

# Controllable and Diverse Data Augmentation with Large Language Model for Low-Resource Open-Domain Dialogue Generation

Zhenhua Liu, Tong Zhu, Jianxiang Xiang, Wenliang Chen

Soochow University

{zhliu0106, tzhu7, jxxiang0720}@stu.suda.edu.cn

wlchen@suda.edu.cn

## Abstract

Data augmentation (DA) is crucial to mitigate model training instability and over-fitting problems in low-resource open-domain dialogue generation. However, traditional DA methods often neglect semantic data diversity, restricting the overall quality. Recently, large language models (LLM) have been used for DA to generate diversified dialogues. However, they have limited controllability and tend to generate dialogues with a distribution shift compared to the seed dialogues. To maximize the augmentation diversity and address the controllability problem, we propose **Summary-based Dialogue Augmentation with LLM (SDA)**. Our approach enhances the controllability of LLM by using dialogue summaries as a planning tool. Based on summaries, SDA can generate high-quality and diverse dialogue data even with a small seed dataset. To evaluate the efficacy of data augmentation methods for open-domain dialogue, we designed a clustering-based metric to characterize the semantic diversity of the augmented dialogue data. The experimental results show that SDA can augment high-quality and semantically diverse dialogues given a small seed dataset and an LLM, and the augmented data can boost the performance of open-domain dialogue models.

## 1 Introduction

Data-driven deep learning models often require large amounts of data, which is especially important for open-domain dialogue generation (Zhang et al., 2020b; Roller et al., 2020). However, data resources are usually scarce in new dialogue scenarios (like counseling or empathetic dialogues). Furthermore, it is difficult to annotate dialogues given the context, since there are multiple plausible responses. As a result, the collection of large amounts of high-quality and semantically diverse dialogue data is extremely expensive and time-consuming (Li et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2018; Dinan et al., 2019).




Figure 1: Overview of traditional data augmentation method and Summary-based Dialogue Augmentation with LLM (SDA).

A feasible solution is data augmentation (DA) (Shorten and Khoshgoftaar, 2019; Feng et al., 2021), but it struggles to perform high-quality augmentation when the seed dataset is small. Traditional DA methods for natural language processing include rule-based methods (Xie et al., 2020; Wei and Zou, 2019; Karimi et al., 2021) and model-based methods (Sennrich et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2020; Ng et al., 2020; Anaby-Tavor et al., 2020), which limit the data diversity (Xu et al., 2023). As shown in Figure 1 (a), the traditional DA methods usually perturb the seed data at word-level or sentence-level, with little semantic differences.

Specifically, several approaches of data augmentation have been proposed for open-domain dialogue systems and achieved a certain success (Zhang et al., 2020a; Ou et al., 2022). However, the semantic diversity of the augmented dialogues generated by these methods is still constrained by the *Seed Dialogue*. In addition, these methods are difficult to apply to low-resource scenarios.

Recently, LLM has shown great potential in various natural language processing tasks with in-context learning (ICL). Given an instruction and a few exemplars, LLM can perform a series of complex tasks (Brown et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2022). In this paper, we investigate the augmentation of a small *Seed Dialogue* dataset using solely the LLM. Since it is trained on huge data, LLM can provide diversity for our task. Nevertheless, directly prompting the LLM usually lacks controllability and tends to generate dialogues with a distribution shift compared to the *Seed Dialogue*.

Based on the above challenges and problems, we propose **Summary-based Dialogue Augmentation with LLM (SDA)** for low-resource open-domain dialogue generation. A three-step approach as shown in Figure 1 (b): Firstly, we convert the *Seed Dialogue* into *Seed Dialogue Summary* with the assistance of LLM, which briefly summarizes the main topics and contents of the dialogue. Secondly, we leverage the *Seed Dialogue Summary* to generate more dialogue summaries with a wide diversity of topics. Finally, we take the augmented dialogue summaries as the planning to generate a dialogue. Directly prompting LLM usually lacks controllability and tends to generate unexpected dialogue. Our solution takes a different way by taking *Dialogue Summary* as the planning to prompt LLM. The dialogue summary, as an abstract representation of a dialogue, can briefly present the main topics and contents of the dialogue, which improves LLM’s controllability. In the end, we could obtain a *Model-generated Dialogue Pool* which contains a large amount of dialogue data both high-quality and diverse with a similar distribution as the *Seed Dialogue*.

To evaluate the efficacy of our proposed method, we design a clustering-based metric, **SEMANTICDIVERSITY**, to characterize the diversity of the augmented dialogue on the basis of the same distribution as the *Seed Dialogue*. Unlike metrics such as **Distinct** (Li et al., 2016), which evaluate data diversity at the word-level, **SEMANTICDIVERSITY** can evaluate the diversity of augmented dialogues

at the semantic-level. Experimental results indicate that, given a small seed dataset and LLM, SDA can effectively augment dialogues with both high quality and semantic diversity. Furthermore, this augmented data enhances the performance of open-domain dialogue generation models.

