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Abstract

A typical end-to-end task-oriented dialog system transfers context into dialog state, and upon which generates a response, which usually faces the problem of error propagation from both previously generated inaccurate dialog states and responses, especially in low-resource scenarios. To alleviate these issues, we propose BORT, a back and denoising reconstruction approach for end-to-end task-oriented dialog system. Squarely, to improve the accuracy of dialog states, back reconstruction is used to reconstruct the original input context from the generated dialog states since inaccurate dialog states cannot recover the corresponding input context. To enhance the denoising capability of the model to reduce the impact of error propagation, denoising reconstruction is used to reconstruct the corrupted dialog state and response. Extensive experiments conducted on MultiWOZ 2.0 and CamRest676 show the effectiveness of BORT. Furthermore, BORT demonstrates its advanced capabilities in the zero-shot domain and low-resource scenarios.

1 Introduction

Recently, task-oriented dialog systems, which aim to assist users to complete some booking tasks, have attracted great interest in the research community and the industry (Zhang et al., 2020c). Task-oriented dialog systems have been usually established via a pipeline system, including several modules such as natural language understanding, dialog state tracking, dialog policy, and natural language generation. The natural language understanding module converts user utterance into the structured semantic representation. The dialog state generated by the dialog state tracking module is used to query the database to achieve matched entities. The natural language generation module converts the action state estimated by the dialog policy module to the natural language response. This modular-based architecture is highly interpretable and easy to implement, used in most practical task-oriented dialog systems in the industry. However, every module is optimized individually and doesn’t consider the entire dialog history, which affects the performance of the dialog system. Therefore, many researchers focus on end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems to train an overall mapping from user natural language input to system natural language output (Lei et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2020b; Hosseini-Asl et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021).

However, all existing task-oriented dialog systems still suffer from one or more types of error propagation problems from both previously generated inaccurate dialog states and responses, as is illustrated in Figure 1. Firstly, the generated dialog state, which is crucial for task completion of task-oriented dialog systems, is usually inaccurate across the end-to-end task-oriented dialog system training. Secondly, the previously generated dialog state and response are encoded to create the current...
dialog state and response during inference, while
the oracle previous dialog state and response are
encoded during training. There exists a discrep-
ancy between training and inference, affecting the
quality of generated system responses.

We propose BORT, a back and denoising recon-
struction approach for end-to-end task-oriented di-
alog systems to alleviate these issues. To improve
dialog state learning ability, back reconstruction
is used to reconstruct the generated dialog state
back to the original input context to ensure that the
information in the input side is completely trans-
formed to the output side. In addition, to enhance
doing the capability of the task-oriented dialog
system to reduce the impact of error propagation,
denoising reconstruction is used to reconstruct the
corrupted dialog state and response. It guarantees
that the system learns enough internal information
of the dialog context to recover the original ver-

tion. Experimental results on MultiWOZ 2.0 and
CamRest676 show that our proposed BORT sub-
stantially outperforms baseline systems. This paper
primarily makes the following contributions:

• We propose two effective reconstruction
strategies, i.e., back and denoising reconstruc-
tion strategies, to improve the performance of
end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems.

• Extensive experiments and analysis on Mul-
tiWOZ 2.0 and CamRest676 show the effect-
viveness of BORT.

• BORT achieves promising performance in
zero-shot domain scenarios and alleviates
poor performance in low-resource scenarios.

2 Task-Oriented Dialog Framework

As illustrated in Figure 2(a), we construct an
encoder-decoder framework for an end-to-end task-
oriented dialog system via dialog state tracking and
response generation tasks. One shared encoder en-
codes dialog context, and two different decoders
decode dialog state and system response, respec-
tively. The objective function \( L_{all} \) of the entire
training process is optimized as:

\[
L_{all} = L_B + L_R, \tag{1}
\]

where \( L_B \) is the objective function for dialog state
tracking, and \( L_R \) is the objective function for re-

