

# CONQRR: Conversational Query Rewriting for Retrieval with Reinforcement Learning

Zeqiu Wu  $\diamond^*$  Yi Luan  $\spadesuit$  Hannah Rashkin  $\spadesuit$  David Reitter  $\spadesuit$  Gaurav Singh Tomar  $\spadesuit$

$\diamond$ University of Washington  $\spadesuit$ Google Research

{zeqiuwu1}@uw.edu

{luanyi, hrashkin, reitter, gtomar}@google.com

## Abstract

For open-domain conversational question answering (CQA), it is important to retrieve the most relevant passages to answer a question, but this is challenging compared with standard passage retrieval because it requires understanding the full dialogue context rather than a single query. Moreover, it can be expensive to re-train well-established retrievers such as search engines that are originally developed for non-conversational queries. To facilitate their use, we develop a query rewriting model CONQRR that rewrites a conversational question in context into a standalone question. It is trained with a novel reward function to directly optimize towards retrieval and can be adapted to any fixed blackbox retriever using reinforcement learning. We show that CONQRR achieves state-of-the-art results on a recent open-domain CQA dataset, a combination of conversations from three different sources. We also conduct extensive experiments to show the effectiveness of CONQRR for any given fixed retriever.

## 1 Introduction

Conversational question answering (CQA) systems (Reddy et al., 2019; Choi et al., 2018) allow information-seeking users to ask a sequence of questions interactively. In an open-domain setting, we often want the answer to be grounded in trustworthy, external evidence. How do we find this evidence? Compared to standard retrieval tasks (Nguyen et al., 2016; Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), passage retrieval for CQA poses new challenges in understanding the current user question, as each question needs to be interpreted within the dialogue context. Recently, the first large-scale open-domain CQA dataset (Anantha et al., 2021) and a related passage retrieval task have become available.

The task of *query rewriting (QR) in a conversation* (Elgohary et al., 2019) is to convert

\*Work done during an internship at Google Research.




Figure 1: A conversational question answering agent rewrites the current user question “Who won?” into a more effective one (in orange) for the given retriever to identify the passage that answers the question.

a contextually-dependent question into a self-contained version. It enables the use of a standard retriever like BM25 (Robertson and Zaragoza, 2009) without tuning it on conversation-specific labeled data. This is desirable because, in practice, it is expensive to have pre-existing resources like search engines (Komeili et al., 2021) replaced with a retriever fine-tuned for a specific task. In this work, we seek to build a QR model that rewrites a user query in a CQA dialogue into some fixed retriever’s input, in such a way that optimizes for retrieval performance. For example, in Figure 1, the agent first rewrites the current user query “Who won?” into “Who won MasterChef season 10?”. With such a rewritten query, the retriever in the figure can then retrieve the best answer passage for the question.

Recent work that leverages QR for conversational retrieval (Anantha et al., 2021; Dalton et al., 2020) usually collects human-written queries to train a supervised QR model. However, human annotators usually rewrite conversational queries to maximize their legibility outside the dialogue context, but not necessarily to optimize the retrieval performance. We conduct comprehensive experiments in Section 4.5 that confirm these human-annotated rewrites indeed sometimes lose informa-

tion from the dialogue context. Consequently, such limitations also apply to supervised models trained to produce such human-labeled rewrites. We design a reinforcement learning (RL)-based model CONQRR (**C**onversational **Q**uery **R**ewriting for **R**etrieval) that directly optimizes the rewritten query towards retrieval performance, with only heuristically obtained retrieval supervision. As running retrieval to calculate the reward for every training step can be time-consuming, we adopt a novel reward function that computes an approximate but effective retrieval performance metric on in-batch passages. Our reward function does not assume any specific retriever model design, and is thus generic enough for CONQRR to adapt to any given retriever system. In contrast, prior QR models are agnostic to downstream retrievers.

We experiment with two different fixed retrievers, and show CONQRR outperforms baseline supervised models on three conversational retrieval metrics for an average of 13% performance boost on a recent open-domain CQA dataset QReCC (Anantha et al., 2021). We also observe the performance boost on three QReCC subsets from different conversation sources. CONQRR demonstrates robustness to out-of-domain dialogues and longer dialogue contexts, compared to supervised models. We even show that on one QReCC subset, our predicted rewrites outperform human-annotated rewrites, which confirms human-annotated rewrites are not necessarily optimal for retrieval.

To conclude, our contributions are as follows. 1) We conduct a novel quantitative study to analyze the limitations of human annotated rewrites as well as the importance of QR for retrieval in conversational question answering. 2) We build a RL-based model CONQRR for the task of query rewriting for conversational retrieval, that can optimize towards and be adapted to any given fixed retrieval system with our novel reward function. 3) CONQRR achieves state-of-the-art results on the public dataset QReCC, a combination of conversations from three different sources. 4) Our extensive analysis shows that CONQRR is effective for any given retriever, and is robust to out-of-domain dialogues and longer dialogue contexts.

