

Do Response Selection Models Really Know What's Next? Utterance Manipulation Strategies for Multi-turn Response Selection

Taesun Whang^{1*} Dongyub Lee^{2*} Dongsuk Oh³ Chanhee Lee³

Kijong Han⁴ Dong-hun Lee⁴ Saebyeok Lee^{1,3}

¹Wisnut Inc.

²Kakao Corp.

³Korea University

⁴Kakao Enterprise

Abstract

In this paper, we study the task of selecting optimal response given user and system utterance history in retrieval-based multi-turn dialog systems. Recently, pre-trained language models (*e.g.*, BERT, RoBERTa, and ELECTRA) have shown significant improvements in various natural language processing tasks. This and similar response selection tasks can also be solved using such language models by formulating them as dialog-response binary classification tasks. Although existing works using this approach successfully obtained state-of-the-art results, we observe that language models trained in this manner tend to make predictions based on the relatedness of history and candidates, ignoring the sequential nature of multi-turn dialog systems. This suggests that the response selection task alone is insufficient in learning temporal dependencies between utterances. To this end, we propose utterance manipulation strategies (UMS) to address this problem. Specifically, UMS consist of several strategies (*i.e.*, insertion, deletion, and search), which aid the response selection model towards maintaining dialog coherence. Further, UMS are self-supervised methods that do not require additional annotation and thus can be easily incorporated into existing approaches. Extensive evaluation across multiple languages and models shows that UMS are highly effective in teaching dialog consistency, which lead to models pushing the state-of-the-art with significant margins on multiple public benchmark datasets.

1 Introduction

In recent years, building intelligent conversational agents has gained increased attention in the field of natural language processing (NLP). Among widely used dialog systems, retrieval-based dialog systems (Lowe et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2017; Zhang




Figure 1: An example of multi-turn response selection. BERT-based model tends to calculate the matching score of a dialog-response pair depending on its semantic relatedness ((a) < (b)). More details are described in Section 5.2.

et al., 2018) are implemented in a variety of industries since they provide accurate, informative, and promising responses. In this study, we focus on multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based dialog systems. This is a task of predicting the most likely response under given dialog history from a set of candidates.

Existing works (Wu et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2018; Tao et al., 2019a; Yuan et al., 2019) have studied utterance-response matching based on attention mechanisms including self-attention (Vaswani et al., 2017). Most recently, as pre-trained language models (*e.g.*, BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), and ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020)) have achieved substantial improvements in performance in diverse NLP tasks, multi-turn response selection also has been resolved by using such language models (Whang et al., 2019; Lu et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020; Humeau et al.,

*These authors equally contributed to this work.

2020).

However, we tackle three crucial problems in applying language models to response selection. 1) Domain adaptation based on an additional training on target corpus is extremely not only time-consuming but also costly in computation. 2) Formulating response selection as a dialog-response binary classification task is insufficient in representing intra- and inter-utterance interaction, since dialog context is formed by concatenating all utterances. 3) The models tend to select the optimal response depending on how semantically similar it is to a given dialog. As shown in Figure 1, we experiment to verify that BERT-based response selection model is trained properly to select the next utterance rather than dialog-related response. The result shows that the model tends to give higher probability score to the response which is more semantically related to the dialog context rather than consistent response. Although it is obvious that the ground truth is suitable for being the next utterance, the model highly depends on its semantic meaning.

To address these issues, this paper proposes Utterance Manipulation Strategies (UMS) for multi-turn response selection. Specifically, UMS consist of three powerful strategies (*i.e.*, insertion, deletion, and search), which effectively help the response selection model to learn temporal dependencies between utterances and maintain dialog coherence. In addition, these strategies are fully self-supervised methods that do not require additional annotation and can be easily adapted to existing studies. We briefly summarize the main contributions of this paper: 1) We show that existing response selection models are more likely to predict a semantically relevant response with its dialog rather than the next utterance. 2) We propose simple but novel utterance manipulation strategies, which are highly effective in predicting the next utterance. Our model has strengths in effectively performing in-domain classification. 3) Experimental results on three benchmarks (*i.e.*, Ubuntu, Douban, and E-commerce) show that our proposed model outperforms state-of-the-art methods. We also obtain significant improvements in performance on a new Korean open-domain corpus compared to the baselines.

