Abstract

Semantic parsing converts natural language queries into structured logical forms. The paucity of annotated training samples is a fundamental challenge in this field. In this work, we develop a semantic parsing framework with the dual learning algorithm, which enables a semantic parser to make full use of data (labeled and even unlabeled) through a dual-learning game. This game between a primal model (semantic parsing) and a dual model (logical form to query) forces them to regularize each other, and can achieve feedback signals from some prior-knowledge. By utilizing the prior-knowledge of logical form structures, we propose a novel reward signal at the surface and semantic levels which tends to generate complete and reasonable logical forms. Experimental results show that our approach achieves new state-of-the-art performance on ATIS dataset and gets competitive performance on O\textsc{vernig}ht dataset.

1 Introduction

Semantic parsing is the task of mapping a natural language query into a logical form (Zelle and Mooney, 1996; Wong and Mooney, 2007; Zettlemoyer and Collins, 2007; Lu et al., 2008; Zettlemoyer and Collins, 2005). A logical form is one type of meaning representation understood by computers, which usually can be executed by an executor to obtain the answers.

The successful application of recurrent neural networks (RNN) in a variety of NLP tasks (Bahdanau et al., 2014; Sutskever et al., 2014; Vinyals et al., 2015) has provided strong impetus to treat semantic parsing as a sequence-to-sequence (Seq2seq) problem (Jia and Liang, 2016; Dong and Lapata, 2016). This approach generates a logical form based on the input query in an end-to-end manner but still leaves two main issues: (1) lack of labeled data and (2) constrained decoding.

Firstly, semantic parsing relies on sufficient labeled data. However, data annotation of semantic parsing is a labor-intensive and time-consuming task. Especially, the logical form is unfriendly for human annotation.

Secondly, unlike natural language sentences, a logical form is strictly structured. For example, the lambda expression of “show flight from ci0 to ci1” is \((\lambda 0 \ e \ (\text{and} \ (\text{from} \ 0 \ ci0) \ (\text{to} \ 0 \ ci1) \ (\text{flight} \ 0 \)))\). If we make no constraint on decoding, the generated logical form may be invalid or incomplete at surface and semantic levels.

Surface The generated sequence should be structured as a complete logical form. For example, left and right parentheses should be matched to force the generated sequence to be a valid tree.

Semantic Although the generated sequence is a legal logical form at surface level, it may be meaningless or semantically ill-formed. For example, the predefined binary predicate from takes no more than two arguments. The first argument must represent a flight and the second argument should be a city.

To avoid producing incomplete or semantically ill-formed logical forms, the output space must be constrained.

In this paper, we introduce a semantic parsing framework (see Figure 1) by incorporating dual learning (He et al., 2016) to tackle the problems mentioned above. In this framework, we have a primal task (query to logical form) and a dual task (logical form to query). They can form a closed loop, and generate informative feedback signals to...
train the primal and dual models even without supervision. In this loop, the primal and dual models restrict or regularize each other by generating intermediate output in one model and then checking it in the other. Actually, it can be viewed as a method of data augmentation. Thus it can leverage unlabeled data (queries or synthesized logical forms) in a more effective way which helps alleviate the problem of lack of annotated data.

In the dual learning framework, the primal and dual models are represented as two agents and they teach each other through a reinforcement learning process. To force the generated logical form complete and well-formed, we newly propose a validity reward by checking the output of the primal model at the surface and semantic levels.

We evaluate our approach on two standard datasets: ATIS and OVERNIGHT. The results show that our method can obtain significant improvements over strong baselines on both datasets with fully labeled data, and even outperforms state-of-the-art results on ATIS. With additional improvements over strong baselines on both datasets: ATIS and OVERNIGHT, our method is competitive with state-of-the-art systems on O\textsc{overnight}. Furthermore, we conduct extensive experiments to further investigate our framework in semi-supervised settings, trying to figure out why it works.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- An innovative semantic parsing framework based on dual learning is introduced, which can fully exploit data (labeled or unlabeled) and incorporate various prior-knowledge as feedback signals. We are the first to introduce dual learning in semantic parsing to the best of our knowledge.
- We further propose a novel validity reward focusing on the surface and semantics of logical forms, which is a feedback signal indicating whether the generated logical form is well-formed. It involves the prior-knowledge about structures of logical forms predefined in a domain.
- We conduct extensive experiments on ATIS and \textsc{overnight} benchmarks. The results show that our method achieves new state-of-the-art performance (test accuracy 89.1%) on ATIS dataset and gets competitive performance on \textsc{overnight} dataset.