2.1 Dialog State Tracking

Motivated by Lin et al. (2020), we model the Lev-
enshtein dialog state, which means the difference
between the current dialog state and the previous
dialog state, for dialog state tracking task to gen-
erate minimal dialog state and reduce the inference
latency. The Levenshtein dialog state \( \Delta B_t \) of
dialog turn \( t \), is generated based on the previous
dialog state \( B_{t-1} \), the previous system response \( R_{t-1} \),
and the current user utterance \( U_t \) via the encoder-
decoder framework:

\[
H_{eb} = encoder(B_{t-1}, R_{t-1}, U_t), \tag{2}
\]

\[
\Delta B_t = decoder_b(H_{eb}), \tag{3}
\]

where \( H_{eb} \) denotes the hidden representation
of the encoder for dialog state tracking. Therefore,
the dialog state tracking objective function can be
optimized by minimizing:

\[
L_B = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{n_i} -\log P(\Delta B_t | B_{t-1}, R_{t-1}, U_t), \tag{4}
\]

where \( N \) denotes the number of dialog sessions, \( n_i \)
denotes the number of dialog turns in the dialog
session \( i \).

For inference, a predefined function \( \Omega(\cdot) \) is used
to generate the dialog state \( B_t \) as

\[
B_t = \Omega(\Delta B_t, B_{t-1}). \tag{5}
\]

The predefined function \( \Omega(\cdot) \) deletes the slot-value
pair in \( B_{t-1} \) when the \( NULL \) symbol appears in the
\( \Delta B_t \), and it updates the \( B_{t-1} \) when new slot-value
pair or new value for one slot appears in the \( \Delta B_t \).
Refer to Lin et al. (2020) for more details. The
generated dialog state \( B_t \) is used to query the corre-
sponding database. The database state embedding
\( DB_t \) represents the number of matched entities and
whether the booking is available or not. The em-
bedding \( DB_t \) is used as the start token embedding
of the response decoder for response generation.

2.2 Response Generation

The response \( R_t \) of dialog turn \( t \) is generated based
on the previous system response \( R_{t-1} \), the current
user utterance \( U_t \), the current dialog state \( B_t \), and
the database state embedding \( DB_t \), which is for-
mulated as:

\[
H_{sr} = encoder(R_{t-1}, U_t, B_t), \tag{6}
\]

\[
R_t = decoder_r(H_{sr}, DB_t), \tag{7}
\]
where $H_{cr}$ denotes the hidden representation of the encoder for response generation. Therefore, the response generation objective function can be optimized by minimizing:

$$L_R = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{n_i} -\log P(R_t|R_{t-1}, U_t, B_t, DB_t). \quad (8)$$

### 3 Methodology

In this section, we propose two reconstruction strategies, i.e., back reconstruction and denoising reconstruction, respectively. Generally, during task-oriented dialog training, objective functions $L_{BR}$ and $L_{DR}$ are added to enhance model learning ability. The general objective function of a task-oriented dialog system can be reformulated as follows:

$$L_{all} = L_B + L_R + \lambda_1 L_{BR} + \lambda_2 L_{DR}, \quad (9)$$

where $L_{BR}$ and $L_{DR}$ denote the objective functions for back reconstruction and denoising reconstruction. $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are hyper-parameters that adjust the weights of the objective functions.

#### 3.1 Back Reconstruction

Dialog state is essential for the task completion of a task-oriented dialog system (Wang et al., 2022). As illustrated in Figure 2(b), we propose a back reconstruction strategy to mitigate the generation of inaccurate dialog states, including encoder-reconstructor and encoder-decoder-reconstructor modules. For the encoder-reconstructor module, the dialog context $C(t) = (B_{t-1}, R_{t-1}, U_t)$ could be reconstructed to enhance encoder information representation by the encoder hidden representation $H_{eb}$. For the encoder-decoder-reconstructor module, the decoder hidden representation $H_{db}$ could be used to reconstruct the dialog context $C(t)$ to encourage the dialog state decoder to achieve complete information of dialog context.

The dialog state would be reconstructed back to the source input and the corresponding reconstruction score would be calculated to measure the adequacy of the dialog state. The objective function $L_{BR}$ for the back reconstruction is optimized by minimizing:

$$L_{BR} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{n_i} -\log P(C(t)|H_{eb})$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{n_i} -\log P(C(t)|H_{db}). \quad (10)$$

#### 3.2 Denoising Reconstruction

To enhance the denoising capability of the task-oriented dialog system, we propose denoising reconstruction to guarantee that the system learns enough dialog context representation to recover the
original version, as illustrated in Figure 2(c). Motivated by denoising auto-encoder strategy that maps a corrupted input back to the original version (Vincent et al., 2010), we introduce noise in the form of random token deleting and masking in the source input to improve the dialog model learning ability. Specifically, we delete or mask every token in the previous dialog state and system response with a probability $\alpha$. More concretely, we propose two denoising reconstruction modules, i.e., dialog state denoising and response denoising modules.