In summary, our contributions include:

- We propose SDA, a dialogue augmentation approach that exploits the potential of LLM to augment the given small seed data. Our approach improves the controllability of LLM by using summary as planning, which generates high-quality and diverse dialogue data that matches the distribution of seed data.
- We develop a new clustering-based metric **SEMANTICDIVERSITY**, which could characterize the semantic diversity of the augmented dialogue on the basis of the same distribution as the *Seed Dialogue*. We conduct a comprehensive analysis of augmented dialogue data to demonstrate the superior data quality and diversity generated by SDA, compared to other baseline methods.
- Extensive experiments show that our proposed solution can boost model performance in low-resource scenarios.

## 2 Related Work

Related work involves in-context learning and data augmentation.

**In-Context Learning.** With the increasing ability of large language models, in-context learning (ICL) performs few-shot learning by doing inference conditioning on several exemplars (Brown et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2022). ICL has obtained success in semantic parsing (Pasupat et al., 2021; Rubin et al., 2022; Shin and Durme, 2021), information extraction (Wan et al., 2023; He et al., 2023), machine translation (Zhu et al., 2023; Sia and Duh, 2023), and other Natural Language Processing tasks. In particular, there have been some previous attempts to apply ICL to dialogue systems (Yu et al., 2021; Parikh et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2022; Hu et al., 2022; Madotto et al., 2021). In this paper, we use the capabilities of ICL to perform data augmentation on small seed dialogue data.

**Data Augmentation.** The traditional data augmentation methods for natural language processing




Figure 2: Main framework of our method. The process is in three steps: (1) First, summarizing the seed dialogue into dialogue summary. (2) Secondly, we leverage the seed dialogue summary to generate more dialogue summaries with a wide diversity of topics. (3) Finally, we convert the augmented dialogue summary back into dialogue. All these steps are performed by LLM.

include rule-based methods (Xie et al., 2020; Wei and Zou, 2019; Karimi et al., 2021) and model-based methods (Sennrich et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2020; Ng et al., 2020; Anaby-Tavor et al., 2020). As shown in Figure 1, the augmented data obtained using these methods are usually word-level or sentence-level alternative representations of the seed data, with little semantic differences. In addition to the traditional methods, another line of work is prompting LLM to augment various natural language processing datasets (Chen et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Sahu et al., 2022; Mehri et al., 2022; Rosenbaum et al., 2022). In particular, several approaches have been proposed for open-domain dialogue systems (Zhang et al., 2020a; Ou et al., 2022). However, the semantic diversity of the augmented dialogues generated by these methods is still constrained by the seed data and the data distribution does not necessarily match the seed data distribution. In addition, these methods are difficult to apply to low-resource scenarios. Instead, our method improves the controllability of LLM, which can generate high-quality and diverse dialogues that match the distribution of seed data.

### 3 Methodology

Conventional techniques for data augmentation frequently produce dull and monotonous dialogue

content that lacks diversity. To remedy this problem, we propose SDA, Summary-based Dialogue Augmentation, where all these procedures are accomplished through LLM’s In-Context Learning (ICL). With the assistance of ICL, LLM can accomplish the specified task without fine-tuning model parameters. In this paper, we choose LLaMA-7B (Touvron et al., 2023) as the backbone, while it is possible to apply our approach with other LLMs. The main framework is illustrated in Figure 2, which includes Seed Dialogue Summarization, Dialogue Summary Augmentation, and Dialogue Generation with Summary.

#### 3.1 Task definition

The *Seed Dialogue Pool*,  $\mathbf{D}_{seed} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$ , consists of  $n$  dialogues, where dialogue  $d = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$  includes  $k$  utterances. With a given LLM  $M$  and  $\mathbf{D}_{seed}$ , our objective is to obtain a *Model-generated Dialogue Pool*  $\mathbf{D}_{aug}$  consisting of  $m$  dialogues that are both high-quality and diverse, where  $m \gg n$ .

