

# Question Generation in Knowledge-Driven Dialog: Explainability and Evaluation

Juliette Faille\*, Quentin Brabant\*\*,  
Gwenole Lecorve\*\*, Lina M. Rojas-Barahona\*\*, and Claire Gardent\*

\*Université de Lorraine, CNRS/LORIA {juliette.faille, claire.gardent}@loria.fr

\*\*Orange Innovation {quentin.brabant, gwenole.lecorve, lina.rojas}@orange.com

## Abstract

We explore question generation in the context of knowledge-grounded dialogs focusing on explainability and evaluation. Inspired by previous work on planning-based summarisation, we present a model which instead of directly generating a question, sequentially predicts first a fact then a question. We evaluate our approach on 37k test dialogs adapted from the KGCONV dataset and we show that, although more demanding in terms of inference, our approach performs on par with a standard model which solely generates a question while allowing for a detailed reference-less evaluation of the model behaviour in terms of relevance, factuality and pronominalisation.

## 1 Introduction

Recent years have seen an increasing number of approaches aiming to ground dialog models in general purpose knowledge graphs either to avoid over-generic dialog turns (Han et al., 2015; Sun et al., 2018; Moon et al., 2019) or to support information seeking dialogs (Liu et al., 2019; Perez-Beltrachini et al., 2023). Here, we focus instead on how knowledge can be used to support dialogs where facts are used to guide the generation of a series of questions intended to quizz a user about a given topic or entity. Specifically, we focus on dialogs where each question-answer pair is grounded in a fact and facts are triples from the Wikidata Knowledge Base (KB). An example dialog is shown in Table 1.

We confront several challenges. First, the generated question must fit the dialog context in that it should be neither redundant nor irrelevant (relevance). Second, it should be factual i.e., it should bear on an attested fact (factuality). Third, it should be natural sounding, in particular, integrating the anaphors that are typical of conversational dialogs (pronouns). These three challenges are further compounded by an evaluation challenge:

Given that a dialog can be continued in multiple ways, how can we evaluate the behavior of a dialog model with respect

T <sub>1</sub>	(Sitara Achakzai, field of work, feminism)
Q <sub>1</sub>	What was the field of work of Sitara Achakzai?
A <sub>1</sub>	feminism
T <sub>2</sub>	(Sitara Achakzai, death manner, murder)
Q <sub>2</sub>	What was the cause of death of Achakzai?
A <sub>2</sub>	homicide
T <sub>3</sub>	(Sitara Achakzai, birthplace, Afghanistan)
Q <sub>3</sub>	Where was she born ?
A <sub>3</sub>	Afghanistan
T <sub>4</sub>	(Afghanistan, capital, Kabul)
Q <sub>4</sub>	What is the capital of Afghanistan?
A <sub>4</sub>	Kabul
T <sub>5</sub>	(Afghanistan, lowest point, Amu Darya)
Q <sub>5</sub>	What is the lowest point of Afghanistan?
A <sub>5</sub>	Amu Darya

Table 1: Example of dialog in the KGCONV dataset (T:Triple, Q:Question, A:Answer).

to relevance, factuality and pronominalisation?

We present an explainable approach to knowledge-grounded, conversational question generation (QG) which permits addressing this question.

In contrast to a standard conversational QG model which generates a question conditioning on some input, we train our question generation model to first generate a KB triple and then continue generating the corresponding question. That is, in our approach, question generation is conditioned on both the input context and a predicted KB triple. This has two key advantages.

First, it improves explainability<sup>1</sup> as the predicted triple question generation is conditioned on, can be viewed as a strong indicator of why the model generated that question.

Second, it helps assessing both factuality (is the predicted triple a well-formed triple of the KB?) and relevance (is the generated triple in topic and new with respect to the triples already captured

<sup>1</sup>We adopt (Barredo Arrieta et al., 2019)’s definition of explainability: a model is explainable if it can be explained to a human using some kind of interface between the model and the human. As we shall see, in our case, this interface is provided by the interplay between dialog context, generated triple and generated question.

by the dialog context?). In addition, comparing the generated question with the predicted triple can be used to assess the contextual relevance of the generated question (does the generated question match the generated triple?) and to verify the correctness of pronouns (does the pronoun genre match the semantic genre of the corresponding entity in the predicted triple and is the pronoun ambiguous given the genre of the previously mentioned entities?) .

In short, training a model to generate both a triple and a question instead of only a question enables a fine-grained, automatic and reference-less evaluation of the generated questions.

We make the following contributions.

- Using the KGCONV dataset<sup>2</sup>, a dataset of 70K dialogs where each (question,answer) pair is grounded in a Wikidata triple, we demonstrate how our approach permits assessing factuality, relevance and pronouns.
- We compare our model with a standard, question-only generation model and show that while more demanding in terms of inference and more explainable, our architecture reaches similar overall performance in terms of both automatic (similarity score against multiple references) and human evaluation scores.
- Using an ablation study, we highlight the impact of knowledge on dialog coherence. Conditioning dialog response generation on a knowledge graph (in addition to dialog context) drastically helps reduce the proportion of generated questions that are either off topic or factually incorrect.
- All data, models, and scripts to reproduce our results will be made publicly available.

