinking Action Spaces for Reinforcement Learning in End-to-end Dialog Agents with Latent Variable Models. In *Proc. of the 2019 Conf. of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 1208–1218.
- [46] L. Zhou, J. Gao, D. Li, and H.-Y. Shum. 2020. The design and implementation of xiaoice, an empathetic social chatbot. *Comp. Linguistics* 46, 1 (2020), 53–93.

A APPENDIX

A.1 DM Training Hyper-Parameters

Our supervised and RL models were trained with the following hyper-parameters.

The supervised RNN model is trained with a learning rate of 0.0001, batch size of 16, a dropout probability of 0.2 and 200K training steps. Its architecture includes a GRU layer with 200 units.

For the supervised transformer model, we use the BERT-Medium checkpoint⁸ having uncased vocabulary, hidden dimension $H = 512$, $L = 8$ transformer layers, and $A = 8$ attention heads per layer. This model was trained for 20000 steps with a global batch size of 768 divided among 8 TPUV3 chips, using the Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of $\epsilon = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ (decayed to zero), $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$.

For the RL models, SAQL-RNN, CAQL-RNN, SAQL-Reg-RNN, and CAQL-Reg-RNN use a fully connected feedforward network for Q -function approximation. These networks are composed of 3 layers and each layer is composed of 1024 RELU units. The SAQL-RNN network is trained using a learning rate $\epsilon = 7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $k = 2M$ steps. Warmstarted with the SAQL-RNN weights, the SAQL-Reg-RNN network is trained with $\epsilon = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$ and $k = 2.4M$. The CAQL-RNN network is trained with $\epsilon = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $k = 2M$, where the inner maximization problem uses a GA learning rate of $\epsilon_{GA} = 1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ and runs for a maximum of $k_{GA} = 25$ steps. Warmstarted with the CAQL-RNN weights, the CAQL-Reg-RNN network is trained with $\epsilon = 3 \cdot 10^{-6}$ and $k = 2M$. SAQL-Transformer, SAQL-Reg-Transformer, CAQL-Transformer, and CAQL-Reg-Transformer all follow almost the same settings as SAQL-RNN, SAQL-Reg-RNN, CAQL-RNN, and CAQL-Reg-RNN but are trained with $\epsilon = 3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $k = 4M$, $\epsilon = 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $k = 2.5M$, $\epsilon = 3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $k = 3M$, $\epsilon = 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $k = 3M$ respectively. The models are trained with batch size $|B| = 32$, and in all two-step CQL regularized models the regularization coefficient α is 0.1.⁹ SAQL-Reg-E2E was trained with $k = 320,000$, $\epsilon = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $|B| = 48$, $\gamma = 0.8$ and $\alpha = 0.01$. All these hyper-parameters are chosen from the best settings of their corresponding grid-search optimization.

A.2 Full Live Experiment Results

The average relative change in the live experiment metrics of the experiments w.r.t the control is shown in Table 4 for all models, including the CQL variants.

⁸<https://github.com/google-research/bert>

⁹Compared with learning rates, tuning α does not have much effect on model training.

Table 4: Mean relative change of experiments vs. the control metrics. Here, T stands for transformer.

Metric	SAQL-RNN	SAQL-Reg-RNN	SAQL-T	SAQL-Reg-T	CAQL-RNN	CAQL-T	CAQL-Reg-T	SAQL-Reg-E2E
Conversation length	+30%	+3.6%	+23%	+19%	+14%	+18%	+8.9%	-0.7%
Cooperative response	+8%	-20%	-6.8%	-0.3%	-5.8%	-4%	-4.3%	-8%
Non-cooperative response	+112%	+75%	+178%	+125%	+54%	+120%	+130%	+41%
Explicit positive feedback	+32%	+42%	+9.7%	+0.4%	-20%	+6.8%	+5.8%	-6%
Explicit negative feedback	-18%	-7%	+8.6%	-7.7%	+1%	-14%	+15%	+27%