2 Related Work

Early approaches to response selection have focused on single-turn response selection (Wang

et al., 2013; Hu et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2015). Recently, multi-turn response selection has obtained more attention by researchers. Lowe et al. (2015) proposed dual encoder architecture which uses an RNN-based models to match the dialog and response. Zhou et al. (2016) proposed the multi-view model that encodes dialog context and response both on word-level and utterance-level. However, these models have limitations to fully reflect the relationship between the dialog and response. To alleviate this, Wu et al. (2017) proposed the sequential matching network which utilizes matching metrics to match each utterance with response. As self-attention (Vaswani et al., 2017) mechanism has been proved its effectiveness, it is applied in subsequent works (Zhou et al., 2018; Tao et al., 2019a,b). Yuan et al. (2019) recently pointed out that previous approaches construct dialog representation with abundant information but noisy, which would deteriorate the performance. They proposed an effective history filtering technique to avoid using excessive history information.

Most recently, many researches based on pre-trained language models including BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) are proposed. Generally, most models formulate the response selection task as a dialog-response binary classification task. Whang et al. (2019) first applied BERT for multi-turn response selection and obtained state-of-the-art results through further training BERT on domain-specific corpus. Subsequent researches (Lu et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020) focused on modeling speaker information and showed its effectiveness in response retrieval. Humeau et al. (2020) investigated the trade-off relationship between model complexity and computation efficiency in the language models. They proposed poly-encoders that ensure fast inference speed, even though the performance is slightly lower than that of the cross-encoder.

3 Proposed Method

3.1 Language Models for Response Selection

Pre-trained Language Models Recently, pre-trained language models, such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020), were successfully adapted to a wide range of NLP tasks, including multi-turn response selection, achieving state-of-the-art results. In this work, we build upon this success and evaluate our method by incorporating it into BERT and ELECTRA.




Figure 2: An overview of Utterance Manipulation Strategies. Input sequence for each manipulation strategy is dynamically constructed by extracting k consecutive utterances from the original dialog context during the training period. Also, target utterance is randomly chosen from either the dialog context (Insertion, Search) or the random dialog (Deletion).

Domain-specific Post-training Since contextual language models are pre-trained on general corpora, such as the Toronto Books Corpus and Wikipedia, it is less effective to directly fine-tune these models on downstream tasks if there is a domain shift. Hence, it is a common practice to further train such models with the language modeling objective using texts from the target domain to reduce the negative impact. This has shown to be effective in various tasks including review reading comprehension (Xu et al., 2019) and SuperGLUE (Wang et al., 2019). Existing works on multi-turn response selection (Whang et al., 2019; Gu et al., 2020; Humeau et al., 2020) also adapted this post-training approach and obtained state-of-the-art results. We also employ this post-training method in this work and show its effectiveness in improving performance (Section 5.1).

Training Response Selection Models Following several researches based on contextual language models for multi-turn response selection (Whang et al., 2019; Lu et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020), a pointwise approach is used to learn a cross-encoder that receives both dialog context and response simultaneously. Suppose that a dialog agent is given a dialog dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(U_i, r_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$. Each triplet consists of 1) a sequence of utterances $U_i = [u_1^i, u_2^i, \dots, u_{|U|}^i]$ representing the historical context, where u_j^i is a single utterance, 2) a

response r_i , and 3) a label $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Each utterance u_j^i and response r_i are composed of multiple tokens including a special “End Of Turn” token [EOT] at the end of each utterance, following the work of Whang et al. (2019). In general, input sequence,

$$\mathbf{X} = [[\text{CLS}] u_1 u_2 \dots u_{n_u} [\text{SEP}] r [\text{SEP}]],$$

is fed into pre-trained language models (*i.e.*, BERT, ELECTRA), then output representation of [CLS] token, $\mathbf{x}_{[\text{CLS}]} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$, is used to classify whether dialog-response pair is consistent. A relevance score of the dialog utterances and response is formulated as,

$$g(U, r) = \sigma(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_{[\text{CLS}]} + b), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ and b is trainable parameters. We use binary cross-entropy loss to optimize the models.

3.2 Utterance Manipulation Strategies

Figure 2 describes the overview of our proposed method, utterance manipulation strategies. We propose a multi-task learning framework, which consists of three highly effective auxiliary tasks for multi-turn response selection, utterance 1) *insertion*, 2) *deletion*, and 3) *search*. These tasks are jointly trained with the response selection model during the fine-tuning period. To train the auxiliary

tasks, we add new special tokens, [INS], [DEL], and [SRCH] for the utterance insertion, deletion, and search tasks, respectively. We cover how we train the model with these special tokens in the following sections.

Utterance Insertion Despite the huge success of BERT, it has limitations to understand discourse-level semantic structure since NSP, one of BERT’s objectives, only performs to distinguish whether the given sentence pairs are irrelevant. In multi-turn response selection, the model needs the ability not only to distinguish the utterances with different semantic meanings but also to discriminate whether the utterances are consecutive even if they are semantically related. We propose *utterance insertion* to resolve the issues above.