## 2 Dataset

The KGCONV dataset consists of 70,596 English dialogs such that each dialog is composed of a sequence of question-answer pairs about Wikidata entities. Specifically, each KGCONV question-answer pair is grounded in a triple (subject, property, object) whose object is the expected answer. For example, the question-answer pair “Q: Where was Obama born?, A: Hawaii” is associated with the triple (Obama, place of birth, Honolulu).

As illustrated in Table 2, each dialog  $D$  in KGCONV is associated with a root entity  $e$  which is the subject entity of the triple initiating the dialog, the Wikidata category  $T_e$  of that entity and

<sup>2</sup>The KGCONV dataset and paper are currently under anonymous peer review and the dataset will be made publicly available as soon as the paper is published.

$e$	Sitara Achakzai
$T_e$	person
$Len_K$	5
RDF graph $K$	$\langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Afghanistan $\langle p \rangle$ lowest point $\langle o \rangle$ Amu Darya $\langle /t \rangle \langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ birthplace $\langle o \rangle$ Afghanistan $\langle /t \rangle \langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ field of work $\langle o \rangle$ feminism $\langle /t \rangle \langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ death manner $\langle o \rangle$ murder $\langle /t \rangle \langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Afghanistan $\langle p \rangle$ capital $\langle o \rangle$ Kabul $\langle /t \rangle$
$D_{QA_{nl}}$	$\langle q \rangle$ What was the field of work of Sitara Achakzai? $\langle a \rangle$ feminism $\langle q \rangle$ What was the cause of death of Achakzai? $\langle a \rangle$ homicide
$D_{Q_{nl}}$	$\langle q \rangle$ What was the field of work of Sitara Achakzai? $\langle q \rangle$ What was the cause of death of Achakzai?
$D_{kl}$	$\langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ field of work $\langle o \rangle$ feminism $\langle /t \rangle \langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ death manner $\langle o \rangle$ murder $\langle /t \rangle$
$D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$	$\langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ field of work $\langle o \rangle$ feminism $\langle q \rangle$ What was the field of work of Sitara Achakzai? $\langle a \rangle$ feminism $\langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ death manner $\langle o \rangle$ murder $\langle /t \rangle \langle q \rangle$ What was the cause of death of Achakzai? $\langle a \rangle$ homicide
Ref	[TRIPLE] $\langle t \rangle \langle sj \rangle$ Sitara Achakzai $\langle p \rangle$ birthplace $\langle o \rangle$ Afghanistan infarction $\langle /t \rangle$ [QUESTION] Where was she born ?

Table 2: Input elements and reference output for the generation of the third question of the dialog of Table 1

the graph  $K_D$  consisting of the Wikidata triples associated with the question-answer pairs making up  $D$ . The number of questions in a dialog is at least 5 and at most 19.

We write  $\mathcal{K}_{KGConv}$  the set of all Wikidata triples (143K triples) grounding the KGCONV dialogs ( $\mathcal{K}_{KGConv} = \cup_{D \in KGConv} K_D$ ).

## 3 Problem Formulation

Given  $K = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$ , a knowledge graph representing a set of facts, and  $D$  a dialog context, the task consists in generating an adequate follow-up question  $q$  which is grounded in a fact  $f_i \in K$ .

To enhance explainability, we propose a model which grounds the generation of the next question  $q$ , not only in  $D$  and  $K$ , but also in the corresponding fact. That is, instead of directly decoding a question  $q$  from  $K$  and  $D$ :

$$K, D \Rightarrow q$$

we train an encoder-decoder which decodes the concatenation of  $f_q$  and  $q$  where  $f_q$  is the fact underlying  $q$  :

$$K, D \Rightarrow f_q, q$$

As we shall see in Section 6, the underlying motivation for this architecture is that the predicted triple can serve as an interface between the user and the model thereby improving its explainability.

In what follows, we refer to the two types of models as Question-Only and Extended QG model respectively.

## 4 Input

Drawing on the hybrid NL/KB nature of the KG-CONV dataset, we experiment with different knowledge sources and dialog contexts.

**Knowledge Graph.** In our KB-based dialog setting, each generated question should be grounded in a fact. This raises the issue of content selection: given some knowledge graph  $K$ , to what extent does the model learn to select a fact that is both relevant and non redundant with respect to the current dialog context?

To study the ability of our model to select a relevant fact from a Knowledge Graph, we train and test on input graphs of varying size and relevance. Specifically, we condition generation either on  $K_D$ , the set of triples associated with dialog  $D$  in the KGCONV dataset or on  $K^+$ , a larger set of triples which includes in addition to  $K_D$  ( $K_D \subset K^+$ ), three types of "distractor" triples which are not in  $K_D$ :

- Out-of-Scope triples (entity): triples not in  $K_D$  whose subject is of the same Wikidata category as the root entity of the dialog.
- Out-of-Scope triples (property): triples not in  $K_D$  whose property appears in  $K_D$ .
- Noise triples: triples that are not in  $K_D$  but whose subject, property and object are in  $K_{KGConv}$ .