For the dialog state denoising module, we reconstruct the new Levenshtein dialog state, which means the corrupted part of the dialog state rather than the complete dialog state in the original denoising auto-encoder. The Levenshtein dialog state $\Delta B_{t-1}^t$ of dialog turn $t$, is generated based on the noisy dialog context $N_B(t) = (N(B_{t-1}), R_{t-1}, U_t)$. $N(B_{t-1})$ is the previous corrupted dialog state. For example, the Levenshtein dialog state ‘taxi_destination=stevenage train station’ is reconstructed from the corrupted dialog state where ‘taxi_destination’ is masked and ‘train’ is deleted, as shown in Figure 2(c). For response denoising module, the previous system response $R_{t-1}$ of dialog turn $t$ is reconstructed based on the noisy dialog context $N_R(t) = (N(R_{t-1}), U_t, B_t, DB_{t-1})$. $N(R_{t-1})$ is the previous noisy system response. Therefore, the objective function $\mathcal{L}_{DR}$ for the denoising reconstruction is optimized by minimizing:

$$\mathcal{L}_{DR} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{n} -\log P(\Delta B_{t-1}^t|N_B(t))$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{n} -\log P(R_{t-1}|N_R(t)).$$

(11)

### 3.3 Training and Inference Details

There exists inconsistency between the lexicalized user utterance and delexicalized system response, which is used to reduce the influence of different slot values on evaluation (Zhang et al., 2020b). This adds an extra burden for the system to generate a delexicalized system response. To alleviate this issue, we introduce delexicalized user utterances for response generation while lexicalized user utterances are still used for dialog state tracking. For example, ‘02:15’ is converted into delexicalized form ‘[taxi_arriveby]’ for response generation, as shown in Figure 2(a). Different forms of user utterances take better training of both tasks, ultimately improving task completion.

For inference of dialog state tracking, generated previous dialog state, oracle previous system response, and current user utterance are used as dialogue context to generate the current Levenshtein dialog state. For inference of response generation, motivated by Yang et al. (2021), we use generated previous system response instead of oracle previous system response to generate the current system response to maintain coherence throughout the whole dialog session.

### 4 Experiments

#### 4.1 Datasets and Evaluation Metrics

To establish our proposed end-to-end task-oriented dialog system, we consider two task-oriented dialogue datasets, MultiWOZ 2.0 (Budzianowski et al., 2018) and CamRest676 (Wen et al., 2017).

MultiWOZ 2.0 is a large-scale human-to-human multi-domain task-oriented dialog dataset. The dataset consists of seven domains: attraction, hospital, police, hotel, restaurant, taxi, and train. It contains 8438, 1000, and 1000 dialog sessions for training, validation, and testing datasets. Each dialog session covers 1 to 3 domains, and multiple different domains might be mentioned in a single dialog turn. Particularly, there are no hospital and police domains in the validation and testing dataset.

To make our experiments comparable with previous work (Zhang et al., 2020b; Lin et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021), we use the pre-processing script released by Zhang et al. (2020b) and follow the automatic evaluation metrics to evaluate the response quality of the task-oriented dialog system. Inform rate measures if a dialog system has provided a correct entity; Success rate measures if a dialog system has provided a correct entity and answered all the requested information; BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) measures the fluency of the generated response; the combined score, which is computed by $(Inform + Success) \times 0.5 + BLEU$, measures the overall quality of the dialog system. To evaluate the performance of dialog state tracking, we use the joint goal accuracy to measure the accuracy of generated dialog states.

CamRest676 is a small-scale restaurant-domain dataset. It contains 408, 136, 132 dialog sessions for training, validation, and testing datasets. To make our experiments comparable with previous work (Lei et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2021), we use the same delexicalization strategy and use BLEU score and Success F1 to evaluate the response qual-
Table 1: Comparison of end-to-end models evaluated on MultiWOZ 2.0. “++” after a score indicates that the proposed BORT is significantly better than Baseline (mask=0) at significance level $p < 0.01$. * denotes the re-evaluated result by the author-released model since the result reported in this original paper (Yang et al., 2021) was evaluated using the ground truth dialog state instead of generated dialog state to query the database entities.

