

Transfer Learning for Context-Aware Question Matching in Information-seeking Conversation Systems in E-commerce

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

Multi-turn information-seeking conversation systems are an important and challenging research topic. Although some advanced neural matching models have been proposed for this task, there are at least two problems with them: the models are generally not efficient for industrial applications, and they rely on a large amount of labeled data, which may not be available. In this paper, we study transfer learning for multi-turn information seeking conversation systems. We propose an efficient and effective multi-turn conversation model based on convolutional neural networks. We further extend our model to adapt the knowledge learned from a resource-rich domain to further boost our model performance. We have deployed our model in an industrial bot¹ application and observed a significant improvement over the existing online model.

1 Introduction

With the popularity of E-commerce websites, there are a growing number of user/customer questions seeking information regarding their shopping items. To efficiently handle customer questions, one recent approach is to build an information-seeking conversation system. In the E-commerce environment, the information-seeking conversation system can serve millions of customer questions per day. The majority of customer questions (around 90%) are business-related or information-seeking questions. In addition, most of the information-seeking conversations are multi-turn (75% of queries have more than one turn²).

¹anonymized link T.B.A.

²according to a statistic in a big E-commerce company

Recent research in this area has focused on conversation systems with deep learning and reinforcement learning (Shang et al., 2015; Yan et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016a,b; Sordoni et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2017). The recent proposed Sequential Matching Network (SMN) (Wu et al., 2017) matches a response with each utterance in the context at multiple levels of granularity to distill important matching information, leading to state-of-the-art performance on two multi-turn conversation corpora. However, there are at least two problems with these methods: they may not be efficient enough for industrial applications, and they rely on a large amount of labeled data which may not be available in reality.

To address the problem of efficiency, we made three major modifications to SMN to boost the efficiency of the model while preserving its effectiveness. First, we remove the RNN layers of inputs from the model; Second, SMN uses a SI-based Pyramid model (Pang et al., 2016) to model each utterance and response pair. Observing that a SE-based BCNN model (Yin and Schütze, 2015) is complementary to the SI-based model, we further extend the component to incorporate a SE-based BCNN model, resulting in a hybrid CNN (hCNN) (Yu et al., 2017); Third, instead of using a RNN to model the output representations, we consider a CNN model followed by a fully-connected layer to further boost the effectiveness of our model. As shown in our experiments, our final model yields comparable results with better efficiency than SMN.

To address the second problem, we study transfer learning (TL) (Pan and Yang, 2010) to help domains with limited data. TL has been extensively studied in the last decade. With the popularity of deep learning, many Neural Network (NN) based methods are proposed (Yosinski et al., 2014). A typical framework uses a shared NN

to learn shared features for both source and target domains (Mou et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2017). Another approach is to use both a shared NN and domain-specific NNs to derive shared and domain-specific features (Liu et al., 2017). This is improved by some studies (Ganin et al., 2016; Taigman et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2017) that consider adversarial networks to learn more robust shared features across domains. Inspired by these studies, we extended our model to efficiently adapt the knowledge learned from a resource-rich domain to help our task. Our TL model is based on (Liu et al., 2017), with enhanced source and target specific domain discrimination losses. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to study transfer learning for context-aware question matching in conversations.

Experiments on both benchmark and commercial data sets show that our proposed model outperforms several baselines including the state-of-the-art SMN model. We have also deployed our model in an industrial bot and observed a significant improvement over the existing online model.

2 Model

Our model is designed to address the following general problem. Given an input sequence of utterances $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ and a candidate question r , our task is to identify the matching degree between the utterances and the question. When the number of utterances is one, our problem is identical to paraphrase identification (PI) (Yin and Schütze, 2015) or natural language inference (NLI) (Bowman et al., 2015). Furthermore, we consider a transfer learning setting to transfer knowledge from a source domain to help a target domain.

