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In this paper, we address the problem of answering complex information needs by conversing with search engines, in the sense that users can express their queries in natural language, and directly receive the information they need from a short system response in a conversational manner. Recently, there have been some attempts towards a similar goal, e.g., studies on Conversational Agents (CAs) and Conversational Search (CS). However, they either do not address complex information needs, or they are limited to the development of conceptual frameworks and/or laboratory-based user studies.

We pursue two goals in this paper: (1) the creation of a suitable dataset, the Search as a Conversation (SaaC) dataset, for the development of pipelines for conversations with search engines, and (2) the development of a state-of-the-art pipeline for conversations with search engines, the Conversations with Search Engines (CaSE), using this dataset. SaaC is built based on a multi-turn conversational search dataset, where we further employ workers from a crowdsourcing platform to summarize each relevant passage into a short, conversational response. CaSE enhances the state-of-the-art by introducing a supporting token identification module and a prior-aware pointer generator, which enables us to generate more accurate responses.

We carry out experiments to show that CaSE is able to outperform strong baselines. We also conduct extensive analyses on the SaaC dataset to show where there is room for further improvement beyond CaSE. Finally, we release the SaaC dataset and the code for CaSE and all models used for comparison to facilitate future research on this topic.
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1 INTRODUCTION

As we surround ourselves with a range of mobile devices, e.g., smartphones, smartwatches, which only have small screens available or even no screen at all, search is increasingly performed in a conversational manner.\(^1\) Despite this development, for complex information needs where a user’s intent may be unclear or where it is not obvious what the single direct answer should be (if any), complex search engine result pages (SERPs) are still the dominant format to present results to users. SERPs are typically characterized by a diverse set of snippets, usually grouped along vertical dimensions and/or by modality, which is far from our natural mode of communication through conversations. Hence, even when we interact with search engines, the more natural mode of interaction, instead of a complex SERP is conversational in nature [4, 5, 11, 28]. Figure 1 illustrates the difference given the information need “The Bronze Age collapse and the transition into a dark age”. In a traditional SERP scenario, we would use keywords to express our information need. For each query, we issue the keywords to a search engine and receive a SERP with a ranked list of results, possibly with snippets, in return. Then, we go through the list and find the information we need from the relevant SERP. If not, we reformulate our query and this process is repeated until our information need is satisfied. Alternatively, we can fulfill our information need through conversations with search engines. Here, we would express our need in natural language and we would directly receive the information we need in a short system response, that is a summary of relevant results listed in the SERP, in a conversational manner.

Although conversational agents for connecting people to information have attracted a lot of attention, most studies focus on task-oriented dialogue systems (TDS) [8], question answering (QA) [43], or machine reading comprehension (MRC) [10, 29]. In these scenarios, users have well-specified and specific information needs and their queries are mostly simple questions that can be

\(^1\)https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumer-insights/personal-needs-search-trends/
answered by a relatively short text span (entity mentions, etc.) extracted from the given background knowledge (database, documents, etc.). But search engines cater for a much broader set of needs. Users’ queries can be far more complex than a simple factoid question, and often cannot be answered by extracting a short span from a text snippet. Recently, there have been some studies on CS that target complex queries, however, most of them are limited to examining conceptual frameworks or laboratory-based user studies [28, 35]. Although there are some available datasets, they all have critical limitations. The CAsT dataset\(^2\) only provides ground truth passages as answers and does not have conversational responses. The MS MARCO QA dataset [24] is single-turn and when there is no answer, it just leaves the system response blank, which is sufficient for training models but not suitable for evaluation. Hence, the conversational datasets that are available today are not sufficient to support the development of conversations with search engines.

To address this gap we pursue two goals: (1) the creation of a suitable dataset for the development of pipelines for conversations with search engines, and (2) the development of state-of-the-art baseline components that make up such a pipeline using this dataset. The dataset, called Search as a Conversation (SaaC), is developed in a Wizard-of-Oz fashion [6]. We simulate users based on conversational queries from the CAsT dataset. Then, we employ online workers (a.k.a., “wizards”) to play the role of the system. The wizards have access to a SERPs from which they can get useful information to respond to the user queries. We ask the wizards to find supporting sentences from results/snippets on a SERPs and summarize them into short conversational responses. When there is no direct answer, we ask the wizards to generate something that is likely relevant, e.g., “It could be the extrinsic evidence, but I am not sure . . .”, or interesting to the user, e.g., “I have no idea about how melatonin was discovered. But I can tell you that . . .”.

As to our second main goal in this paper, using the SaaC dataset for the development of pipelines to support conversations with search engines, we devise a modularized multi-task learning framework, called Conversations with Search Engines (CaSE). CaSE decomposes conversations with search engines into four sub-tasks: (1) conversation & passage understanding (CPU), (2) relevant passage selection (RPS), (3) supporting token identification (STI), and (4) response generation (RG). CPU is a module aiming at understanding and encoding conversations and passages. RPS then finds relevant passages based on the encoded representations from the CPU. STI further identifies supporting tokens that are eventually used in the responses. Finally, RG generates the responses based on the outputs from above three modules.