#### 3.2 Seed Dialogue Summarization

To generate diverse and informative dialogues, we first summarize every seed dialogue data  $d$  into a seed dialogue summary  $s$ . The dialogue summary, as an abstract representation of a dialogue, can briefly present the main topics and contents of the

```

Summarize the following dialogue between User A and User B:
Exemplar 1:
User A: Hello, this is Lucy. May I speak to Mr. Smith?
User B: Oh, hello, Lucy. What's up?
User A: I'm afraid I can't come to work today, Mr. Smith.
User B: Oh, what's wrong with you?
Summary:
In the above dialogue, User A calls User B and asks to speak to Mr. Smith. User B answers and they exchange greetings. User A informs User B that he won't be able to come to work today ...
...
Exemplar 6:
[Seed Dialogue]
Summary:
In the above dialogue,

```

Table 1: Prompt used for summarizing the seed dialogue. Due to the space limit, we only display one exemplar in the table.

```

Two people are chatting with each other, here are some possible summaries of their dialogue:
Summary 1: [summary 1 from seed dialogue summary pool]
Summary 2: [summary 2 from seed dialogue summary pool]
Summary 3: [summary 3 from seed dialogue summary pool]
Summary 4: [summary 4 from seed dialogue summary pool]
Summary 5: [summary 5 from seed dialogue summary pool]
Summary 6: [summary 6 from model-generated dialogue summary pool]
Summary 7: [summary 7 from model-generated dialogue summary pool]
Summary 8: [summary 8 from model-generated dialogue summary pool]
Summary 9:

```

Table 2: Prompt used for generating new summaries.

dialogue. We write a prompt  $p_{d2s}$ , accompanied by a task description and 5 exemplars, to improve the performance of ICL, which can be found in Table 1.

Given  $p_{d2s}$  and  $d \in \mathbf{D}_{seed}$ , we can obtain the dialogue summary  $s$  with LLM  $\mathbf{M}$ :

$$s = \mathbf{M}(p_{d2s}, d).$$

Afterwards, we obtain the *Seed Dialogue Summary Pool*  $\mathbf{S}_{seed} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ , which contains  $n$  dialogue summaries corresponding to the seed dialogues.

### 3.3 Dialogue Summary Augmentation

LLM can be prompted to generate new and novel dialogue summaries when presented with some existing summaries. In this way, we can augment summaries from a small set of seed data. Given the *Seed Dialogue Summary Pool*  $\mathbf{S}_{seed}$ , we propose a method in the bootstrapping fashion to generate diverse dialogue summaries. For every step, we sample 8 dialogue summaries as in-context exemplars and then prompt the LLM to generate a new dialogue summary. Of the 8 exemplar dialogue summaries, 5 are sampled from *Seed Dialogue*

*Summary*, and 3 are from *Model-generated Dialogue Summary Pool* to promote diversity. The new dialogue summary is then added to the *Model-generated Dialogue Summary Pool*  $\mathbf{S}_{aug}$ . It is worth noting that when  $\mathbf{S}_{aug}$  is empty, all the 8 exemplars are sampled from the  $\mathbf{S}_{seed}$ . The procedure repeats until  $\mathbf{S}_{aug}$  reaches a certain size  $m$ . The prompt  $p_{s2s}$  is shown in Table 2.

### 3.4 Dialogue Generation with Summary

Next, we take dialogue summary  $s \in \mathbf{S}_{aug}$  as the planning to generate a dialogue  $d_{new}$ . To improve the controllability and quality, the summary  $s$  is used as planning when generating the new dialogue  $d_{new}$ . The summary contains the main topics and contents of the conversation. Based on this, we can prompt LLM to generate the dialogue data. The prompt  $p_{s2d}$  is shown in Table 3.

As mentioned in subsection 3.1, a dialogue  $d = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$  consist of  $k$  utterances. So we need to iteratively generate utterance  $u_i$  based on the dialogue summary  $s$  and the previously generated  $u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}$ . Given  $p_{s2d}$ ,  $s \in \mathbf{S}_{aug}$  and  $u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}$ , we can obtain the utterance  $u_i$  with LLM  $\mathbf{M}$ :

$$u_i = \mathbf{M}(e_{s2d}, s, u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}).$$

```

Convert the following summary into dialogue:
Exemplar 1:
In the above dialogue, User A calls User B and asks to speak to Mr. Smith ...
Dialogue:
User A: Hello, this is Lucy. May I speak to Mr. Smith?
User B: Oh, hello, Lucy. What's up?
User A: I'm afraid I can't come to work today, Mr. Smith.
User B: Oh, what's wrong with you?
...
Exemplar 6:
[Dialogue Summary]
Dialogue:
User A:

```

Table 3: Prompt used for turning the summary into a dialogue. Due to the space limit, we only display one exemplar in the table.

We repeat this process until the number of utterances in a dialogue data  $d$  is greater than 3 and the last utterance contains 'bye' or 'see you'. In the end, we obtain the final *Model-generated Dialogue Pool*  $\mathbf{D}_{aug} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m\}$ , which contains  $m$  model-generated dialogue data.

### 3.5 Data Filtering

The limitations of the LLM's capabilities may result in unsatisfactory model-generated dialogue summaries or dialogue data. As a result, filtering the generated data becomes necessary.