4.2 Settings

In the training process for the task-oriented dialog system, we select two backbone models. BORT is a transformer-based system initialized by a pre-trained model. BORT_G is a GRU-based system without a pre-trained model. The detailed training settings and results of the BORT_G backbone are provided in Appendix A.1.

For the BORT backbone, we use pre-trained T5-small (Raffel et al., 2020) to initialize the dialog system, based on the HuggingFace Transformers library (Wolf et al., 2020) and follow the settings of Lin et al. (2020). There are six layers for the encoder and the decoder. The dimension of hidden layers is set to 512, and the head of attention is 8. The batch size is set to 96. The AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) is used to optimize the model parameters. The learning rate is 0.0025, and the learning rate decay is 0.8. The hyper-parameters $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are set to 0.05 and 0.03, respectively. For the denoising reconstruction strategy, the noise probability $\alpha$ is 0.15. The hyper-parameter analysis is provided in Appendix A.2.

Training early stops when no improvement on the combined score of the validation set for five epochs. All results in the low-resource scenario are the average scores of three runs. One P40 GPU is used to train all dialog systems.

4.3 Baselines

Compared with other previous work, our proposed BORT is evaluated in two context-to-response settings: end-to-end modeling to generate dialog state and system response, and policy optimization to generate system response based on ground truth dialog state. Policy optimization results are provided in Appendix A.3.

Sequicity (Lei et al., 2018) and DAMD (Zhang et al., 2020b) are GRU-based end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems with a copy mechanism. Decoder based pre-trained model GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) is used in SimpleTOD (Hosseini-Asl et al., 2020), SOLOIST (Peng et al., 2020), and UBAR (Yang et al., 2021). Encoder-decoder based pre-trained model T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) and BART (Lewis et al., 2020) is used in MinTL (Lin et al., 2020). Reinforcement learning is used in LAVA (Lubis et al., 2020) and SUMBT+LaRL (Lee et al., 2020). Especially, SUMBT+LaRL merges a dialog state tracking model SUMBT (Lee et al., 2019) and a dialog policy model LaRL (Zhao et al., 2019) and fine-tune them via reinforcement learning, achieving the state-of-the-art performance.

In addition, we implement two baseline systems. One baseline is the base architecture of a task-oriented dialog system, as illustrated in Figure 2(a). The other is a noise-based baseline system, just masking 15% tokens in the dialog context for dialog training.

4.4 Main Results

Table 1 presents the detailed inform rates, success rates, BLEU scores, and combined scores of end-
to-end dialog models on the MultiWOZ 2.0. Our re-implemented baseline system performs better than MinTL (Lin et al., 2020), using the same pre-trained T5-small model. This indicates that the baseline is a strong system. Our proposed BORT significantly outperforms our re-implemented baseline system by 6.5 combined scores, while the simple noise-based method (Baseline (mask=0.15)) doesn’t achieve better performance. Moreover, BORT outperforms the previous state-of-the-art SUMBT+LaRL by 1.6 combined scores, achieving the best performance in terms of inform rate, success rate, and combined score. This further demonstrates the effectiveness of our proposed BORT.

Table 2: Comparison of end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems on CamRest676.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Success F1</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequicity</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDM</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLOIST</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT</td>
<td><strong>89.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Comparison of end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems evaluated on the standardized setting (Nekvinda and Dušek, 2021).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAMD (Zhang et al., 2020b)</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABLES (Zhang et al., 2020a)</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutGPT (Kulhánek et al., 2021)</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinTL-T5-small (Lin et al., 2020)</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLOIST (Peng et al., 2020)</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoTS (Jeon and Lee, 2021)</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB A R (Yang et al., 2021)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT</td>
<td><strong>85.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The performance of the different components of our proposed BORT on MultiWOZ 2.0. BR denotes back reconstruction, DR denotes denoising reconstruction, UD denotes user utterance delexicalization.

