

AUTODIAL: Efficient Asynchronous Task-Oriented Dialogue Model

Prajjwal Bhargava Pooyan Amini Shahin Shayandeh Chinnadhurai Sankar
Meta AI
prajj@meta.com

Abstract

As large dialogue models become commonplace in practice, the problems surrounding high compute requirements for training, inference, and larger memory footprint persist. In this work, we present AUTODIAL, a multi-task dialogue model that aims to address these challenges concerned with the deployment of such models. AUTODIAL extends the BART architecture with parallel decoders to perform the four key dialogue tasks. Using classification decoders over generative ones allows AUTODIAL to significantly reduce memory footprint (11x fewer parameters) and achieve faster inference (3-6x speedups) times compared to an existing competitive generative approach which relies on the text-to-text interface such as SIMPLETOD. Our results show that extending current dialogue models with parallel decoders can be a viable alternative for deployment in resource-constrained environments.

1 Introduction

Dialogue systems are playing an increasingly growing role in how humans interact with devices and services. Existing works such as SimpleTOD (Hosseini-Asl et al., 2020) have adopted generative (text-to-text) approaches which require conditioning upon different text sequences for key dialogue tasks such as action/response generation and dialogue state tracking (DST). While these approaches have managed to achieve competitive results on numerous tasks, they often have large memory requirements and prohibitively high inference latency, making them impractical for use in resource-restricted environments. Moreover, accounting for the ever-growing changing needs of the user such as adding support for a new dialogue task or a domain in a modular fashion, is non-trivial with a generative approach.

To address these issues, we present AUTODIAL, an **asynchronous task-oriented dialogue** model that can perform inference on multiple dialogue




Figure 1: AUTODIAL architecture. Representations formed from the encoder are leveraged by parallel decoders (shown in blue and orange) for several dialogue tasks, indicated by arrows. Dialog Context Encoder is kept frozen. All the tasks highlighted in blue were considered as part of this study. More tasks can be added by solely training the task-specific decoder while keeping everything else fixed i.e non-trainable (highlighted in orange).

tasks concurrently in an asynchronous manner. The model, as shown in Figure 1, extends the popular BART architecture (Lewis et al., 2020) by adding parallel decoders for dialogue tasks allowing it to achieve 3-6x faster inference times while having 11x fewer parameters with no degradation in performance compared to SIMPLETOD on three key dialogue tasks of MULTIWOZ and GOOGLE SGD each. Additionally, this architecture enables the flexible addition of new decoders in an asynchronous manner i.e training an additional small decoder without training any other component of the model, making it easier to support new dialogue tasks or domains¹. Since the pre-trained representations play a cardinal role, we also explore pre-finetuning of the AUTODIAL and find that pre-finetuning benefits the larger variant marginally over smaller variant suggesting that it becomes more beneficial as the model size increases. We open source our code here².

2 Background

In this section, we focus our discussion on SIMPLETOD, which formed the primary baseline for com-

¹<https://colinraffel.com/blog/a-call-to-build-models-like-we-build-open-source-software.html>

²<https://github.com/prajjwal1/autodial>

parison with AUTODIAL along with pre-finetuning which was done to study its role on AUTODIAL. Additionally we provide details on tasks which were considered for training and evaluating AUTODIAL.

SimpleTOD: Conventionally task-oriented dialogue (TOD) systems have been built independently with separate supervision of each component. A popular approach SIMPLETOD which uses an identical architecture as BART (Lewis et al., 2020) recasts the TOD as a causal unidirectional language modeling task to solve numerous sub-tasks in a text-to-text manner. By training the model end-to-end to generate a specific type of response when provided with a specific type of context, the user can generate belief states, actions and de-lexicalized response as part of a multi-step process. The multi-step process includes generating a belief state from system and user utterances, in the next step, model’s output from previous step is concatenated with utterances to generate actions and so on.

Pre-finetuning (PFT) is an additional training phase proposed by Aghajanyan et al. (2021) wherein a language model undergoes multi-task training on many downstream tasks after pre-training and before fine-tuning to encode task-specific representations. We specified the datasets used for performing pre-finetuning in section 3.