## 2 Related Work

### Conversational Question Answering (CQA)

Most existing CQA datasets (Choi et al., 2018; Reddy et al., 2019) are designed to address the task

of reading a reference document (e.g., a Wikipedia article) and answering a series of interconnected information-seeking questions in a conversation. Different from our work, such datasets do not require the retrieval step. QReCC (Anantha et al., 2021) is a recently released open-domain CQA dataset of dialogues where a conversational agent first retrieves the most relevant passage(s) before generating an answer response to the a question.

**Conversational Retrieval** Early work in the information retrieval community has already established the importance of conversational retrieval to be used within interactive search sessions (Belkin et al., 1995; Solomon, 1997). A few recent works (Dalton et al., 2020; Qu et al., 2020) collect retrieval datasets for such conversational search scenarios. Dalton et al. (2020) annotate 80 conversations for the TREC CAsT-19 task, where each conversation only contains a sequence of user questions. For this TREC CAsT-19 task, Yu et al. (2020) propose a framework to automatically generate a large number of weak QR supervisions with additional non-conversational data resources, in order to train a QR model followed by a fixed retriever. Kumar and Callan (2020) develop a retrieval framework that focuses on the passage re-ranker instead of the first-step retrieval model. Qu et al. (2020) derive their conversational search dataset based on QuAC by removing all answer turns and proposes to fine-tune a dual encoder retriever for their conversational search task. In contrast, QReCC (Anantha et al., 2021) is a large-scale open-domain CQA dataset that goes beyond conversational search, with each conversation containing both user and agent utterances. The authors use a supervised QR model based on GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019) followed by a BM25 retriever for the retrieval task. Conversational retrieval is also leveraged as an intermediate component in some social chat agents to address factual hallucination and user engagement (Shuster et al., 2021; Komeili et al., 2021).

**Query Rewriting (QR)** There are many studies (Chen et al., 2018; Ahmad et al., 2019) in the information retrieval research on query reformulation or suggestion to help users better refine their queries. These studies only consider single user queries, while conversational QR targets to convert a user query within the dialogue context into a standalone query. Conversational QR is initially proposed to improve a model’s understanding of

the dialogue context (Elgohary et al., 2019), and gets recently adopted to address more downstream tasks like conversational retrieval and question answering (Anantha et al., 2021; Dalton et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020). Query rewriting is also related to concepts like sentence de-contextualization (Choi et al., 2021) and prompt-based learning (Liu et al., 2021).

**RL for Text Generation** Prior work applies RL approaches to address various text generation tasks like machine translation (Ranzato et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2016), text summarization (Paulus et al., 2018; Celikyilmaz et al., 2018) and image captioning (Rennie et al., 2017). Instead of maximizing the likelihood of generating each reference output, such work directly optimizes towards the generation quality metrics like BLEU, ROUGE or CIDEr. Nogueira and Cho (2017) proposes to apply RL based on gold passage labels to generate a reformulated user query that can effectively improve the downstream retrieval task – for non-conversational queries. In contrast, we focus on more challenging conversational queries, and only use heuristically labeled passages and an approximate retrieval metric for computational efficiency. Adolphs et al. (2021) apply RL with restricted action space to refine retrieval results for standard queries and require multiple rounds of retrieval.

### 3 Approach

**Problem Definition** In this work, we focus on the task of *query rewriting (QR)* for *conversational passage retrieval* with a *fixed* retriever. The inputs to this task include a dialogue context  $x$  consisting of a sequence of previous utterances  $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n-1})$  and the current user question  $u_n$ , a passage corpus  $P$  and a blackbox retriever  $R$ .  $R$  cannot be changed in any way and can only return a ranked list of top-k passages when given a query string and a passage corpus. The task aims to rewrite  $x$  into a query  $q$  such that  $R$  can take  $q$  as the input query to retrieve passages relevant to  $x$  from  $P$ . Specifically, a passage  $p$  is relevant to  $x$  if  $p$  provides enough information to answer  $u_n$  in the context of  $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n-1})$ .

In this section, we first introduce a T5-based QR model (T5QR) that applies a generic Seq2Seq training objective with QR supervised examples in Section 3.1. Then we introduce our RL-based framework CONQRR (**C**onversational **Q**uery **R**ewriting for **R**etrieval) that trains a QR model to optimize




Figure 2: Our CONQRR framework. Yellow and blue arrows mark the flow of MLE and RL loss calculation respectively. During inference, only components with dashed borders are applied.

towards and to be adaptable to any given retriever, without gold retrieval supervision in Section 3.2.

#### 3.1 T5QR

T5 is an encoder-decoder model that is pretrained on large textual corpora (Raffel et al., 2020). We fine-tune T5 to rewrite a conversational query with the input as the concatenation of utterances in the dialogue context  $x$  and the output as the gold human-annotated rewrite  $\hat{q}$ . Note that we concatenate the utterances in a reversed order such that  $u_n$  becomes the first one in the input string<sup>1</sup>. Utterances are separated with a separator token “[SEP]” in the concatenated string. The model is then trained to maximize the likelihood (MLE) of generating  $\hat{q}$ , which is a self-contained version of the query  $u_n$  that can be interpreted without knowing previous turns  $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n-1})$  in  $x$ .