2.1 Multi-Turn hCNN (MT-hCNN)

We present an overview of our model in Fig. 1. In a nutshell, our model first obtains a representation for each utterance and candidate question pair using hybrid CNN (hCNN), then concatenates all the representations, and feeds them into a CNN and fully-connected layer to obtain our final output.

hCNN. The hybrid CNN (hCNN) model (Yu et al., 2017) is based on two existing models: a SE-based BCNN model (Yin et al., 2016) and a SI-based Pyramid model (Pang et al., 2016). The former uses two separate CNN to encode the two input sentences and then combines the resulting




Figure 1: Our proposed multi-turn hybrid CNN.

sentence embeddings as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_1 &= \text{CNN}_1(\mathbf{X}_1); \quad \mathbf{h}_2 = \text{CNN}_2(\mathbf{X}_2). \\ \mathbf{H}_b &= \mathbf{h}_1 \oplus \mathbf{h}_2 \oplus (\mathbf{h}_1 - \mathbf{h}_2) \oplus (\mathbf{h}_1 \cdot \mathbf{h}_2). \end{aligned}$$

where $-$ and \cdot refer to element-wise subtraction and multiplication, and \oplus refers to concatenation.

Furthermore, we add a SI-base Pyramid component to the model, we first produce an interaction matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, where $\mathbf{M}_{i,j}$ denotes the dot-product score between the i^{th} word in \mathbf{X}_1 and the j^{th} word in \mathbf{X}_2 . Next, we stack two 2-D convolutional layers and two 2-D max-pooling layers on it to obtain the hidden representation \mathbf{H}_p . Finally, we concatenate the hidden representations as output for each input sentence pair: $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2} = \text{hCNN}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) = \mathbf{H}_b \oplus \mathbf{H}_p$.

MT-hCNN. We now extend hCNN to handle multi-turn conversations. Let $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots, u_n\}$ be the utterances, r is the candidate question.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_{u_i, r} &= \text{hCNN}(\mathbf{u}_i, r). \quad \text{for } i \in [1, n] \\ \mathbf{H} &= [h_{u_1, r}; h_{u_2, r}; \dots; h_{u_n, r}]. \\ \mathbf{P} &= \text{CNN}_3(\mathbf{H}). \\ \mathbf{O} &= \text{Fully-Connected}(\mathbf{P}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that CNN3 is another CNN with a 2-D convolutional layer and a 2-D max-pooling layer, the output of CNN3 is feed into a fully-connected layer to obtain final representation \mathbf{O} .

2.2 Transfer with Domain Discriminators

We further study transfer learning (TL) to learn knowledge from a source-rich domain to help our target domain, in order to reduce the dependency on a large scale labeled training data. As similar to (Liu et al., 2017), we use a shared MT-hCNN and domain-specific MT-hCNNs to derive shared features \mathbf{O}^c and domain-specific features \mathbf{O}^s and \mathbf{O}^t . The domain specific output layers are:

$$\hat{y}^k = \begin{cases} \sigma(\mathbf{W}^{sc}\mathbf{O}^c + \mathbf{W}^s\mathbf{O}^s + \mathbf{b}^s), & \text{if } k = s \\ \sigma(\mathbf{W}^{tc}\mathbf{O}^c + \mathbf{W}^t\mathbf{O}^t + \mathbf{b}^t), & \text{if } k = t \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{W}^{sc} , \mathbf{W}^{tc} , \mathbf{W}^s , and \mathbf{W}^t are the weights for shared-source, shared-target, source, and target domains respectively, while \mathbf{b}^s and \mathbf{b}^t are the biases for source and target domains respectively.

Following (Liu et al., 2017), we use an adversarial loss L_{adv} on the shared feature space to encourage the features learned to be indistinguishable across two domains:

$$L_{adv} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^1 p(d_i = k | \mathbf{U}, r) \log p(d_i = k | \mathbf{U}, r)$$

where d_i is the domain label and $p(d_i | \cdot)$ is the domain probability from a domain discriminator.