4.6 Ablation Study

We empirically investigate the performance of the different components of BORT as shown in Table 4. Our introduced user utterance delexicalization strategy gains 1.9 combined scores, indicating the effectiveness of the user utterance delexicalization strategy. Back reconstruction performs slightly better than denoising reconstruction by 1 combined score regarding the two proposed reconstruction strategies. Moreover, the combination of both reconstruction strategies can complement each other to further improve the performance of the dialog system. The detailed analysis on different modules of every reconstruction strategy is provided in Appendix A.4.

4.7 Dialog State Tracking

Table 5 reports the dialog state tracking performance of the end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems on MultiWOZ 2.0. BORT substantially outperforms MinTL (Lin et al., 2020) using the same pre-trained T5-small model by 2.8 points, achieving 54.0 joint goal accuracy. Moreover, BORT achieves the highest joint goal accuracy among the end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems. This indicates that our proposed reconstruction strategies could improve dialog state learning ability.

4.8 Case Study and Human Evaluation

Moreover, we analyze translation examples and conduct a human evaluation to further explore the
effectiveness of BORT. Figure 3 shows an example generated by MinTL and BORT, respectively. More examples are provided in Appendix A.5. MinTL generates the response to request for the preferred area about college since it generates an inaccurate dialog state ‘attraction_type=college’ rather than correct dialog state ‘attraction_name=jesus college’. In contrast, BORT generates an accurate dialog state, achieving the appropriate response that provides the information of jesus college. These further demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed reconstruction strategies.

Figure 3: An example of the task-oriented dialog systems in dialog session PMUL4025.

For human evaluation, we manually evaluate the quality of generated responses on 50 dialog sessions, which are randomly extracted from the MultiWOZ 2.0 testing set. We consider the fluency and appropriateness of the generated response based on scores ranging from 1 to 5. The fluency metric measures whether the generated response is fluent. The appropriateness metric measures whether the generated response is appropriate and the system understands the user’s goal. Three fluent English speakers are asked to evaluate these generated responses. The average scores evaluated by them are shown in Table 6. The results are consistent with the automatic evaluation, indicating that BORT could improve the quality of generated response.

Table 6: The human evaluation of the end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems on MultiWOZ 2.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MinTL-T5-small</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBAR</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Comparison of combined scores on the MultiWOZ 2.0 in the zero-shot domain scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Train</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAMD</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBAR</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinTL</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 Domain Adaptation Analysis

To investigate the domain adaptation ability of BORT to generalize to some unseen domains, we simulate zero-shot experiments by excluding one domain and training BORT on other domains. As shown in Table 7, the train and taxi domains achieve the highest combined scores because they have a high overlap in ontology with other domains. In addition, BORT and MinTL with an encoder-decoder-based pre-trained model achieve significantly better domain adaptation performance than DAMD without a pre-trained model and UBAR with a decoder-based pre-trained model, which demonstrates the encoder-decoder based pre-trained model have better domain transferability. Moreover, our proposed reconstruction strategy could further improve combined scores in the zero-shot domain scenario.

4.10 Low Resource Scenario Analysis

To better assess the robustness of our proposed BORT, we choose 5%, 10%, 20%, and 30% of training dialog sessions to investigate the performance of task-oriented dialog systems in the low resource scenario. As shown in Table 8, BORT substantially outperforms other methods in these low-resource scenarios. This is because the error propagation problem in the low resource scenario is more serious, while BORT could effectively alleviate the error propagation problem. Moreover, our proposed BORT trained on the 30% dataset performs comparably to some baseline systems trained on all datasets as shown in Table 1. These further demonstrate that our proposed BORT is robust, alleviating poor performance in the low-resource
Table 8: Comparison of task-oriented dialog systems on the MultiWOZ 2.0 in the low resource scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>5% Inform Success BLEU Combined</th>
<th>10% Inform Success BLEU Combined</th>
<th>20% Inform Success BLEU Combined</th>
<th>30% Inform Success BLEU Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAMD</td>
<td>49.1 23.7 11.3 47.7</td>
<td>57.6 32.6 12.0 57.1</td>
<td>64.7 45.0 15.3 70.2</td>
<td>64.5 47.3 15.5 71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBAR</td>
<td>35.7 21.2 11.0 39.5</td>
<td>62.4 43.6 12.7 65.7</td>
<td>78.2 56.3 14.1 81.4</td>
<td>91.2 65.4 14.7 88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinTL</td>
<td>55.2 40.9 13.9 62.0</td>
<td>67.7 55.7 15.3 77.0</td>
<td>66.7 57.9 17.3 79.6</td>
<td>74.9 66.5 17.3 88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT</td>
<td>69.8 45.0 11.0 74.5</td>
<td>68.6 15.5 83.1</td>
<td>82.1 65.5 14.3 88.1</td>
<td>93.0 69.9 17.2 94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 Error Propagation Analysis