#### 3.2 CONQRR

Training with a standard MLE loss makes the QR model agnostic to the downstream retriever  $R$ . In addition, human-annotated rewrites are not necessarily the most effective ones for passage retrieval (See Section 4.5 for an exploration).

This motivates us to design our RL-based framework CONQRR (Figure 2) that trains a QR model directly optimized towards the passage retrieval performance and can be easily adapted to any given blackbox retriever. CONQRR also has T5 as the base model architecture and we initialize it with T5QR as a warm-up<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>We do this to prevent the most recent conversational turns from being truncated.

<sup>2</sup>In our analysis experiments in Section 4.5, we also try to initialize CONQRR with T5. Although initializing with T5QR gives better results, both setups generally perform well.

**Weak Retrieval Supervision** Since QR models with standard supervised training like T5QR do not require labels for the passage retrieval task, we use heuristically obtained relevant passage labels instead of gold labels for RL reward calculation. In conversational QA datasets, each conversational question naturally comes with an answer, which can be leveraged to induce weak passage retrieval supervision. For each  $x$ , we mark its weak relevant passage label  $p$  as the one having a string span with the highest token overlap F1-score with the question’s following answer string  $u_{n+1}$ <sup>3</sup>:

$$p = \arg \max_{p' \in P} \left[ \arg \max_{s \in p'} \text{sim}(s, u_{n+1}) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{sim}()$  calculates the token overlap score between two strings.

**RL Training** For each training example with the dialogue context  $x$ , we use the concatenated utterances in  $x$  as the model input. For each input, we generate  $m$  sampled rewritten queries  $(q_{s_1}, \dots, q_{s_m})$  as well as a baseline generated rewrite  $q$ . To generate each sampled rewrite  $q_s$ , at time step  $t$  of the decoding process, a token  $q_s^t$  is drawn from the decoder probability distribution  $Pr(w|x, q_s^{1:t-1})$ . The baseline rewrite  $q$  is the output of greedy decoding, which is also applied for query rewriting during inference. We then apply a self-critical sequence training algorithm (Rennie et al., 2017) to calculate the reward for each  $q_s$  relative to  $q$  as  $r(q_s) = \text{score}(q_s) - \text{score}(q)$ . Ideally, the  $\text{score}()$  function should be some retrieval evaluation metric like mean reciprocal rank (MRR) or Recall@K. However, as it is very costly to run actual retrieval for each training step, we instead use an approximate scoring function described below.

To compute  $\text{score}(q)$  for a rewrite  $q$ , we first use  $q$  to do retrieval from the in-batch passage candidates  $P_X$  defined as follows, instead of from the full passage corpus  $P$ . We pre-compute one positive and one negative passage ( $p$  and  $p_n$ ) for each training example  $x$ , and define the set of all such positive and negative passages of input examples in a batch  $X$  as the in-batch passage candidates  $P_X$ . The positive passage  $p$  is heuristically assigned to  $x$  as described before.  $p_n$  is a randomly selected passage that is different from  $p$ , 50% of the time from the top 100 BM25-retrieved

<sup>3</sup>If multiple passages have the highest score, we randomly choose one.

candidates<sup>4</sup> and 50% from  $P$ . Formally, we define  $P_X = \{p^i, p_n^i | x_i \in X\}$  as the set of in-batch passage candidates for the batch  $X$ . Then for a generated rewritten query  $q$  of  $x \in X$ , we calculate  $\text{score}(q)$  as the accuracy of the retriever  $R$  ranking the gold passage  $p$  highest from  $P_X$ . We denote  $R(q, P_X, k)$  as the retrieved  $k$ -th most relevant passage by  $R$  from the candidate pool  $P_X$ , and define:

$$\text{score}(q) = \mathbb{1}[R(q, P_X, 1) = p] \quad (2)$$

Then the RL training loss for  $x$  becomes:

$$\mathcal{L}_{RL} = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m r(q_{s_i}) \log Pr(q_{s_i}|x)$$

$$Pr(q_{s_i}|x) = \prod_{t=1}^{|q_{s_i}|} Pr(q_{s_i}^t | x, q_{s_i}^{1:t-1})$$

In order to stabilize the RL training and to maintain the readability (Paulus et al., 2018; Celikyilmaz et al., 2018) of predicted rewrites, we mix the RL and MLE losses to be the final training loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_{RL} + (1 - \alpha) \mathcal{L}_{MLE}$$

where  $\alpha$  is a tunable parameter.

### 3.3 Retriever Models

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of CONQRR on any given fixed black-box retriever, we experiment with two retrieval systems used during inference as well as training of CONQRR.

**BM25** We follow (Anantha et al., 2021) to use Pyserini (Yang et al., 2017) with the default parameters  $k_1 = 0.82$  and  $b = 0.68$ . These values were chosen based on retrieval performance on MS MARCO (Nguyen et al., 2016), which contains non-conversational queries only. During the RL training of CONQRR, due to the complexity of applying Pyserini to calculate rewards on-the-fly, we instead use a Pyserini approximate called BM25-light. The only differences between them are that BM25-light (1) uses T5’s subword tokenization instead of whole word tokenization and (2) does not use special operations (e.g., stemming) as applied in Pyserini. After training, we still run inference and report retrieval performance on BM25.