**Summary Filtering.** We only keep the dialogue summaries that include 'User A' and 'User B', and make sure the length of summary has at least 18 tokens. In order to enhance diversity, we compute the Rouge-L score for each model-generated summary  $s$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{aug}$ . The model-generated summary  $s$  is added to  $\mathbf{S}_{aug}$  only if the Rouge-L score is less than  $T_s$ .

**Dialogue Filtering.** During each step of utterance generation, we filter out utterances that are less than 5 tokens in length. When obtained a dialogue  $d$ , we compute the semantic embedding of  $d$  and  $\forall d' \in \mathbf{D}_{aug}$  using Sentence Transformer (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019a), namely  $e_d$  and  $e_{d'}$ . We calculate the cosine similarity between  $e_d$  and other embeddings, take the top 5 values and obtain their average value. If the resulting value is less than  $T_d$ , we add it to the  $\mathbf{D}_{aug}$ . Otherwise, we continue with the step of generating utterances. If the number of utterances in a dialogue data  $d$  is greater than 10 and still does not meet the requirements, we reset it and regenerate the utterances.

### 3.6 Evaluation of Augmented Dialogues: SEMANTICDIVERSITY

In order to evaluate the semantic diversity of the augmented dialogues, we design a metric called SEMANTICDIVERSITY (SD), as shown in 1. Given seed data  $\mathbf{D}_{seed}$  and augmented data  $\mathbf{D}_{aug}$ , the output of the algorithm is the semantic diversity value  $v$ . Firstly, we compute sentence embeddings of seed data to get  $\mathbf{H}_{seed}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_{aug}$  using Sentence-Transformer<sup>1</sup> (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019b). Then we run KMeans algorithm (Pedregosa et al., 2011) on  $\mathbf{H}_{seed}$ , and the number of clusters was set to  $\sqrt{|\mathbf{D}_{seed}|}/2$ . Next, we predict the nearest cluster centroid  $h_{nearest}$  for every  $h_i \in \mathbf{H}_{aug}$ , calculate the Euclidean distance  $v_i$  between them, and then add  $v_i$  to the set  $V$ . The average score of  $V$  is the final semantic diversity value  $v$ . The larger  $v$  is, the sparser the distribution of augmented data in the semantic space, and the more diverse the data is.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Datasets

We evaluate various data augmentation methods on DAILYDIALOG (Li et al., 2017), a chit-chat dataset that contains high-quality human conversations about daily life. To simulate low-resource scenarios, we randomly sample 100 dialogues for training, 100 for validation, and 1000 for testing, respectively. The training data is used as the seed dataset for subsequent experiments.

<sup>1</sup><https://www.sbert.net/>. In this paper, we choose all-mpnet-base-v2 as the sentence encoder.

---

**Algorithm 1** SEMANTICDIVERSITY

---

**Input:** seed data  $\mathbf{D}_{seed}$ , augmented data  $\mathbf{D}_{aug}$ **Output:** semantic diversity value  $v$ 

- 1:  $\mathbf{H}_{seed}, \mathbf{H}_{aug} \leftarrow \text{Encoding}(\mathbf{D}_{seed}, \mathbf{D}_{aug})$   $\triangleright$   
Encode seed data and augmented data into hidden states via Sentence-Transformers
  - 2: Run KMeans algorithm on  $\mathbf{H}_{seed}$  with  $\sqrt{|\mathbf{D}_{seed}|/2}$  clusters
  - 3:  $V \leftarrow \{\}$
  - 4: **for**  $h_i \in \mathbf{H}_{aug}$  **do**
  - 5:   Calculate the Euclidean distance  $v_i$  between  $h_i$  and its nearest cluster centroid  $h_{nearest}$  among the  $\sqrt{|\mathbf{D}_{seed}|/2}$  clusters
  - 6:    $V \leftarrow V \cup v_i$
  - 7: **end for**
  - 8:  $v = \text{mean}(V)$   $\triangleright$  Get the average score of  $V$
  - 9: **return**  $v$
- 

## 4.2 Baseline Methods

We compare the proposed method with other baseline methods of data augmentation:

**MLM.** Similar to Cai et al. (2020) and Ng et al. (2020), we mask 15% tokens per seed dialogue, and reconstruct these tokens with RoBERTa-Large (Liu et al., 2019).

**ICL.** First, we sample 5 random dialogues from the seed dataset and concatenate them to construct a prompt. Given the prompt, we use LLM to generate a new dialogue with nucleus sampling decoding ( $p = 0.9$ ). The maximum utterance length is 50 and the maximum number of dialogue turns is 10.

**ICL<sub>context=n</sub>.** Based on the above ICL, we sample an additional seed dialogue with the first  $n$  turns of context to prompt the LLM. In this paper, we set  $n$  to 1/2/3, and name the corresponding methods as ICL<sub>context=1</sub>, ICL<sub>context=2</sub>, and ICL<sub>context=3</sub>, respectively.