We first extract k consecutive utterances from the original dialog context, then randomly select one of the utterances to be inserted. To train the model to find where the selected utterance should be inserted, [INS] tokens are positioned before and after each utterance. [INS] tokens are represented as possible position of the target utterance. Input sequence for utterance insertion is denoted as,

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{INS}} = [[\text{CLS}] [\text{INS}]_1 u_1 [\text{INS}]_2 u_2 \dots u_{t-1} [\text{INS}]_t u_{t+1} \dots u_k [\text{INS}]_k [\text{SEP}] u_t [\text{SEP}]],$$

where u_t is the target utterance and $[\text{INS}]_t$ is the target insertion token.

Utterance Deletion Recent BERT-based models for multi-turn response selection regard the task as a dialog-response binary classification. Even though they are extended in a multi-turn manner by using separating token (e.g., [SEP], [EOT]), it lacks utterance-level interaction between dialog context and response. To alleviate this, we propose a novel auxiliary task, *utterance deletion*, for enriching utterance-level interaction in multi-turn conversation.

Same as the *utterance insertion*, k consecutive utterances are extracted from the original dialog context, then an utterance from a random dialog is inserted among the k extracted utterances. In other words, $k + 1$ utterances are composed of K utterances from the original conversation and one from the different dialog. To train the model to find unrelated utterance, [DEL] tokens are positioned before each utterance. The objective of the utterance deletion task is to predict which utterance causes inconsistency. We denote the input

sequence for utterance deletion as,

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{DEL}} = [[\text{CLS}] [\text{DEL}]_1 u_1 [\text{DEL}]_2 u_2 \dots [\text{DEL}]_t u^{rand} [\text{DEL}]_{t+1} u_t \dots [\text{DEL}]_{k+1} u_k [\text{SEP}]],$$

where u^{rand} is the utterance from the random dialog and $[\text{DEL}]_t$ is the target deletion token.

Utterance Search Whereas two previous auxiliary tasks are performed in properly ordered dialog, we design a novel task, *utterance search*, which aims to find an appropriate utterance from the randomly shuffled utterances. The objective of this task is to learn temporal dependencies between semantically similar utterances.

Given k consecutive utterances same as the previous tasks, we shuffle utterances except the last utterance and insert [SRCH] tokens before each shuffled utterance. Utterance search aims to find the previous utterance of the last utterance from the jumbled utterances. Input sequence for utterance search is denoted as,

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{SRCH}} = [[\text{CLS}] [\text{SRCH}]_1 u'_1 [\text{SRCH}]_2 u'_2 \dots [\text{SRCH}]_t u'_t \dots u'_{k-1} [\text{SEP}] u_k [\text{SEP}]],$$

where $\{u'_t\}_{t=1}^{k-1}$ is a set of utterances which are randomly shuffled except the last utterance u_k . The previous utterance of u_k is denoted as u'_t (i.e., u_{k-1}) and $[\text{SRCH}]_t$ is the target search token.

3.3 Multi-Task Learning Setup

The input sequence of each task is fed into the language models. The output representations of special tokens (i.e., [INS], [DEL], and [SRCH]) are used to classify whether each token is in a correct position to be inserted, deleted, and searched. Target tokens for each task (i.e., $[\text{INS}]_t$, $[\text{DEL}]_t$, and $[\text{SRCH}]_t$) are labeled as 1, otherwise 0. We calculate the probability of the token being a target, denoted as follows.

$$p(y_{\text{TASK}} = 1 | \mathbf{X}_{\text{TASK}}) = \sigma(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_{\text{TASK}} + b), \quad (2)$$

where $\text{TASK} \in \{\text{INS}, \text{DEL}, \text{SRCH}\}$ and \mathbf{x}_{TASK} is the output representation of each special token. We use binary cross-entropy loss for all auxiliary tasks to optimize each model. The final loss is determined by summing up response selection loss and UMS losses with the same ratio¹.

¹We obtained the best results by summing up all the losses equally.

Dataset	Ubuntu			Douban			E-Commerce			Kakao			
	Train	Val	Test	Train	Val	Test	Train	Val	Test	Train	Val	Test (Web)	Test (Clean)
# pairs	1M	500K	500K	1M	50K	6670	1M	10K	10K	1M	50K	5139	7164
pos:neg	1:1	1:9	1:9	1:1	1:1	1.2:8.8	1:1	1:1	1:9	1:1	1:1	1.6:7.4	2:7
# avg turns	10.13	10.11	10.11	6.69	6.75	6.45	5.51	5.48	5.64	3.00	3.00	3.49	3.25

Table 1: Corpus statistics of multi-turn response selection datasets.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate our model on three widely used response selection benchmarks, *Ubuntu Corpus V1* (Lowe et al., 2015), *Douban Corpus* (Wu et al., 2017), and *E-Commerce Corpus* (Zhang et al., 2018). Also, a new open-domain dialog corpus, *Kakao Corpus*, is utilized to evaluate our model. All datasets consist of dyadic multi-turn conversations and their statistics are summarized in Table 1.