The motivation for these additional triples is that they act as "distractors" for content selection with each distractor type representing a different type of similarity with relevant triples (all triples in  $K_D$ ). While Noise triples are markedly distinct from the set  $K_D$  of triples associated with the dialog at hand, Out-of-Scope triples are semantically close to triples in  $K_D$  and are therefore harder to filter out.

We denote by  $K_n^+$  the set  $K_D$  with  $n$  additional triples of each type (i.e.,  $K_0^+ = K_D$ ,  $K_1^+$  has 3 more triples than  $K_D$  and so on). We experiment with  $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , capping the total number of added triples to the size of  $K_D$ . Thus, there are at most as many noisy and out-of-scope triples as relevant ones.

**Dialog Context.** As explained in Section 2, in the KGCONV dataset, each question-answer pair in a dialog is associated with the corresponding KG triple e.g.,

T: (*Henri\_Poincare*, *birth\_place*, *Nancy*)  
 Q: *Where was Henri Poincaré born?*  
 A: *Nancy*

We leverage this dual (T, Q:A) information to compare four ways of representing the context:

$D_{QA_{nl}}$  the standard dialog context consisting of all the preceding natural language turns ;  $D_{Q_{nl}}$  the dialog context consisting of all the preceding natural language questions;  $D_{kl}$ , the factual context consisting of the sequence of facts grounding the preceding dialog turns; and  $D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$ , a hybrid context consisting of the sequence of preceding dialog turns and their associated facts. Table 2 illustrates these four types of contexts.

## 5 Experimental Setting

We describe the models and the data used for training and testing.

### 5.1 Models

**Extended QG Model.** We use the pre-trained encoder-decoder **T5-small**<sup>3</sup> model and fine-tune it on the KGCONV dataset. We use the implementation from Huggingface and train on two GPUs (Nvidia GTX 1080 Ti, 11 GiB) with early stopping criteria on the validation loss. We use greedy decoding. The input to the model is a concatenation of 5 elements

$$e, T_e, Len_K, K, D$$

where  $e$  is the root entity of the graph and  $T_e$  its Wikidata semantic category.  $K$  is a set of RDF triples,  $Len_K$  is the number of triples in  $K$  and  $D$  is the dialog context. The output of the model is the concatenation of a triple  $f$  and a natural language question  $q$ , where, as illustrated on the last line of Table 2,  $f$  and  $q$  are prefixed with the special markers [TRIPLE] and [QUESTION] respectively. At training time,  $f$  is the Wikidata triple underlying the natural language question  $q$ . At test time, it is predicted. Note that as we have four context types, we train four different models.

**Question-Only QG Model.** As our model is tasked with generating both a triple and a question rather than just a question, it is possible that the added transparency comes at the cost of a degraded performance with respect to a model that directly generates the question. We therefore create a model with the same input as described above, but whose output is now only the next question in natural language. For this Question-Only model, we use the context type  $D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$ .

### 5.2 Data

We use the 46,808 dialogs of KGCONV training set, 7,477 dialogs of the validation set and 10,753 of the test set. We augment these sets with corresponding  $K_1^+$ ,  $K_2^+$  and  $K_3^+$  Knowledge Graphs as described in Section 3 and obtain 161,142 dialogs

<sup>3</sup>A small model is preferred because we want to study model explainability through factuality, relevance, semantic adequacy and referring expressions.

Context Type	$D_{QA_{nl}}$	(%)	$D_{Q_{nl}}$	(%)	$D_{kl}$	(%)	$D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$	(%)
# test examples	313583		321270		315815		313865	
# distinct generated triples	16519		18146		17875		16597	
<b>Relevant triples</b>	303723	96	286439	89	301970	96	304794	97
Exact match with target	123684	39	109031	34	123605	39	131453	42
Other triple from input graph ( $K_D$ )	180039	57	177408	55	178365	56	173341	55
<b>Irrelevant triples</b>	9860	3	34831	11	13845	4	9071	3
Repetitions	1788	1	23149	7	1308	0	1705	1
Out-of-scope (entity) triples	305	0	640	0	340	0	398	0
Out-of-scope (property) triples	5327	2	6987	2	6437	2	5448	2
Noise triples		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ill-formed triples	460	0	2033	1	1663	1	710	0
Triples not in KGCONV	5514	2	7403	2	7761	2	4977	2

Table 3: **Evaluating the generated triples.** For simplicity we rounded the ratio - as a result they do not always add up to exactly 100. Note also that, as some categories overlap, the total number of irrelevant triples differ from the sum of all bad cases i.e., Repetitions, OOS (entity), etc.

for the train set, 25,701 for the validation set and 37,056 for the test set. To avoid too many repetitions in the training and validation sets, we keep half (randomly selected) of all possible contexts for each dialog. For the test samples, we keep all contexts. We have 666,711 training instances, 105,665 validation, and 323,826 test instances. We remove instances with lengths longer than the model size, i.e. with more than 512 tokens. This represents for each of the context types less than 2% of the training samples.