Differently, to encourage the specific feature space to discriminate between different domains, we consider applying domain discrimination losses on the two specific feature spaces. We further add two negative cross-entropy losses: L_s for source domain and L_t for target domain:

$$L_s = -\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \mathbb{I}^{d_i=s} \log p(d_i = s | \mathbf{U}^s, r^s)$$

$$L_t = -\frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \mathbb{I}^{d_i=t} \log p(d_i = t | \mathbf{U}^t, r^t)$$

where $\mathbb{I}^{d_i=k}$ is an indicator function set to 1 when the statement ($d_i = k$) holds, or 0 otherwise.

Finally, we obtain a combined loss as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}} -\frac{1}{n_{\mathbf{k}}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{2} (y_j^k - \hat{y}_j^k)^2 + \frac{\lambda_1}{2} L_{adv} + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} L_s + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} L_t + \frac{\lambda_4}{2} \|\Theta\|_F^2.$$

where Θ denotes model parameters.

3 Experiments

We evaluate the *efficiency* and *effectiveness* of our base model, the *transferability* of the model, and the *online evaluation* in an industrial chatbot.

Datasets: We collect the chat logs between customers and a chatbot from “2017-10-01” to “2017-10-20” in an E-commerce company. The chatbot indexes all the questions in our QA database using Lucene, and call back the 15 most similar questions for each query using the TF-IDF model. We then ask a business analyst to annotate the candidate questions as positive or negative. In all, we have annotated 63,000 context-response pairs. This dataset (*EData*) is used as our *Target* data.

Furthermore, we build our *Source* data as follows. In the chatbot, if the confidence score of answering a given user query is low, we prompt three top related questions for users to choose. We collected the user click logs, where we treat the clicked question as positive and the others as negative. We collected 510,000 query-question pairs from the click logs in total as the source. For the source and target datasets, we use 80% for training, 10% for validation, and 10% for testing.

Compared Methods: We compared our multi-turn model (MT-hCNN) with two CNN based models ARC-I and ARC-II (Hu et al., 2014), and several advanced neural matching models: MV-LSTM (Wan et al., 2016), Pyramid (Pang et al., 2016) Duet (Mitra et al., 2017), SMN (Wu et al., 2017)³, and a degenerated version of our model that removes CNN3 from our MT-hCNN model (MT-hCNN-d). All the methods in this paper are implemented with Tensorflow and are trained with NVIDIA Tesla K40M GPUs.

Settings: We use the same parameter settings of hCNN in (Yu et al., 2017). For the CNN_3 in our model, we set window size of convolution layer as 2, ReLU as the activation function, and the stride of max-pooling layer as 2. The hidden node size of the *Fully-Connected* layer is set as 128. AdaGrad is used to train our model with an initial learning rate of 0.08. We use MAP, Recall@5, Recall@2, and Recall@1 as evaluation metrics.

3.1 Comparison on Base Models

The results of comparison on base models are shown in Table 1. First, the RNN based meth-

³The reported SMN results are based on the TensorFlow code from authors, and without using any over sampling of negative training data.

Table 1: Comparison of base models on Ubuntu Dialog Corpus (UDC) and an E-commerce data (EData).

