NPFL123 Dialogue Systems
5. Neural NLU & State Tracking

https://ufal.cz/npfl123

Ondřej Dušek, Vojtěch Hudeček, Tomáš Nekvinda
& Jan Cuřín, Petr Fousek

14. 3. 2022

Charles University
Faculty of Mathematics and Physics
Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics

Neural networks

- Can be used for both classification & sequence models

- **Non-linear functions**, composed of basic building blocks
  - stacked into **layers**
  - whole network ~ "pipeline"/"flow"

- Layers are built of **activation functions**:
  - linear functions
  - nonlinearities – sigmoid, tanh, ReLU
  - softmax – probability estimates:

$$\text{softmax}(\mathbf{x})_i = \frac{\exp(x_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{x}|} \exp(x_j)}$$

- Fully differentiable – training by gradient descent
  - gradients **backpropagated** from outputs to all parameters
 - (composite function differentiation)

Sigmoid
$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$

tanh
$\tanh(x)$

ReLU
$\max(0, x)$

https://medium.com/@shrutija
don10104776/survey-on-
activation-functions-for-deep-
learning-9689331ba092

Neural networks – features

- You can use the same ones as for LR/SVM…
  - but it's a lot of work to code them in
- **Word embeddings**
  - let the network learn features by itself
    - input is just words (vocabulary is numbered)
      - top ~50k words + *<unk>*, or subwords
  - distributed word representation
    - each word = **vector of floats** (~50-2000 dims.)
  - part of network parameters – trained
    a) random initialization
    b) pretraining
  - the network learns which words are used similarly
    - they end up having close embedding values
    - different embeddings for different tasks

http://blog.kaggle.com/2016/05/18/home-depot-product-search-relevance-winners-interview-1st-place-alex-andreas-nurlan/

http://ruder.io/word-embeddings-2017/

Recurrent Neural Networks

- Many identical layers with shared parameters (**cells**)
  - ~ the same layer is applied multiple times, taking its own outputs as input
    - ~ same number of layers as there are tokens
    - output = **hidden state** – fed to the next step
  - additional input – next token features
- Cell types
  - **basic RNN**: linear + tanh
    - problem: vanishing gradients
    - can't hold long recurrences
  - **GRU, LSTM**: more complex, to make backpropagation work better
    - "gates" to keep old values

basic RNN cell

hidden state
in (h_{t-1})

linear
& tanh

concat

hidden state
out (h_t)
= output

input embedding

GRU cell

LSTM cell

https://medium.com/@saurabh.rathor092/
simple-rnn-vs-gru-vs-lstm-difference-lies-
in-more-flexible-control-5f33e07b1e57

Encoder-Decoder Networks

- Default RNN paradigm for sequences/structure prediction
  - **encoder** RNN: encodes the input token-by-token into **hidden states** h_t
    - next step: last hidden state + next token as input
  - **decoder** RNN: constructs the output token-by-token
    - initialized by last encoder hidden state
    - output: hidden state & softmax over output vocabulary + argmax
    - next step: last hidden state + last generated token as input
  - LSTM/GRU cells over vectors of ~ embedding size
  - MT, dialogue, parsing…
    - more complex structures linearized to sequences

$$\boldsymbol{h}_0 = \boldsymbol{0}$$
$$\boldsymbol{h}_t = \mathrm{cell}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{h}_{t-1})$$

$$\boldsymbol{s}_0 = \boldsymbol{h}_T$$
$$p(y_t | y_1, \dots y_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathrm{softmax}(\boldsymbol{s}_t)$$
$$\boldsymbol{s}_t = \mathrm{cell}(\boldsymbol{y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{s}_{t-1})$$

https://lilianweng.github.io/lil-log/2018/06/24/attention-attention.html

https://medium.com/syncedreview/a-brief-overview-of-attention-mechanism-13c578ba9129

Attention Models

- Encoder-decoder too crude for complex sequences
  - the whole input crammed into a fixed-size vector (last hidden state)