## 6 Evaluation methodology and results

We provide a quantitative evaluation of our Extended QG model in terms of relevance, factuality and pronominalisation drawing on statistics about the generated triples and the relation between triples and generated questions.

Since such statistics are not available for the Question-Only QG model, we carry out a human evaluation to compare their ability to generate relevant queries<sup>4</sup> and we use automatic metrics to compare their overall performance.

### 6.1 Relevance and Factuality

To assess whether a question is factual and relevant with respect to a given dialog context, we analyse both the generated triples (Table 3) and the similarity between predicted triples and the generated questions .

**Triples.** We consider a triple to be factual if it is well-formed and present in the KGCONV Knowledge-Base<sup>5</sup>. We consider it to be relevant if it is either an exact match of the reference triple

<sup>4</sup>We did not do a human evaluation for factuality as this is much more difficult to assess for humans.

<sup>5</sup>This is an approximation as the triple could be present in Wikidata or simply denote a true fact not captured by Wikidata.

or a triple from the input RDF graph  $K_D$  which is not already present in the current dialog context (recall that by construction, triples in  $K_D$  are neither out-of-domain nor out-of-scope).

Table 3 shows detailed triples related statistics for the various types of contexts. We find a low ratio of ill-formed and out of domain triples (Triple not in KGCONV) which shows that the model learns to mostly predict true facts.

Context	$D_{QA_{nl}}$	$D_{Q_{nl}}$	$D_{kl}$	$D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$
Avg GLEU	0.76	0.78	0.73	0.76

Table 4: Mean of the GLEU scores between a question and the triple it was conditioned on.

Similarly, the high ratio of relevant triples (89 to 96%) indicates a good ability of the model to generate triples that are neither redundant nor irrelevant to the dialog context. The  $D_{Q_{nl}}$  contexts yield notably more irrelevant triples (11%) than the other context types (between 3% and 4% of irrelevant triples) and more repeated triples (7% against 1% for the other types of context). This highlights the fact that to avoid repetitions and irrelevant turns, generation should be conditioned on a dialog context which includes not only questions but also their answers.

Finally, we see that the ratio of generated out-of-scope and noisy triples is low for all models (0 to 2%) and for all numbers of added distractors triples<sup>6</sup>. This indicates that the model can correctly discriminate between relevant and irrelevant triples even when these triples have similarities (shared entity type or property) with relevant ones.

**Triple/Question Similarity** Given that most predicted triples are relevant, if most questions

<sup>6</sup>While we do not give the detailed breakdown here because of space restrictions, we found that  $K_1^+$ ,  $K_2^+$  or  $K_3^+$  yield a similar number of mistakes.



match those predicted triples, we can deduce that most generated questions are likely to be relevant. To compute the similarity between a generated question and verbalizations of the triple it was conditioned on at inference time, we use Google BLEU against multiple references drawing on the fact that, on average, KGCONV has 12 references per triple (Johnson et al., 2017).

The results are shown in Table 4. We find that the average G-BLEU score is high (from 0.73 to 0.76) across the board. Such high G-BLEU scores indicate a good match between generated triples and questions suggesting that the generated questions are well-formed relevant questions overall.

## 6.2 Pronouns

Dialogs typically include pronouns. As in our approach, the generated question is grounded in a fact, we can analyse both whether a pronoun gender matches its referent (the subject entity in the fact the question is conditioned on) and whether its antecedent is easy to identify or in other words, whether the pronoun is ambiguous<sup>7</sup>. We do this as follows.

- **Gender.** For each entity in our dataset, we retrieve its Wikidata ‘sex or gender’ object if any. We classify the retrieved genders into three main categories: feminine, masculine, and other genders (which contain different types of gender queer categories). For the ‘other genders’ category, we accept all pronouns as correct pronouns. If an entity does not have any ‘sex or gender’ property we consider it as a neutral entity. To assess whether a pronoun in a generated question has the correct gender, we check whether this gender (either feminine, masculine, neutral, or other gender) is the same as the gender of its referent, i.e. the subject entity of the triple the question is conditioned on.
- **Ambiguity** We say that a pronoun with gender  $g$  is ambiguous if the last entity of gender  $g$  mentioned in the dialog context is not the referent of that pronoun. Figure 1 shows an example. While the referent of the masculine pronoun occurring in the generated question is "William Herschel", the last entity of masculine gender mentioned in the dialog is "Nevil Maskelyne". We approximate the number of ambiguous pronouns using the following two heuristics. First, we consider that any pronoun occurring in a null dialog context is ambiguous (since it cannot corefer with a previously mentioned entity). Second, we count as

ambiguous any pronoun in a generated question whose referent is different from the entity of the same gender last mentioned in the dialog.