| Data | UDC | | | | | EData | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|
| Methods | MAP | R@5 | R@2 | R@1 | Time | MAP | R@5 | R@2 | R@1 | Time |
| ARC-I | 0.2810 | 0.4887 | 0.1840 | 0.0873 | 16 | 0.7314 | 0.6383 | 0.3733 | 0.2171 | 23 |
| ARC-II | 0.5451 | 0.8197 | 0.5349 | 0.3498 | 17 | 0.7306 | 0.6595 | 0.3671 | 0.2236 | 24 |
| Pyramid | 0.6418 | 0.8324 | 0.6298 | 0.4986 | 17 | 0.8389 | 0.7604 | 0.4778 | 0.3114 | 27 |
| Duet | 0.5692 | 0.8272 | 0.5592 | 0.4756 | 20 | 0.7651 | 0.6870 | 0.4088 | 0.2433 | 30 |
| MV-LSTM | 0.6918 | 0.8982 | 0.7005 | 0.5457 | 1632 | 0.7734 | 0.7017 | 0.4105 | 0.2480 | 2495 |
| SMN | 0.7327 | 0.9273 | 0.7523 | 0.5948 | 56 | 0.8145 | 0.7271 | 0.4680 | 0.2881 | 85 |
| MT-hCNN-d | 0.7027 | 0.8992 | 0.7512 | 0.5838 | 20 | 0.8401 | 0.7712 | 0.4788 | 0.3238 | 31 |
| MT-hCNN | 0.7323 | 0.9172 | 0.7525 | 0.5978 | 24 | 0.8418 | 0.7810 | 0.4796 | 0.3241 | 36 |

ods like MV-LSTM and SMN have clear advantages over the two CNN-based approaches ARC-I and ARC-II, and are better or comparable with the state-of-the-art CNN-based models Pyramid and Duet; Second, our MT-hCNN outperforms MT-hCNN-d, which shows the benefits of adding a convolutional layer to the output representations of all the utterances; Third, we find SMN does not perform well in EData compared to UDC. One potential reason is that UDC has significantly larger data size than EData (1000k vs. 51k), which can help to train a complex model like SMN; Last but not least, our proposed MT-hCNN shows the best results in terms of all the metrics in EData, and the best results in terms of R@2 and R@1 in UDC, which shows the effectiveness of MT-hCNN.

We further evaluate the inference time⁴ of these models. As shown in Table 1, MT-hCNN has comparable or better results when compared with SMN (the state-of-the-art multi-turn conversation model), but is much more efficient than SMN (around 57% time reduction). MT-hCNN also has similar efficiency with CNN-based approaches but with better performance. In all, our proposed MT-hCNN is shown to be both efficient and effective for question matching in multi-turn conversations.

3.2 Comparison with TL Models

To evaluate the effectiveness of our transfer learning setting, we compare our full model with three baselines: Src-only that uses only source data, Tgt-only that uses only target data, and TL-S that use both source and target data with the adversarial training as in (Liu et al., 2017).

As shown in Table 2, Src-only performs worse than Tgt-only. This shows that the source and target domains are related but different. Despite the domain shift, TL-S is able to leverage knowledge from the source domain and boost performance;

⁴the time of scoring a query and N candidate questions. N is 10 in UDC, and 15 in EData.

last, our final model shows comparable and better performance than TL-S, this demonstrates the helpfulness of adding domain discriminators on both source and target domains.

Table 2: Comparison of different TL models.

| Data | E-commerce data (EData) | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Methods | MAP | R@5 | R@2 | R@1 |
| Src-only | 0.7012 | 0.7123 | 0.4343 | 0.2846 |
| Tgt-only | 0.8418 | 0.7810 | 0.4796 | 0.3241 |
| TL-S | 0.8521 | 0.8022 | 0.4812 | 0.3255 |
| Ours | 0.8523 | 0.8125 | 0.4881 | 0.3291 |

3.3 Online Evaluations

We deployed our model online in an E-commerce chatbot. For each query, the chatbot uses the TF-IDF model in Lucene to return a set of candidates, then uses our model to rerank all the candidates and returns the top. We set the candidate size as 15 and context length as 3. To accelerate the computation, we bundle the 15 candidates into a mini-batch to feed into our model. We compare our method with the online model - a degenerated version of our model that only uses the current query to retrieve candidate, i.e. context length is 1. We have run 3-day A/B testing on the Click-Through-Rate (CTR) of the models. As shown in Table 3, our method consistently outperforms the online model, yielding 5% ~ 10% improvement.