2 Primal and Dual Tasks of Semantic Parsing

Before discussing the dual learning algorithm for semantic parsing, we first present the primal and dual tasks (as mentioned before) in detail. The primal and dual tasks are modeled on the attention-based Encoder-Decoder architectures (i.e. Seq2seq) which have been successfully applied in neural semantic parsing (Jia and Liang, 2016; Dong and Lapata, 2016). We also include copy mechanism (Gulcehre et al., 2016; See et al., 2017) to tackle unknown tokens.

2.1 Primal Task

The primal task is semantic parsing which converts queries into logical forms (Q2LF). Let \( x = x_1 \cdots x_{|x|} \) denote the query, and \( y = y_1 \cdots y_{|y|} \) denote the logical form. An encoder is exploited to encode the query \( x \) into vector representations, and a decoder learns to generate logical form \( y \) depending on the encoding vectors.

Encoder Each word \( x_i \) is mapped to a fixed-dimensional vector by a word embedding function \( \psi(\cdot) \) and then fed into a bidirectional LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997). The hidden vectors are recursively computed at the \( i \)-th time step via:

\[
\overrightarrow{h}_i = f_{\text{LSTM}}(\psi(x_i), \overrightarrow{h}_{i-1}), i = 1, \ldots, |x| \tag{1}
\]

\[
\overleftarrow{h}_i = f_{\text{LSTM}}(\psi(x_i), \overleftarrow{h}_{i+1}), i = |x|, \ldots, 1 \tag{2}
\]

\[
h_i = [\overrightarrow{h}_i; \overleftarrow{h}_i] \tag{3}
\]

where \([\cdot;\cdot]\) denotes vector concatenation, \( h_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \), \( n \) is the number of hidden cells and \( f_{\text{LSTM}} \) is the LSTM function.

Decoder Decoder is an unidirectional LSTM with the attention mechanism (Luong et al., 2015). The hidden vector at the \( t \)-th time step is computed by \( s_t = f_{\text{LSTM}}(\phi(y_{t-1}), s_{t-1}) \), where \( \phi(\cdot) \) is the token embedding function for logical forms and \( s_t \in \mathbb{R}^n \). The hidden vector of the first time step is initialized as \( s_0 = \overrightarrow{h}_1 \). The attention weight for the current step \( t \) of the decoder, with the \( i \)-th step in the encoder is \( a_i^t = \frac{\exp(u_i^t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \exp(u_j^t)} \) and

\[
u_i^t = \mathbf{v}^T \tanh(\mathbf{W}_1 h_i + \mathbf{W}_2 s_t + \mathbf{b}_u) \tag{4}
\]
At each step, make a soft decision between generation and copy. If copy is chosen, the output words are from either a fixed output vocabulary \( V \). The predicted token between \( \text{Nallapati et al. (2016)} \) and pointer network implementation of \( \text{See et al. (2017)} \), a hybrid mechanism to improve model generalization following \( \text{Gulcehre et al., 2016} \). The predicted token is \( \text{end-of-sequence token “EOS” is emitted}. \)

We also include copy mechanism to improve model generalization following the implementation of \( \text{See et al. (2017)} \), a hybrid between \( \text{Nallapati et al. (2016)} \) and pointer network (Gulcehre et al., 2016). The predicted token is from either a fixed output vocabulary \( V_y \) or raw input words \( x \). We use sigmoid gate function \( \sigma \) to make a soft decision between generation and copy at each step \( t \).

\[
g_t = \sigma(v_y^T [s_t; c_t; \phi(y_{t-1})] + b_g) \quad (7)
\]

\[
P(y_t|y_{<t}, x) = g_t P_{gen}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) + (1 - g_t) P_{copy}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \quad (8)
\]

where \( g_t \in [0, 1] \) is the balance score, \( v_y \) is a weight vector and \( b_g \) is a scalar bias. Distribution \( P_{copy}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \) will be described as follows.  

**Copy Mechanism** We also include copy mechanism to improve model generalization following the implementation of \( \text{See et al. (2017)} \), a hybrid between \( \text{Nallapati et al. (2016)} \) and pointer network (Gulcehre et al., 2016). The predicted token is from either a fixed output vocabulary \( V_y \) or raw input words \( x \). We use sigmoid gate function \( \sigma \) to make a soft decision between generation and copy at each step \( t \).

\[
g_t = \sigma(v_y^T [s_t; c_t; \phi(y_{t-1})] + b_g) \quad (7)
\]

\[
P(y_t|y_{<t}, x) = g_t P_{gen}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) + (1 - g_t) P_{copy}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \quad (8)
\]

where \( g_t \in [0, 1] \) is the balance score, \( v_y \) is a weight vector and \( b_g \) is a scalar bias. Distribution \( P_{copy}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \) will be described as follows.  