Ubuntu Corpus V1 Ubuntu dataset is a large multi-turn conversation corpus, which is constructed from Ubuntu internet relay chat. It mainly consists of conversations of two participants who discuss how to troubleshoot Ubuntu operating system. We utilize the data released by Xu et al. (2017), where numbers, urls, paths are replaced with special placeholders following the previous works (Wu et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2018).

Douban Corpus Douban dataset is a Chinese open-domain dialog corpus, while the Ubuntu Corpus is a domain specific dataset. It is constructed by web-crawling from Douban group², which is a popular social networking service (SNS) in China.

E-commerce Corpus E-Commerce dataset is another Chinese multi-turn conversation corpus. It is collected from real-world customer consultation dialogs from Taobao³, which is the largest Chinese e-commerce platform. It consists of several types of conversations (e.g., commodity consultation, recommendation, negotiation) based on various commodities.

Kakao Corpus Kakao dataset is a large Korean open-domain dialog corpus, which is constructed by Kakao corporation⁴. It is mainly web-crawled from Korean SNS such as Korean Twitter and Reddit. In a similar manner that Ubuntu dataset was

constructed, we take the last utterance of the dialog as a positive response and the rest as dialog context. Negative responses are randomly sampled from the other conversations. We split the test set into two sets; 1) *web* is same as the training set. 2) *clean* consists of grammatically correct conversations which are constructed by human annotators and inspected by the NLP experts.

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluated our model using several retrieval metrics, following the previous researches (Lowe et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2018; Yuan et al., 2019). First, we employ 1 in n recall at k , denoted as $R_n@k$ ($k = \{1, 2, 5\}$), which gets 1 when a ground truth is positioned in k selected list and 0 otherwise. Also, three other metrics, mean average precision (MAP), mean reciprocal rank (MRR), and precision at one (P@1), are used especially for Douban and Kakao since these two datasets may contain more than one positive response among candidates.

4.3 Training Details

We implement our model by using PyTorch deep learning framework (Paszke et al., 2019) based on the open source code⁵ (Wolf et al., 2019). Since we experiment on three different languages (i.e., English, Chinese, Korean), initial checkpoints for BERT and ELECTRA are adapted from several works (Devlin et al., 2019; Clark et al., 2020; Cui et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020). Specifically, we employ *base* pre-trained models for all languages except for Chinese (whole word masking (WWM) strategy is used for Chinese BERT⁶). Since ELECTRA for Korean is not available, we do not conduct ELECTRA-based experiments on the Kakao Corpus. All our experiments, both post-training and fine-tuning, are run on 4 Tesla V100 GPUs. For fine-tuning, we trained the models with a batch size of 32 using adam optimizer with a initial learning rate of 3e-5. The maximum sequence length is set to 512 and k for UMS is set to 5. Our code