The results of the pronoun evaluation are given in Table 5. We observe a good ratio of questions containing pronouns (between 8 and 13% of the test examples) and a good diversity of the triples giving rise to such questions (about 25% of the dataset triples lead to the generation of a question containing a pronoun). Interestingly, while contexts that contain natural language questions have a similar ratio of questions with pronouns, the  $D_{kl}$  context, which only consists of triples, induces a much higher rate of pronouns.

Focusing on gender first, we observe a strong bias for masculine pronouns and correspondingly a higher error rate (62%) for feminine pronouns when the context is text only. A possible explanation is that, as they are fewer feminine pronouns in the data, the model tends to over-generate masculine pronouns thereby leading to a gender mismatch with the target entity. Thus while the overall proportion of pronouns with incorrect gender is low (ranging from 3% to 4%), this is likely mainly due to a gender bias.

Regarding ambiguity, we find that the proportion of ambiguous pronouns is quite high, ranging between 29% and 36% and suggesting that referring expression generation in dialog is not yet a solved problem. As our counts are based on a heuristics however, a human evaluation would be needed to verify that cases that are deemed ambiguous by these heuristics are not in fact lifted by common sense knowledge. For instance, in the sentence "I hit the window with a stone and it broke", we understand the pronoun "it" as referring to "the window" even though "the window" is not the closest entity of neutral gender.

## 6.3 Comparison with the Question-Only QG Model

We aim to determine whether the added explainability supported by our Extended QG model comes at the cost of a performance decline.

**Automatic Evaluation** Multiple automatic metrics can be used to evaluate the output of a generation model. Since our test set is large (313K instances) and the KGCONV dataset makes available a large number of references for each dialog turn (12 on average), we choose to use Google BLEU which is fast to compute and gives reasonably reliable results when multiple references are available. Specifically, we compute the G-BLEU score between the generated question and the set of references containing the verbalizations of a correct triple (i.e., a triple in the input RDF graph

<sup>7</sup>We limit our analysis to third-person pronouns and ignore first and second-person pronouns, which are usually rhetorical.

Dialog Context	T: (NGC 2539, discoverer or inventor, William Herschel) Q: Who found NGC 2423? A: William Herschel
	T: (NGC 2539, constellation, Puppis) Q: What is the name of the constellation which NGC 2423 belongs? A: Puppis
	T: (William Herschel, student of, Nevil Maskelyne) Q: What was the name of Herschel’s teacher? A: Nevil Maskelyne
Last feminine entity	-
Last masculine entity	Nevil Maskelyne
Last neutral entity	Puppis
Generated Question	where was he buried?
Generated Triple	(William Herschel, place of burial, Westminster Abbey)
Pronoun	he
Pronoun Antecedent	William Herschel
Gender of the pronoun’s antecedent	masculine

Figure 1: **Example of Gender Ambiguous Pronoun:** The pronoun denotes a male entity (William Herschel) which is different from the last mentioned male entity (Nevil Maskelyne).

Context Type	$D_{QA_{nl}}$	$D_{Q_{nl}}$	$D_{kl}$	$D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$
questions with a pronoun	9%	8%	13%	8%
“he”	53%	47%	54%	52%
“it”	32%	35%	34%	35%
“him”	7%	10%	8%	7%
“she”	8%	7%	3%	6%
“her”	<1%	1%	4%	<1%
pronouns with gender mistakes	5%	5%	3%	4%
“he”	29%	44%	68%	52 %%
“she”	62 %	39%	18%	34%
“him”	4 %	9 %	9 %	8%
“her”	3%	5 %	2 %	2%
“it”	2%	3%	3 %	4 %
ambiguous pronouns	30%	36%	34%	29%
“it”	64%	67%	76%	66%
“he”	18%	19%	15%	21%
“she”	14%	9%	4%	9%
“him”	3%	4%	4%	3%
“her”	1%	1%	1%	1%
pronominalized distinct triples	22%	19%	24%	19%

Table 5: Results of the pronouns evaluation.

but not in the dialog context). We then select the maximum G-BLEU score found.

On the test set (313,474 instances), the mean G-BLEU score of the Question-Only QG model is 0,50 against 0.52 for our model. The difference is statistically significant (t-test with  $p < 0.01$ ) suggesting a better overall performance for our model.

**Human Evaluation** We perform a human evaluation on 300 dialog contexts randomly selected among the person, historical event, food, ideology or country categories, as these are the easiest categories to assess without specific background knowledge. We select 60 dialog contexts of each length

from one to five in order to have some diversity in dialog lengths and keep the annotation task reasonably simple.