**Entity Mapping** Although the copy mechanism can deal with unknown words, many raw words can not be directly copied to be part of a logical form. For example, \( \text{kobe bryant} \) is represented as \( \text{en.player.kobe_bryant} \) in \( \text{OVERNIGHT (Wang et al., 2015)} \). It is common that entities are identified by Uniform Resource Identifier (URI, Klyne and Carroll, 2006) in a knowledge base. Thus, a mapping from raw words to URI is included after copying. Mathematically, \( P_{copy} \) in (8) is calculated by:

\[
P_{copy}(y_t = w|y_{<t}, x) = \sum_{i,j: KB(x_i) = w} \sum_{k=i}^j a_k^i
\]

where \( i < j \), \( a_k^i \) is the attention weight of position \( k \) at decoding step \( t \), \( KB(\cdot) \) is a dictionary-like function mapping a specific noun phrase to the corresponding entity token in the vocabulary of logical forms.

**2.2 Dual Model**

The dual task \( LF2Q \) is an inverse of the primal task, which aims to generate a natural language query given a logical form. We can also exploit the attention-based Encoder-Decoder architecture (with copy mechanism or not) to build the dual model.

**Reverse Entity Mapping** Different with the primal task, we reversely map every possible KB entity \( y_t \) of a logical form to the corresponding noun phrase before query generation, \( KB^{-1}(y_t) \).

Since each KB entity may have multiple aliases in the real world, e.g. \( \text{kobe bryant} \) has a nickname \( \text{the black mamba} \), we make different selections in two cases:

- For paired data, we select the noun phrase from \( KB^{-1}(y_t) \), which exists in the query.
- For unpaired data, we randomly select one from \( KB^{-1}(y_t) \).

\( KB^{-1}(\cdot) \) is the inverse operation of \( KB(\cdot) \), which returns the set of all corresponding noun phrases given a KB entity.
3 Dual learning for Semantic Parsing

In this section, we present a semantic parsing framework with dual learning. We use one agent to represent the model of the primal task ($Q_{2LF}$) and another agent to represent the model of the dual task ($LF_{2Q}$), then design a two-agent game in a closed loop which can provide quality feedback to the primal and dual models even if only queries or logical forms are available. As the feedback reward may be non-differentiable, reinforcement learning algorithm (Sutton and Barto, 2018) based on policy gradient (Sutton et al., 2000) is applied for optimization.

Two agents, $Q_{2LF}$ and $LF_{2Q}$, participate in the collaborative game with two directed loops as illustrated in Figure 1. One loop starts from a query, generates possible logical forms by agent $Q_{2LF}$ and tries to reconstruct the original query by $LF_{2Q}$. The other loop starts from the opposite side. Each agent will obtain quality feedback depending on reward functions defined in the directed loops.

3.1 Learning algorithm

Suppose we have fully labeled dataset $T = \{(x, y)\}$, unlabeled dataset $Q$ with only queries if available, and unlabeled dataset $LF$ with only logical forms if available. We firstly pre-train the primal model $Q_{2LF}$ and the dual model $LF_{2Q}$ on $T$ by maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). Let $\Theta_{Q_{2LF}}$ and $\Theta_{LF_{2Q}}$ denote all the parameters of $Q_{2LF}$ and $LF_{2Q}$ respectively. Our learning algorithm in each iteration consists of three parts:

3.1.1 Loop starts from a query

As shown in Figure 1 (a), we sample a query $x$ from $Q \cup T$ randomly. Given $x$, $Q_{2LF}$ model could generate $k$ possible logical forms $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k$ via beam search ($k$ is beam size). For each $y_i$, we can obtain a validity reward $R^{val}_q(y_i)$ (a scalar) computed by a specific reward function which will be discussed in Section 3.2.1. After feeding $y_i$ into $LF_{2Q}$, we finally get a reconstruction reward $R^{rec}_q(x, y_i)$ which forces the generated query as similar to $x$ as possible and will be discussed in Section 3.2.2.