²<https://www.douban.com>

³<https://www.taobao.com>

⁴<https://www.kakaocorp.com>

⁵<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

⁶<https://github.com/ymcui/Chinese-BERT-wwm>

Models	Ubuntu			Douban						E-commerce		
	R ₁₀ @1	R ₁₀ @2	R ₁₀ @5	MAP	MRR	P@1	R ₁₀ @1	R ₁₀ @2	R ₁₀ @5	R ₁₀ @1	R ₁₀ @2	R ₁₀ @5
CNN (Kadlec et al., 2015)	0.549	0.684	0.896	0.417	0.440	0.226	0.121	0.252	0.647	0.328	0.515	0.792
LSTM (Kadlec et al., 2015)	0.638	0.784	0.949	0.485	0.537	0.320	0.187	0.343	0.720	0.365	0.536	0.828
BiLSTM (Kadlec et al., 2015)	0.630	0.780	0.944	0.479	0.514	0.313	0.184	0.330	0.716	0.365	0.536	0.825
MV-LSTM (Wan et al., 2016)	0.653	0.804	0.946	0.498	0.538	0.348	0.202	0.351	0.710	0.412	0.591	0.857
Match-LSTM(Wang and Jiang, 2016)	0.653	0.799	0.944	0.500	0.537	0.345	0.202	0.348	0.720	0.410	0.590	0.858
Multi-View (Zhou et al., 2016)	0.662	0.801	0.951	0.505	0.543	0.342	0.202	0.350	0.729	0.421	0.601	0.861
DL2R (Yan et al., 2016)	0.626	0.783	0.944	0.488	0.527	0.330	0.193	0.342	0.705	0.399	0.571	0.842
SMN (Wu et al., 2017)	0.726	0.847	0.961	0.529	0.569	0.397	0.233	0.396	0.724	0.453	0.654	0.886
DUA (Zhang et al., 2018)	0.752	0.868	0.962	0.551	0.599	0.421	0.243	0.421	0.780	0.501	0.700	0.921
DAM (Zhou et al., 2018)	0.767	0.874	0.969	0.550	0.601	0.427	0.254	0.410	0.757	0.526	0.727	0.933
IoI (Tao et al., 2019b)	0.796	0.894	0.974	0.573	0.621	0.444	0.269	0.451	0.786	0.563	0.768	0.950
MSN (Yuan et al., 2019)	0.800	0.899	0.978	0.587	0.632	0.470	0.295	0.452	0.788	0.606	0.770	0.937
BERT (Gu et al., 2020)	0.808	0.897	0.975	0.591	0.633	0.454	0.280	0.470	0.828	0.610	0.814	0.973
BERT-SS-DA (Lu et al., 2020)	0.813	0.901	0.977	0.602	0.643	0.458	0.280	0.491	0.843	0.648	0.843	0.980
SA-BERT (Gu et al., 2020)	0.855	0.928	0.983	0.619	0.659	0.496	0.313	0.481	0.847	0.704	0.879	0.985
BERT (ours)	0.820	0.906	0.978	0.597	0.634	0.448	0.279	<u>0.489</u>	0.823	0.641	0.824	0.973
ELECTRA	0.826	0.908	0.978	0.602	0.642	0.465	0.287	0.483	0.839	0.609	0.804	0.965
UMS _{BERT}	0.843	0.920	0.982	0.597	0.639	0.466	0.285	0.471	0.829	<u>0.674</u>	<u>0.861</u>	<u>0.980</u>
UMS _{ELECTRA}	<u>0.854</u>	<u>0.929</u>	<u>0.984</u>	<u>0.608</u>	<u>0.650</u>	<u>0.472</u>	<u>0.291</u>	0.488	<u>0.845</u>	0.648	0.831	0.974
BERT+	0.862	0.935	0.987	0.609	0.645	0.463	0.290	0.505	0.838	0.725	0.890	0.984
ELECTRA+	0.861	0.932	0.985	0.612	0.655	0.480	0.301	0.499	0.836	0.673	0.835	0.974
UMS _{BERT+}	0.875	0.942	0.988	0.625	0.664	0.499	0.318	0.482	0.858	0.762	0.905	0.986
UMS _{ELECTRA+}	0.875	0.941	0.988	0.623	0.663	0.492	0.307	0.501	0.851	0.707	0.853	0.974

Table 2: Results on Ubuntu, Douban, and E-Commerce datasets. All the evaluation results except ours are cited from published literature (Tao et al., 2019b; Yuan et al., 2019; Lu et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020). The underlined numbers mean the best performance for each block and the **bold** numbers mean state-of-the-art performance for each metric.

and post-trained checkpoints for all benchmarks are publicly available⁷.

4.4 Baselines

Single-turn Matching Models These baselines, including CNN, LSTM, BiLSTM (Kadlec et al., 2015), MV-LSTM (Wan et al., 2016), and Match-LSTM (Wang and Jiang, 2016), are based on matching between a dialog context and a response. They constructed the dialog context by concatenating utterances and regarded it as a long document.

Multi-turn Matching Models Multi-View (Zhou et al., 2016) utilize both word- and utterance-level representations; DL2R (Yan et al., 2016) reformulates the last utterance with previous utterances in the dialog context; SMN (Wu et al., 2017) first constructs attention matrices based on word and sequential representations of each utterance and response, then obtains matching vectors by using CNN; DUA (Zhang et al., 2018) utilizes deep utterance aggregation to form a fine-grained context representation; DAM (Zhou et al., 2018) obtains matching representations of the utterances and response using self- and cross-attention based on Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017); IoI (Tao et al., 2019b)

lets utterance-response interaction go deep in a matching model; MSN (Yuan et al., 2019) filters only relevant utterances using a multi-hop selector network.