Because there are no ground truth labels for STI to define a supervised learning loss, we present a weakly-supervised Confidence-Critical Cross Entropy (CCCE) learning loss based on the intuition that the overlapping tokens between the ground truth responses and the passages are more likely supporting tokens than the non-overlapping ones, especially overlapping larger rare tokens. In order to make CaSE generate more accurate responses, we propose a Prior-aware Pointer Generator (PPG) to implement RG by considering the passage and token probabilities from RPS and STI as priors so that the generated responses are expected to be more accurate by including supporting tokens from relevant passages. We conduct experiments to: (1) compare the performance of state-of-the-art methods from related tasks to our CaSE, (2) understand the contribution of the four sub-tasks in CaSE, and (3) identify room for further improvement on SaaC beyond CaSE.

To sum up, the contributions of this work are as follows:

- We introduce the task of conversations with search engines and build a new dataset, the SaaC dataset.

\(^2\)http://www.treccast.ai/
We decompose the task into four sub-tasks (CPU, RPS, STI, RG), and propose a modularized CaSE model that uses a weakly-supervised CCCE loss to identify the supporting tokens and PPG to encourage generating more accurate responses.

We conduct extensive experiments to show the effectiveness of CaSE and identify room for further improvement on conversations with search engines.

2 DATASET
We next describe the stages involved in creating the SaaC dataset.

2.1 Collecting Conversational Queries
TREC CAsT [12] has already built a collection of conversational query sequences, so we reuse their data to reduce development cost. Here, we briefly recall the process used in collecting the TREC CAsT data. The topics in CAsT are collected from a combination of previous TREC topics (Common Core [9], Session Track [18], etc.), MS MARCO Conversational Sessions, and the CAsT organizers [12]. The organizers ensured that the information needs are complex (requiring multiple rounds of elaboration), diverse (across different information categories), open-domain (not requiring expert domain knowledge to access), and mostly answerable (with sufficient coverage in the passage collection). A description of an example topic is shown in Figure 2. Then, the TREC CAsT organizers created sequences of conversational queries for each turn. They started with the description of the topic and manually formulated the first conversational query. After that, they formulated follow-up

![Fig. 2. The process of building the SaaC dataset.](image-url)
Table 1. Comparison of conversational datasets on search, chitchat and question answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Multiple turns</th>
<th>Complex query</th>
<th>Open domain</th>
<th>Conversational response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAsT [12]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holl-e [23], WoW [13]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS MARCO [24]</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuAC [10], CoQA [30]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaaC (this paper)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversational queries by introducing coherent transitions, e.g., coreference and omission. For example, “Tell me about the Bronze Age collapse. … What is the evidence for it? (introducing coreference).”, or “What is a physician’s assistant? … What’s the average starting salary in the UK? … What about in the US? (introducing omission).” There is a constraint that later conversational queries only depend on the previous queries, but not on system responses. We will discuss this constraint later. The reader is referred to Dalton et al. [12] for a more detailed account.

2.2 Collecting Candidate Passages

For our dataset creation, we combine three standard TREC collections: MARCO Ranking passages, Wikipedia (TREC CAR), and News (Washington Post) as the passage collection. To introduce more complex passages and meanwhile achieve higher recall for the current query, we follow Voskarides et al. [38] to extend the current query by extracting words that capture relevant information from previous turns and add them to the query of the current turn. Next, we use standard query likelihood with Dirichlet smoothing and RM3 relevance feedback as the ranking model to retrieve the top 10 candidate passages (if the ground truth passage is within the top 10, otherwise, we retrieve the top 9 and manually add the ground truth passage). Note that although we rewrote the current query to make it self-contained (which will be detailed in the next subsection), we did not use the rewritten queries when preparing the candidate passages in order to stay close to practical search engines. Finally, we randomly shuffle the top 10 candidate passages to eliminate position bias.

2.3 Collecting Conversational Responses

We employ online workers from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk)3 to collect conversational responses in a Wizard-of-Oz fashion, where we ask the workers to play the role of the system and write responses based on the provided passages, as shown in Figure 2. Specifically, we first rewrite the queries if necessary and we require that the rewritten queries should be self-contained (step 1). Then, the workers need to list all supporting spans from the passages that contain facts to help generate the responses (step 2). The supporting spans are kept the same as they are in the passages. Finally, we ask the workers to summarize the supporting spans into short, conversational responses. Other requirements include: (1) make sure the responses are case sensitive and grammatically correct; (2) avoid using the spans directly in the responses without summarization; (3) talk about secondary relevant information or information that could be interesting to the users, when no answer can be found in the passages. To guarantee that the collected data meets our requirements, we only employed high-quality master workers of MTurk and we manually checked each annotation ourselves.

Table 1 shows that while SaaC shares some characteristics with existing datasets, it also has its own unique characteristics, tailored to support research on conversations with search engines. out

---
3https://www.mturk.com/
Table 2. Some examples from the SaaC dataset. For comparison, we also include examples from the MS MARCO dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queries</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about the Bronze Age collapse.</td>
<td>It may be because of a shortage of tin, that is necessary for the melt of bronze that forced to seek an alternative of this metal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the evidence for it?</td>
<td>Could be the extrinsic evidence, but I am not sure whether it can support the collapse of the Bronze Age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some of the possible causes?</td>
<td>One of the possible causes of the Bronze Age collapse is the invasion of the Sea Peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who were the Sea Peoples?</td>
<td>The Sea Peoples are Greek mercenaries of the Persians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of all the datasets available at the time of writing, MS MARCO is the closest to SaaC; Table 2 list some instances from both datasets to show their differences.