A hyper-parameter $\alpha$ is exploited to balance these two rewards in $r^I_i = \alpha R^{val}_q(y_i) + (1 - \alpha) R^{rec}_q(x, y_i)$, where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

By utilizing policy gradient (Sutton et al., 2000), the stochastic gradients of $\Theta_{Q_{2LF}}$ and $\Theta_{LF_{2Q}}$ are computed as:

$$\nabla \theta_{Q_{2LF}} E[r] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} r^I_i \nabla \theta_{Q_{2LF}} \log P(y_i|x; \Theta_{Q_{2LF}})$$

$$\nabla \theta_{LF_{2Q}} E[r] = \frac{1 - \alpha}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \nabla \theta_{LF_{2Q}} \log P(x|y_i; \Theta_{LF_{2Q}})$$

3.1.2 Loop starts from a logical form

As shown in Figure 1 (b), we sample a logical form $y$ from $LF \cup T$ randomly. Given $y$, $LF_{2Q}$ model generates $k$ possible queries $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k$ via beam search. For each $x_i$, we can obtain a validity reward $R^{val}_{lf}(x_i)$ (a scalar) which will also be discussed in Section 3.2.1. After feeding $x_i$ into $Q_{2LF}$, we can also get a reconstruction reward $R^{rec}_{lf}(y, x_i)$, which forces the generated logical form as similar to $y$ as possible and will be discussed in Section 3.2.2.

A hyper-parameter $\beta$ is also exploited to balance these two rewards by $r^I_i = \beta R^{val}_{lf}(x_i) + (1 - \beta) R^{rec}_{lf}(y, x_i)$, where $\beta \in [0, 1]$.

By utilizing policy gradient, the stochastic gradients of $\Theta_{Q_{2LF}}$ and $\Theta_{LF_{2Q}}$ are computed as:

$$\nabla \theta_{Q_{2LF}} E[r] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} r^I_i \nabla \theta_{Q_{2LF}} \log P(y_i|x; \Theta_{Q_{2LF}})$$

$$\nabla \theta_{LF_{2Q}} E[r] = \frac{1 - \beta}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \nabla \theta_{LF_{2Q}} \log P(x|y_i; \Theta_{LF_{2Q}})$$

3.1.3 Supervisor guidance

The previous two stages are unsupervised learning processes, which need no labeled data. If there is no supervision for the primal and dual models after pre-training, these two models would be rotten especially when $T$ is limited.

To keep the learning process stable and prevent the models from crashes, we randomly select samples from $T$ to fine-tune the primal and dual models by maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). Details about the dual learning algorithm for semantic parsing are provided in Appendix A.

3.2 Reward design

As mentioned in Section 3.1, there are two types of reward functions in each loop: validity reward ($R^{val}_q$, $R^{val}_{lf}$) and reconstruction reward ($R^{rec}_q$, $R^{rec}_{lf}$). But each type of reward function may be different in different loops.
3.2.1 Validity reward

Validity reward is used to evaluate the quality of intermediate outputs in a loop (see Figure 1). In the loop starts from a query, it indicates whether the generated logical forms are well-formed at the surface and semantic levels. While in the loop starts from a logical form, it indicates how natural and fluent the intermediate queries are.

**Loop starts from a query:** We estimate the quality of the generated logical forms at two levels, i.e. surface and semantics. Firstly, we check whether the logical form is a complete tree without parentheses mismatching. As for semantics, we check whether the logical form is understandable without errors like type inconsistency. It can be formulated as

\[ R_{val}^q(y) = \text{grammar\_error\_indicator}(y) \]  

which returns 1 when \( y \) has no error at the surface and semantic levels, and returns 0 otherwise.

If there exists an executing program or search engine for logical form \( y \), e.g. dataset OVERNIGHT (Wang et al., 2015), \( \text{grammar\_error\_indicator}(\cdot) \) has been included.

Otherwise, we should construct a grammar error indicator based on the ontology of the corresponding dataset. For example, a specification of ATIS can be extracted by clarifying all (1) entities paired with corresponding types, (2) unary/binary predicates with argument constraints (see Table 1). Accordingly, Algorithm 1 abstracts the procedure of checking the surface and semantics for a logical form candidate \( y \) based on the specification.

