

Synthetic Query Generation using Large Language Models for Virtual Assistants

Sonal Sannigrahi*[†]
sonal.sannigrahi@tecnico.ulisboa.pt
Instituto Superior Técnico
Lisbon, Portugal

Youssef Oualil
youalil@apple.com
Apple
Aachen, Germany

Thiago Fraga-Silva
tfragadasilva@apple.com
Apple
Aachen, Germany

Christophe Van Gysel[†]
cvangysel@apple.com
Apple
Cambridge, MA, USA

ABSTRACT

Virtual Assistants (VAs) are important Information Retrieval platforms that help users accomplish various tasks through spoken commands. The speech recognition system (speech-to-text) uses query priors, trained solely on text, to distinguish between phonetically confusing alternatives. Hence, the generation of synthetic queries that are similar to existing VA usage can greatly improve upon the VA’s abilities—especially for use-cases that do not (yet) occur in paired audio/text data. In this paper, we provide a preliminary exploration of the use of Large Language Models (LLMs) to generate synthetic queries that are complementary to template-based methods. We investigate whether the methods (a) generate queries that are similar to randomly sampled, representative, and anonymized user queries from a popular VA, and (b) whether the generated queries are specific. We find that LLMs generate more verbose queries, compared to template-based methods, and reference aspects specific to the entity. The generated queries are similar to VA user queries, and are specific enough to retrieve the relevant entity. We conclude that queries generated by LLMs and templates are complementary.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Search interfaces; Query log analysis**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Speech recognition**.

KEYWORDS

virtual assistants, synthetic query log generation

ACM Reference Format:

Sonal Sannigrahi, Thiago Fraga-Silva, Youssef Oualil, and Christophe Van Gysel. 2024. Synthetic Query Generation using Large Language Models for Virtual Assistants. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR ’24)*, July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3661355>

*Work performed while an intern at Apple.

[†]Equal contribution.

SIGIR ’24, July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

This is the author’s version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive Version of Record was published in *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR ’24)*, July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3661355>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Virtual Assistants (VAs) are important [9] Information Retrieval (IR) platforms that help users accomplish various tasks. Users primarily interact with VAs through voice commands, where users initiate a retrieval request by uttering a query.

The Automated Speech Recognition (ASR) component of the VA system transcribes the spoken user query, which is then subsequently processed by the retrieval engine. However, the ASR system is trained on audio/text pairs that are expensive and time-consuming to obtain. During the recognition process, the ASR system employs a query prior trained solely on text to disambiguate between phonetically-similar recognition candidates. Hence, the query prior is a powerful mechanism to modify the ASR system’s behavior, and has been shown to be an effective manner to improve the recognition of tail named entities [3, 8, 10, 14, 17].

In order to correctly recognize emerging entities [4], the ASR system’s query prior is estimated using a mixture of usage-based and synthetic text data. Synthetic queries are typically generated using a template-based approach [2, 13]. A query template, such as “*play music by \$ARTIST*”, representing the generic intent of a user wanting to play music by a specific artist, is instantiated using a popularity-weighted list of entities. However, template-based approaches are stringent, may only represent a limited set of use-cases, and are not well-suited to generate synthetic queries for use-cases that are specific to particular entities. For example, the query “*play Taylor Swift’s debut performance at the Grammy’s*” represents the user’s intent to play the song “*Fifteen*” by Taylor Swift which was Swift’s debut performance at the Grammy’s in 2009. While creating a template based on this query would be possible, it does not generalize across entities: some entities may not have performed at the Grammy’s and finding the relevant venue would require manual curation. Hence, synthetic query generation methods that can generate queries tailored to specific entities are necessary.

Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLM) have shown impressive improvements in language understanding tasks [5] through their emergent capabilities [16]. In IR, there have been various works focusing on the generation of queries using LLMs [1, 11, 15].

In this paper, we perform a preliminary analysis of the use of LLMs to produce query priors in VA ASR. We generate synthetic queries by prompting LLMs using a description of the artist gathered from Wikipedia. Then, we evaluate the generated queries in




Figure 1: Proposed pipeline to generate queries for a VA via an LLM.

terms of their *similarity* to randomly sampled, representative, and anonymized user queries from a popular VA, in addition to the queries’ ability to retrieve the entity for which they were generated. More specifically, the research questions addressed are as follows: (RQ1) Can LLMs generate VA queries that are similar to user queries extracted from VA query logs (i.e., domain match)? (RQ2) Are the LLM-generated queries good at retrieving the entity for which they were generated (i.e., specificity)?