2.4 The SaaC dataset

The SaaC dataset has 80 topics (with a total of 748 queries, and 7 – 12 queries per topic) from CAsT. Almost all of the queries are with complex information need, among which 359 are “what” queries, 144 are “how” queries, and 47 are “why” queries.

We report some descriptive statistics on the SaaC dataset in Table 3; for comparison we include the same information for the MS MARCO dataset.

Table 3. Further statistics about the SaaC dataset. For comparison, we include the same information for the MS MARCO dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SaaC</th>
<th>MS MARCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#query length</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#answer length</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#passage length</td>
<td>155.25</td>
<td>67.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#pairwise passage similarity</td>
<td>31.14%</td>
<td>26.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1-gram overlap</td>
<td>80.75%</td>
<td>90.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2-gram overlap</td>
<td>47.68%</td>
<td>72.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3-gram overlap</td>
<td>34.85%</td>
<td>63.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4-gram overlap</td>
<td>27.85%</td>
<td>58.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#query common words ratio</td>
<td>70.80%</td>
<td>56.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#answer common words ratio</td>
<td>60.21%</td>
<td>53.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
common words ratio” denotes the ratio of common words (word frequency \( \geq 100,000 \)) in the query and answer, respectively. We can see from Table 3 that SaaC is more complex and conversational than MS MARCO. SaaC is more complex in that (1) the “#query/answer/passage length” is larger, which means the queries are more complex to understand, and the passages contain more noise; and (2) the “pairwise passage similarity” is larger, which means it has more confusing candidate passages, making it hard to find the correct ones. SaaC is also more conversational because: (1) the “n-gram overlap” between the answers and passages is much smaller, which means the answers are more abstractive; and (2) the “#query/answer common words ratio” is larger, which means the queries and answers are more in spoken languages which are more informal.

3 METHOD

Formally, given a series of previous user queries \( Q^{t-1} = [q^{t-m}, q^{t-m+1}, \ldots, q^{t-1}] \) in natural language, the user query at the current turn \( q^t \), and a list of candidate passages \( D^t = [d^1, d^2, \ldots, d^k] \) that have been retrieved by a search engine and potentially contain the answers (or are at least relevant to \( q^t \)), the SaaC task is to generate a short response \( r^t \) for \( q^t \) by finding the relevant passages and summarizing the supporting spans from these passages into a conversational response.

In this work, we decompose the SaaC task into four sub-tasks: (1) conversation & passage understanding (CPU), (2) relevant passage selection (RPS), (3) supporting token identification (STI), and (4) response generation (RG), as shown in Figure 3. We devise a modularized framework, Conversations with Search Engines (CaSE), to operationalize the sub-tasks in an end-to-end way.

Specifically, the CPU module first encodes each query \( q \) and passage \( d \) into a sequence of hidden representations, i.e.,

\[
H_{q^t} = [h_{q^t}, \ldots, h_{q^t_{|q^t|}}] \text{ for } q^t, \text{ and} \]

\[
H_{d^k} = [h_{d^k}, \ldots, h_{d^k_{|d^k|}}] \text{ for } d^k.
\]

While creating effective queries from multi-turn questions is a challenging task in itself, we assume that the candidate documents are provided in advance so as to simplify the experimental design and facilitate reproducibility.
Then, based on the query and passage representations, the RPS module selects the relevant passage by estimating the passage relevance probability $P(d^k | Q^t)$ for each passage $d^k$ in the candidate pool $D^t$. After that, the STI module estimates the probability of each passage token to be a supporting token, $P(d^k_i | d^k, Q^t)$, where a token is supporting if it contributes to the final responses. Finally, the RG module takes the outputs from the above three modules into consideration and generates a short response, token by token. In particular, $P(d^k | Q^t)$ and $P(d^k_i | d^k, Q^t)$ are modeled as priors in the RG module.

In the following subsections, we will describe our proposed solution for each module in detail.

### 3.1 Conversation and Passage Understanding

We employ a Transformer model to perform conversation and passage understanding, which relies on self-attention to extract important information to represent conversations and passages. Specifically, for the conversational queries $Q^t = Q^{t-1} \cup \{q^t\}$, we first concatenate the tokens as one sequence, and then input it into a stack of Transformer encoder blocks \[37\] to obtain representations for each query and each token

\[ h^i \in \mathbb{R}^{|q_t| \times h_d] \times |N| \text{ between the conversation tokens} H_{Q^t} \text{ and each passage } H_{d^k} \text{ as follows:} \]

\[
M_{Qd_k} = \begin{bmatrix}
    f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_1^t, m}, h_{d_1^k}) & f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_2^t, m}, h_{d_1^k}) & \ldots & f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_k^t, m}, h_{d_1^k}) \\
    f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_1^t, m}, h_{d_2^k}) & f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_2^t, m}, h_{d_2^k}) & \ldots & f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_k^t, m}, h_{d_2^k}) \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_1^t, m}, h_{d_k^k}) & f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_2^t, m}, h_{d_k^k}) & \ldots & f^{Qd_k}(h_{q_k^t, m}, h_{d_k^k})
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)
\]