**Algorithm 1 Grammar error indicator on ATIS**

**Input:** Logical form string \( y \); specification \( D \)

**Output:** 1/0, whether \( y \) is valid

1: \textbf{if} to\_lisp\_tree\( (y) \) succeed \textbf{then}
2: \hspace{1em} \text{lispTree} \leftarrow \text{to\_lisp\_tree}\( (y) \)
3: \hspace{1em} \triangleright \text{using Depth-First-Search for lispTree}
4: \hspace{1em} \textbf{if} type\_consistent\( (\text{lispTree, D}) \) \textbf{then}
5: \hspace{2em} \text{return} 1
6: \hspace{1em} \textbf{end if}
7: \hspace{1em} \textbf{end if}
8: \hspace{1em} \text{return} 0

apply length-normalization (Wu et al., 2016) to make a fair competition between short and long queries.

\[ R_{val}^q(x) = \log \frac{LM_q(x)}{\text{Length}(x)}, \]

where \( LM_q(\cdot) \) is a language model pre-trained on all the queries of \( Q \cup T \) (referred in Section 3.1).

3.2.2 Reconstruction reward

Reconstruction reward is used to estimate how similar the output of one loop is compared with the input. We take log likelihood as reconstruction rewards for the loop starts from a query and the loop starts from a logical form. Thus,

\[ R_{rec}^q(x, y_i) = \log P(x | y_i; Q \cup T) \]

\[ R_{rec}^lf(y, x_i) = \log P(y | x_i; \Theta_{2Q}) \]

where \( y_i \) and \( x_i \) are intermediate outputs.

4 Experiment

In this section, we evaluate our framework on the ATIS and OVERNIGHT datasets.

4.1 Dataset

**ATIS** We use the preprocessed version provided by Dong and Lapata (2018), where natural language queries are lowercased and stemmed with NLTK (Loper and Bird, 2002), and entity mentions are replaced by numbered markers. We also leverage an external lexicon that maps word phrases (e.g., first class) to entities (e.g., first:cl) like what Jia and Liang (2016) did.

**OVERNIGHT** It contains natural language paraphrases paired with logical forms across eight domains. We follow the traditional 80%/20% train/valid splits as Wang et al. (2015) to choose the best model during training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>entity</td>
<td></td>
<td>lunch:me, snack:me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al</td>
<td>delta:al, usair:al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pd</td>
<td>morning:pd, late:pd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>instances</th>
<th>args0</th>
<th>args1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unary</td>
<td>_city</td>
<td>ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_airport</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_oneway</td>
<td>flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binary</td>
<td>_from</td>
<td>flight</td>
<td>ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_services</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_during_day</td>
<td>flight</td>
<td>pd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A truncated specification for ATIS.
ATIS and OVERTIGHT never provide unlabeled queries. To test our method in semi-supervised learning, we keep a part of the training set as fully labeled data and leave the rest as unpaired queries and logical forms which simulate unlabeled data.

4.2 Synthesis of logical forms

Although there is no unlabeled query provided in most semantic parsing benchmarks, it should be easy to synthesize logical forms. Since a logical form is strictly structured and can be modified from the existing one or created from simple grammars, it is much cheaper than query collection. Our synthesized logical forms are public.

4.2.1 Modification based on ontology

On ATIS, we randomly sample a logical form from the training set, and select one entity or predicate for replacement according to the specification in Table 1. If the new logical form after replacement is valid and never seen, it is added to the unsupervised set. 4592 new logical forms are created for ATIS. An example is shown in Figure 2.

4.2.2 Generation based on grammar

Wang et al. (2015) proposed an underlying grammar to generate logical forms along with their corresponding canonical utterances on OVERTIGHT, which can be found in SEMPRE. We reorder the entity instances (e.g., ENTITYNP) of one type (e.g., TYPENP) in grammar files to generate new logical forms. We could include new entity instances if we want more unseen logical forms, but we didn’t do that actually. Finally, we get about 500 new logical forms for each domain on average. More examples can be found in Appendix B.

4.3 Experimental settings

4.3.1 Base models

We use 200 hidden units and 100-dimensional word vectors for all encoders and decoders of $Q^2LF$ and $LF^2Q$ models. The LSTMs used are in single-layer. Word embeddings on query side are initialized by Glove6B (Pennington et al., 2014). Out-of-vocabulary words are replaced with a special token $\langle unk \rangle$. Other parameters are initialized by uniformly sampling within the interval $[-0.2, 0.2]$. The language model used is also a single-layer LSTM with 200 hidden units and 100-dim word embedding layer.

4.3.2 Training and decoding

We individually pre-train $Q^2LF/LF^2Q$ models using only labeled data and language model $LM_q$ using both labeled and unlabeled queries. The language model is fixed for calculating reward. The hyper-parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are selected according to validation set (0.5 is used), and beam size $k$ is selected from $\{3, 5\}$. The batch size is selected from $\{10, 20\}$. We use optimizer Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with learning rate 0.001 for all experiments. Finally, we evaluate the primal model ($Q^2LF$, semantic parsing) and report test accuracy on each dataset.