Tasks: We consider two datasets for our study that are large-scale, multi-turn, multi-domain task-oriented dialogue datasets, namely MULTIWOZ V2.2 and GOOGLE SGD. MULTIWOZ V2.2 contains 8.4k dialogues across seven domains, with an average of 13.46 turns per dialogue. GOOGLE SGD is a larger dataset with over 16k dialogues covering 21 domains, with an average of 20.4 turns per dialogue.

We briefly define the four dialogue tasks that are common across both datasets used in this study. Note that all of these tasks require the same input i.e. context C_t .

- **Dialogue State Tracking** involves generating the belief state B_t , which is a list of triplets containing values for slots in a particular domain (DOMAIN, SLOT_NAME, VALUE).
- **Dialogue Act Prediction** requires prediction of a triplet constructed by concatenating the domain, entity, and slot key for that dialogue turn. An example dialogue act would

be "Attraction_Inform_address" where attraction, inform and address are the domain, entity, and slot keys respectively. There are a total of 93 and 444 classes in MULTIWOZ and GOOGLE SGD, respectively.

- **Dialogue Intent Prediction** necessitates deriving the intent of the user. Examples of intents include Taxi-Request, Hotel-Inform. There are 18 and 23 intents in MULTIWOZ and GOOGLE SGD, respectively.
- **Domain Prediction** focuses on the classification of a given example into a set of the domain such as RESTAURANT.

3 Experimental Details

Architecture: In addition to BART architecture, AUTODIAL contains additional classification decoders in parallel that can work in an asynchronous fashion and are specialized for each dialogue task. The encoder representations are kept frozen for retention of pre-trained knowledge. For each of the task, the encoder receives the same context C_t , which is the concatenation of user (U) and system (S) utterances ($C_t = [U_0, S_0...U_t]$). Each parallel decoder is trained independently of each other and gets the same vector representation from the encoder. In AUTODIAL, the generative decoder used for the DST task is a BART decoder, while separate identical classification decoders were used for the remaining tasks which are comprised of a 2-layer transformer network. Each decoder receives its corresponding label for computation of binary cross entropy loss during training time. The independent nature of the decoder allows for outputs to be gathered in an asynchronous manner unlike generative decoder which requires multiple forward passes to produce all the outputs for the dialogue tasks.

Baseline : SIMPLETOD served as the primary baseline and represents the conventional case where all the weights of the model are trained. In addition, we compare AUTODIAL with a modified variant of SIMPLETOD wherein the encoder weights were kept fixed but the generative decoder was fine-tuned on the respective downstream tasks, we call this baseline GENERATIVE. This baseline allowed us to evaluate how effective the parallel classification decoders of AUTODIAL are against a generative decoder (Raffel et al., 2020) as the encoder is kept common across both.

Baseline	Small / Large MULTIWOZ	Small / Large GOOGLE SGD
Dialogue State Tracking		(JGA)
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	50.6 _[0.33] / 56.4 _[0.23]	29.97 _[0.24] / 31.81 _[0.38]
GENERATIVE	37.2 _[0.4] / 45.4 _[0.26]	26.8 _[0.09] / 29.6 _[0.3]
Dialogue Act Prediction		(Accuracy)
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	82 _[0.18] / 84.16 _[0.25]	51 _[0.32] / 50.6 _[0.42]
GENERATIVE	76.2 _[0.49] / 71.1 _[7.5]	47.9 _[0.1] / 45.3 _[0.38]
AUTODIAL	69.6 _[0.69] / 68.5 _[0.19]	45.8 _[0.23] / 51.8 _[0.53]
Dialogue Intent Prediction		(Accuracy)
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	85 _[0.18] / 86.94 _[0.39]	69.03 _[0.16] / 66 _[0.34]
GENERATIVE	82.5 _[0.36] / 82.6 _[0.46]	68.5 _[0.09] / 66 _[0.34]
AUTODIAL	83.5 _[0.6] / 83.6 _[0.24]	69.2 _[0.19] / 67.19 _[0.33]
Dialogue Domain Prediction		(Accuracy)
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	96.83 _[0.45] / 96.23 _[0.77]	74.73 _[0.47] / 75.5 _[0.47]
GENERATIVE	94.9 _[2] / 97.2 _[0.69]	74.04 _[0.21] / 71 _[0.86]
AUTODIAL	96.2 _[0.28] / 95.6 _[0.43]	76 _[1.42] / 73.5 _[0.23]