where $f^{Qd_k}$ is the cross-correlation function, which is modeled as:

\[
f^{Qd_k}(h_{q^t}, h_{d^k}) = \mathbf{v}^{Qd_k}^\top [h_{q_1} \oplus h_{d_1} \oplus (h_{q_2} \odot h_{d_2})], \quad (4)
\]

where $\mathbf{v}^{Qd_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N \times 1}$ is the parameter vector; $\oplus$ denotes the concatenation operation and $\odot$ denotes the Hadamard product. Then, a Dynamic Coattention Network as proposed in \[40\] is used to obtain the dual attention representations for the conversational queries $H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}$, and each passage $H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t}$ as follows:

\[
H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t} = \left[ H_{Q^t} \oplus H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}^1 \oplus H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}^2 \oplus (H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}^1 \odot H_{Q^t}) \oplus (H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}^2 \odot H_{Q^t}) \right], \quad (5)
\]

\[
H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t} = \left[ H_{d^k} \oplus H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t}^1 \oplus H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t}^2 \oplus (H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t}^1 \odot H_{d^k}) \oplus (H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t}^2 \odot H_{d^k}) \right],
\]

where

\[
H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}^k = \max \{ M_d H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t} \}_{k=1, \ldots, |D^t|}, \quad (6)
\]

\[
H_{Q^t \rightarrow D^t}^1 = \max \{ M_d H_{d^k \rightarrow Q^t} \}_{k=1, \ldots, |D^t|}, \quad (7)
\]
where $y_i$ is a weak label indicating whether $d_i$ is a supporting token; $\hat{y}_d$ is a coefficient indicating the confidence of $d_i$ as a supporting token, which is defined as:

$$c(d_i) \propto \frac{1}{\log \text{freq}(d_i)} \cdot \prod_{n \geq 0} |d_i \cap \cap r^{t_n}|.$$  

(12)

where freq($d_k$) is the token frequency in the data collection. The first term models how “rare” $d_i$ is, the second term models how likely $d_i$ and its $n$ surrounding tokens are supporting tokens (overlapped with ground truth). Finally, $c(d_i)$ ensures that rare and more often overlapped tokens get more opportunities to be identified as supporting tokens.

3.3 Supporting Token Identification

Previous methods directly generate the responses after passage selection, which we hypothesize can be improved by incorporating a dedicated supporting token identification (STI) module. The core idea is that, besides learning to select the relevant passage, the model could also learn to identify supporting tokens, which might be used to generate the response.

To do so, we use a similar architecture as in the RPS module (parameters are not shared) to get updated representations $H_{Q^i \leftarrow D^i}$ and $H_{D^i \leftarrow Q^i}$. But, instead of estimating the passage relevance score based on the "[CLS]" representation, we compute the probability of each passage token as a supporting token $P(d_k \mid d_i, Q^i)$. Specifically, we use an MLP to get the supporting token likelihood score for each token with $h_{d_k \leftarrow Q^i} \in H_{D^i \leftarrow Q^i}$ as input, which is normalized with a sigmoid to obtain $P(d_k \mid d_i, Q^i)$.

Unfortunately, there are no ground truth labels to define a supervised learning loss to train $P(d_k \mid d_i, Q^i)$. To this end, we design a weak supervision signal based on the following intuitions: (1) If a passage token $d_i$ is a supporting token, it must exist in the ground truth response; (2) If the surrounding tokens of $d_i$ are also in the ground truth response, $d_i$ is more likely to be a supporting token; (3) Rare passage tokens that exist in the ground truth response are more likely to be supporting tokens than frequent ones. Specifically, we devise a Confidence-Critical Cross Entropy (CCCE) loss as follows:

$$L_{STI} = - \sum_{d_i \in D^i} \sum_{d_j \in d_i} \left[ c(d_i) \hat{y}_d \log P(d_i \mid d_j, Q^i) + (1 - \hat{y}_d) \log(1 - P(d_i \mid d_j, Q^i)) \right].$$

(11)
3.4 Response Generation

We propose a Prior-aware Pointer Generator (PPG) to implement the RG module, which is able to generate tokens from a predefined vocabulary and copy tokens from both the queries and passages. Especially when estimating the copy probability, PPG takes the passage relevance and supporting token likelihood into consideration.

Given the previous decoded tokens \( r_{0:j}^t = [r_0^t, \ldots, r_{j-1}^t] \) (\( r_0^t \) is set to a special token “[BOS]” indicating the beginning of decoding), we first use a stack of Transformer decoder blocks \([37]\) to obtain the hidden representations

\[
H_{r_{0:j}}^Q = [h_{r_0^Q}^Q, \ldots, h_{r_{j-1}^Q}^Q],
\]

which takes \( r_{0:j}^t \) and \( H_{Q^{t-D^t}} \) as inputs. Then, we use another stack of Transformer Decoder blocks to obtain hidden representations

\[
H_{r_{0:j}}^D = [h_{r_0^D}^D, \ldots, h_{r_{j-1}^D}^D],
\]

which takes \( H_{r_{0:j}}^Q \) and \( H_{D^t-Q^t} \) as inputs. Afterwards, we estimate the token probability from three modes: generating from the vocabulary \( g \), copying from queries \( c_{Q^t} \), and copying from passages \( c_{D^t} \).