## 4.3 Implementation Settings

We set hyper-parameters for the three steps of our method according to the performance on the validation data. For Seed Dialogue Summarization (subsection 3.2), we use beam-search decoding with  $beam\_size = 3$ . For Dialogue Summary Augmentation (subsection 3.3), we use nucleus sampling decoding with  $p = 0.9$  and  $temperature = 0.9$  for generating more diverse dialogues with LLM. The hyper-parameters of Dialogue Generation with Summary (subsection 3.4) are similar to Dialogue Summary Augmentation but  $temperature = 0.6$  for better dialogue fluency. For Data Filtering (sub-

section 3.5),  $T_s$  is set to 0.35, while  $T_d$  is set to 0.8.

Given the *Seed Dialogue*, we collect 1,000 dialogues for each augmentation method. After obtaining the augmented dataset, we fine-tune a pre-trained encoder-decoder model, BART-large (Lewis et al., 2019), with a learning rate of 5e-5, a batch size of 32, and the maximum sequence length of 512. We adopt the checkpoint with the lowest validation set loss for evaluation. During the inference stage, we use greedy search decoding and limited the maximum decoding length to 50.

## 4.4 Evaluation Metrics

**Automatic Evaluation.** We use LLM to compute the average perplexity (PPL) to evaluate the data fluency. For the data diversity, we employ Distinct-1/2 (Li et al., 2016) (Dist-1 and Dist-2) for word-level evaluation and SEMANTICDIVERSITY (described in subsection 3.6) for semantic-level evaluation.

For model prediction, we use SacreBLEU (Post, 2018) and Rouge-L (Lin, 2004) to measure the similarity of the predicted response to the ground truth, and corpus-level Distinct-1/2 (Li et al., 2016) to measure the text diversity.

**Human Evaluation.** For model prediction, we randomly select 50 dialogue context-response pairs respectively. Three annotators are asked to rate the response quality from three aspects: (1) **Fluency**: whether the response is smooth and grammatically correct. (2) **Coherence**: whether the response is coherent with the context. (3) **Informativeness**: whether the response is informative or not. The rating range is [0, 1, 2], where a higher score indicates better quality. Model prediction’s final score is averaged across the three annotators.

## 5 Result and Analysis

### 5.1 Evaluating Augmented Dialogue

To begin with, it is primary to evaluate the augmented dialogue generated by different methods. The result of the automatic evaluation is summarized in Table 4 and Figure 3, which demonstrates that our SDA-generated augmented dialogue data with the lowest perplexity, indicating the highest level of fluency in the text. MLM got the highest perplexity, indicating that the mask-then-reconstruct approach cannot achieve the fluency of seed data. It is worth noting that although the Dist-1/2 scores of SDA are lower than ICL, ICL<sub>context=1</sub>




Figure 3: Dialogue perplexity distribution with different data augmentation methods (best viewed in color).




Figure 4: The t-SNE visualization of augmented dialogues.

Methods	PPL	Dist-1	Dist-2	SD
MLM	6.77	1.76	7.01	61.81
ICL	3.81	3.42	21.47	75.85
$ICL_{context=1}$	4.00	3.18	19.57	73.49
$ICL_{context=2}$	4.26	3.03	18.41	72.37
$ICL_{context=3}$	4.46	2.83	16.91	71.32
SDA	3.58	3.01	16.45	77.52
w/o SF	6.01	3.87	22.35	69.02
w/o DF	5.93	4.10	22.80	69.82
w/o SF+DF	5.80	3.97	21.98	68.97

Table 4: Automatic evaluation on augmented dialogue, along with the ablation results. SD refers to SEMANTICDIVERSITY.

Methods	B.	R.	D-1	D-2
$\emptyset$	0.87	9.47	2.27	10.13
+MLM	0.94	9.78	2.15	9.01
+ICL	1.32	12.61	3.73	16.48
+ $ICL_{context=1}$	1.23	12.54	3.65	15.21
+ $ICL_{context=2}$	1.08	11.82	3.31	13.44
+ $ICL_{context=3}$	0.98	10.45	2.7	11.63
+SDA	1.34	12.96	4.09	18.56
w/o SF	1.15	11.93	3.21	15.16
w/o DF	0.99	11.79	3.53	14.66
w/o SF+DF	1.00	11.04	3.30	14.54

Table 5: Automatic evaluation on dialogue model prediction, along with the ablation results.  $\emptyset$  only uses the seed data to fine-tune the dialogue model. B./R./D-1/D-2 stands for SacreBLEU/ROUGE-L/Dist-1/Dist-2 respectively.

and  $ICL_{context=2}$ , the SEMANTICDIVERSITY of SDA is the highest. In other words, the diversity of SDA is not significant at the word-level, but it performs best at the semantic-level. For the baselines based on ICL, the less the number of contexts used, the higher the Dist-1/2 and SD.

