

Model-based Bayesian Reinforcement Learning for Dialogue Management

Pierre Lison Language Technology Group, University of Oslo

August 26, 2013 Interspeech



- Hand-crafting dialogue policies is hard!
 - Noise & uncertainty (e.g. speech recognition errors)
 - Large number of possible trajectories
- Alternative: automatically optimise dialogue policies from (real or simulated) experience
- Two types of approaches:
 - Model-free reinforcement learning
 - Model-based reinforcement learning

Focus of

this talk



- Hand-crafting dialogue policies is hard!
 - Noise & uncertainty (e.g. speech recognition errors)
 - Large number of possible trajectories
- Alternative: automatically optimise dialogue policies from (real or simulated) experience
- Two types of approaches:
 - **Model-free** reinforcement learning

Model-based reinforcement learning



- Model-based reinforcement learning:
 - Collect interactions and use them to estimate explicit models of the domain
 - Use the resulting models to plan the best action
- Key advantage: can exploit prior knowledge to structure the domain models
- We present an experiment showing the benefits of this approach



























POMDPs with model uncertainty





- After each observation, the parameters are updated via Bayesian inference
 - Parameter distributions gradually narrowed down to the values that best fit the observed data
- Forward planning is used to select the next action to execute at runtime
 - Three source of uncertainty: state uncertainty, stochastic action effects, and model uncertainty





- Dialogue domains often have large, complex state and action spaces
- Need generalisation/abstraction techniques to avoid the «curse of dimensionality»
- The framework of **probabilistic rules** offers such abstraction language
 - Capture domain structure through (parametrised) rules mapping conditions to probabilistic effects
 - Drastic reduction in the number of parameters



• Structured if...then...else cases associating conditions to distributions over effects:

```
if (condition<sub>1</sub> holds) then

P(effect_1) = \theta_1, P(effect_2) = \theta_2, ...

else if (condition<sub>2</sub> holds) then

P(effect_3) = \theta_3, ...
```

 Probabilistic rules serve as high-level templates for a Bayesian network

[P. Lison, «Probabilistic Dialogue Models with Prior Domain Knowledge», SIGDIAL 2012]



Probabilistic rules: example

r₁: ∀ X:
if (a_m = AskConfirm(X) ∧ i_u ≠ X) then
[P(a_u' = Disconfirm) =
$$θ_1$$
]



Probabilistic rules: example

r₁:
$$\forall$$
 X:
if (a_m = AskConfirm(X) ∧ i_u ≠ X) **then**
[P(a_u' = Disconfirm) = θ_1]







- Evaluation of the learning approach in a simulated environment:
 - Human-robot interaction domain (with Nao robot)
 - Simulator constructed from Wizard-of-Oz data
 - **Goal**: estimate the *transition model* of the domain (reward model is given)





- Simulation models:
 - User modelling: how the user is expected to react to the system actions
 - Context modelling: how the system actions change the state of the environment
 - Error modelling: how understanding errors can occur
- Collected and annotated Wizard-of-Oz data to empirically estimate these models



Experimental setup

• Two alternative formalisations of the transition model:



Classical (factored) categorical distributions

Model structured with probabilistic rules



Results: average return





- Hybrid approach to dialogue policy optimisation:
 - Domain models structured with probabilistic rules
 - Rule parameters estimated via model-based Bayesian RL
- Experiment shows that the rule-structured model outperforms a classical factored model

• Future work:

- Evaluate the approach with real interactions
- Combine offline and online planning