<sup>4</sup>With the BM25 input to be the gold rewrite.



**Dual Encoder (DE)** We use a shared T5-base encoder to encode queries and passages. For each query, the passage relevance is decided by the dot product similarity between the query encoding and each passage encoding. The architecture is the same as the recent DE model (Ni et al., 2021). We use a model fine-tuned on MS MARCO, and keep it fixed for our experiments.

### 3.4 Inference

At inference time, both T5QR and CONQRR work in the same way. The trained QR model is used to greedily decode the rewritten query given a dialogue context. Then, the predicted rewrite is given to the provided retriever to perform retrieval.

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Dataset and Evaluation Metrics

**Dataset** QReCC (Anantha et al., 2021) is a dataset of 14k open-domain conversations in the format of alternating user questions and agent-provided answers with 80k question and answer pairs in total. The conversations are collected from different sources: QuAC (Choi et al., 2018), Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and TREC CAsT-19 (Dalton et al., 2020). QReCC reuses questions in QuAC and TREC conversations and re-annotates answers. For each NQ-based conversation, they only use one randomly chosen question from NQ to be the starting question and then annotate the remaining conversation. Therefore, QReCC can be divided into three subsets for evaluation. We name them as *QuAC-Conv*, *NQ-Conv* and *TREC-Conv* respectively to differentiate them from the original datasets from which they are derived. There are 63k, 16k and 748 question and answer pairs in the three subsets respectively, where TREC-Conv only appears in the test set. Each user question comes with a human-rewritten query. For each agent turn, gold passage labels are provided if any. The entire text corpus for retrieval contains 54M passages, segmented in the released data<sup>5</sup>.

**Evaluation Metrics** Following (Anantha et al., 2021), we use mean reciprocal rank (MRR), Recall@10 and Recall@100 to evaluate the retrieval performance by reusing their provided evaluation

<sup>5</sup>The link to the original QReCC data can be found at <https://zenodo.org/record/5115890#.YZ8kab3MI-Q>.

QR Model	IR model	MRR	R@10	R@100
Transformer++	BM25	0.155	24.8	40.6
T5QR	BM25	0.164	26.2	42.3
CONQRR (mix)	BM25	0.186	29.2	<b>45.0</b>
CONQRR (RL)	BM25	<b>0.191</b>	<b>30.0</b>	44.4

Table 1: Passage retrieval performance of QR models described in Section 4.3, comparable to scores in Anantha et al. (2021) by using the *original* evaluation script and the same BM25 model for QReCC test set. CONQRR achieves state-of-the-art results.

script<sup>6</sup>. Some agent turns in QReCC do not have valid passage labels, and their original evaluation assigns a score of 0 to all such examples. Their updated evaluation script normalizes the scores by removing those examples from the evaluation, which results in 6396, 1442 and 371 test instances for QuAC-Conv, NQ-Conv and TREC-Conv, respectively. This leads to a total of 8209 test instances in QReCC. We use their *normalized* evaluation script for most of our experiments, except that we use the *original* version for calculating scores in Table 1 to compare with their reported QReCC baseline results. We note that these two evaluation scripts only differ by a scaling factor so they should lead to the same conclusions regarding model comparisons.

### 4.2 Implementation Details

Our models are implemented using JAX<sup>7</sup>. Our QR models are all initialized with T5-base (Raffel et al., 2020). For training, we set 64, 1k and 10k as the batch size, warm-up steps and total training steps respectively. We use  $e^{-3}$  and  $e^{-4}$  as the learning rate for supervised and RL training respectively. We use Adafactor (Shazeer and Stern, 2018) as our optimizer with the default parameters. Linear decay is applied after 10% of the total number of training steps, reducing the learning rate to 0 by the end of training. For supervised training, models are selected based on the best dev set Rouge-1 F1 score with the gold rewrites, following Anantha et al. (2021). CONQRR is initialized with T5QR. For RL-based training of CONQRR, models are selected based on the average in-batch gold passage prediction accuracy as in Eq. (2) on dev set with greedily decoded rewrites. We observe that CONQRR works well when  $\alpha$  is large. We tune its values in 0.9, 0.95, 0.97, 0.99 for a mixed MLE and RL loss, and use 0.99 as the final value. We also

<sup>6</sup>The evaluation script can be found at <https://github.com/scail-conf/SCAI-QReCC-21>.