**Vocabulary generator.** The probability of generating a token from the predefined vocabulary is estimated as:

\[
P(r_{t}^t \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t, g) = P(g \mid r_{0:j}^t) \text{softmax}(\text{mlp}([r_{j-1}^t \oplus h_{r_{j-1}^t}^D \oplus h(a^t)])),
\]

where \( P(g \mid r_{0:j}^t) \) denotes the probability of the generation mode \( g \); \( h(a^t) \) is the answer representation from the STI module, which is estimated as follows:

\[
h(a^t) = \sum_{d^k \in D^t} P(d^k \mid Q^t) \sum_{d_i^k \in d^k} P(d_i^k \mid d^k, Q^t) h_{d_i^k-Q^t},
\]

where \( P(d^k \mid Q^t) \) is the passage relevance probability; \( h_{d_i^k-Q^t} \) is the \( i \)-th token representation from \( H_{d_i^k-Q^t} \). Both are from the RPS module. \( P(d_i^k \mid d^k, Q^t) \) is the supporting token probability from the STI module.

**Query pointer generator.** We use another additive attention to estimate the probability of copying a token from the conversational queries:

\[
P(r_{t}^t = Q_i^t \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t, c_{Q^t}) = P(c_{Q^t} \mid r_{0:j}^t)P(Q_i^t \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t),
\]

where \( P(c_{Q^t} \mid r_{0:j}^t) \) is the query copying mode probability; and \( P(Q_i^t \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t) = \text{attention}(\text{query} : h_{r_{j-1}^Q}^Q, \text{key} : H_{Q^{t-D^t}}) \).

**Prior-aware passage pointer generator.** The probability of copying a token from the passages is

\[
P(r_{t}^t = d_i^k \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t, c_{D^t}) = P(c_{D^t} \mid r_{0:j}^t) \sum_{d_i^k \in D^t} P(d_i^k \mid Q^t) \cdot \sum_{d_i^k \in D^t} P(d_i^k \mid d_i^k, Q^t) P(d_i^k \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t),
\]

where \( P(c_{D^t} \mid r_{0:j}^t) \) is the passage copying mode probability; \( P(d_i^k \mid Q^t) \) is the passage prior from the RPS module and \( P(d_i^k \mid d_i^k, Q^t) \) is the supporting token prior from the STI module; and \( P(d_i^k \mid Q^t, D^t, r_{0:j}^t) = \text{attention}(\text{query} : h_{r_{j-1}^D}^D, \text{key} : H_{D^{t-Q^t}}) \).
To coordinate the probabilities from different modes, we learn a mode coordination probability:

\[ P(d | r_{t0}^f), P(c_Q | r_{t0}^f), P(c_D | r_{t0}^f) = W^T [h_{f_{t-1}} \oplus h_Q^{att} \oplus h_D^{att}], \tag{18} \]

where \( W \in 3N \times 3 \) is the parameter matrix; \( h_Q^{att} \) and \( h_D^{att} \) are the attended query and passage representations from the two attentions in the query and passage pointer generators, respectively. The final probability at the \( j \)-th decoding step

\[ P(r_{tj}^f | Q^f, D^f, r_{t0}^f) = P(r_{tj}^f | Q^f, D^f, r_{t0}^f, g) + P(r_{tj}^f | Q^f, D^f, r_{t0}^f, c_Q^f) + P(r_{tj}^f | Q^f, D^f, r_{t0}^f, c_D^f). \]

If a token is absent from a mode, its corresponding probability from that mode is set to zero.

We use the negative log likelihood loss to train PPG as follows:

\[ L_{RG} = - \sum_{r_{tj}^f \in \mathcal{R}} \log P(r_{tj}^f | Q^f, D^f, r_{t0}^f). \tag{19} \]

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We seek to answer the following research questions:

(RQ1) What is the performance of CaSE compared to other methods? Does CaSE outperform the state-of-the-art methods in terms of response generation and passage ranking performance? What, if any, are the performance differences on the MS MARCO and SaaC datasets?

(RQ2) What is the effect of different components of CaSE on its overall performance?

(RQ3) Where does CaSE fail? That is, is there any room for further improvement on the SaaC dataset?

4.1 Datasets and Evaluation Metrics

As pointed out in §2.4, SaaC contains 80 topics (with 748 queries) from CAsT, which is too small to train neural models in an end-to-end fashion. Hence, we train all the models that we consider on the MS MARCO 2.1 Q&A + Natural Language Generation training set (MS MARCO train) [24]. Although this is a single-turn dataset and the queries and responses are less conversational than in the SaaC dataset (see Table 2), it does have passage relevance labels and human written answers, which is sufficient as a training set. MS MARCO is the sole dataset with real queries from search engines and human written answers. We only keep data samples where the “wellFormedAnswers” field is not empty. This ensures that these well-formed answers are true natural language answers and not just span selections.\(^5\) We randomly split the original development set into two sets with roughly equal size, one as our development set (MS MARCO dev) and the other as our test set (MS MARCO test). The sizes of the MS MARCO train, MS MARCO dev, MS MARCO test, and SaaC test are 524,105, 32,345, 32,225, and 1,008, respectively.