- **Attention** = "memory" of **all** encoder hidden states
  - weighted combination
  - re-weighted every decoder step
    → can focus on currently important part of input
  - fed into decoder inputs + decoder softmax layer

attention value = **context vector**

t = decoder step
$1 \dots n$ = encoder steps

encoder hidden state

$$c_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{ti} h_i$$

decoder state

trained parameters

attention weights
= **alignment model**

$$\alpha_{ti} = \text{softmax}(v_\alpha \cdot \tanh(W_\alpha \cdot s_{t-1} + U_\alpha \cdot h_i))$$

- **Self-attention** – over previous decoder steps

Attention Mechanism

https://skymind.ai/wiki/attention-mechanism-memory-network

- Various architectures possible

- Classification
  - feed-forward NN
  - RNN + attention weight → softmax
  - convolutional networks
  - Transformer

- Sequence tagging
  - RNN (LSTM/GRU) → softmax over hidden states
    - default version: label bias (like MEMM)
    - CRF over the RNN possible
  - Still treats intent + slots independently

encoder hidden states

(Raffel & Ellis, 2016)
https://colinraffel.com/publications/iclr2016feed.pdf

https://www.depends-on-the-definition.com/guide-sequence-tagging-neural-networks-python/

7

- Same network for both tasks
- **Bidirectional encoder**
  - 2 encoders: left-to-right, right-to-left
  - concatenate hidden states
  - "see the whole sentence before you start tagging"
- Decoder – tag word-by-word, inputs:
  - a) attention
  - b) input encoder hidden states ("aligned inputs")
  - c) both
- Intent classification:
  softmax over last encoder state
  - + specific intent context vector (attention)

# NN NLU – Joint Intent & Slots (Liu & Lane, 2016) http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.01454

- Extended version: use slot tagging in intent classification
  - Bidi encoder
  - Slots decoder with encoder states & attention
  - Intent decoder – attention over slots decoder states

- Works slightly better

Dialogue State Tracking

- Dialogue management consist of:
  - **State update** ← here we need DST
  - Action selection (later)

- **Dialogue State** needed to remember what was said in the past
  - tracking the dialogue progress
  - summary of the whole dialogue history
  - basis for action selection decisions

U: I'm looking for a restaurant in the <u>city centre</u>.
S: OK, what kind of food do you like?
U: Chinese.
❌ *S: What part of town do you have in mind?*
❌ *S: Sure, the Golden Dragon is a good Chinese restaurant. It is located in the west part of town.*
✔️ *S: Sure, the Golden Dragon is a good Chinese restaurant. It is located in the <u>city centre</u>.*

Dialogue State Contents

- "All that is used when the system decides what to say next"

- **User goal**/preferences ~ NLU output

  - slots & values provided (search constraints)
  - information requested

- Past **system actions**
  - information provided
    - slots and values
    - list of venues offered ← U: *Give me the address of <u>the first one</u> you talked about.*
      U: *Is there <u>any other</u> place in this area?*
  - slots confirmed ← S: *OK, Chinese food. […]*
  - slots requested ← S: *What time would you like to leave?*

- **Other** semantic context
  - user/system utterance: bye, thank you, repeat, restart etc.

Ontology

- To describe possible states
- Defines all concepts in the system
  - List of slots
  - Possible range of values per slot
  - Possible actions per slot
    - requestable, informable etc.
  - Dependencies
    - some concepts only applicable
      for some values of parent concepts

  food_type – only for type=restaurant
  has_parking – only for type=hotel

"if entity=venue, then…"

entity = {venue, landmark}
venue.type = {restaurant, bar,…}

some slot names may need disambiguation
(venue type vs. landmark type)

(Young, 2009)
http://mi.eng.cam.ac.uk/research/dialogue/papers/youn09.pdf

Problems with Dialogue State

- NLU is unreliable
  - takes unreliable ASR output
  - makes mistakes by itself – some utterances are ambiguous
  - output might conflict with ontology

- Possible solutions:
  - detect contradictions, ask for confirmation
  - ignore low-confidence NLU input
    - what's "low"?
    - what if we ignore 10x the same thing?

- Better solution: make the state probabilistic – **belief state**

ASR: 0.5 *I'm looking for an expensive hotel*
      0.5 *I'm looking for inexpensive hotels*

NLU: 0.3 inform(type=restaurant, stars=5)

only hotels have stars!