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/google/jax>

QR Model	IR System	QReCC (Overall)			QuAC-Conv			NQ-Conv			TREC-Conv (OOD)		
		MRR	R10	R100	MRR	R10	R100	MRR	R10	R100	MRR	R10	R100
T5QR	BM25	0.328	52.5	84.7	0.33	52.7	85.0	0.345	54.2	83.9	<b>0.230</b>	44.5	82.3
CONQRR (mix)	BM25	0.373	58.5	<b>90.2</b>	0.379	59.2	<b>90.9</b>	<b>0.385</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>88.9</b>	0.229	<b>44.7</b>	<b>82.7</b>
CONQRR (RL)	BM25	<b>0.383</b>	<b>60.1</b>	88.9	<b>0.395</b>	<b>61.6</b>	90.2	0.378	58.0	86.7	0.198	43.5	75.9
Gold Rewrite	BM25	0.398	62.6	98.5	0.403	62.9	98.4	0.408	63.8	99.0	0.273	53.8	98.9
T5QR	DE	0.361	56.2	75.9	0.349	55.7	76.1	0.417	58.7	74.2	0.343	55.9	79.2
CONQRR (mix)	DE	0.395	61.9	81.8	0.387	62.0	82.4	0.439	62.2	79.0	<b>0.361</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>81.0</b>
CONQRR (RL)	DE	<b>0.418</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>0.416</b>	<b>65.9</b>	<b>85.8</b>	<b>0.453</b>	<b>64.1</b>	<b>80.9</b>	0.327	55.2	79.6
Gold Rewrite	DE	0.422	64.8	84.0	0.409	64.5	84.1	0.483	65.8	83.2	0.411	66.0	86.5

Table 2: Passage retrieval performance on the QReCC test set and three subsets QuAC-Conv, NQ-Conv and TREC-Conv, where TREC-Conv is an out-of-domain (OOD) subset. Recall@10 and Recall@100 are abbreviated as R10 and R100. CONQRR (mix) beats the supervised T5QR model on all retrieval (IR) system and test set combinations.

report the performance with using only RL loss, where  $\alpha = 1.0$ . For the experiment with  $\alpha = 1.0$  and the retriever to be BM25, our results are obtained with the initialized model being finetuned with only 10% QR labels, as this works better than using 100% QR labels<sup>8</sup>. The maximum length of dialogue context fed into the model is 384 (longer than 97.9% dialogue contexts in QReCC) and the maximum output rewrite length is 64 (longer than 99.9% gold rewrites). Each training process is run on 8 TPU nodes. It takes about 2 and 9 hours for supervised or RL-based training.

For identifying the heuristic gold passage in Eq. (1), as searching within all candidates in the whole passage corpus is very time-consuming, we instead first use BM25 to retrieve the top 100 passages from  $P$  based on each gold rewrite, and then locate the best passage from these 100 candidates.

For retriever models, BM25 Pyserini simply encodes the whole query input and each passage without truncating.<sup>9</sup> For the dual encoder, the maximum query or passage length is 384.<sup>10</sup>

### 4.3 Compared Systems

For QR models, we compare our supervised model **T5QR** and **CONQRR (mix/RL)** with a mixed ( $\alpha = 0.99$ ) or pure RL ( $\alpha = 1.0$ ) loss. We also compare to the original baseline **Transformer++**, which is based on GPT2-medium that achieves the best retrieval performance in (Anantha et al.,

<sup>8</sup>Note that we still use 100% QR labels for getting hard negative passages from top-100 BM25-retrieved candidates as in Section 3.2.

<sup>9</sup>We set maximum query and passage length as 128 and 2000 for BM25-light, but only less than 99.9% cases require truncation with these thresholds.

<sup>10</sup>The average passage length is 378, but we notice performance drop by further increasing the maximum length.

2021). Transformer++ has two language modeling heads that produce separate vocabulary distributions, which are then combined via a weighted sum for rewritten query generation. Similar to T5QR, it is trained end-to-end by using all QR labels in a standard supervised learning (SL) manner. For analysis purposes, we also report performance for directly using the concatenated dialogue context as the retriever input without any query rewriting in Section 4.5. We experiment with **BM25** and **DE** as two different retrievers, as described in Section 3.3.

### 4.4 Quantitative Results

The original baseline Transformer++ has numbers reported on the overall QReCC test set with BM25 as the retriever. As mentioned in Section 4.1, to have a direct comparison, we first compare all QR models’ downstream retrieval performance with the same setup in Table 1 with the original version of their evaluation script. T5QR and CONQRR outperform the baseline Transformer++ by 5% and 18% respectively, averaged on three metrics<sup>11</sup>, although Transformer++ is based on a larger base model - GPT2-medium. Therefore CONQRR (RL) becomes the *state-of-the-art* QR model for passage retrieval on QReCC.

Table 2 shows more comprehensive retrieval results comparing CONQRR and the supervised model T5QR, with the normalized evaluation script (see Section 4.1). For the overall QReCC test set as well as all the three subsets, we see that CONQRR trained with a mixed loss *consistently outperforms* T5QR on both BM25 and DE, with an average

<sup>11</sup>We obtained prediction results from the authors and re-run their evaluation script. The numbers we got are slightly lower than what’s reported in their paper, but do not affect the conclusions.