BERT-based Models Recently, BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) is also applied to response selection, such as vanilla BERT (Gu et al., 2020), BERT-SS-DA (Lu et al., 2020), and SA-BERT (Gu et al., 2020). In these models, the dialog context is represented as a long document as in single-turn matching models. They mainly utilize speaker information of each utterance in the dialog context to extend BERT into a multi-turn fashion.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Quantitative Results

Table 2 reports the quantitative results on Ubuntu, Douban, and E-Commerce datasets. In our experiments, we set two conditions for pre-trained language models. 1) Two different pre-trained language models (*i.e.*, BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020)) are utilized for fine-tuning. 2) We adapt domain-specific post-training approach (Whang et al., 2019; Humeau et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020) (each post-trained model is denoted as BERT+ and ELECTRA+). Based on these ini-

⁷<https://github.com/taesunwhang/UMS-ResSel>

Test Split	Approach	MAP	MRR	P@1	R ₁₀ @1	R ₁₀ @2	R ₁₀ @5
Web	BERT	0.671	0.720	0.555	0.391	0.599	0.890
	UMS _{BERT}	0.699	0.751	0.606	0.428	0.623	0.911
Clean	BERT	0.726	0.792	0.648	0.395	0.612	0.888
	UMS _{BERT}	0.761	0.834	0.716	0.431	0.663	0.903

Table 3: Evaluation Results on Kakao Corpus.

tial settings, we explore how effective UMS are for multi-turn response selection.

For all datasets, models with UMS significantly outperform the previous state-of-the-art methods. Specifically, UMS_{BERT+} achieves absolute improvement of 2.0% and 5.8% in $R_{10}@1$ on Ubuntu and E-Commerce datasets, respectively. For Douban dataset, MAP and MRR are considered to be main metrics rather than $R_{10}@1$ because test set contains more than one ground truth in the candidates. UMS_{BERT+} achieves absolute improvement of 0.5% in these metrics.

To evaluate the effectiveness of UMS, we compare the models with UMS and those without them. Since existing BERT-based approaches (Lu et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020) reported different performance of BERT, we reimplement it for a fair comparison with our proposed UMS_{BERT}. The models with UMS consistently show performance improvement regardless of whether language models are post-trained on each corpus or not. For the models without post-training, different results are obtained depending on the dataset. ELECTRA mainly shows better results for Ubuntu and Douban datasets, while BERT shows better results for E-Commerce dataset. On the contrary, BERT+ achieves the best performance for all corpora in comparison among the models with post-training. We believe that post-training on domain-specific corpus gives the model more opportunities to learn whether given two dialogs are relevant through NSP, which has the effect of data augmentation.

Results on Kakao Corpus We report evaluation results on Kakao Corpus in Table 3. Since ELECTRA for Korean is unavailable, we only compare BERT and UMS_{BERT} for two test splits. *Clean* shows better results than *Web* with respect to all metrics regardless of using UMS. This might be because *Clean* contains less grammatical errors and typos, which interfere with accurate understanding of the context. Also, UMS_{BERT} significantly improves performance compared to the baseline for both split, specifically it achieves absolute improvement of 5.1% and 6.8% in P@1 on *Web* and *Clean*, respectively.

Approach	Model	Original		Adversarial	
		R ₁₀ @1	MRR	R ₁₀ @1	MRR
Baselines	BERT	0.820	0.887	0.199	0.561
	BERT+	0.862	0.915	0.203	0.573
	ELECTRA	0.826	0.890	0.304	0.614
	ELECTRA+	0.861	0.914	0.329	0.636
	Avg	0.842	0.902	0.259	0.596
UMS	BERT	0.843	0.902	0.310	0.622
	BERT+	0.875	0.923	0.363	0.656
	ELECTRA	0.854	0.910	0.397	0.668
	ELECTRA+	0.875	0.922	0.437	0.692
	Avg	0.862	0.914	0.377	0.660

Table 4: Adversarial experimental results on Ubuntu Corpus. All models are evaluated using $R_{10}@1$ and MRR metrics.

5.2 Adversarial Experiment

Even though BERT-based models have shown state-of-the-art performance for response selection task, we experiment to know if these models are trained to predict the next utterance properly. Inspired by Jia and Liang (2017) and Yuan et al. (2019), we design an adversarial experiment to investigate whether language models for response selection are trained properly. First, we train the models using the original training set, then evaluate them on either original or adversarial test set. To construct the adversarial test set, we randomly extract an utterance from the dialog context and replace it with one of negative responses among candidates (See Figure 1). In adversarial test set, assuming there are n candidates per conversation, a set of candidates consists of a ground truth, an extracted utterance from the dialog context, and $n-2$ negative responses. The extracted utterance is not deleted from the original dialog since it can be crucial for selecting the optimal response.

Table 4 reports the experimental results of BERT(+) and ELECTRA(+) models. We compare the models without UMS and those with, denoted as baselines and UMS, respectively. Even though the performances drop significantly in the adversarial set regardless of using UMS, we observe that UMS decline less than baselines. To be specific, $R_{10}@1$ score is decreased by 58% and 48% on average for baselines and UMS, respectively. It is also encouraging that UMS show absolute improvement of 12% with respect to $R_{10}@1$ on the adversarial set compared to the 2% improvement on the original set (See Table 4). In addition, while baselines tend to drop the performance on adversarial set as training progressed, UMS show a tendency to increase significantly. Hence, it is reasonable to




Figure 3: $R_{10}@1$ comparison of adversarial example for each model. Lower $R_{10}@1$ means that it is good at predicting the next utterance (ground truth).

