

Model	Trigger Rate	Click Rate	Accuracy
Previous	1.35%	11.16%	73.67%
Ours	3.89%	18.33%	80.88%

Table 1: Comparison between the previous and our proposed framework.

into issue (predicate), invoice (object), VAT (adjunct) and state-positive (querytype).

Knowledge Graph

After manual annotation of representative queries, each factor has its own synonyms. Next, a knowledge graph containing relationships among the domain, intents, representative queries, factors and synonyms can be obtained. With this graph, the factors within the similar queries can be automatically annotated through the RQ-SQ relationship. For example, two SQs corresponding to RQ2 in Figure 1 will inherit RQ2’s factors with restrictions. In this way, we build a corpus without much human annotation quickly and we believe that the noise caused by the auto-annotation could help generalize the model to some extent.

Neural Model

Following (Devlin et al. 2019), we modify Bert into a multi-task form, since there are intent and factor classification tasks in this scenario. Therefore, each online query will have its own predicted factors and intent. When the intent is not convincing enough, which indicates the current query is fuzzy, the factors show its effect on how to complete it.

Experiment

Data Setting and Parameters

In our experiment, we build our corpus containing 23 domains upon our online serving system *JIMI*. Eventually, we manually annotate 900 representative queries on average for each domain including average 38 predicates, 32 objects, 31 adjuncts and 17 querytypes respectively. We collect similar queries from online logs in the past two months with frequency over 4 times to obtain about 9,000 similar queries each domain with auto-annotation, which reduces the annotation costs largely.

We choose the Chinese Bert model¹ as the basis of the proposed framework. With certain modifications, Bert is able to adapt to both intent and factor classification tasks. We finetune the model on the data mentioned above, with the same parameter settings as the original.

Experimental Results

With the above settings, the proposed framework achieves 85% on average in terms of accuracy for each factor in each domain. We test our framework in Domain Invoice online. As shown in Table 1, our proposed framework outperforms the previous Bert-base (Devlin et al. 2019) FAQ matching

¹<https://github.com/ymcui/Chinese-BERT-wwm>



Figure 2: An example of completing a fuzzy query online.

framework by 2.54%, 7.17% and 7.21% in terms of the trigger rate, click rate and accuracy respectively, which demonstrates the effectiveness of our proposed framework.

Figure 2 shows an example on how our proposed framework can help the users complete their fuzzy expressions online. In the beginning, the user questions “how about this invoice”, where we know that predicate and adjunct are missing. Based on the existing factors, several related intents can be retrieved. Our proposed framework provides candidate selections within these intents. The user selects the one which is able to complete his intent and our system answers him with the predefined answer properly.

Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we proposed a multi-factor classification framework on query level, which is helpful to complete users’ fuzzy queries and to clarify their intents. In the future, we look forward to generalizing better answers with the key factors provided by the framework with further exploration.

References

- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT 2019*, 4171–4186.
- E, H.; Niu, P.; Chen, Z.; and Song, M. 2019. A Novel Bi-directional Interrelated Model for Joint Intent Detection and Slot Filling. In *ACL 2019*, 5467–5471.
- Zhang, C.; Li, Y.; Du, N.; Fan, W.; and Yu, P. S. 2019. Joint Slot Filling and Intent Detection via Capsule Neural Networks. In *ACL 2019*, 5259–5267.
- Zhang, J.; Ye, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Qiu, L.; Fu, B.; Li, Y.; Yang, Z.; and Sun, J. 2020. Multi-Point Semantic Representation for Intent Classification. In *AAAI 2020*, 9531–9538.