Table 3: Comparison with the online model.

| CTR | Day1 | Day2 | Day3 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Online Model | 0.214 | 0.194 | 0.221 |
| Our Model | 0.266 | 0.291 | 0.288 |

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a conversation model based on Multi-Turn hybrid CNN (MT-hCNN). We further extended our model to adapt the knowledge learned from a resource-rich domain. Extensive experiments and an online deployment in an E-commerce chatbot show the efficiency and effectiveness of this model.

References

- S. R. Bowman, G. Angeli, C. Potts, and C. D. Manning. 2015. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In *EMNLP*.
- Y. Ganin, E. Ustinova, H. Ajakan, P. Germain, H. Larochelle, F. Laviolette, M. Marchand, and V. Lempitsky. 2016. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17(59):1–35.
- B. Hu, Z. Lu, H. Li, and Q. Chen. 2014. Convolutional neural network architectures for matching natural language sentences. In *NIPS '14*.
- J. Li, M. Galley, C. Brockett, G. P. Spithourakis, J. Gao, and W. B. Dolan. 2016a. A persona-based neural conversation model. In *ACL '16*.
- J. Li, W. Monroe, A. Ritter, D. Jurafsky, M. Galley, and J. Gao. 2016b. Deep reinforcement learning for dialogue generation. In *EMNLP '16*.
- P. Liu, X. Qiu, and X. Huang. 2017. Adversarial multi-task learning for text classification. In *ACL*.
- B. Mitra, F. Diaz, and N. Craswell. 2017. Learning to match using local and distributed representations of text for web search. In *WWW '17*.
- L. Mou, Z. Meng, R. Yan, G. Li, Y. Xu, L. Zhang, and Z. Jin. 2016. How transferable are neural networks in nlp applications? In *EMNLP*.
- S. Pan and Q. Yang. 2010. A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering* 22(10):1345–1359.
- L. Pang, Y. Lan, J. Guo, J. Xu, S. Wan, and X. Cheng. 2016. Text matching as image recognition. In *AAAI*.
- L. Shang, Z. Lu, and H. Li. 2015. Neural responding machine for short-text conversation. In *ACL '15*.
- A. Sordoni, M. Galley, M. Auli, C. Brockett, Y. Ji, M. Mitchell, J. Nie, J. Gao, and B. Dolan. 2015. A neural network approach to context-sensitive generation of conversational responses. In *NAACL '15*.
- Y. Taigman, A. Polyak, and L. Wolf. 2017. Unsupervised cross-domain image generation. *ICLR*.
- S. Wan, Y. Lan, J. Guo, J. Xu, L. Pang, and X. Cheng. 2016. A deep architecture for semantic matching with multiple positional sentence representations. In *AAAI '16*.
- Y. Wu, W. Wu, C. Xing, M. Zhou, and Z. Li. 2017. Sequential matching network: A new architecture for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots. In *ACL '17*.
- R. Yan, Y. Song, and H. Wu. 2016. Learning to respond with deep neural networks for retrieval-based human-computer conversation system. In *SIGIR '16*.
- Z. Yang, R. Salakhutdinov, and W. W. Cohen. 2017. Transfer learning for sequence tagging with hierarchical recurrent networks. *ICLR*.
- W. Yin and H. Schütze. 2015. Convolutional neural network for paraphrase identification. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- W. Yin, H. Schütze, B. Xiang, and B. Zhou. 2016. Abcnn: Attention-based convolutional neural network for modeling sentence pairs. *Transactions of ACL* 4:259–272.
- J. Yosinski, J. Clune, Y. Bengio, and H. Lipson. 2014. How transferable are features in deep neural networks? In *NIPS*.
- J. Yu, M. Qiu, J. Jiang, J. Huang, S. Song, W. Chu, and H. Chen. 2017. Modelling domain relationships for transfer learning on retrieval-based question answering systems in e-commerce. *CoRR* abs/1711.08726.