Auxiliary Tasks		$R_{10}@1$	$R_{10}@2$	$R_{10}@5$	MRR
1	None	0.826	0.908	0.978	0.890
2	INS	0.836	0.917	0.980	0.897
3	DEL	0.848	0.924	0.983	0.905
4	SRCH	0.834	0.915	0.981	0.896
5	INS + DEL	0.853	0.927	0.984	0.909
6	INS + SRCH	0.841	0.920	0.982	0.901
7	DEL + SRCH	0.852	0.927	0.983	0.908
8	INS + DEL + SRCH	0.854	0.929	0.984	0.910

Table 5: Ablation Study on Ubuntu Corpus. We choose ELECTRA as the baseline in this analysis. INS, DEL, and SRCH denote that the model trained with utterance insertion, deletion, and search, respectively.

assume that our UMS are robust to adversarial examples and good at *in-domain* classification.

Figure 3 describes the performance of each model, ranking adversarial example (*i.e.*, randomly sampled utterance from the conversation) as the most likely response. While BERT- and ELECTRA-based models show similar performance on the original set, ELECTRA-based models outperform BERT-based models with significant margins (a gap of 10%) on the adversarial set regardless of whether they are trained from post-trained checkpoints. For example, different patterns of the evaluation results between BERT+ and ELECTRA are observed according to the test sets (original : BERT+ > ELECTRA, adversarial : BERT+ < ELECTRA). We have two perspectives on these results. 1) *Next sentence prediction* in BERT overfits the model to predict semantically relevant sentence rather than the next sentence. 2) Since ELECTRA is trained through *replaced token detection* in which the model learns to discriminate between real input tokens and replacements generated from small *Masked Language Model*, it is more effective in representing contextual information from the sequence.




Figure 4: t-SNE embeddings of UMS_{BERT+} output representations for each special token in UMS (*i.e.*, [INS], [DEL], and [SRCH]). All embeddings are sampled from test sets of each dataset. Orange and blue denote the target and other remaining tokens for each auxiliary task.

5.3 Ablation Study

We performed ablation studies on the Ubuntu Corpus to investigate which auxiliary tasks are more crucial for response selection. As shown in Table 5, we explore the impact of each auxiliary task by constructing all the combinations of possible subsets. Based on the observations of using only one auxiliary task (*i.e.*, $3 > 2 \approx 4$) and two tasks (*i.e.*, $5 \approx 7 > 6$), we obtain the results, DEL > INS \approx SRCH, with respect to the importance of manipulation strategy. Since DEL consists of input sequence that contains an irrelevant utterance to the original dialog context, it may be more advantageous for learning to distinguish dialog consistency and coherence than INS and SRCH. We obtain the best results when all the auxiliary tasks are trained altogether simultaneously with the response selection criterion.

5.4 Visualization

As shown in Figure 4, we visualize the output representations of special tokens learned by our proposed UMS through t-SNE embeddings. Scatter plots colored in orange represent target tokens (*i.e.*, $[INS]_t$, $[DEL]_t$, and $[SRCH]_t$ in Section 3.3) and those in blue represent the rest of tokens. All representations are extracted from test sets of three

datasets (Ubuntu, Douban, and E-Commerce) in this analysis. In overall, the results show that UMS_{BERT+} effectively learns dialog coherence for all datasets. In the case of Ubuntu dataset, insertion and search tasks tend to be less clustered different from the other two datasets. Since many utterances in Ubuntu dataset mainly consist of many technical terminologies which may cause structural ambiguity, the tasks constructed within the same dialog are difficult to be performed. On the contrary, the model can easily learn discourse structure on open-domain datasets such as Douban and E-Commerce.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we pointed out the limitations of existing works based on pre-trained language models such as BERT in retrieval-based multi-turn dialog systems. To address these, we proposed highly effective utterance manipulation strategies (UMS) for multi-turn response selection. The UMS are fully applied in self-supervised manner and can be easily incorporated into existing models. We obtained new state-of-the-art results on multiple public benchmark datasets (*i.e.*, Ubuntu, Douban, and E-Commerce) and significantly improved results on Korean open-domain dialog corpus. For the future work, we plan to develop a response selection model which is more robust to adversarial examples by designing various adversarial objectives.