Using the Amazon Mechanical Turk platform, we recruited 5 annotators who have the Amazon Mechanical Turk “Master Qualification”, i.e. who consistently submitted high-quality results in the past. We paid 0.18\$ for dialogs of lengths 1 or 2, 0.27\$ for dialogs of lengths 3 and 4 and 0.63\$ for dialogs of length 5. The total cost of the 1,500 annotations (300 dialogs by five annotators) was 448\$.

The annotators were showed with each dialog, the question generated by each of the two models (randomly labeled as questions A and B for the different dialogs). We ask the 5 annotators to evaluate the question generated by each model along three criteria: (1) fluency, (2) whether the generated question is a repetition of information present in the dialog context, and (3) the coherence of each of the generated questions with the dialog context. Fluency and repetition are evaluated on a binary scale (yes, no), coherence on a ternary scale (high, medium, low). We then use a majority vote among annotators to determine the final annotation of each question and compute the ratio of cases for which each model is assessed to be fluent, non repetitive and coherent.

We compute Cohen’s kappa and the observed agreement (i.e. the proportion of examples for which annotators agree) between each pair of annotators. We report the mean in Table 6. The relatively low Cohen’s kappa and high observed agreement are likely due to the fact that our data is skewed as both the Extended and the Question Only QG model perform on average very well regarding the 3 evaluation criteria.

	Cohen’s $\kappa$	Obs. Agr.
fluency (QO)	0,18	0,93
fluency (M)	0,19	0,91
repetition (QO)	0,31	0,87
repetition (M)	0,26	0,84
coherence (QO)	0,15	0,67
coherence (M)	0,16	0,65

Table 6: Evaluation of the inter-annotator agreement for the human evaluation (QO: Question-Only QG model, M: Extended QG model).

The human evaluation shows similar results for the Question Only QG model and for our model with 93% of the generated questions judged fluent by the annotators for the Question Only QG model vs. 91% for our model. 87% of the Question Only QG model output was judged non-repetitive for the Question Only QG model vs. 84% for our model. 67% of the generated questions was considered coherent with the dialog context for our model against 65% for the Question Only QG model. Although generating a triple and a question does not seem to improve the quality of the generation, it does not degrade the quality either.

## 7 Ablation study

We use ablation to assess the respective impact of the input knowledge graph and the dialog context on dialog coherence. We train and test the same model as in Section 5 with the exact same data, ablating either the input knowledge graph or the dialog context from the input.

**Ablating the Input Knowledge Graph.** We hypothesise that by conditioning question generation not only on the dialog context but also on a knowledge graph  $K$  helps learn a dialog model which produces coherent sequences of questions. To quantitatively assess the impact of this added input on dialog coherence, we ablate  $K_D$  and examine the triples generated by the ablated model. The results are shown in Table 7. Depending on the context type between 91% and 92% of generated triples are incorrect. Almost all of them (between 81 % and 84% of the generated triples) are hallucinated triples not belonging to the set of KGCONV triples, a large set of 132K Wikidata triples. We further investigate for the  $D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$  context what these hallucinated triples contain. In most of the hallucination cases (81%), even though the triple is not in  $\mathcal{K}_{KGCONV}$ , the subject, the property and the object are in  $\mathcal{K}_{KGCONV}$ . This means that entities and properties from  $\mathcal{K}_{KGCONV}$  are rearranged into non existing Wikidata triples (examples are given in Figure 2).

**Ablating the Context D.** Unsurprisingly, ablating the dialog context (Table 8) drastically re-

<b>With subject, property and object in <math>\mathcal{K}_{KGCONV}</math></b> (Milky Way, located in the administrative territorial entity, New York City) (Nicolas Louis de Lacaille, place of birth, Paris)
<b>With object not in <math>\mathcal{K}_{KGCONV}</math></b> (Armand David, inv. founded by, Yvonne-Altas) (LC3:PE [autophagosome membrane], encoded by, CL3PE)

Figure 2: Examples of triples generated when ablating RDF graph  $K$ .

Context Type	$D_{QA_{nl}}$	$D_{Q_{nl}}$	$D_{kl}$	$D_{QA_{nl}+kl}$
# Test examples	323k	302k	323k	323k
Incorrect triple	92%	92%	91%	91%
Repetition	2%	1%	2%	1%
Triple not in KGCONV	84%	81%	83%	82%
Subject not in KGCONV	13%	28%	17%	15%
Property not in KGCONV	14%	33%	17%	16%
Object not in KGCONV	13%	29%	17%	15%

Table 7: Ablation of RDF graph  $K$ , Results of triple evaluation.

duces the proportion of correct triples (51%) and increases the ratio of repetitions (46%).

Question

	#	%
# test examples	323765	
Correct triples	166716	51
Exact match with target	36474	11
Other triple from input RDF	130242	40
Incorrect triples	157049	49
Repetitions	149363	46
Out-of-scope (entity) triples	327	0
Out-of-scope (property) triples	8713	3
Noise triples generated	0	0
Ill-formed triples	182	0
Triples with a property not in KGCONV	6989	2

Table 8: Ablation of context  $D$ , results of triple evaluation.