Table 1: Results on MULTIWOZ 2.2 and GOOGLE SGD. Numbers in subscript denote standard deviation observed across 3 runs. Bolded numbers represent cases where AUTODIAL is competitive to the other two baselines namely SIMPLETOD and GENERATIVE. AUTODIAL is either competitive with or outperforms the baselines.

Model	Parameter count
ENCODER	202M
AUTODIAL DECODER (x1)	26M
SIMPLETOD DECODER	202.6M
SIMPLETOD	406M

Table 2: Parameter count of different components used in AUTODIAL and SIMPLETOD. The encoder weights are common to AUTODIAL and SIMPLETOD and are non-trainable during fine-tuning stage for AUTODIAL.

Metrics: We measured performance on DST using Joint Goal Accuracy (JGA). It measures the accuracy of generated belief states against oracle belief states. Results on the classification tasks report accuracy (exact matching). We treat all classification tasks as a multi-label classification problem. It is worth noting that we performed DST in the same way as SIMPLETOD and has been included in this study to demonstrate that AUTODIAL can have generative decoders also. GENERATIVE baseline in Table 1 is equivalent to having a generative decoder (required by DST task) in AUTODIAL. This study is concerned with classification tasks as a result of which the performance and memory gains described in this work apply to all tasks except DST.

Models: We trained AUTODIAL with two training strategies, fine-tuning and pre-finetuning, the results of which have been shown in Table 1 and Table 3 respectively. We trained with two model sizes for each training stage. The smaller variant

has 6 layers each both in the encoder and decoder, thus having $\sim 2x$ fewer parameters compared to the larger one (Table 2). The setup and hyperparameter details have been provided in Appendix.

Pre-finetuning We pre-finetuned BART on three large dialogue datasets: all three variants of TASKMASTER (Byrne et al., 2019), MSR E2E (Li et al., 2018), and MULTIDOGO (Peskov et al., 2019) for 2.2M training steps. We provide more details of the data in Appendix B.

4 Results

Performance of AUTODIAL From Table 1, we can see that AUTODIAL performs comparably on most tasks while being 15x parameter deficient than SIMPLETOD (26M vs 406M parameters). We observed that AUTODIAL lags behind SIMPLETOD by 17.9% on the Dialogue Act Prediction task from MULTIWOZ. Interestingly, the same is not true on GOOGLE SGD where AUTODIAL outperforms SIMPLETOD by 2.3%, despite the larger number of labels GOOGLE SGD has (4x more). AUTODIAL maintained parity with GENERATIVE and SIMPLETOD baselines on both Dialogue Intent Prediction and Dialog Domain Prediction tasks.

Reduction in Training and Inference Time Table 4 showed that AUTODIAL provided significant speedups in both inference and training time compared to both baselines. Specifically, we observed

Baseline	Small / Large MULTIWOZ	Small / Large SGD
Dialogue State Tracking		
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	48.7 _[0.54] / 55.5 _[0.37]	31.6 _[0.45] / 30.2 _[0.2]
GENERATIVE	31.4 _[3.17] / 47.9 _[0.5]	26.6 _[0.2] / 31.2 _[0.38]
Dialogue Act Prediction		
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	76.2 _[0.31] / 83.69 _[0.16]	50.75 _[0.34] / 50.8 _[0.13]
GENERATIVE	76.2 _[0.31] / 80.38 _[0.4]	47.6 _[0.06] / 50.76 _[0.11]
AUTODIAL	68.6 _[1.54] / 71.85 _[0.66]	45.5 _[0.46] / 42.1 _[0.84]
Dialogue Intent Prediction		
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	80.2 _[0.29] / 86.59 _[0.42]	69.5 _[0.19] / 66.5 _[4]
GENERATIVE	80.2 _[0.29] / 84.7 _[0.64]	69.5 _[0.19] / 66.5 _[4.06]
AUTODIAL	83.2 _[0.06] / 82.2 _[0.07]	69 _[0.73] / 74.3 _[0.21]
Dialogue Domain Prediction		
SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	96.2 _[1.14] / 96.5 _[1.31]	75.16 _[0.66] / 74.5 _[0.9]
GENERATIVE	94.3 _[1.02] / 97.16 _[0.66]	74.8 _[0.27] / 73.86 _[1.97]
AUTODIAL	96.4 _[0.15] / 97.13 _[0.06]	78.4 _[0.46] / 78.5 _[0.79]