Belief State

- Assume we don't know the true dialogue state
    - but we can estimate a **probability distribution over all possible states**
    - In practice: per-slot distributions
- More robust
    - **accumulates probability** mass over **multiple turns**
        - low confidence – if the user repeats it, we get it the 2nd time
    - accumulates probability over **NLU n-best lists**
- Plays well with probabilistic dialogue policies
    - but not only them – rule-based, too

Belief State

Dialogue as a Markov Decision Process

- MDP = probabilistic control process
    - model – Dynamic Bayesian Network
        - random variables & dependencies in a graph/network
        - "dynamic" = structure repeats over each time step t
    - s_t – dialogue **states** = what the user wants
    - a_t – **actions** = what the system says
    - r_t – **rewards** = measure of quality
        - typically slightly negative for each turn, high positive for successful finish
    - $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ – **transition probabilities**
- Markov property – state defines everything
- Problem: we're not sure about the dialogue state

(from Milica Gašić's slides)

Partially Observable (PO)MDP

- Dialogue states are **not observable**
  - modelled probabilistically – belief state $b(s)$ is a prob. distribution over states
  - states (*what the user wants*) influence **observations** o_t (*what the system hears*)

- Still Markovian
  - $b'(s') = \frac{1}{Z} p(o|s') \sum_{s \in S} p(s'|s,a) b(s)$
  - $b(s)$ can be modelled by an HMM

(from Filip Jurčíček's slides)

action

state

observation

reward

grey = observed
white = unobserved

(from Milica Gašić's slides)

Digression: Generative vs. Discriminative Models

What they learn:

- **Generative** – whole distribution $p(x, y)$
- **Discriminative** – just decision boundaries between classes $\sim p(y|x)$

To predict $p(y|x)$...

- **Generative models**
  - Assume some functional form for $p(y), p(x|y)$
  - Estimate parameters of $p(y), p(x|y)$ directly from training data
  - Use Bayes rule to calculate $p(y|x)$
- **Discriminative models**
  - Assume some functional form for $p(y|x)$
  - Estimate parameters of $p(y|x)$ directly from training data

they get the same thing, but in different ways

https://medium.com/@mlengineer/generative-and-discriminative-models-af5637a66a3

Generative vs. Discriminative Models

Example: elephants vs. dogs http://cs229.stanford.edu/notes/cs229-notes2.pdf

- **Discriminative**:
    - establish decision boundary (~find distinctive features)
    - classification: just check on which side we are
- **Generative**
    - ~ 2 models – what elephants & dogs look like
    - classification: match against the two models

- Discriminative – typically better results
- Generative – might be more robust, more versatile
    - e.g. predicting the other way, actually generating likely (x, y)'s

Naïve Generative Belief Tracking

- Using the HMM model
  - estimate the transition & observation probabilities from data

$$b(s) = \frac{1}{Z} \underbrace{p(o_t|s_t)}_{\text{observation probability}} \sum_{s_{t-1} \in S} \underbrace{p(s_t|a_{t-1}, s_{t-1})}_{\text{transition probability}} \underbrace{b(s_{t-1})}_{\text{previous belief}}$$

- Problem: too many states
  - e.g. 10 slots, 10 values each $\rightarrow 10^{10}$ distinct states – intractable

- Solutions:
  - only track stuff that appeared in NLU
  - only track n most probable (beam)
  - merge similar states
  - **partition the state** – assume slots are independent, use per-slot beliefs
    - state $\mathbf{s} = [s^1, \dots s^N]$, belief $b(\mathbf{s}_t) = \prod_i b(s_t^i)$

Generative BT: Parameter Tying

i-th slot

- Per-slot: $b(s_t^i) = \sum_{s_{t-1}, o_t^i} p(o_t^i | s_t^i) p(s_t^i | a_{t-1}^i, s_{t-1}^i) b(s_{t-1}^i)$

  observation probability   transition probability   previous belief

- Further simplification: **tie most parameters**
  - estimates from data are unreliable anyway → basically uses 2 parameters only ☺

transition probabilities:

$$p(s_t^i | a_{t-1}^i, s_{t-1}^i) = \begin{cases} \theta_T \text{ if } s_t^i = s_{t-1}^i \\ \frac{1-\theta_T}{\#\text{values}^{i-1}} \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