4.4 Results and analysis

We perform a PSEUDO baseline following the setup in Sennrich et al. (2016) and Guo et al. (2018). The pre-trained $LF^2Q$ or $Q^2LF$ model is used to generate pseudo $\langle query, logical form \rangle$ pairs from unlabeled logical forms or unlabeled queries, which extends the training set. The pseudo-labeled data is used carefully with a discount factor (0.5) in loss function (Lee, 2013), when we train $Q^2LF$ by supervised training.

4.4.1 Main results

The results are illustrated in Table 2 and 3. ATT and ATTTPTR represent that the primal/dual models are attention-based Seq2seq and attention-based Seq2seq with copy mechanism respectively. We train models with the dual learning algorithm if DUAL is included, otherwise we only train the primal model by supervised training. $LF$ refers to the synthesized logical forms. PSEUDO uses the
Q as a data augmentation procedure, e.g., the other model. Actually, it can also be explained model sends informative signals to help regularize models can teach each other in dual learning: one can generate samples utilized by LF in Table 2 and 3. We think the QLF is considered. tively, the performances are improved further. We

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ATIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZC07 (Zettlemoyer and Collins, 2007)</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUBL (Kwiatkowski et al., 2011)</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSP++ (Poon, 2013)</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISP (Zhao and Huang, 2015)</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ2TREE (Dong and Lapata, 2016)</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN+SUPATT (Rabinovich et al., 2017)</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANX (Yin and Neubig, 2018)</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COARSE2Fine (Dong and Lapata, 2018)</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT + PSEUDO(LF)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT + DUAL</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT + DUAL + LF</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTPtr</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTPtr + PSEUDO(LF)</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTPtr + DUAL</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTPtr + DUAL + LF</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Test accuracies on ATIS compared with previous systems.

4LF2Q model and LF to generate pseudo-labeled data. From the overall results, we can see that:

1) Even without the additional logical forms by synthesizing, the dual learning based semantic parser can outperform our baselines with supervised training, e.g., “ATT + DUAL” gets much better performances than “ATT + PSEUDO(LF)” in Table 2 and 3. We think the Q2LF and LF2Q models can teach each other in dual learning: one model sends informative signals to help regularize the other model. Actually, it can also be explained as a data augmentation procedure, e.g., Q2LF can generate samples utilized by LF2Q and vice versa. While the PSEUDO greatly depends on the quality of pseudo-samples even if a discount factor is considered.

2) By involving the synthesized logical forms LF in the dual learning for each domain respectively, the performances are improved further. We achieve state-of-the-art performance (89.1%) on ATIS as shown in Table 3. On OVERNIGHT dataset, we achieve a competitive performance on average (80.2%). The best average accuracy is from Su and Yan (2017), which benefits from cross-domain training. We believe our method could get more improvements with stronger pri-

3) Copy mechanism can remarkably improve accuracy on ATIS, while not on OVERNIGHT. The average accuracy even decreases from 80.2% to 79.9% when using the copy mechanism. We argue that OVERNIGHT dataset contains a very small number of distinct entities that copy is not essential, and it contains less training samples than ATIS. This phenomenon also exists in Jia and Liang (2016).

4.4.2 Ablation study

Semi-supervised learning We keep a part of the training set as labeled data T randomly and leave the rest as unpaired queries (Q) and logical forms (LF) to validate our method in a semi-supervised setting. The ratio of labeled data is 50%. PSEUDO here uses the Q2LF model and Q to generate pseudo-labeled data, as well as LF2Q model and LF. From Table 4, we can see that the dual learning method outperforms the PSEUDO baseline in two datasets dramatically. The dual learning method is more efficient to exploit unlabeled data. In general, both unpaired queries and logi-

4Although there is another published result that achieved better performance by using word class information from Wiktionary (Wang et al., 2014), it is unfair to compare it with our results and other previous systems which only exploit data resources of ATIS.
Table 4: Semi-supervised learning experiments. We keep 50% of the training set as labeled data randomly, and leave the rest as unpaired queries (Q) and logical forms (LF) to simulate unsupervised dataset.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>ATIS</th>
<th>OVERNIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATIT</td>
<td>LMlf</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ DUAL</td>
<td>grammar check</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTPTR</td>
<td>LMlf</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ DUAL</td>
<td>grammar check</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Test accuracies on ATIS and OVERNIGHT in semi-supervised learning setting (the ratio of labeled data is 50%). On OVERNIGHT, we average across all eight domains. LMlf means using a logical form language model for validity reward, while “grammar check” means using the surface and semantic check.

form LM. We think that simple language models may suffer from long-dependency and data imbalance issues, and it is hard to capture inner structures of logical forms from a sequential model.