## 8 Related Work

We review some of the approaches used to evaluate the quality of automatically generated dialogs.

### Automatic Dialog Coherence Evaluation.

Various approaches have been proposed to help assess the coherence of a dialog response with the dialog context and/or with a reference turn. Dziri et al. (2019) measure dialog coherence based on Natural Language Inference (NLI) calculating whether the dialog context entails, contradicts or is neutral with the generated dialog response. Lowe et al. (2017) propose the ADEM metric for response evaluation in dialogs which uses both the context and response references. Similarly, the

RUBER metric proposed by [Tao et al. \(2017\)](#) blends reference and reference-less evaluation approaches, by using evaluating generated turn with respect to both a reference and the input query. More recently, [\(Huang et al., 2020\)](#) constructs graphs of the dialog topics and computes a coherence score based on that graph.

Different from these approaches, we propose an explanation by design architecture which allows for a detailed analysis of the model behaviour.

### Human Dialog Coherence Evaluation.

Another direction that has been extensively pursued to better analyse the behaviour of dialog models, is the design of human evaluation protocols.

For the human evaluation of their knowledge-grounded conversation generation, [Zhou et al. \(2021\)](#) use two criteria, appropriateness and informativeness (which were originally proposed by [Zhou et al. \(2018\)](#)). Appropriateness measures whether the grammar, topic and logic of the response is correct in the conversation context and informativeness whether it mentions some new information compared to the context. In Wizards of Wikipedia, [Dinan et al. \(2019\)](#) propose a dialog generation model able to retrieve information from a knowledge base. For its human evaluation they use engagingness which they found to increase when the model provides more new knowledge. Engagingness is not directly and exclusively a measure of coherence but can be expected to drop significantly if the model includes a lot of repetitions or jumps illogically from one topic to another. Some papers use a human evaluation criteria which is specific to the coherence of the generated dialog. For instance, [Gu et al. \(2021\)](#) use “answer consistency” and ask annotators if the questions and answers are consistent. [Shen et al. \(2021\)](#) simply use a “coherence” criterion and ask annotators if the generated question is coherent with the input data (in their case a text).

While we resort to human evaluation to compare our model with a Question-Only model, the core intuition underlying our approach is that evaluation can be facilitated by the model architecture (in our case an alternative decoding strategy), thereby reducing the need for human evaluation.

## 9 Conclusion and Future work

Evaluation is a long outstanding issue in dialog modeling. Given the many ways in which a dialog context can be extended, how can we provide reference-less metrics to assess the well-formedness of the model output ?

In this work, we show that in a conversational setting where each dialog turn is grounded in knowledge, we can draw on the close intertwining of facts and natural language to design a model

which permits such assessment. The key underlying idea is that by analysing both the predicted triples and the relation between predicted triple and predicted question, we can have a detailed analysis of the model behaviour.

We illustrate the workings of our model by training it on the KGCONV dataset, considering various types of context (questions, question-answer pairs, facts, facts and question-answer pairs), analysing the impact of these contexts on dialog quality and comparing its performance with a question-only generation model. We find that conditioning generation on both questions and answers or on the corresponding triples is crucial to maintain coherence; that coreferences are generally better handled when the context includes KB facts; and that pronouns are often ambiguous. We compare our model with a standard, black box, end-to-end QG model and find that while more transparent, our model performs on par with this standard model. Our ablation study further shows that conditioning question generation on both dialog context and a knowledge graph drastically improves coherence.

In future work, it would be interesting to investigate how the approach generalises to knowledge-based dialog datasets such as CSQA ([Liu, 2021](#)) which includes more complex questions; and to explore ways of mitigating pronoun ambiguity.