θ_T = "rigidity" (bias for keeping previous values),
otherwise all value changes have the same probability

observation probabilities:

$$p(o_t^i | s_t^i) = \begin{cases} \theta_O p(o_t^i) \text{ if } o_t^i = s_t^i \\ \frac{1-\theta_O}{\#\text{values}^{i-1}} p(o_t^i) \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

θ_O ~ confidence in NLU
$p(o_t^i)$ = NLU output

i.e. believe in value given by NLU with θ_O,
distribute rest of probability equally

(Žilka et al., 2013)
https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W13-4070/

Basic Discriminative Belief Tracker

- Based on the previous model
  - same slot independence assumption
- Even simpler – "always trust the NLU" $\longrightarrow$
  - this makes it parameter-free
  - …and kinda rule-based
  - but very fast, with reasonable performance

NLU output

"user mentioned this value"

$$p(s_t^i|a_{t-1}^i, s_{t-1}^i, o_t^i) = \begin{cases} p(o_t^i) \text{ if } s_t^i = o_t^i \land o_t^i \neq \text{🤕} \\ p(o_t^i) \text{ if } s_t^i = s_{t-1}^i \land o_t^i = \text{🤕} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

"no change"

user silent about slot i

update rule:
$$b(s_t^i) = \sum_{s_{t-1}^i, o_t^i} \underbrace{p(s_t^i|a_{t-1}^i, s_{t-1}^i, o_t^i)}_{\text{discriminative model}} b(s_{t-1}^i)$$

substitution

"null value" "not mentioned earlier" "not mentioned now"

$$b(s_t^i) = \begin{cases} s_t^i = \text{🤕}: \quad p(s_{t-1}^i = \text{🤕})p(o_t^i = \text{🤕}) \\ \text{else}: \qquad p(o_t^i = s_t^i) + p(o_t^i = \text{🤕})p(s_t^i = s_{t-1}^i) \end{cases}$$

"non-null"   "mentioned now"   "carry-over"

the rule is now deterministic

Tracker types

- **Generative** trackers – need many assumptions to be tractable
  - cannot exploit arbitrary features
  - … or they can, but not if we want to keep them tractable
  - often use handcrafted parameters
  - … may produce unreliable estimates   (Williams, 2012) https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6424197

X
- **Discriminative** trackers – can use any features from dialogue history
  - parameters estimated from data more easily
  - generally used nowadays

- General distinction
  - **static models** – encode whole history into features
  - **dynamic/sequence models** – explicitly model dialogue as sequential

Static Discriminative Trackers

- Generally predict $p(s_t | o_1, a_1, \ldots, a_{t-1}, o_t)$
  - any kind of classifier (SVM, LR...)
  - need fixed feature vector from $o_1, a_1, \ldots, a_{t-1}, o_t$ (where t is arbitrary)
    - current turn, cumulative, sliding window
  - per-value features & tying weights– some values are too rare

- Global feature examples: (Metallinou et al., 2013) https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P13-1046
  - NLU n-best size, entropy, lengths (current turn, cumulative)
  - ASR scores

- Per-value v examples:
  - rank & score of hypo with v on current NLU n-best + diff vs. top-scoring hypo
  - # times v appeared so far, sum/average confidence of that
  - # negations/confirmations of v so far
  - reliability of NLU predicting v on held-out data

- Dialogue as a sequence $p(s_1, \dots s_t | o_1, \dots o_t)$
- **CRF** models
  - similar features as static
  - feature value: NLU score for the given thing (e.g. DA type + slot + value)
  - target: per-slot BIO coding

|	Utterance	Goals	
		Food	Area
S_1	Hello, How may I help you?		
U_1	I need a Persian restaurant in the south part of town.	Persian	South
S_2	What kind of food would you like?		
U_2	Persian.	Persian	South
S_3	I'm sorry but there is no restaurant serving persian food		
U_3	How about Portuguese food?	Portuguese	South
S_4	Peking restaurant is a nice place in the south of town.		
U_4	Is that Portuguese?	Portuguese	South
S_5	Nandos is a nice place in the south of town serving tasty Portuguese food.		
U_5	Alright. Whats the phone number?	Portuguese	South
S_6	The phone number of nandos is 01223 327908 .		
U_6	And the address?	Portuguese	South
S_7	Sure, nandos is on Cambridge Leisure Park Clifton Way.		
U_7	Thank you good bye.		