In addition to the SEMANTICDIVERSITY value showing the semantic diversity of the augmented dialogues, we conduct t-SNE visualization for both ICL and SDA methods. We sample 100 dialogues from the augmented data obtained from ICL and SDA respectively, then use Sentence Transformer to calculate their sentence embeddings, and finally perform t-SNE visualization, as shown in the Figure 4. We observe that:

- SDA demonstrates higher diversity compared to ICL, aligning with the SEMANTICDIVER-




Figure 5: The performance of various data augmentation methods given 100/200/500 seed dialogues (best viewed in color). The initial two (PPL, SD) are metrics for evaluating the augmented data, while the latter four are metrics for evaluating the predictions of the model trained on the augmented data.

Dataset	Flu.	Coh.	Inf.	Average
ICL	1.51	1.05	1.04	1.20
ICL <sub>context=1</sub>	1.53	1.08	0.98	1.19
ICL <sub>context=2</sub>	1.48	0.91	0.84	1.08
ICL <sub>context=3</sub>	1.44	0.74	0.82	1.00
SDA	1.62	1.20	1.19	1.34

Table 6: Human evaluation on dialogue model prediction with different data augmentation methods. Flu./Coh./Inf. stands for Fluency/Coherence/Informativeness respectively.

SITY values presented in Table 4. This underscores the efficacy of the SEMANTICDIVERSITY metric.

- ICL exhibits some distribution shift compared to the seed data, while the SDA fully covers the distribution of the seed data. This indicates that SDA has better controllability than ICL.

## 5.2 Evaluating Dialogue Model

After determining that our augmented dialogues are of fairly high quality and diversity, we attempt

to use the augmented datasets as training data for the dialogue model. The experimental results with automatic evaluations are summarized in Table 5, which indicates that SDA outperforms all the baselines on all the automatic metrics. This confirms the effectiveness of our dialogue augmentation method, which could generate high-quality and semantic-diverse dialogue data. We can further observe that: (1) The data quality produced by the MLM method is unsatisfactory. Consequently, the Dist-1/2 of model predictions are inferior to those obtained by training solely on seed data. (2) The ICL method performs well on the model, demonstrating large models can generate high-quality dialogue data. However, as more rounds of context are given, the diversity of augmented data diminishes, leading to a gradual decline in the model’s performance. In addition, based on the results from Table 4 and Table 5, we observe that there is a positive correlation between the SD of a dataset and the performance of models trained using this dataset. This suggests that the SD metric provides an effective measure for evaluating the diversity of augmented datasets.

The human evaluation results are presented in



Table 6. As shown in the table, our proposed method outperforms other data augmentation methods on all three criteria, achieving an average score of 1.34. The performance of the ICL method are sub-optimal, ranking second to our method. However, adding the contextualized ICL datasets ( $ICL_{context=1}$ ,  $ICL_{context=2}$ , and  $ICL_{context=3}$ ) does not lead to consistent improvement, and the best performance is achieved using our proposed method. In addition, we find that these methods have little difference in fluency, indicating that the pre-trained model has strong generation capabilities and is not greatly affected by the dataset. However, there is a large gap in coherence and informativeness, which is highly related to the relevance of the data. In summary, these findings confirm the effectiveness of our method in generating more fluent, coherent, and informative responses in open-domain dialogue generation.

### 5.3 Ablation Analysis of Filtering

We further explore the necessity of the data filtering module by ablation experiments. Specifically, we compare SDA with three variants of it: (1) SDA without Summary Filtering (w/o SF), (2) SDA without Dialogue Filtering (w/o DF), (3) SDA without Summary Filtering and Dialogue Filtering (w/o SF+DF). The ablation results are shown in Table 4 and Table 5. From these results, we find that:

- Without data filtering, both fluency and semantic diversity show a significant decrease, although data Dist-1/2 improves.
- For model predictions, all three variants show significant decreases in each metric. Among them, SDA w/o SF+DF has the lowest average score.

The above findings indicate that both SF and DF are indispensable for our method.

### 5.4 Ablation Analysis of Various Number of Seed Dialogue

We also conduct experiments to evaluate the performance of various data augmentation methods given a varying number of seed dialogues. Specifically, the number of seed dialogues selected is 100, 200, and 500 respectively. The data augmentation methods chosen for comparison include MLM, ICL, and SDA. The detailed results are illustrated in Figure 5. We observe that:

- With varying number of seed data, the augmented data generated through the SDA method exhibits superior fluency.
- As the quantity of seed data increases, the diversity metrics (SD, Dist-1, Dist-2) for all augmentation methods show improvement.
- When the number of seed data is relatively small, the advantages of SDA over other methods are more pronounced.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper presents SDA, a data augmentation approach for low-resource open-domain dialogue generation. Our approach improves the controllability of LLM by taking dialogue summary as planning, which generates high-quality and diverse dialogue data without distribution shift compared to the seed data. In order to evaluate data diversity at the semantic-level, we design a metric, SEMANTIC-DIVERSITY, instead of word-level which is often used in the previous studies. Experimental results show that SDA can augment high-quality dialogue with diverse semantics, which can be further used to improve model performance in low-resource scenarios. Furthermore, SEMANTICDIVERSITY metric exhibits a strong positive correlation with the performance of the dialogue model.