To investigate the denoising capability of our proposed BORT, we perform the simulated experiments, where noise is added in the oracle dialog state for the policy optimization evaluation. In detail, we replace every token in the oracle dialog state with the masked token with a probability to generate synthetic noise. As shown in Figure 4, BORT performs substantially better than the baseline system in the noisy scenario. In particular, as the noise ratio in the oracle dialog state increases, the performance gap between the baseline system and BORT increases. When noise proportion is 0, BORT still performs better than the baseline system because BORT generates more appropriate response via the denoising reconstruction strategy. These demonstrate that our proposed BORT is robust and effective.

5 Related Work

End-to-end task-oriented dialog system has attracted much attention in the dialog community. A two-stage copynet framework was proposed to establish an end-to-end task-oriented dialog system based on a single sequence-to-sequence model (Lei et al., 2018). Zhang et al. (2020b) proposed a multi-action data augmentation framework to improve the diversity of dialog responses. Recently, large-scale language model pre-training has been effective for enhancing many natural language processing tasks (Peters et al., 2018; Radford et al., 2018; Devlin et al., 2019). Decoder-based pre-trained language model such as GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) was used to improve the performance of end-to-end task-oriented dialog system (Budzianowski and Vulić, 2019; Hosseini-Asl et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021). The Levenshtein dialog state instead of the dialog state was generated to reduce the inference latency (Lin et al., 2020). In addition, they used encoder-decoder-based pre-trained model such as T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) and BART (Lewis et al., 2020) to establish a dialog system. In contrast with previous work, in which system response was generated, Wu et al. (2020) used encoder-based pre-trained model such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) for task-oriented dialog system, aiming to retrieve the most relative system response from a candidate pool. Reinforcement learning could also be used to enable task-oriented dialog systems to achieve more successful task completion (Lubis et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020).

Tu et al. (2017) proposed an encoder-decoder-reconstructor framework for neural machine translation to alleviate over-translation and under-translation problems. Reconstruction strategy was used to moderate dropped pronoun translation problems (Wang et al., 2018). In contrast, we considered the adequacy of semantic representations rather than natural language sentences to build the reconstruction model. Vincent et al. (2010) proposed a denoising autoencoder, in which random noise is added to enhance the robustness of the model, alleviating the overfitting problem of traditional auto-encoder. The denoising auto-encoder strategy was used as the language model to generate more fluent translation candidates for the unsupervised neural machine translation (Artetxe et al., 2018; Lample et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2019). In addition, a denoising auto-encoder was used to pre-train sequence-to-sequence models on the large scale corpus (Lewis et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020). In contrast, we proposed a denoising reconstruction mechanism to alleviate the error propagation problem along the multi-turn conversation flow.
6 Conclusion

This paper proposes back and denoising reconstruction strategies for the end-to-end task-oriented dialog system. Back reconstruction strategy is proposed to mitigate the generation of inaccurate dialog states, achieving better task completion of the task-oriented dialog system. Denoising reconstruction is used to train a robust task-oriented dialog system, further alleviating the error propagation problem. Our extensive experiments and analysis on MultiWOZ 2.0 and CamRest676 demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed reconstruction strategies.
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A Appendix

A.1 BORT_G Settings and Results

For the BORT_G backbone, we follow the settings of Zhang et al. (2020b). We use one layer bi-directional GRU for the encoder and the decoder. The dimension of hidden layers is set to 100. The batch size is 128. The AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) is used to optimize the model parameters, and the learning rate is 0.005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAMD</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinTL-T5-small</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT_G</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Comparison of end-to-end models evaluated on MultiWOZ 2.0.

As shown in Table 9, BORT_G performs better than DAMD without a pre-trained model, achieving the improvement of 15.0 combined scores, even though multi-action data augmentation is not used in BORT_G. Moreover, BORT_G outperforms MinTL (Lin et al., 2020), using the pre-trained model. This demonstrates the effectiveness and applicability of our proposed reconstruction strategies.