Our contributions are as follows: (1) We propose a prompt for LLMs to produce natural queries for the music domain for VAs, and perform extensive experiments comparing the LLM-generated queries to queries generated using template-based methods, (2) We provide insights through analysis into the differences between queries generated using the various methods.

2 METHODOLOGY

Fig. 1 shows an overview of our approach, which consists of the following three main components: (1) entity descriptions extracted from Wikipedia to provide context for synthetic query generation, (2) the prompt which incorporates the entity description and formulates a request to the LLM to generate synthetic data, where we also specify the intent the queries need to represent, and (3) the LLM, which takes the prompt as input and subsequently generates a list of synthetic queries as output.

2.1 Knowledge Base

We build our music artist knowledge base by linking Wikipedia data with artist profiles on a popular streaming service. The paragraphs in the Wikipedia articles are used as contexts to generate synthetic queries using LLMs (§2.2). The combination of the Wikipedia article, and the artist profile retrieved from the streaming service, are used to build a search engine to evaluate the end-to-end performance of the generated queries (§4.2). We obtained a catalog of music artist entities by downloading the list of most popular artists on a streaming service in July 2023 and linking them to their respective Wikipedia profile using property P2850 (i.e., “Artist ID Number”) through Wikidata’s SPARQL query service¹. We also use the *MusicGroup*² metadata object, embedded in the source of each artist page on music.apple.com, with entries that include artist name, biography, an unique artist ID, as well as discography information. Between both the Wikipedia dumps and the artist database, we maintain a direct linking to produce a knowledge base of 14 161 artists.

2.2 Prompt & LLMs

Our prompt is depicted in Fig. 2. For each entity in the knowledge base (§2.1), we create prompts by populating the artist name

```
[ARTIST DESCRIPTION]
Generate [K] queries based on the information
above about [ARTIST NAME] to play music or learn
more about [ARTIST NAME].
Here are some examples: [EXAMPLES]
```

Figure 2: LLM prompt used during our experiments. [ARTIST DESCRIPTION] and [ARTIST NAME] are replaced with an entity description, and the entity name, resp. [EXAMPLES] are a list of example VA queries for the specific intent. We fix [EXAMPLES] to the following “play, queue, turn on, etc”. [K] is the number of queries.

and use the lead section (i.e., the introduction) as their description. For music artists, the lead section typically references notable audiography, collaborations and life events. The number of queries, K , is set to 40 (§3.1) in this paper. We use the OpenAI API to generate queries with four model variants³. More specifically, we experiment with babbage-002, gpt-3.5-turbo, gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct, and gpt-4 (see §3.1 for details).

3 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

3.1 Query generation methods under comparison

We generate queries for all 14 161 entities from our knowledge base (§2.1) using (a) the entity name by itself, (b) a template-based approach using the top- K (according to prior probability) music query templates released as part of [13] (excluding the templates that consist of only the entity name by itself in order to differentiate from approach (a)), and (c) four different LLMs available via OpenAI’s API using the prompt in Fig. 2 (§2.2) where we ask the LLM to generate K queries: babbage-002, gpt-3.5-turbo (v0613), gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct, and gpt-4; with $K = 40$. During our experiments, we report evaluation measures at various values of $K \leq 40$, in which case we extract the first K queries from the list of 40 queries (rather than issuing multiple requests to the LLM with varying K). Generated queries that start with a VA wakeword (e.g., “hey VA” where VA refers to the name of the assistant), have the prefix corresponding to the wakeword removed. For example, a query “hey VA play Moderat” is normalized to “play Moderat”. This step aims at avoiding biases towards methods that frequently generate the wakeword during domain match evaluation (§4.1).