Input	IR	Topic-Concentrated			Topic-Shifted		
		MRR	R10	R100	MRR	R10	R100
Dial Context	BM25	<b>0.806</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>97.3</b>	0.206	39.5	69.2
Ours (mix)	BM25	0.543	75.3	93.8	<b>0.299</b>	<b>49.7</b>	<b>83.0</b>
Ours (RL)	BM25	0.592	76.9	94.8	0.268	48.1	78.3
Gold Rewrite	BM25	0.547	75.4	99.7	0.341	58.7	98.5
Dial Context	DE	<b>0.702</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>91.5</b>	0.224	41.5	66.0
Ours (mix)	DE	0.511	69.4	84.9	<b>0.390</b>	<b>58.6</b>	76.9
Ours (RL)	DE	0.597	77.5	87.9	0.370	57.2	<b>77.7</b>
Gold Rewrite	DE	0.545	71.9	86.8	0.449	64.5	83.1

Table 3: Passage retrieval results of using dialogue context, predicted or gold rewrite as the retriever input, of examples for which the gold passage(s) has (*Topic-Concentrated*) or has no (*Topic-Shifted*) overlap with gold passages in previous turns, with the fixed BM25 or DE retriever.

of 8% increase for all evaluation metrics. This shows CONQRR can be applied to *any given retrieval system* effectively. Comparing CONQRR (RL) and T5QR on the overall QReCC test set with both BM25 and DE, we see that CONQRR (RL) is able to greatly boost the performance by 13% on average to even close to human performance. CONQRR (RL) also consistently performs the best on the QuAC-Conv set. When using DE as the retriever, CONQRR (RL) even outperforms human on QuAC-Conv. However, CONQRR (RL) underperforms T5QR on TREC-Conv by 8% and 2% for BM25 and DE, which indicates that training with pure RL loss may not generalize well to out-of-domain examples.

#### 4.5 Analysis

##### Limitation of Human Rewrites & Importance of QR

We conduct analysis experiments to show that for topic-concentrated conversations, the dialogue context may contain valuable content for retrieving the next passage while such content could get ignored in even the human rewrite. On the other hand, we observe that directly using the concatenated dialogue context as the retriever input for passage retrieval is brittle in topic-shift scenarios where query rewriting shows great advantage. We categorize test examples that have at least one previous turn in the dialogue context into two groups, where the gold passage(s) for the current query has or has no overlap with gold passages in previous turns. We consider these two groups to approximately represent *topic-concentrated* and *topic-shifted* examples, as shown in Table 3. The split is done on examples in NQ-Conv and TREC-Conv only, as all QuAC conversations are originally




Figure 3: Recall@100 versus the number of questions in the dialogue context, with DE as the retriever.

collected based on a single Wikipedia article (Qu et al., 2020). Table 3 shows that the dialogue context outperforms even the gold (human) rewrite on the “Topic-Concentrated” set by an average of 22% and 17% for BM25 and DE respectively, which confirms the limitation of human-labeled rewrites. We also see that predicted rewrites by CONQRR (RL) successfully surpass the limit of gold rewrites on this “Topic-Concentrated” set.

However, for the “Topic-Shifted” set, gold rewrite outperforms dialogue context by 52% and 61% on BM25 and DE respectively. Using predicted rewrites by CONQRR (mix) outperforms dialogue context by 30% and 44% on BM25 and DE respectively. Therefore, we argue that a rewritten query has great values in the aspect of robustness to topic shifts. These observations are largely unexplored in previous work, and they are actually the motivations for us to build CONQRR that can optimize directly towards any fixed retriever and can go beyond the human annotation limitations.

**Effect of Dialogue Context Length** Figure 3 shows the Recall@100 score on QuAC-Conv and TREC-Conv with DE as the retriever versus various dialogue context length. Dialogue context lengths are grouped into 1-2, 3-4 and  $\geq 4$  questions (including both history and current questions). Overall, compared to T5QR, CONQRR has less of a performance drop as the dialogue context length increases. Using the concatenated dialogue context as the retriever input even leads to better performance as the length increases on QuAC-Conv with mostly topic-concentrated conversations, but its robustness becomes dramatically worsened on TREC-Conv. In contrast, both T5QR and CONQRR have similar robustness on two data subsets, which confirms the importance of QR discussed




Figure 4: Recall@100 on QReCC versus the percentage of QR supervision used to train T5QR (also the initial model of CONQRR), with DE as the retriever.

QR Model	QuAC-Conv		NQ-Conv		TREC-Conv	
	L	OL	L	OL	L	OL
T5QR	10.9	3.9	8.9	3.6	8.2	3.1
Ours (mix) w/ BM25	12.1	4.5	9.5	4.0	8.5	3.3
Ours (RL) w/ BM25	11.2	4.5	10.1	4.5	9.4	3.7
Ours (mix) w/ DE	12.1	4.5	9.6	4.0	8.7	3.4
Ours (RL) w/ DE	28.2	14.4	21.7	12.1	18.3	8.1
Gold	12.1	4.5	9.3	4.0	8.4	3.5

Table 4: Average number of tokens (L) and overlapping tokens (OL) with the gold passage(s) in generated rewrites. Training CONQRR (ours) with rewards from BM25 or DE leads to different rewrite outputs.

above. We have similar observations for BM25.