### Limitations

In this paper, we develop a simple open-domain dialogue augmentation method with LLM. Our method strongly relies on the ICL capacity of LLM, which is related to the scale of the model (Kaplan et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2020). However, due to GPU resource limitations, we have not performed any experiments with larger scale LLM. In general, the larger the model is, the better the augmented dialogue is. Moreover, we have not explored the upper limit of the number of augmented data given the seed data. When the size of the augmented data grows to a certain level, simply boosting the number of data often becomes less efficient for model performance. This paper applied the method solely to the DAILYDIALOG dataset. For conducting the method in other dialogue scenarios, it may require modifying the instructions to ensure that LLM generates dialogue data that aligns more with the expectations.

## Ethics Statement

Due to the training data and training methods of LLM, there is a potential risk of generating biased, harmful, or otherwise unwanted output. More fine-grained analysis and filtering work needs to be done before the actual application.

## References

- Ateret Anaby-Tavor, Boaz Carmeli, Esther Goldbraich, Amir Kantor, George Kour, Segev Shlomov, N. Tepper, and Naama Zwerdling. 2020. Do not have enough data? deep learning to the rescue! In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Hengyi Cai, Hongshen Chen, Yonghao Song, Cheng Zhang, Xiaofang Zhao, and Dawei Yin. 2020. Data manipulation: Towards effective instance learning for neural dialogue generation via learning to augment and reweight. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Maximillian Chen, Alexandros Papangelis, Chenyang Tao, Andrew Rosenbaum, Seokhwan Kim, Yang Liu, Zhou Yu, and Dilek Z. Hakkani-Tür. 2022. Weakly supervised data augmentation through prompting for dialogue understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2210.14169.
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. Wizard of Wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. A survey for in-context learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2301.00234.
- Steven Y Feng, Varun Gangal, Jason Wei, Sarath Chandar, Soroush Vosoughi, Teruko Mitamura, and Eduard Hovy. 2021. A survey of data augmentation approaches for nlp. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 968–988.
- Jiabang He, Lei Wang, Yingpeng Hu, Ning Liu, Huijuan Liu, Xingdong Xu, and Hengtao Shen. 2023. Icd3ie: In-context learning with diverse demonstrations updating for document information extraction. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.05063.
- Yushi Hu, Chia-Hsuan Lee, Tianbao Xie, Tao Yu, Noah A Smith, and Mari Ostendorf. 2022. In-context learning for few-shot dialogue state tracking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 2627–2643.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, T. J. Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2001.08361.
- Akbar Karimi, L. Rossi, and Andrea Prati. 2021. Aeda: An easier data augmentation technique for text classification. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdel rahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and William B Dolan. 2016. A diversity-promoting objective function for neural conversation models. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 110–119.
- Yanran Li, Hui Su, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Shuzi Niu. 2017. Dailydialog: A manually labelled multi-turn dialogue dataset. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 986–995.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. **ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries**. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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*, abs/1907.11692.
- Andrea Madotto, Zhaojiang Lin, Genta Indra Winata, and Pascale Fung. 2021. Few-shot bot: Prompt-based learning for dialogue systems. *ArXiv*, abs/2110.08118.
- Shikib Mehri, Yasemin Altun, and Maxine Eskénazi. 2022. Lad: Language models as data for zero-shot dialog. In *SIGDIAL Conferences*.
- Nathan Ng, Kyunghyun Cho, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. 2020. Ssmba: Self-supervised manifold based data augmentation for improving out-of-domain robustness. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1268–1283.
- Jiao Ou, Jinchao Zhang, Yang Feng, and Jie Zhou. 2022. Counterfactual data augmentation via perspective transition for open-domain dialogues. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