5 Related Work

Lack of data A semantic parser can be trained from labeled logical forms or weakly supervised samples (Krishnamurthy and Mitchell, 2012; Berant et al., 2013; Liang et al., 2017; Goldman et al., 2018). Yih et al. (2016) demonstrate logical forms can be collected efficiently and more useful than merely answers to queries. Wang et al. (2015) construct a semantic parsing dataset starting from grammar rules to crowdsourcing paraphrase. Jia and Liang (2016) induce synchronous context-free grammar (SCFG) and creates new “recombinant” examples accordingly. Su and Yan (2017) use multiple source domains to reduce the cost of collecting data for the target domain. Guo et al. (2018) pre-train a question generation model to produce pseudo-labeled data as a supplement. In this paper, we introduce the dual learning to make full use of data (both labeled and unlabeled). Yin et al. (2018) introduce a variational auto-encoding model for semi-supervised semantic parsing. Beyond semantic parsing, the semi-supervised and adaptive learnings are also typical in natural language understanding (Tur et al., 2005; Bapna et al., 2017; Zhu et al., 2014, 2018; Zhu and Yu, 2018).

Constrained decoding To avoid invalid parses, additional restrictions must be considered in the decoding. Dong and Lapata (2016) propose SEQ2TREE method to ensure the matching of parentheses, which can generate syntactically valid output. Cheng et al. (2017) and Dong and Lapata (2018) both try to decode in two steps, from a coarse rough sketch to a finer structure hierarchically. Krishnamurthy et al. (2017) define a grammar of production rules such that only well-typed logical forms can be generated. Yin and Neubig (2017) and Chen et al. (2018a) both transform the generation of logical forms into query graph construction. Zhao et al. (2019) propose a hierarchical parsing model following the structure of semantic representations, which is predefined by domain developers. We introduce a validity reward at the surface and semantic levels in the dual learning algorithm as a constraint signal.

Dual learning Dual learning framework is first proposed to improve neural machine translation (NMT) (He et al., 2016). Actually, the primal and dual tasks are symmetric in NMT, while not in semantic parsing. The idea of dual learning has been applied in various tasks (Xia et al., 2017), such as Question Answering/Generation (Tang et al., 2017, 2018), Image-to-Image Translation (Yi et al., 2017) and Open-domain Information Extraction/Narration (Sun et al., 2018). We are the first to introduce dual learning in semantic parsing to the best of our knowledge.

6 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we develop a semantic parsing framework based on dual learning algorithm, which enables a semantic parser to fully utilize labeled and even unlabeled data through a dual-learning game between the primal and dual models. We also propose a novel reward function at the surface and semantic levels by utilizing the prior-knowledge of logical form structures. Thus, the primal model tends to generate complete and reasonable semantic representation. Experimental results show that semantic parsing based on dual learning improves performance across datasets.

In the future, we want to incorporate this framework with much refined primal and dual models, and design more informative reward signals to make the training more efficient. It would be appealing to apply graph neural networks (Chen et al., 2018b, 2019) to model structured logical forms.
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A Detailed algorithm

**Algorithm 2 Dual Learning Framework for Semantic Parsing**

**Input:**
1. Supervised dataset $T = \{ (x, y) \}$; Unsupervised dataset for queries $Q$ and logical forms $LF$;
2. Pre-trained models on $T$: $Q2LF$ model $P(y|x; \Theta_{Q2LF})$, $LF2Q$ model $P(x|y; \Theta_{LF2Q})$;
3. Pre-trained model on $Q$ and queries of $T$: Language Model for queries $LM_q$;
4. Indicator performs surface and semantic check for a logical form: grammar_error_indicator($\cdot$);
5. Beam search size $k$, hyper parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$, learning rate $\eta_1$ for $Q2LF$ and $\eta_2$ for $LF2Q$;