3.2 Evaluation measures

To answer RQ1, we measure the likelihood of the generated queries under a 4-gram back-off language model [6] estimated on randomly sampled and anonymized user queries over a span of 2 years from a popular VA. We apply Good Turing smoothing, and N-grams

¹https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:SPARQL_query_service

²<https://schema.org/MusicGroup>

³<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/overview>

	entity name	templates	babbage-002	gpt-3.5-turbo	gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct	gpt-4
# entities	14161	14161	13848	14161	14156	14161
# unique queries per entity	1.00 ± 0.00	39.51 ± 0.50	9.64 ± 14.74	41.60 ± 3.61	40.09 ± 2.27	39.99 ± 0.13
query length per entity	1.58 ± 0.80	3.78 ± 1.24	52.30 ± 122.05	8.11 ± 2.66	8.42 ± 4.03	8.31 ± 2.47
% of queries with > 15 terms	0.01%	0.01%	40.85%	1.17%	1.44%	1.16%

Table 1: Statistics of generated queries across the approaches under consideration (§3.1).

that occur infrequently (less than 3 times) in the data are filtered out. The negative log-likelihood (NLL) of a single query q with $|q|$ terms is defined as $\text{NLL}(q) = -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{|q|} \log P(q_i | q_1 \dots q_{i-1})\right)$, where $P(q_i | q_1 \dots q_{i-1})$ represents the probability of the term q_i under the 4-gram LM. Using a 4-gram LM, rather than looking for exact matches in query logs, provides us with a flexible approach to score the likelihood of a query, while also having the ability to assign a score to queries not present in the query logs. The lower the NLL, the more a query is likely under VA user query behavior. We report median NLL across a query set of the first K queries for each entity.

For **RQ2**, we measure to what capacity the generated queries can retrieve the entity for which they were generated in order to measure query specificity. We build an index of our knowledge base 14 161 entities where each entity is represented by its Wikipedia page and its profile on a music streaming service (§2.1), including biography and most popular discography. Both indexed documents and queries are pre-processed by lower-casing, removing punctuation and non-alphanumeric characters, removing stopwords, and applying a Porter stemmer. We use the BM25-L retrieval model [12, §3.2] with $k_1 = 1.5$, $b = 0.75$ and $\delta = 0.5$. Since for each query, there is only one relevant entity, we report reciprocal rank (RR), averaged over the top- K queries q and entities e , with RR defined as

$$\text{RR}(q, e) = \frac{1}{\text{rank}(q, e)}$$

where $\text{rank}(q, e)$ equals the rank of the entity e for which query q was generated under the BM25-L retrieval model. The higher the RR, the better a query is able to retrieve the entity it was generated for (and, hence, the more specific an entity is). We report mean RR across a query set for the first K queries generated for each entity.

4 RESULTS

Table 1 shows statistics on the generated queries using the various methods (§3.1). In Fig. 3a, we see that while the standalone entity-name and template-based methods generate relatively short queries (1–4 terms), the LLM-based methods tend to be more verbose (~8 terms). A sample of generated queries for entity *Post Malone* (Q21621919) is depicted in Table 2. The babbage-002 LLM, a GPT base model not trained with instruction following [7], performs poorly and fails to generate reasonable queries. As expected, the template-based approach generates queries that are stylistically simple, since the template is independent from the entity for which the queries are being generated. On the other hand, queries generated by LLM-based methods are able to refer to information present in the artist description that was fed as context to the LLM. We will now answer the research questions raised in §1 and further defined in §3.2.


Method	Sample of generated queries
entity name	<i>“Post Malone”</i>
templates	<i>“play Post Malone”, “play the song Post Malone”, “play Post Malone music”</i>
babbage-002	<i>“Start with CTRL + M”, . . .</i>
gpt-3.5	<i>“play White Iverson by Post Malone”, “queue Congratulations by Post Malone”, “turn on Post Malone’s album Beerbongs & Bentleys”</i>
gpt-3.5 (instruct)	<i>“play Post Malone’s debut single White Iverson”, “play Post Malone’s hit song Rockstar”, “play Post Malone’s song Sunflower from the Spider-Man Into the Spider-Verse soundtrack”</i>
gpt-4	<i>“play White Iverson by Post Malone”, “add Rockstar by Post Malone to my playlist”, “turn up the volume for Psycho by Post Malone”</i>

Table 2: Example of queries generated by the various methods (§3.1).


4.1 Similarity to VA usage queries

For **RQ1**, Fig. 3b shows the negative log likelihood (§3.1) for the methods under consideration. The entity name by itself aligns closest with user behavior, while the template-based approach is a close second. This is not surprising, since the templates we used were created by domain experts by analyzing high-frequency use-cases in a representative sample of VA usage [13, §3.1]. Hence, the entity name and template method represent frequent use-cases at the head of the query distribution.