A.2 Hyper-parameter Analysis

In Figure 5, we empirically investigate how the hyper-parameters in Eq. 9 affects the dialog performance on the MultiWOZ 2.0 validation set. The selection of hyper-parameters $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ influence the role of the $L_{BR}$ and $L_{DR}$ across the entire end-to-end task-oriented dialog training process. Larger values of $\lambda_1$ or $\lambda_2$ cause the $L_{BR}$ or $L_{DR}$ to play a more important role than the original task-oriented dialog loss terms. The smaller the value of $\lambda_1$ or $\lambda_2$, the less important is the $L_{BR}$ or $L_{DR}$. As Figure 5 shows, $\lambda_1$ ranging from 0.01 to 0.5 nearly all enhances task-oriented dialog performance, and when $\lambda_2$ is larger than 0.3, the performance underperforms the baseline system. When $\lambda_1 = 0.05$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.03$, our proposed BORT achieves the best performance on the validation set.

In addition, the influence of noise type and noise proportion on the performance of our proposed BORT on the MultiWOZ 2.0 validation set is empirically investigated, as shown in Figure 6. Both deletion and masking noise strategies could improve the dialog performance. In particular, their combination is further better than both of them. This demonstrates that both noise strategies can complement each other to further improve the dialog performance. As shown in Figure 6, when the noise proportion is 0.15, our proposed BORT achieves the best performance on the validation set.

A.3 Policy Optimization Evaluation

The detailed inform rates, success rates, BLEU scores, and combined scores of policy optimization dialog models on the MultiWOZ 2.0 are presented in Table 10. The ground truth dialog state is used for the policy optimization setting to query the database entities and generate system responses. Our proposed BORT achieves performance comparable to the state-of-the-art LAVA in terms of inform rate. In addition, compared with previous policy optimization methods, BORT achieves bet-
Table 10: Comparison of policy optimization models evaluated on MultiWOZ 2.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Pre-trained</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>BLEU Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LaRL (Zhao et al., 2019)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SimpleTOD (Hosseini-Asl et al., 2020)</td>
<td>DistilGPT2</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDSA (Chen et al., 2019)</td>
<td>BERT-base</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDM (Wu et al., 2021)</td>
<td>GPT-2</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMD (Zhang et al., 2020b)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLOIST (Peng et al., 2020)</td>
<td>GPT-2</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBAR (Yang et al., 2021)</td>
<td>DistilGPT2</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVA (Lubis et al., 2020)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDNO (Wang et al., 2021)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT (Wu et al., 2021)</td>
<td>GPT-2</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORT</td>
<td>T5-small</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: The performance of the different components of the two proposed reconstruction strategies. enc-dec denotes encoder-reconstructor module, enc-dec-rec denotes encoder-decoder-reconstructor module.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back reconstruction</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>107.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o enc-rec</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o enc-dec-rec</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>104.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denoising reconstruction</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o dialog state denoising</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>105.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o response denoising</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.4 Ablation Study

Moreover, we further investigate the performance of the different components of the two proposed reconstruction strategies, respectively. As shown in Table 11, encoder-decoder-reconstructor module for back reconstruction strategy significantly outperforms encoder-reconstructor module by 2.2 combined scores because dialog state decoder could achieve more dialog context information for encoder-decoder-reconstructor. In addition, regarding two denoising reconstruction modules, dialog state denoising and response denoising have achieved similar performance. These two modules could improve the denoising capability of the task-oriented dialog system.

A.5 More examples

Figures 7 - 11 show several examples generated by MinTL and BORT, respectively. As shown in Figure 7, MinTL generates the inadequate dialog state, which may provide the hotel without internet. Our proposed BORT reconstructs the generated dialog state back to the original input context to ensure the information in the input side is completely transformed to the output side to achieve an adequate dialog state via a back reconstruction strategy. Figure 8 shows that our proposed BORT generated the correct slot value ‘european’ rather than the corrupted one ‘europeon’ from the corrupted dialog context, indicating the robustness of the denoising reconstruction strategy. As shown in Figures 9 - 11, MinTL generates the inaccurate dialog state, leading to the inaccurate response. The results are consistent with our opinion that the generated dialog state, which is crucial for task completion of a task-oriented dialog system, has always been inaccurate across the end-to-end task-oriented dialog system training. Moreover, Figure 11 shows that MinTL faces the problem of error propagation from both previously generated inaccurate dialog states and responses. Our proposed BORT can alleviate these issues via reconstruction strategies, further demonstrating the effectiveness of BORT.
Hello there! Could you help me find a hotel? I am looking for one that has free parking and is expensive.