**Output:** Parameters $\Theta_{Q2LF}$ of $Q2LF$ model

**repeat**

▷ Reinforcement learning process uses unlabeled data, also reuses labeled data

8: Sample a query $x$ from $Q \cup T$;
9: $Q2LF$ model generates $k$ logical forms
10: for each possible logical form $y_i$ do
11: Obtain validity reward for $y_i$ as
12: Get reconstruction reward for $y_i$ as
13: Compute total reward for $y_i$ as
14: end for
15: Obtain stochastic gradient of $\Theta_{Q2LF}$:
16: Compute stochastic gradient of $\Theta_{LF2Q}$:
17: Model updates:

▷ After reinforcement learning process, use labeled data to fine-tune models

18: Sample a logical form $y$ from $LF \cup T$;
19: $LF2Q$ model generates $k$ queries
20: for each possible query $x_i$ do
21: Obtain validity reward for $x_i$ as
22: Get reconstruction reward for $x_i$ as
23: Compute total reward for $x_i$ as
24: end for
25: Compute stochastic gradient of $\Theta_{LF2Q}$:
26: Compute stochastic gradient of $\Theta_{Q2LF}$:
27: Model updates:

28: Sample a $(x, y)$ pair from $T$;
29: Update $\Theta_{Q2LF}$ by $\Theta_{Q2LF} \leftarrow \Theta_{Q2LF} + \eta_1 \cdot \nabla_{\Theta_{Q2LF}} \hat{E}[r]$
30: Update $\Theta_{LF2Q}$ by $\Theta_{LF2Q} \leftarrow \Theta_{LF2Q} + \eta_2 \cdot \nabla_{\Theta_{LF2Q}} \hat{E}[r]$
31: until $Q2LF$ model converges
B Examples of synthesized logical forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>After Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( lambda $0 e ( and ( flight $0 ) ( meal $0 lunch:me ) ) ( from $0 ci0 ) ( to $0 ci1 ) ) ) ( lambda $0 e ( and ( flight $0 ) ( meal $0 dinner:me ) ) ( from $0 ci0 ) ( to $0 ci1 ) ) )</td>
<td>( lambda $0 e ( and ( flight $0 ) ( meal $0 dinner:me ) ) ( from $0 ci0 ) ( to $0 ci1 ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= a0 ( abbrev delta:al ) )</td>
<td>(= a0 ( abbrev usair:al ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( lambda $0 e ( and ( flight $0 ) ( class_type $0 thrift:cl ) ) ( from $0 ci0 ) ( to $0 ci1 ) ) ) ( lambda $0 e ( and ( flight $0 ) ( class_type $0 business:cl ) ) ( from $0 ci0 ) ( to $0 ci1 ) ) )</td>
<td>( lambda $0 e ( and ( flight $0 ) ( class_type $0 business:cl ) ) ( from $0 ci0 ) ( to $0 ci1 ) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Examples of synthesized logical forms on ATIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Logical Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( ( lambda s ( call SW.filter ( var s ) ( string position ) ( string ! = en.position.point_guard ) ) ( call SW.domain ( string player ) ) ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( ( lambda s ( call SW.filter ( var s ) ( string position ) ( string ! = en.position.forward ) ) ) ( call SW.domain ( string player ) ) ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blo.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.block ) ( string ! type ) ) ( string shape ) ) ( string = en.shape.cube ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.block ) ( string ! type ) ) ( string shape ) ) ( string = en.shape.pyramid ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.location ) ( string ! type ) ) ( call SW.reverse ( string location ) ) ) ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.location ) ( string ! type ) ) ( call SW.reverse ( string location ) ) ) ) ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.housing_unit ) ( string ! type ) ) ( string housing_type ) ) ( string = ) ( call SW.concat en.housing.apartment.en.housing.condo ) ) ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.housing_unit ) ( string ! type ) ) ( string housing_type ) ) ( string = ) ( call SW.concat en.housing.condo.en.housing.apartment ) ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.article ) ( string ! type ) ) ( string author ) ) ( string = ) en.person.efron ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.getProperty ( call SW.singleton.en.article ) ( string ! type ) ) ( string author ) ) ( string = ) en.person.lakoff ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty en.recipe.rice_pudding ( string cuisine ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty en.recipe.rice_pudding ( string cuisine ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty en.restaurant.that_cafe ( string neighborhood ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty en.restaurant.that_cafe ( string neighborhood ) ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty en.field.computer_science ) ) ( call SW.domain ( string student ) ) ( string student ) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>( call SW.listValue ( call SW.getProperty en.field.computer_science ) ) ( call SW.domain ( string student ) ) ( string student ) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Examples of synthesized logical forms on OVERNIGHT.