We use BLEU (up to 4-grams using uniform weights), and ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L to evaluate the response generation performance, which are commonly used in natural language generation tasks, e.g., QA, MRC [19, 25]. We also report MAP, Recall@5 and NDCG for passage ranking performance.

4.2 Methods Used for Comparison

We collect and implement state-of-the-art methods from various related tasks.

- **S2SA**. S2SA is a sequence-to-sequence with attention model; it is commonly used as a baseline for natural language generation tasks [22, 23].

\(^5\)https://github.com/microsoft/MSMARCO-Question-Answering
• **GTTP** [32]. GTTP improves S2SA by incorporating a pointer mechanism that enables it to copy tokens from the input during generation. GTTP achieves state-of-the-art performance on many natural language generation tasks [26, 30].

• **TMemNet** [13]. TMemNet was first introduced for the knowledge grounded dialogue task. It combines a Memory Network and Transformer to do knowledge selection and dialogue response generation.

• **GLKS** [31]. GLKS is a state-of-the-art method for Background-Based Conversations (BBC) (the best performing method on the Holl-E⁶ dataset at the time of writing). It introduces a mechanism to combine global and local knowledge selection for dialogue response generation.

• **Masque** [25]. Masque is the best performing method on the MS MARCO Q&A + Natural Language Generation task at the time of writing. Because we only use “wellFormedAnswers” to train the models, we remove the answer possibility classifier and style token.

• **CaSE**. CaSE is proposed in this paper.

4.3 Implementation Details

For a fair comparison, we implement all models in our experiments based on the same code framework to ensure that they share the same codes apart from the model itself. We set the word embedding size and hidden size to 256. We use the BERT vocabulary⁷ for all methods but we avoid using any extra resources for all methods, including pre-trained embeddings. The vocabulary size is 30,522. The learning rate was increased linearly from zero to 2.5 × 10⁻⁴ in the first 6,000 steps and then annealed to 0 by using a cosine schedule. We use gradient clipping with a maximum gradient norm of 1. We use the Adam optimizer (α = 0.001, β₁ = 0.9, β₂ = 0.999, and ℵ = 10⁻⁸). An exponential moving average was applied to all trainable variables with a decay rate of 0.9995. For all models, we combine multiple losses linearly if there is more than one. We train all models on four TITAN X (Pascal) GPUs. The batch size is chosen from (32, 64, 128) according to the GPU memory. We select the best models based on performance on the development set.

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

5.1 How Does CaSE Perform?

To answer RQ1, we report the results of all methods on both MS MARCO⁸ and SaaC; see Table 4. S2SA, GTTP and GLKS do not perform passage ranking, so there are no MAP, Recall@5 and NDCG results. Given the results, there are three main observations.

Table 4. Overall performance (%). **Bold face** indicates the best result in terms of the corresponding metric. R-1: ROUGE-1; R-2: ROUGE-2; R-L: ROUGE-L. * and ** indicate CaSE is significantly better than Masque (p-value < 0.05 and p-value < 0.01 with t-test, respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>MS MARCO test</th>
<th>SaaC test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2SA</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>25.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTTP</td>
<td>47.41</td>
<td>25.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLKS</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMemNet</td>
<td>48.01</td>
<td>29.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masque</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>37.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaSE</td>
<td><strong>57.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶https://github.com/nikitacs16/Holl-E
⁷https://github.com/huggingface/transformers
⁸The performance is not comparable to the leaderboard of MS MARCO at http://www.msmarco.org/leaders.aspx as different training, test sets and evaluation scripts are used.
First, CaSE achieves the best results on both datasets in terms of all metrics. Especially, CaSE can outperform the best performing model Masque on the MS MARCO leaderboard and the best model GLKS from the BBC task (at the time of writing). Generally, CaSE improves over Masque by around 2%pt in terms of generation evaluation metrics and around 1–2%pt in terms of passage ranking metrics. Part of the improvement is from the proposed STI and PPG modules, which we will analyze in more detail in §5.2.

Second, the results on the MS MARCO dataset are much higher than those on the SaaC dataset. This is the case for all methods, including CaSE. For example, the BLEU score of CaSE is 18.82%pt higher on MS MARCO for response generation, and the MAP score is 48.53%pt higher. This confirms that SaaC is a more challenging and more suitable dataset than MS MARCO for research on conversations with search engines. SaaC is more challenging because (1) the queries and passages are more complex, which is clear from Table 3. (2) SaaC has greater query, passage and answer lengths and the passages are more similar. SaaC is more suitable for conversations with search engines because (1) it has multi-turn conversations, which introduces the requirements of modeling context from historical turns. (2) the responses are more abstractive and conversational, which is closer to real conversation scenarios. See §5.3 for further details.

Third, modeling passage selection is necessary. On the one hand, we can see that the methods with passage selection modules (TMemNet, Masque and CaSE) are generally much better than those without (i.e., S2SA, GTTP and GLKS). On the other hand, we also notice that the improvements for passage ranking are consistent with the improvements for response generation.