**Effect of Model Initialization** We investigate how sensitive CONQRR is to the initialized supervised model T5QR. We experiment with training T5QR with 0%, 1%, 10% or 100% of QR labels in the QReCC train set<sup>12</sup>. For the case of 0% examples, we simply use the original T5 checkpoint without fine-tuning. Then we train CONQRR with pure RL loss. Figure 4 plots the curve of Recall@100 on the overall QReCC data using DE as the retriever versus the percentage of QR labels used to train the supervised model T5QR (as well as the model to initialize CONQRR). We see that CONQRR is not sensitive to the percentage of QR supervision provided for the initial supervised model, even if the initial model’s own performance is more sensitive to QR supervision (the curve for T5QR). We also observe that even T5QR potentially does not require a large number of QR labels for training, as its curve become flattened after 1% supervision.

**Quantitative Attributes of Rewrites** Table 4 shows statistics of the average number of tokens

<sup>12</sup>Note that this is the percentage of QR labels used for training the initialized model. We still use 100% QR labels to induce hard negative passages as in Section 3.2.




Figure 5: Evaluation metric scores on QReCC for T5QR w/ or w/o brevity penalty and CONQRR (mix), with DE as the retriever.

Input	Topic-Concentrated			Topic-Shifted		
	MRR	R10	R100	MRR	R10	R100
Dial Context	<b>0.741</b>	<b>84.9</b>	<b>92.3</b>	0.396	65.0	85.4
Gold Rewrite	0.516	74.0	91.3	<b>0.422</b>	<b>66.2</b>	<b>86.6</b>

Table 5: Results of using dialogue context or gold rewrite as the retriever input with the *finetuned* DE as the retriever.

per rewritten query, as well as overlapping tokens (excluding stopwords) between the rewritten query and the gold passage(s). We see that CONQRR generally generates longer rewrites with more overlapping tokens with gold passage(s), compared with T5QR. When having DE as the retriever, CONQRR (RL) can generate more than double the length of T5QR, CONQRR (mix) and even human rewrites.

However, we argue that simply generating a longer rewritten query is not the only factor that contributes to better retrieval performance. We investigate into this by applying a brevity penalty (Wu et al., 2016) during decoding for T5QR such that its average query length matches that of CONQRR (mix). Figure 5 shows that CONQRR still outperforms T5QR with the brevity penalty for all three evaluation metrics on QReCC. Therefore, learning what to generate is also crucial to the performance boost, for which we will show examples to illustrate soon.

**Rewrite Examples** Table 6 shows two examples of generated rewritten queries of T5 and CONQRR (mix) trained with DE in the loop, as well as the human rewrites. In the left example, the rewrite of CONQRR is able to generate an entity “John Stossel” that is also mentioned in the gold passage but not included by rewrites from T5QR or Human. Thus, even if the human rewrite is longer by containing the book’s full name, CONQRR is able



Dialogue Context	<p><i>Q</i>: What were <b>John Stossel</b>'s most popular publications?</p> <p><i>A</i>: Give Me a Break: How I Exposed Hucksters, Cheats, and Scam Artists and Became ...</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Q</i>: What was the response?</p>	<p><i>Q</i>: What were some notable live performances at the Buena Vista Social Club?</p> <p><i>A</i>: <b>Ibrahim Ferrer and Rubén González</b> ...</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Q</i>: What other live performances are important?</p>
Gold Passage	<p><b>Stossel</b> has written three books. Give Me a Break: ... It was a New York Times bestseller for 11 weeks ...</p>	<p>The first performances ... <b>Ibrahim Ferrer and Rubén González</b> performed together ... a 1999 Miami performance ...</p>
CONQRR (mix)	<p>What was the response to <b>John Stossel</b>'s book, Give Me a Break? (Rank=2)</p>	<p>What other live performances at the Buena Vista Social Club are important besides <b>Ibrahim Ferrer and Rubén González</b>? (Rank=2)</p>
T5QR	<p>What was the response to the book Give Me a Break? (Rank &gt;100)</p>	<p>What other live performances are important at the Buena Vista Social Club? (Rank=18)</p>
Human	<p>What was the response to Give Me a Break: How I Exposed Hucksters, Cheats, and Scam Artists and Became the Scourge of the Liberal Media? (Rank &gt;100)</p>	<p>What other live performances of the Buena Vista Social Club are important? (Rank=17)</p>

Table 6: Examples of predicted rewrites and the gold passage rank by using them as the DE retriever input.

to retrieve the gold passage more effectively with a partial book name along with its author name. In the right example, CONQRR generates a much longer rewritten query that contains much richer contextual information.

**Fine-tuned Retriever** Although our work focuses on the fixed retriever setting, we also conduct an experiment of fine-tuning the DE retriever with the concatenated dialogue context or the gold rewrite as the query input, with results in Table 5. The numbers are comparable to those in Table 3. We see that if a retriever can be fine-tuned, in contrast to conclusions we have for Table 3, dialogue context gives reasonably good results for topic-shifted conversations that are very close to the gold rewrite performance. Thus, when the retriever is flexible to be fine-tuned, the usefulness of QR for conversational retrieval needs further investigation.