Next up, at approximately half the log-likelihood, queries generated by the LLMs seem to represent infrequent, tail use-cases. While not entirely absent from VA usage, they are not as common as the straight-forward templates. This is explained by the fact that the LLM-generated queries often reference specific songs or albums by the artist—extracted from the artist’s description—resulting in less generic queries. However, this lack of generality yields queries that reference multiple entities and, hence, tend to be at most as—and often, significantly less—likely as queries referencing only a single entity. Note that in our prompt (Fig. 2), we did not instruct the LLMs to exhibit this behavior. We answer **RQ1** as follows: queries generated by LLMs trained with instruction following correlate with VA user behavior, although they tend to be more specific than queries generated using template-based approaches. This raises the question whether template- and LLM-based approaches are complementary when it comes to synthetic query generation. In fact, comparing the query sets generated by the template-based method and gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct, the mean/std. dev of the Jaccard coefficient across entities equals 0.0038 ± 0.0084 , indicating very low overlap, and hence, complementarity.



(a) Distribution of generated query lengths across the approaches under consideration (§3.1). Lengths that exceed 15 tokens are not depicted, but are documented in Table 1.



(b) Median NLL (§3.2; lower is better) for the various query generation methods (except babbage-002 since it leads to very high NLL) for various query cut-offs ($K = 10, 20, 30, 40$). See Fig. 3a for the legend.



(c) Reciprocal rank (§3.2; higher is better) for the various query generation methods (except babbage-002 since it generates non-sensical queries) for various query cut-offs ($K = 10, 20, 30, 40$). See Fig. 3a for the legend.

Figure 3

4.2 Query specificity

For RQ2, Fig. 3c depicts the reciprocal rank for the various methods (§3.1) at various cut-offs of the list of generated queries. The entity name method performs best, since it does not contain any superfluous terms and matches directly the specific entity mention contained within the entity’s textual representation. The template-based method performs nearly as well as the entity name method, since it generates queries that contain the entity name padded with carrier terms that are non-specific to the entity (e.g., “play”, “song”). The LLM-based methods score slightly worse than the entity name and template methods, since the queries generated using LLMs are more verbose and can include terms that match non-relevant entities. For example, song titles often consist of generic, non-specific terms and multiple songs can have the same title. Between the LLM-based generated query collections, gpt-4 performs worst. When examining the effect of query cut-off (K), we see that as K increases, RR generally decreases. This is due to the fact that, as K increases, queries become more complex and can contain terms that confuse the retrieval model. We answer RQ2 as follows: entity-centric queries generated by LLMs achieve an average reciprocal rank of 0.70; indicating that the correct entity is often ranked highly. However, since LLMs generate more verbose queries, there are more terms in the queries that can throw off the retrieval model.

4.3 Complementarity

Finally, following the conclusions to RQ1 and RQ2 above, and the qualitative examples in Table 2, we find that template- and LLM-based methods are complementary as follows: (1) template-based methods allow to generate synthetic queries for frequent use-cases (e.g., for tail entities) that apply across all entities (e.g., “play music by \$ARTIST”) and are computationally inexpensive, whereas

(2) LLM-based methods can generate specialized/infrequent use-cases (e.g., for popular/controversial entities) specific to the entity in question (e.g., “play Taylor Swift’s duet with Ed Sheeran”)—while having a higher computational cost. Hence, template- and LLM-based methods can be combined to build a richer synthetic query collection with coverage for both (a) tail entities, and (b) tail use-cases.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we performed a preliminary analysis of the use of LLM-based approaches for the generation of synthetic queries for training a query prior used within a VA speech recognition system. We find that template- and LLM-based approaches are complementary since (a) template-based methods can generate queries for frequent use-cases and infrequent entities, and (b) LLM-based methods are better suited to target infrequent use-cases tailored to a specific entity. One limitation of this work is that we relied on OpenAI’s API for LLMs. However, we did not observe any significant differences in behavior between the LLMs we experimented with, and we believe that the overall conclusion that template- and LLM-based query generation methods are complementary will remain valid. Another limitation is that the LLM training data can bias the generated query priors, however addressing this is out of the scope of the current work. Future work includes approaches to mix together the results of the multiple query generation methods, such that the final collection aligns with user behavior; in addition to exploration of the prompt used to query the LLM, use of more advanced prompting techniques (e.g., chain of thought), and LLM fine-tuning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Manos Tsagkias, Lyan Verwimp, Russ Web, Sameer Badaskar, and the anonymous reviewers for their comments and feedback.