References

- Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yiming Cui, Wanxiang Che, Ting Liu, Bing Qin, Shijin Wang, and Guoping Hu. 2020. [Revisiting pre-trained models for chinese natural language processing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13922*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Jia-Chen Gu, Tianda Li, Quan Liu, Zhen-Hua Ling, Zhiming Su, Si Wei, and Xiaodan Zhu. 2020. [Speaker-aware bert for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*.
- Baotian Hu, Zhengdong Lu, Hang Li, and Qingcai Chen. 2014. [Convolutional neural network architectures for matching natural language sentences](#). In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2042–2050.
- Samuel Humeau, Kurt Shuster, Marie-Anne Lachaux, and Jason Weston. 2020. [Poly-encoders: Architectures and pre-training strategies for fast and accurate multi-sentence scoring](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Robin Jia and Percy Liang. 2017. [Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2021–2031.
- Rudolf Kadlec, Martin Schmid, and Jan Kleindienst. 2015. [Improved deep learning baselines for ubuntu corpus dialogs](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.03753*.
- Dongyub Lee, Myeongcheol Shin, Taesun Whang, Seungwoo Cho, Byeongil Ko, Daniel Lee, Eungyun Kim, and Jaechoon Jo. 2020. [Reference and document aware semantic evaluation methods for korean language summarization](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03510*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Ryan Lowe, Nissan Pow, Iulian Serban, and Joelle Pineau. 2015. [The Ubuntu dialogue corpus: A large dataset for research in unstructured multi-turn dialogue systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 285–294.
- Junyu Lu, Xiancong Ren, Yazhou Ren, Ao Liu, and Zenglin Xu. 2020. [Improving contextual language models for response retrieval in multi-turn conversation](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1805–1808.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. [Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library](#). In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 8026–8037.
- Chongyang Tao, Wei Wu, Can Xu, Wenpeng Hu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2019a. [Multi-representation fusion network for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots](#). In *Pro-*

- ceedings of the Twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, pages 267–275.
- Chongyang Tao, Wei Wu, Can Xu, Wenpeng Hu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2019b. [One time of interaction may not be enough: Go deep with an interaction-over-interaction network for response selection in dialogues.](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–11.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need.](#) In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5998–6008.
- Shengxian Wan, Yanyan Lan, Jun Xu, Jiafeng Guo, Liang Pang, and Xueqi Cheng. 2016. [Match-srnn: Modeling the recursive matching structure with spatial rnn.](#) In *Proceedings of the 25th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, page 29222928.
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2019. [Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems.](#) In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3266–3280.
- Hao Wang, Zhengdong Lu, Hang Li, and Enhong Chen. 2013. [A dataset for research on short-text conversations.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 935–945.
- Mingxuan Wang, Zhengdong Lu, Hang Li, and Qun Liu. 2015. [Syntax-based deep matching of short texts.](#) In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, page 13541361.
- Shuohang Wang and Jing Jiang. 2016. [Learning natural language inference with LSTM.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1442–1451.
- Taesun Whang, Dongyub Lee, Chanhee Lee, Kisu Yang, Dongsuk Oh, and HeuiSeok Lim. 2019. [An effective domain adaptive post-training method for bert in response selection.](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04812*.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2019. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing.](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.
- Yu Wu, Wei Wu, Chen Xing, Ming Zhou, and Zhoujun Li. 2017. [Sequential matching network: A new architecture for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots.](#) In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 496–505.
- Hu Xu, Bing Liu, Lei Shu, and S Yu Philip. 2019. [Bert post-training for review reading comprehension and aspect-based sentiment analysis.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2324–2335.
- Zhen Xu, Bingquan Liu, Baoxun Wang, Chengjie Sun, and Xiaolong Wang. 2017. [Incorporating loose-structured knowledge into conversation modeling via recall-gate lstm.](#) In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 3506–3513.
- Rui Yan, Yiping Song, and Hua Wu. 2016. [Learning to respond with deep neural networks for retrieval-based human-computer conversation system.](#) In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 55–64.
- Chunyuan Yuan, Wei Zhou, Mingming Li, Shangwen Lv, Fuqing Zhu, Jizhong Han, and Songlin Hu. 2019. [Multi-hop selector network for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots.](#) 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 111–120.
- Zhuosheng Zhang, Jiangtong Li, Pengfei Zhu, Hai Zhao, and Gongshen Liu. 2018. [Modeling multi-turn conversation with deep utterance aggregation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3740–3752.
- Xiangyang Zhou, Daxiang Dong, Hua Wu, Shiqi Zhao, Dianhai Yu, Hao Tian, Xuan Liu, and Rui Yan. 2016. [Multi-view response selection for human-computer conversation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 372–381.
- Xiangyang Zhou, Lu Li, Daxiang Dong, Yi Liu, Ying Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Dianhai Yu, and Hua Wu. 2018. [Multi-turn response selection for chatbots with deep attention matching network.](#) In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1118–1127.