Here is a list of hotels with free parking and are expensive:

- Hotel 1 with free parking and is expensive
- Hotel 2 with free parking and is expensive
- Hotel 3 with free parking and is expensive

I have [hotel_choice] options for you. Do you have a preference on area?

User: I did not receive any list of hotels. Can you just pick 1 for me, a hotel with free parking and that is upscale please.

Golden Response: Here is a [hotel_name] in [hotel_area] that is upscale and has free parking. Would you like me to book it for you?

User: Yes it does. Would you like me to book it for you?

Golden Response: Yes, it does. Would you like me to book it for you?

User: I am also looking for a cheap hotel to crash in. Can you find 1 for me?

Golden Response: Here is a [hotel_name] in the west of [city] that is cheap and has free parking. Would you like me to book it for you?

User: Do you have any expensive hotels with a 3 star rating?

Golden Response: I have [hotel_type] different [hotel_type] for you. [hotel_type] have free wifi and free parking, would you prefer the [hotel_area] or the [hotel_area]?

User: I am sorry, there are no [restaurant_food] restaurants in the [restaurant_area], would you like to try a different type of food?

Golden Response: I am sorry, there are no [restaurant_food] restaurants in the [restaurant_area], would you like to try a different type of food?
User: I need to find a restaurant that serves Welsh food in the centre of town please.

Golden Dialog State: restaurant_food=welsh

Golden Response: I am sorry, but there are no restaurants that serve Welsh food in the centre of town.

MinTL Dialog State: restaurant_area=centre

MinTL Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants that meet your criteria. Would you like to try a different type of food?

BORT Dialog State: restaurant_pricerange=cheap

BORT Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants in the centre of town that serve Welsh food. Would you like to try a different type of food?

User: Yes, are there any Welsh restaurants in the cheap price range that are in North Cambridge?

Golden Dialog State: restaurant_pricerange=cheap

Golden Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants in North Cambridge that serve Welsh food.

MinTL Dialog State: restaurant_area=north

MinTL Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants in North Cambridge that serve Welsh food. Would you like to try a different type of food?

BORT Dialog State: restaurant_food=indian

BORT Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants in the centre of town that serve Welsh food. Would you like to try a different type of food?

User: I am looking for a place to eat that is expensive and serves afternoon tea. Can you help me?

Golden Dialog State: restaurant_pricerange=expensive

Golden Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants like that in the centre of town unfortunately.

MinTL Dialog State: restaurant_food=afternoon tea

MinTL Response: I am sorry, there are no restaurants that serve afternoon tea in the centre of town. Would you like to try a different type of food?

BORT Dialog State: restaurant_area=centre

BORT Response: I am sorry, there are no results for an restaurant in the centre of town. Would you like to try a different type of food?

User: Can you change my food preference to Chinese and when do you need the reservation for?

Golden Dialog State: restaurant_food=chinese

Golden Response: I have changed your food preference to Chinese. How many people are in your group and when do you need the reservation for?

MinTL Dialog State: restaurant_food=chinese

MinTL Response: There are no restaurants in the centre of town that meet your criteria. Would you like to try a different type of food?

BORT Dialog State: restaurant_name=random

BORT Response: I would recommend [restaurant_name] on the [restaurant_area]. How many people are in your group and when do you need the reservation for?

User: No particular part of town, I would appreciate a recommendation. Can you make reservations for me?

Golden Dialog State: restaurant_pricerange=expensive

Golden Response: I would recommend [restaurant_name] on the [restaurant_area]. How many people are in your group and when do you need the reservation for?

MinTL Dialog State: restaurant_pricerange=expensive

MinTL Response: I would recommend [restaurant_name] on the [restaurant_area]. How many people are in your group and when do you need the reservation for?

BORT Dialog State: restaurant_pricerange=expensive

BORT Response: I would recommend [restaurant_name] on the [restaurant_area]. Would you like me to book a table for you?