SPEAKER BIOGRAPHY

Sonal Sannigrahi is a PhD student at Instituto Superior Técnico in Lisbon, Portugal working on multi-modal Natural Language Processing. She previously worked on multilingual representation learning and has published papers at EACL, ACL, amongst others. **Christophe Van Gysel** is a Staff Research Scientist working on the Siri Speech language modeling team at Apple where he works on the boundary between ASR and Search. Christophe obtained his PhD in Computer Science from the University of Amsterdam in 2017. During his PhD, Christophe worked on neural ranking using representation learning models with a focus on entities and published at WWW, SIGIR, CIKM, WSDM, TOIS, amongst others.

COMPANY PROFILE

Apple revolutionised personal technology with the introduction of the Macintosh in 1984. Today, Apple leads the world in innovation with iPhone, iPad, Mac, Apple Watch, and Apple TV. Apple's five software platforms — iOS, iPadOS, macOS, watchOS, and tvOS — provide seamless experiences across all Apple devices and empower people with breakthrough services including the App Store, Apple Music, Apple Pay, and iCloud. Apple's more than 100,000 employees are dedicated to making the best products on earth, and to leaving the world better than we found it.

REFERENCES

- [1] Marwah Alaofi, Luke Gallagher, Mark Sanderson, Falk Scholer, and Paul Thomas. 2023. Can Generative LLMs Create Query Variants for Test Collections? An Exploratory Study. In *SIGIR*. 1869–1873.
- [2] Ankur Gandhe, Ariya Rastrow, and Bjorn Hoffmeister. 2018. Scalable Language Model Adaptation for Spoken Dialogue Systems. In *SLT*. IEEE.
- [3] Sashank Gondala, Lyan Verwimp, Ernest Pusateri, Manos Tsagkias, and Christophe Van Gysel. 2021. Error-driven pruning of language models for virtual assistants. In *ICASSP*.
- [4] David Graus, Daan Odijk, and Maarten de Rijke. 2018. The birth of collective memories: Analyzing emerging entities in text streams. *JAIST* 69, 6 (2018).
- [5] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361* (2020).
- [6] Slava M. Katz. 1987. Estimation of Probabilities from Sparse Data for the Language Model Component of a Speech Recognizer. *ASSP* 35 (1987).
- [7] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 35.
- [8] Ernest Pusateri, Christophe Van Gysel, Rami Botros, Sameer Badaskar, Mirko Hannemann, Youssef Oualil, and Ilya Oparin. 2019. Connecting and comparing language model interpolation techniques. In *Interspeech*.
- [9] Juniper Research. 2019. Digital Voice Assistants in Use to Triple to 8 Billion by 2023, Driven by Smart Home Devices. Press Release.
- [10] Mandana Saebi, Ernest Pusateri, Aaksha Meghawat, and Christophe Van Gysel. 2021. A discriminative entity-aware language model for virtual assistants. In *ICASSP*.
- [11] Hsuan Su, Ting-Yao Hu, Hema Swetha Koppula, Raviteja Vemulapalli, Jen-Hao Rick Chang, Karren Yang, Gautam Varma Mantena, and Oncel Tuzel. 2024. Corpus Synthesis for Zero-shot ASR Domain Adaptation using Large Language Models. (2024).
- [12] Andrew Trotman, Antti Puurula, and Blake Burgess. 2014. Improvements to BM25 and language models examined. In *Australasian Document Computing Symposium*.
- [13] Christophe Van Gysel, Mirko Hannemann, Ernest Pusateri, Youssef Oualil, and Ilya Oparin. 2022. Space-Efficient Representation of Entity-centric Query Language Models. In *Interspeech*.
- [14] Christophe Van Gysel, Manos Tsagkias, Ernest Pusateri, and Ilya Oparin. 2020. Predicting entity popularity to improve spoken entity recognition by virtual assistants. In *SIGIR*.
- [15] Shuai Wang, Harris Scells, Bevan Koopman, and Guido Zuccon. 2023. Can ChatGPT write a good boolean query for systematic review literature search? (2023).
- [16] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2022).
- [17] Youyuan Zhang, Sashank Gondala, Thiago Fraga-Silva, and Christophe Van Gysel. 2023. Server-side Rescoring of Spoken Entity-centric Knowledge Queries for Virtual Assistants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01398* (2023).