phone

food

Persian, Portuguese

method

constraints, alternatives, finished

(Kim & Banchs, 2014) https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W14-4345

Neural State Trackers

- discriminative, many architectures
- basic **static** example:
  use a **feed-forward** as your classifier
  - input – features (w.r.t. slot-value v & time t)
    - NLU score of v
    - n-best rank of v
    - user & system intent (*inform*/*request*)
    - … – other domain-independent, low-level NLU features
  - 3 tanh layers
  - output – softmax
    (= probability distribution over values)
  - static – uses a **sliding window**:
    current time t + few steps back + $\sum$previous

T previous timesteps

sum of everything before then

M input features

t $\quad\cdots\quad$ $t - T + 1$ $\quad\quad$ $(0 \ldots t - T)$

f_1 $\quad$ $f_1(t, v)$ $\quad$ $f_1(t - T + 1, v)$ $\quad$ $\sum_{t'=0}^{t-T} f_1(t', v)$

f_2 $\quad$ $f_2(t, v)$ $\quad$ $f_2(t - T + 1, v)$ $\quad$ $\sum_{t'=0}^{t-T} f_2(t', v)$

$\vdots$

f_M $\quad$ $f_M(t, v)$ $\quad$ $f_M(t - T + 1, v)$ $\quad$ $\sum_{t'=0}^{t-T} f_M(t', v)$

$\mathbf{h}_1 \left[= \tanh(\mathbf{W}_0 \mathbf{f}^T + \mathbf{b}_0) \right]$

(imagine this part for all v's)

$\mathbf{h}_2 \left[= \tanh(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{h}_1^T + \mathbf{b}_1) \right]$

$\mathbf{h}_3 \left[= \tanh(\mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{h}_2^T + \mathbf{b}_2) \right]$

$E(t, v) \left[= \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{h}_3^T \right]$

softmax over
all possible v's + "other"

(Henderson et al., 2013)
https://aclweb.org/anthology/W13-4073

Dynamic Neural State Trackers

- Based on RNNs (turn-level or word-level)

- Typically **not** using NLU – directly ASR/words → belief

- Simple example: RNN over words + classification on hidden states
  - runs over the whole dialogue history (user utterances + system actions)

(Žilka & Jurčíček, 2015)
http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.03471

Summary

- Neural networks primer
  - embeddings
  - layers (sigmoid, tanh, ReLU)
  - recurrent networks (LSTM, GRU), attention
- NN SLU examples: classifier/sequence
- Dialogue state vs. belief state
- Dialogue as **(Partially observable) Markov Decision Process**
- Tracker examples:
  - **Generative** (partitioning, parameter tying)
  - **Discriminative** (basic "rule-based", classifier, neural)
  - **static** vs. **dynamic**
- Next time: dialogue policies

Thanks

Contact us:

**Labs in 10 mins
S4**

Get these slides here:

http://ufal.cz/npfl123

References/Inspiration/Further:

- Filip Jurčíček's slides (Charles University): https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/~jurcicek/NPFL099-SDS-2014LS/
- Milica Gašić's slides (Cambridge University): http://mi.eng.cam.ac.uk/~mg436/teaching.html
- Henderson (2015): Machine Learning for Dialog State Tracking: A Review https://ai.google/research/pubs/pub44018
- Žilka et al. (2013): Comparison of Bayesian Discriminative and Generative Models for Dialogue State Tracking
  https://aclweb.org/anthology/W13-4070 (+David Marek's MSc. thesis https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/122733/)
- Liu & Lane (2016): Attention-Based Recurrent Neural Network Models for Joint Intent Detection and Slot Filling
  http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.01454
- Kim & Banchs (2014): Sequential Labeling for Tracking Dynamic Dialog States
  https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W14-4345