### 5.2 What Do the Components of CaSE Contribute?

To answer RQ2 and analyze the effects of the RPS, STI and RG modules in CaSE, we conduct an ablation study. We do not separately study the modeling and learning of the STI module, as removing the $L_{STI}$ will result in no direct supervision to guide the learning of STI, which does not make sense. The results are shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CaSE variants</th>
<th>MS MARCO test</th>
<th>SaaC test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaSE</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>39.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaSE-RG</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>38.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaSE-STI</td>
<td>55.68</td>
<td>36.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaSE-RPS</td>
<td>56.36</td>
<td>38.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, removing any module will result in a drop in performance in terms of both response generation and relevant passage selection. Specifically, the results drop by more than 2%pt in terms of BLEU and more than 1.5%pt in terms of MAP on the MS MARCO dataset by removing the STI module. This is also true for the RPS and RG modules, although the drops are not as large as for STI. The generation performance of CaSE-STI is even worse than Masque, which confirms the effectiveness of STI. Interestingly, although we found that modeling passage selection is very important (Table 4) for the other models, removing the RPS module does not much influence the overall performance of CaSE. We think the reason is that CaSE incorporates the STI module which has some overlapping effects with RPS to some extent, as when a passage contains more supporting tokens, it is more relevant in general. To sum up, even if the RPS, STI and RG share some common effects, they are also complementary to each other as combining them will bring further improvements.
Table 6. Response generation and passage ranking performance of CaSE on the SaaC dataset w.r.t different conversational turns (%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn ≥</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-L</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
<th>MAP</th>
<th>Recall@5</th>
<th>NDCG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td>0.2117</td>
<td>0.1909</td>
<td>0.3521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.05</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.1607</td>
<td>0.1043</td>
<td>0.2071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>0.1535</td>
<td>0.1289</td>
<td>0.3127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>0.1406</td>
<td>0.0944</td>
<td>0.2892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>08.33</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>0.1361</td>
<td>0.1451</td>
<td>0.3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>08.32</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>0.1451</td>
<td>0.1120</td>
<td>0.3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>0.1060</td>
<td>0.0936</td>
<td>0.2415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>0.1672</td>
<td>0.1088</td>
<td>0.3445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One exception is that CaSE-RG achieves better response generation performance than CaSE on SaaC. We believe that the reason for this behavior is that although CaSE can generate more accurate responses by leveraging the outputs from the RPS and STI modules as priors in PPG (which can be verified by the better performance on MS MARCO), this will influence the abstractiveness of the response, because CaSE is encouraged to put more emphasis on the tokens in the relevant passages with PPG.

5.3 Is there Room for further Improvement?

To answer RQ3, we explore the room for further performance improvements on the SaaC dataset by conducting additional experiments and/or case studies.

First, more effort is needed to properly model the context, i.e., the conversational history, of the current turn query. To illustrate this, we show the performance of the response generation and passage ranking of each turn in Table 6. We see that the performance is much higher in the first turn because there is no context needed to be considered. Performance drops dramatically for the following turns including the 2nd turn, and performance tends to get worse as the number of turns increases. There is an exception for the ≥ 9th turns, which are better than the 8th turn in terms of passage ranking. This may be because that hard queries do not go after the 8th turn in CAsT. We analyzed the queries from the ≥ 9th turns and found that there are a lot of “what” queries in these two turns like “What type does chemical energy belong to?”, which generally needs less modeling of missing context. A deeper understanding of the current query is challenging because it is not just a matter of coreference resolution [1]. It is common that people omit information to keep the conversations natural, which is well reflected in the SaaC dataset.

Second, more effort is needed to obtain a better understanding of the current turn query. To illustrate this, we conduct a comparison of using the original current query (OQ), the context queries and the current original query (CQ+OQ), and the reformulated current query (RQ), as shown in Table 7. RQ is a manually rewritten version of the current original query, where we make sure that RQ is self-contained and does not need to rely on context. We can see that using RQ improves the performance, which is not surprising. But we should also note that even when using RQ, the performance is far from perfect as it does not even outperform the 1st turn in Table 6. This indicates that the model cannot create a understanding of the current query even though all needed information is provided. This is confirmed by the fact that CQ+OQ performs worse than OQ: the model is doing worse by involving more contextual information.

Third, more effort is needed to perform better at passage selection and support identification. We illustrate this by showing the results of CaSE when the ground truth passages (GP) or sentences (GS)
Table 7. Response generation performance of CaSE on the SaaC dataset (%). OQ: Using the original query of the current turn; CQ+OQ: Using context queries + original query of the current turn; RQ: Using reformulated ground truth query of the current turn; GP: Using ground truth passages; GS: Using ground truth supporting sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-L</th>
<th>BLEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OQ</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ+OQ</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>48.74</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>32.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are provided in Table 7. We can see that although CaSE has used effective and complex mechanisms to perform relevant passage selection and supporting token identification, there is still a lot of room to improve in this direction.

Fourth, more effort is needed to investigate how to generate more conversational and abstractive responses. Due to limitations of the MS MARCO data, the models are rarely trained to learn to generate tokens that address the conversational nature of responses. For instance, given the query “What is arnica used for?,” the current model will just list the answers, “arnica, trauma, pain and shock.” The human response is like “Arnica is a plant based remedy used to relief pain. It is also used to speed injury and trauma healing as well as to reduce bruising.” Besides, there are some cases where there is no answer or only a partial answer is available in the passages, the current model will either generate a wrong answer or just leave it blank. However, in practical scenarios, the system should indicate it does not know the answer or only knows part of the answer and reply accordingly, e.g., “Sorry, I don’t know much about the largest tiger shark ever to have lived on Earth or caught. But I do know the largest great white shark ever caught on camera, it was a seven metre-long female, called Deep Blue.” We can build suitable datasets to address this. Alternatively, we can investigate how to leverage datasets from related tasks, e.g., chitchat datasets, where there are more natural and conversational human responses [13, 23].

