# An Auto-Encoder Matching Model for Learning Utterance-Level Semantic Dependency in Dialogue Generation

Liangchen Luo\*, Jingjing Xu\*, Junyang Lin, Qi Zeng, Xu Sun

MOE Key Lab of Computational Linguistics, School of EECS, Peking University (\* indicates equal contribution) {luolc,jingjingxu,linjunyang,pkuzengqi,xusun}@pku.edu.cn

### INTRODUCTION

### Challenge

Generating semantically coherent responses is still a major challenge in *dialogue generation*. Different from conventional text generation tasks, the mapping between inputs and responses in conversations is more complicated, which highly demands the understanding of utterance-level semantic dependency.

#### Method

## CONTRIBUTIONS

- To promote coherence in dialogue generation, we propose a novel AUTO-ENCODER MATCHING model to learn the utterance-level dependency.
- In our proposed model, we explicitly separate utterance representation learning and dependency learning for a better expressive ability.

We propose an AUTO-ENCODER MATCHING (AEM) model to learn such dependency. The model contains two auto-encoders and one mapping module. The auto-encoders learn the semantic representations of inputs and responses, and the mapping module learns to connect the utterance-level representations.

• Experimental results on automatic evaluation and human evaluation show that our model can generate much more coherent text compared to baseline models.

### MODEL

### Encoder

The encoder is an unsupervised auto-encoder based on LSTM. In training, the encoder receives the source text (dialog input), encodes it to an internal representation h, and then decodes h to a new sequence for the reconstruction of the input. We extract the hidden state h as the semantic representation.

### Decoder

Similar to the encoder, the decoder is also a LSTM-based auto-encoder. We use s to indicate the utterancelevel semantic representation.

### Mapping Module

A simple feedforward network is used to transform the source semantic representation h to a new representation t. The mapping module is trained by minimizing the L2 loss between t and s.



### EXPERIMENT

We conduct experiments on DailyDialog dataset (Li et al., 2017). Examples

#### **BLEU Scores**

Models	BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-3	BLEU-4
Seq2Seq	12.43	4.57	2.69	1.84
AEM	13.55	4.89	3.04	2.16
Seq2Seq+Attention	13.63	4.99	3.05	2.13
<b>AEM+Attention</b>	14.17	5.69	3.78	2.84

Table 1: BLEU scores for the AEM and Seq2Seq model.

#### **Diversity of Generated Text**

Considerable improvement of text diversity by AEM, reflected by the number of distinct 1–grams, 2–grams and 3–grams.

Models	Dist-1	Dist-2	Dist-3
Seq2Seq	0.8K	2.7K	5.5K
AEM	3.1K	14.8K	31.2K
Seq2Seq+Attention	2.5K	13.6K	34.6K
AEM+Attention	3.3K	23.2K	53.9K

It is easy to see that the AEM model obviously outperforms the Seq2Seq model. It shows that the utterance-level dependency learnt by the AEM model is useful for generating responses with more diversity.

Input 1: My name is David. What is my name? Seq2Seq: Ours, maria. **AEM:** Pardon me? It is unreasonable! **Input 2:** I'm going to kill you! Seq2Seq: I know. I'm a good man.

### CONCLUSION

- We propose an AUTO-ENCODER MATCHING model to learn the utterance-level semantic dependency, a critical dependency relation for generating coherent and fluent responses.
- The model contains two auto-encoders that learn the utterance representations in an unsupervised way, and a mapping module that builds the mapping between the input representation and response representation.
- Experimental results show that the proposed model significantly improves the quality of generated responses according to automatic evaluation and human evaluation, especially in coherence.

Table 2: Diversity scores for the AEM and Seq2Seq model.

### Human Evaluation

Models	Fluency	Coherence	G-Score
Seq2Seq	6.97	3.51	4.95
AEM	8.11	4.18	5.82
Seq2Seq+Attention	5.11	3.30	4.10
AEM+Attention	7.92	4.97	6.27

Table 3: Human evaluation results. Fluency represents whether each sentence is in correct grammar. Coherence evaluates whether the response is relevant to the input. The score ranges from 1 to 10 (1 $\Rightarrow$ bad, 10 $\Rightarrow$ good).

AEM:	What?!?!!!! No!!
Input 3:	I hate you.
Seq2Seq:	l'm not.
AEM:	You do? You're a
	sweet girl.
Input 4:	How are you?
Seq2Seq:	Fine.
AEM:	Fine. I'm good.
Input 5:	Can you say 'Hello'?
Seq2Seq:	Yeah, I guess.
AEM:	Sure, I guess.

Table 4: Examples generated by the AEM and Seq2Seq model.

### References

Yanran Li, Hui Su, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Shuzi Niu. 2017. Dailydialog: A manually labelled multi-turn dialogue dataset. In Proc. of IJCNLP.

#### Links

arXiv: arxiv.org/abs/1808.08795 code: github.com/lancopku/AMM \* Scan QR code to view the paper