## 5 Conclusion

To summarize, we introduce CONQRR to address query rewriting for conversational passage retrieval with a fixed retriever. Motivated by our analysis showing the limitations of human-labeled rewrites, which are underexplored by most prior work, we adopt a RL approach with a novel reward function to train CONQRR directly towards the retrieval performance. We show that our reward function enables CONQRR to be trained adaptively to any given retriever. The model achieves state-of-the-art retrieval performance on QReCC with conversations from 3 different sources.

Interesting future work includes leveraging query rewriting to facilitate other tasks. For exam-

ple, besides passage retrieval, it can also be used for question answering and response generation to build a full CQA system. General sentence rewriting can be used for understanding contextually-dependent sentences in a long document. As current CQA datasets have limited dialogue format (e.g., alternating questions and answers), future investigation is needed to explore conversations with more dialogue acts or discourse relations like asking for clarifications.

## Acknowledgements

We thank all the Google AI Language members who provided help to this work. We specifically want to thank Kristina Toutanova, Ming-Wei Chang, Daniel Andor, Matthew Lamm, Victoria Fossum, Iulia Turc and Kenton Lee for their valuable insights and feedback. We also want to thank Jianmo Ni for his help on setting up the dual encoder model.

## References

- Leonard Adolphs, Benjamin Boerschinger, Christian Buck, Michelle Chen Huebscher, Massimiliano Ciaramita, Lasse Espeholt, Thomas Hofmann, and Yan- nic Kilcher. 2021. [Boosting search engines with interactive agents](#).
- Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Kai-Wei Chang, and Hongning Wang. 2019. [Context attentive document ranking and query suggestion](#). In *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR'19*, page 385–394, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

- Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. [Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 520–534, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicholas J. Belkin, Colleen Cool, Adelheit Stein, and Ulrich Thiel. 1995. [Cases, scripts, and information-seeking strategies: On the design of interactive information retrieval systems](#). *Expert Systems with Applications*, 9(3):379–395.
- Asli Celikyilmaz, Antoine Bosselut, Xiaodong He, and Yejin Choi. 2018. [Deep communicating agents for abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1662–1675, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wanyu Chen, Fei Cai, Honghui Chen, and Maarten de Rijke. 2018. [Attention-based hierarchical neural query suggestion](#). In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '18*, page 1093–1096, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wentaoh Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [QuAC: Question answering in context](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2174–2184, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eunsol Choi, Jennimaria Palomaki, Matthew Lamm, Tom Kwiatkowski, Dipanjan Das, and Michael Collins. 2021. [Decontextualization: Making Sentences Stand-Alone](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:447–461.
- Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, Vaibhav Kumar, and Jamie Callan. 2020. [Cast-19: A dataset for conversational information seeking](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '20*, page 1985–1988, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Ahmed Elgohary, Denis Peskov, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2019. [Can you unpack that? learning to rewrite questions-in-context](#). 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 5918–5924, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mojtaba Komeili, Kurt Shuster, and Jason Weston. 2021. [Internet-augmented dialogue generation](#).
- Vaibhav Kumar and Jamie Callan. 2020. [Making information seeking easier: An improved pipeline for conversational search](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3971–3980, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021. [Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing](#).
- Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. [Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset](#).
- Jianmo Ni, Gustavo Hernández Ábrego, Noah Constant, Ji Ma, Keith B. Hall, Daniel Cer, and Yinfei Yang. 2021. [Sentence-t5: Scalable sentence encoders from pre-trained text-to-text models](#).
- Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2017. [Task-oriented query reformulation with reinforcement learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 574–583, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Romain Paulus, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2018. [A deep reinforced model for abstractive summarization](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chen Qu, Liu Yang, Cen Chen, Minghui Qiu, W. Bruce Croft, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. [Open-retrieval conversational question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '20*, page 539–548, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#). *OpenAI Blog*. Accessed 22 March 2021.
- 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](#).
- Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Sumit Chopra, Michael Auli, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2016. [Sequence level training with recurrent neural networks](#). In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations*,

*ICLR 2016, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 2-4, 2016, Conference Track Proceedings.*

York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

- Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. [CoQA: A conversational question answering challenge](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:249–266.
- Steven J. Rennie, Etienne Marcheret, Youssef Mroueh, Jerret Ross, and Vaibhava Goel. 2017. [Self-critical sequence training for image captioning](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1179–1195.
- Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. 2009. [The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond](#). *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.*, 3(4):333–389.
- Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. 2018. [Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost](#). In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4596–4604. PMLR.
- Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2021. [Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 3784–3803, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul Solomon. 1997. [Conversation in information-seeking contexts: A test of an analytical framework](#). *Library & Information Science Research*, 19(3):217–248.
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Łukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. [Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation](#).
- Peilin Yang, Hui Fang, and Jimmy Lin. 2017. [Anserini: Enabling the use of lucene for information retrieval research](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR ’17*, page 1253–1256, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Shi Yu, Jiahua Liu, Jingqin Yang, Chenyan Xiong, Paul Bennett, Jianfeng Gao, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2020. [Few-shot generative conversational query rewriting](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR ’20*, page 1933–1936, New