6 RELATED WORK

We briefly present an overview of related work on Conversational Search (CS) and on CAs.

6.1 Conversational Search

The concept of search as a conversation has been around since the 1980s [4, 11]. Until recently, the idea did not attract a lot of attention due to limitations in data and computing resources at the time.

Now, the topic is back in the spotlight. One branch of work conducts user studies on CS. Vtyurina et al. [39] conduct a user study, where they ask 21 participants to solve 3 information seeking tasks by conversing with three agents: an existing commercial system, a human expert, and a perceived experimental automatic system, backed by a human “wizard behind the curtain”. They show that existing conversational assistants cannot be effectively used for complex information search tasks. Vakulenko et al. [36] argue that existing studies neglect exploratory search when users are unfamiliar with the domain of their goal. They investigate interactive storytelling as a tool to enable exploratory search within the framework of a conversational interface. Trippas et al. [35] conduct a laboratory-based observational study for CS, where pairs of people perform search tasks communicating verbally. They conclude that CS is more complex and interactive than traditional search.
Another line of work has proposed theoretical frameworks concerning CS. Radlinski and Craswell [28] present a theoretical framework of information interaction in a chat setting for CS, which highlights the need for multi-turn interactions. Azzopardi et al. [3] propose a conceptual framework that outlines the actions and intents of users and agents in order to enable the user to explore the search space and resolve their information need. The work listed above studies CS either in a theoretical or a user study environment. The theoretical/conceptual frameworks have made requirements about the data annotations more demanding, often going beyond currently available datasets.

Zhang et al. [45] devise a System Ask-User Respond paradigm for CS, and design a memory network for product search and recommendation in e-commerce. Following this line, Aliannejadi et al. [2] and Zamani et al. [44] formulate the task of asking clarifying questions in information retrieval. Bi et al. [7] propose a conversational paradigm for product search, and an aspect-value likelihood model to incorporate both positive and negative feedback on non-relevant items. To advance research on CS, Dalton et al. [12] organize a TREC Conversational Assistance Track (CAsT), which establishes a concrete and standard collection of data with information needs to make systems directly comparable. In the first year, they only focus on candidate passage retrieval: Read the dialogue context and perform retrieval over a large collection of passages. Although the studies listed above propose concrete datasets or methods for CS, none of them targets directly generating conversational system responses by modeling CS in a conversational scenario like we do.

6.2 Conversational Agents

Conversational modeling has long been a hot research topic in natural language processing [16, 20]. Most research falls into three groups: task-oriented dialogue systems (TDS) agents, social bots, and QA agents [14]. TDS aims to achieve a specific task for users, e.g., booking a flight [8], while social bots aim to satisfy the human need for communication and so on [13, 22]. These goals are quite different from people’s goals in search scenarios where user information needs can be more complex and exploratory.

Efforts to build QA agents come in two main flavors: KB-QA and text-QA, which study how to query a KB interactively with natural language, and generate an answer to an input query based on a set of passages, respectively. Early studies focus on extraction-based methods [15, 29, 42], which try to retrieve an entity from a KB, or extract a span from a given passages as direct answers. Later, generation-based methods, which can generate natural language answers, attract more attention [34, 43]. Recently, QA has been extended to multi-turn conversational scenarios [10], which introduce more challenges related to conversational understanding. However, all aforementioned studies mostly target simple (factoid) questions which are relatively easy to answer [17]. On many benchmark datasets, the best models are approaching human performance [10] or even have outperformed humans [30]. Some approaches target complex questions [19, 27]. In particular, Nguyen et al. [24] collect a large-scale dataset, MS MARCO, from Bing usage logs, where the answers are written by real humans to ensure that they are in natural language. However, the work listed above focuses on single-turn QA, which has not been extended to multi-turn conversational scenarios where query understanding, relevant passage finding and response generation, etc. are more challenging.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we propose conversations with search engines as task for the community to consider and we contribute two types of result: First, we release a new test set, SaaC, which is more suitable and challenging for this research than existing resources. Second, we propose an end-to-end neural model, CaSE, to advance the state-of-the-art. We implement state-of-the-art methods from
related tasks and conduct extensive experiments to show that: (1) our CaSE can achieve leading performance; (2) the proposed STI and PPG modules can bring large improvement; (3) SaaC is more challenging and there is significant room for further improvements.

As to future work, on the one hand, we plan to further improve the performance of CaSE by proposing transfer learning methods in order to leverage more multi-turn conversational datasets (e.g., conversational QA [30, 41], conversational MRC [10] and chitchat [21]). On the other hand, we plan to study how to address the cases in SaaC when there is no correct answer or only a partially correct answer. We will also develop ways to lift the restriction of SaaC that later conversational queries only depend on previous queries and not on system responses by introducing mixed initiatives [44].

CODE AND DATA

The SaaC dataset and the code of all methods used for comparison in this paper are shared at https://github.com/PengjieRen/CaSE-1.0.
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