Table 3: Results demonstrating the impact of Pre-finetuning. Numbers in subscript denote standard deviation observed across 3 runs. Bolded numbers represent cases where pre-finetuning helps AUTODIAL outperform the two baselines SIMPLETOD and GENERATIVE. Although pre-finetuning seemed to help on intent and domain predictions tasks, the gains did seem substantial enough compared to pre-training.

Decoder	Small / Large SIMPLETOD (BASELINE)	Small / Large AUTODIAL
MULTIWOZ		
DST	397.12 / 624.87	-
Act	50.96 / 190.26	26.8 / 32.31
Intent	83.16 / 127.4	26.28 / 32.47
Domain	75.42 / 115.81	26.92 / 37.71
GOOGLE SGD		
DST	1621.05 / 2286.81	-
Act	1109.95 / 1800	196.226 / 243
Intent	408.69 / 545	198.47 / 243.19
Domain	377.8 / 561.12	195.59 / 239.69

Table 4: Inference Time (in seconds) of all decoders of AUTODIAL. Inference times for each decoder were averaged out over 10 evaluation runs. Classification decoders are substantially faster than generative decoders used in SIMPLETOD.

2-6x reduced inference times on Dialogue Act, Intent, and Domain Prediction tasks of both MULTIWOZ and GOOGLE SGD. Additionally, AUTODIAL required roughly 2.6x less training time compared to SIMPLETOD under identical experimental settings.

Does Pre-finetuning help ? The benefits of pre-finetuning were primarily seen in the larger variant of GENERATIVE baseline and AUTODIAL (Table 3). With the large variant of GENERATIVE baseline, we saw an improvement of 13.4% and 11.9% on Dialog Act Prediction task of MULTIWOZ and GOOGLE SGD respectively. However the

gains were marginal on the Dialog Intent and Domain Prediction task. We had a similar finding with AUTODIAL wherein we observed an improvement of 10.5% and 6.7% on the Intent and Domain Prediction task of GOOGLE SGD with pre-finetuning. This observation showed that pre-finetuning provides a moderately better initialization point than pre-training when the encoder weights are kept frozen and that the positive effects of it are likely to become pronounced in larger models.

Effectiveness of the frozen encoder As pointed out in section 3, the encoder is kept non-trainable in both GENERATIVE baseline and AUTODIAL, we looked at the performance gap across two scenarios, one in which the encoder is trainable and vice versa by looking at performance of SIMPLETOD and GENERATIVE baselines. We observed nearly equivalent performance from both baselines on DST task of GOOGLE SGD, Dialogue Intent and Domain Prediction tasks of MULTIWOZ and GOOGLE SGD (shown in Table 1). This indicated that pre-trained knowledge of the encoder can be effectively extended through trainable parallel decoders.

5 Conclusion

We presented AUTODIAL, an extension of the BART architecture for task-oriented dialogue systems. AUTODIAL achieved comparable performance to a fully generative approaches such as SIMPLETOD

while requiring fewer parameters and providing faster inference times. Although this task aimed at studying how classification tasks can benefit from AUTODIAL, future work would include how the gains can be realized for generative tasks. Additionally AUTODIAL assumes that all the decoders require the same context input. While many dialogue tasks can be completed with user and system responses which is what we use, there are tasks such as end-to-end dialogue generation that require multiple inference steps. To accommodate for such use cases, AUTODIAL will require some task-specific modifications.