- Soham Parikh, Quairaz Vohra, Prashil Tumbade, and Mitul Tiwari. 2023. Exploring zero and few-shot techniques for intent classification. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.07157.
- Panupong Pasupat, Yuan Zhang, and Kelvin Guu. 2021. Controllable semantic parsing via retrieval augmentation. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830.
- Matt Post. 2018. [A call for clarity in reporting BLEU scores](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers*, pages 186–191, Belgium, Brussels. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019a. [SentenceBERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). 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 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019b. Sentencebert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Stephen Roller, Emily Dinan, Naman Goyal, Da Ju, Mary Williamson, Yinhan Liu, Jing Xu, Myle Ott, Kurt Shuster, Eric Michael Smith, Y.-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2020. Recipes for building an open-domain chatbot. In *Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Andrew Rosenbaum, Saleh Soltan, Wael Hamza, Amir Saffari, Macro Damonte, and Isabel Groves. 2022. Clasp: Few-shot cross-lingual data augmentation for semantic parsing. In *AACL*.
- Ohad Rubin, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2022. Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2655–2671.
- Gaurav Sahu, Pau Rodriguez, Issam Laradji, Parmida Atighehchian, David Vazquez, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2022. Data augmentation for intent classification with off-the-shelf large language models. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI*, pages 47–57.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 86–96.
- Richard Shin and Benjamin Van Durme. 2021. Few-shot semantic parsing with language models trained on code. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Connor Shorten and Taghi M. Khoshgoftaar. 2019. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 6:1–48.
- Suzanna Sia and Kevin Duh. 2023. In-context learning as maintaining coherency: A study of on-the-fly machine translation using large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.03573.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Zhen Wan, Fei Cheng, Zhuoyuan Mao, Qianying Liu, Haiyue Song, Jiwei Li, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2023. Gpt-re: In-context learning for relation extraction using large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.02105.
- Yufei Wang, Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Huang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, and Daxin Jiang. 2022. Promda: Prompt-based data augmentation for low-resource nlu tasks. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Jason Wei and Kai Zou. 2019. Eda: Easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Qizhe Xie, Zihang Dai, Eduard Hovy, Thang Luong, and Quoc Le. 2020. Unsupervised data augmentation for consistency training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6256–6268.
- Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I. Wang, Victor Zhong, Bailin Wang, Chengzu Li, Connor Boyle, Ansong Ni, Ziyu Yao, Dragomir R. Radev, Caiming Xiong, Lingpeng Kong, Rui Zhang, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. 2022. Unifiedskg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. [Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2304.12244.

- Yiben Yang, Chaitanya Malaviya, Jared Fernandez, Swabha Swayamdipta, Ronan Le Bras, Ji-Ping Wang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Yejin Choi, and Doug Downey. 2020. Generative data augmentation for common-sense reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1008–1025.
- Dian Yu, Luheng He, Yuan Zhang, X. Du, Panupong Pasupat, and Qi Li. 2021. Few-shot intent classification and slot filling with retrieved examples. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Rongsheng Zhang, Yinhe Zheng, Jianzhi Shao, Xiaoxi Mao, Yadong Xi, and Minlie Huang. 2020a. Dialogue distillation: Open-domain dialogue augmentation using unpaired data. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 3449–3460.
- Saizheng Zhang, Emily Dinan, Jack Urbanek, Arthur Szlam, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2018. Personalizing dialogue agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too? In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2204–2213.
- Yizhe Zhang, Siqi Sun, Michel Galley, Yen-Chun Chen, Chris Brockett, Xiang Gao, Jianfeng Gao, Jingjing Liu, and Bill Dolan. 2020b. Dialogpt: Large-scale generative pre-training for conversational response generation. In *ACL, system demonstration*.
- Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, Lei Li, and Shujian Huang. 2023. Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.04675.

## A Dialogue Augmentation Examples

We present the examples of dialogue augmentation in [Table 7](#).

Seed Dialogue
User A: I'm going to Japan this year on vacation. User B: Have you ever been to America? User A: No, but I'd really like to. User B: You'd like it.
MLM
User A: I'm going to Japan this year on vacation. User B: Have you ever been to <a href="#">Hawaii</a> ? User A: No, but I'd really like to. User B: You'd like it.
ICL <sub>context=1</sub>
User A: I'm going to Japan this year on vacation. User B: <a href="#">Where do you plan to go?</a> User A: <a href="#">I am thinking about going to Mount Fuji.</a> User B: <a href="#">Did you go last year?</a>
ICL <sub>context=2</sub>
User A: I'm going to Japan this year on vacation. User B: Have you ever been to America? User A: <a href="#">I went to Florida a few years ago.</a> User B: <a href="#">that must have been nice!</a>
ICL <sub>context=3</sub>
User A: I'm going to Japan this year on vacation. User B: Have you ever been to America? User A: No, but I'd really like to. User B: <a href="#">Have you got your American visa yet?</a>
SDA
User A: <a href="#">How do you think we should prepare for our presentation?</a> User B: <a href="#">I think we should practice about 3 times a week.</a> User A: <a href="#">That's a good idea. But do you think we should practice in front of the mirror?</a> User B: <a href="#">I think we should. You can see yourself and correct your mistakes.</a>

Table 7: Examples of augmented dialogue.