## 10 Bibliographical References

### References

- Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Bénézet, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado González, Salvador García, Sergio Gil-Lopez, Daniel Molina, V. Richard Benjamins, Raja Chatila, and Francisco Herrera. 2019. [Explainable artificial intelligence \(xai\): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai](#). *Information Fusion*, 58.
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2018. Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01241*.
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. Wizard of Wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Nouha Dziri, Ehsan Kamalloo, Kory Mathewson, and Osmar Zaiane. 2019. [Evaluating coherence in dialogue systems using entailment](#). 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 3806–3812, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nouha Dziri, Hannah Rashkin, Tal Linzen, and David Reitter. 2022. [Evaluating attribution in dialogue systems: The BEGIN benchmark](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:1066–1083.
- Angela Fan and Claire Gardent. 2022. [Generating biographies on Wikipedia: The impact of gender bias on the retrieval-based generation of women biographies](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8561–8576, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jing Gu, Mostafa Mirshekari, Zhou Yu, and Aaron Sisto. 2021. [ChainCQG: Flow-aware conversational question generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2061–2070, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sangdo Han, Jeesoo Bang, Seonghan Ryu, and Gary Geunbae Lee. 2015. [Exploiting knowledge base to generate responses for natural language dialog listening agents](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 129–133, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lishan Huang, Zheng Ye, Jinghui Qin, Liang Lin, and Xiaodan Liang. 2020. [GRADE: Automatic graph-enhanced coherence metric for evaluating open-domain dialogue systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9230–9240, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Melvin Johnson, Mike Schuster, Quoc V. Le, Maxim Krikun, Yonghui Wu, Zhifeng Chen, Nikhil Thorat, Fernanda Viégas, Martin Wattenberg, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2017. [Google’s multilingual neural machine translation system: Enabling zero-shot translation](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:339–351.
- Yuanmin Leng, François Portet, Cyril Labbé, and Raheel Qader. 2020. [Controllable neural natural language generation: comparison of state-of-the-art control strategies](#). In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Natural Language Generation from the Semantic Web (WebNLG+)*, pages 34–39, Dublin, Ireland (Virtual). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei Li, Wenhao Wu, Moye Chen, Jiachen Liu, Xinyan Xiao, and Hua Wu. 2022. [Faithfulness in natural language generation: A systematic survey of analysis, evaluation and optimization methods](#).
- Tianyu Liu, Xin Zheng, Baobao Chang, and Zhi-fang Sui. 2021. [Towards faithfulness in open domain table-to-text generation from an entity-centric view](#).
- Yi Liu. 2021. [A corpus-based lexical semantic study of Mandarin verbs of zhidao and liaojie](#). In *Proceedings of the 35th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, pages 646–651, Shanghai, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhibin Liu, Zheng-Yu Niu, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2019. [Knowledge aware conversation generation with explainable reasoning over augmented graphs](#). 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 1782–1792, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ryan Lowe, Michael Noseworthy, Iulian Vlad Serban, Nicolas Angelard-Gontier, Yoshua Bengio, and Joelle Pineau. 2017. [Towards an automatic Turing test: Learning to evaluate dialogue responses](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1116–1126, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seungwhan Moon, Pararth Shah, Anuj Kumar, and Rajen Subba. 2019. [OpenDialogKG: Explainable conversational reasoning with attention-based walks over knowledge graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 845–854, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amit Moryossef, Yoav Goldberg, and Ido Dagan. 2019a. [Improving quality and efficiency in plan-based neural data-to-text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 377–382, Tokyo, Japan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amit Moryossef, Yoav Goldberg, and Ido Dagan. 2019b. [Step-by-step: Separating planning from realization in neural data-to-text generation](#). 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 2267–2277, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shashi Narayan, Gonçalo Simões, Yao Zhao, Joshua Maynez, Dipanjan Das, Michael Collins, and Mirella Lapata. 2022. [A well-composed](#)

- text is half done! composition sampling for diverse conditional generation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1319–1339, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shashi Narayan, Yao Zhao, Joshua Maynez, Gonalo Simoes, Vitaly Nikolaev, and Ryan McDonald. 2021. [Planning with learned entity prompts for abstractive summarization](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1475–1492.
- Laura Perez-Beltrachini, Parag Jain, Emilio Monti, and Mirella Lapata. 2023. [Semantic parsing for conversational question answering over knowledge graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2507–2522, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Shen, Fandong Meng, Jinchao Zhang, Yang Feng, and Jie Zhou. 2021. [GTM: A generative triple-wise model for conversational question generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3495–3506, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haitian Sun, Bhuwan Dhingra, Manzil Zaheer, Kathryn Mazaitis, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William Cohen. 2018. [Open domain question answering using early fusion of knowledge bases and text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4231–4242, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Barkavi Sundararajan, Somayajulu Sripada, and Ehud Reiter. 2022. [Error analysis of ToTTo table-to-text neural NLG models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Natural Language Generation, Evaluation, and Metrics (GEM)*, pages 456–470, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chongyang Tao, Lili Mou, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2017. [Ruber: An unsupervised method for automatic evaluation of open-domain dialog systems](#).
- Craig Thomson and Ehud Reiter. 2020. [A gold standard methodology for evaluating accuracy in data-to-text systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 158–168, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emiel van Miltenburg, Miruna Clinciu, Ondřej Dušek, Dimitra Gkatzia, Stephanie Inglis, Leo Leppänen, Saad Mahamood, Emma Manning, Stephanie Schoch, Craig Thomson, and Luou Wen. 2021. [Underreporting of errors in NLG output, and what to do about it](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 140–153, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheng Ye, Liucun Lu, Lishan Huang, Liang Lin, and Xiaodan Liang. 2021. [Towards quantifiable dialogue coherence evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2718–2729, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hao Zhou, Minlie Huang, Yong Liu, Wei Chen, and Xiaoyan Zhu. 2021. [EARL: Informative knowledge-grounded conversation generation with entity-agnostic representation learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2395, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hao Zhou, Tom Young, Minlie Huang, Haizhou Zhao, Jingfang Xu, and Xiaoyan Zhu. 2018. Commonsense knowledge aware conversation generation with graph attention. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’18*, page 4623–4629. AAAI Press.