Ethical considerations / Impact Statement As more research is being done with scaling LMs, we believe that it is equally important to study how these LMs can be made more accessible and enabled to be used in real-world scenarios. With AUTODIAL we hope to highlight the efficacy of using parallel decoders to perform inference for numerous dialogue tasks while staying competitive and being parameter and memory efficient. We hope to see more work being done in this space especially for restricted compute use-case scenarios. Just like any other LM, special care needs to be given in the collection of data for training and capturing unintended behaviors such as biases or heuristics during deployment.

References

- Armen Aghajanyan, Anchit Gupta, Akshat Shrivastava, Xilun Chen, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sonal Gupta. 2021. [Muppet: Massive multi-task representations with pre-finetuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5799–5811, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bill Byrne, Karthik Krishnamoorthi, Chinnadhurai Sankar, Arvind Neelakantan, Daniel Duckworth, Semih Yavuz, Ben Goodrich, Amit Dubey, Kyu-Young Kim, and Andy Cedilnik. 2019. Taskmaster-1: Toward a realistic and diverse dialog dataset.
- Ehsan Hosseini-Asl, Bryan McCann, Chien-Sheng Wu, Semih Yavuz, and Richard Socher. 2020. [A simple language model for task-oriented dialogue](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 20179–20191. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiujun Li, Sarah Panda, JJ (Jingjing) Liu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2018. [Microsoft dialogue challenge: Building end-to-end task-completion dialogue systems](#). In *SLT 2018*.
- A. H. Miller, W. Feng, A. Fisch, J. Lu, D. Batra, A. Bordes, D. Parikh, and J. Weston. 2017. Parlai: A dialog research software platform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06476*.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. [Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Denis Peskov, Nancy Clarke, Jason Krone, Brigi Fodor, Yi Zhang, Adel Youssef, and Mona Diab. 2019. [Multi-domain goal-oriented dialogues \(MultiDoGO\): Strategies toward curating and annotating large scale dialogue data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4526–4536, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kun Qian, Ahmad Beirami, Zhouhan Lin, Ankita De, Alborz Geramifard, Zhou Yu, and Chinnadhurai Sankar. 2021. [Annotation inconsistency and entity bias in multiwoz](#). *CoRR*, abs/2105.14150.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.

A Setup

AUTODIAL was implemented using ParlAI (Miller et al., 2017) and Pytorch (Paszke et al., 2019). We conducted all experiments on an NVIDIA A100 GPU, using a batch size of 8. The hyperparameters used in our experiments have been listed in Table 5. All of our experiments have been averaged out over 3 runs to account for seed variance.

Generation	
Component	Hyperparameter
Learning Rate (GENERATOR MULTIWOZ)	2e-5
Learning Rate (GENERATOR SGD)	1e-5
Learning Rate (SIMPLETOD MULTIWOZ)	2e-5
Learning Rate (SIMPLETOD SGD)	1e-5
Learning Rate (AUTODIAL)	7e-5
Pre-finetuning LR	1e-6
Sequence Length	1000
Optimizer	AdamW
Batchsize	8
Eval batch size	16
Warmup updates	100
Dropout	0
Gradient clipping	1.0
Num epochs	5

Table 5: Hyperparameters used for our experiments

B Data

TaskMaster: The TaskMaster dataset is a large-scale collection of goal-oriented conversations that focuses on simulating human-like dialogues for task-oriented systems. The dataset hopes to provoke interest in written vs spoken language. The datasets consists of two-person dialogs, The dataset was created using the Wizard-of-Oz methodology, where human participants were given specific roles to play while generating the conversations.

MSR-E2E: MSR-E2E is a dataset of human-human conversations in which one human plays the role of an Agent and the other one plays the role of a User. It contains human-annotated conversational data in three domains (movie-ticket booking, restaurant reservation, and taxi booking).

Multidogo : MultiDoGo is a large task-oriented dataset collected in a Wizard of Oz fashion, using both crowd and expert annotators with annotations at varying levels of granularity. It contains 81K dialogues harvested across six domains. It was crafted using the Wizard-of-Oz approach wherein a crowd-sourced worker (the “customer”) is paired with a trained annotator (the “agent”).