

A Survey on Recent Advances in Conversational Data Generation

HEYDAR SOUDANI, Radboud University, The Netherlands

ROXANA PETCU, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

EVANGELOS KANOULAS, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

FAEGHEH HASIBI, Radboud University, The Netherlands

Recent advancements in conversational systems have significantly enhanced human-machine interactions across various domains. However, training these systems is challenging due to the scarcity of specialized dialogue data. Traditionally, conversational datasets were created through crowdsourcing, but this method has proven costly, limited in scale, and labor-intensive. As a solution, the development of synthetic dialogue data has emerged, utilizing techniques to augment existing datasets or convert textual resources into conversational formats, providing a more efficient and scalable approach to dataset creation. In this survey, we offer a systematic and comprehensive review of multi-turn conversational data generation, focusing on three types of dialogue systems: open domain, task-oriented, and information-seeking. We categorize the existing research based on key components like seed data creation, utterance generation, and quality filtering methods, and introduce a general framework that outlines the main principles of conversation data generation systems. Additionally, we examine the evaluation metrics and methods for assessing synthetic conversational data, address current challenges in the field, and explore potential directions for future research. Our goal is to accelerate progress for researchers and practitioners by presenting an overview of state-of-the-art methods and highlighting opportunities to further research in this area.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Conversational AI, Dialogue System, Data Augmentation, Conversation Generation, Task Oriented Dialogues, Open Domain Dialogues, Conversational Information Seeking

ACM Reference Format:

Heydar Soudani, Roxana Petcu, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Faegheh Hasibi. 2024. A Survey on Recent Advances in Conversational Data Generation. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 38 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Conversational AI focuses on enabling machines to interact with humans using natural language [119]. These systems, particularly enhanced by neural networks and deep learning, aim to closely mimic human conversational behaviors [15]. This enhancement is manifested in the system’s ability to handle complicated challenges, such as discussing specialized topics [54, 80, 88], shifting between conversation topics [2], asking proactive questions [109], and integrating emerging topics [95]. To develop systems capable of addressing these sophisticated challenges, a robust and large-scale source of training data is essential.

Crowdsourcing is the primary method for creating conversational datasets, where human workers generate data based on provided instructions [7, 12, 23, 24, 56, 64, 79, 82, 86, 112, 121]. This approach, however, is costly, time-consuming, and challenging to scale or adapt to new domains [33, 84, 92]. It also introduces annotation biases [114] and is ineffective for emerging topics, especially in specialized fields or languages with limited development resources [49]. As an alternative, generating synthetic conversational datasets has emerged as a promising solution. This method

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM




Fig. 1. An overview of multi-turn conversation generation sections and papers.

involves transforming existing textual resources—like documents, tables, and knowledge graphs—into conversational formats or augmenting existing dialogue data with new instances [95]. Synthetic conversation generation is especially beneficial in resource-scarce domains, enabling models to leverage all available resources to enhance learning [31, 75]. Data Generation denotes the process of expanding or enhancing a dataset by creating entirely new data points, as compared to data augmentation, which involves applying transformations or modifications to existing data points. Generation results in more robust and diverse training samples as compared to augmentation, where the new data points are not present in the original dataset, however, are plausible and relevant.

The history of conversational AI traces back to the 1960s with the creation of the first chatbot, Eliza [104]. Eliza operated on rule-based principles, generating responses based on predefined rules tied to specific keywords or facets. Following this, the rise of systems that integrate rule-based and machine learning components has been observed [15, 71], exemplified by platforms such as Apple’s Siri, Amazon’s Alexa, and Microsoft’s Xiaobing. These systems have found commercial and industrial applications, relying on machine learning algorithms to improve response accuracy by learning from historical user interactions and conversation data [72]. Further advancements occurred with the advent of deep learning-based systems, leveraging large models and extensive datasets to enhance their capabilities [71]. Recently, the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) has taken this a step further. These models excel in generating contextually relevant, informative, and diverse responses that mirror human language, thanks to their ability to analyze vast amounts of data and the sophistication of their underlying architectures [15, 116]. Dialog systems can be categorized into three paradigms: Task-oriented (ToD), Open Domain (ODD), and Conversational Information Seeking (CIS) [95, 119].

The first paradigm, known as TOD, seeks to execute tasks at the user’s request by accurately identifying their intentions and furnishing fitting responses [103]. TOD systems are built to comprehend user queries and generate responses that help achieve the user’s objective. They find applications in various domains and use cases, encompassing areas such as flight booking, restaurant reservations, hotel accommodations, taxi services, movie ticket purchases, weather inquiries, navigation assistance, scheduling, and customer service [22, 105]. TOD faces multiple challenges, such as ensuring robust and reliable dialogue state tracking [22], integrating external knowledge bases for extracting specific conversational entities [113], e.g., restaurant names, flight numbers, and cinema schedules, and optimizing response

generation for user satisfaction and task completion [106]. With a focus on these challenges, we propose a taxonomy for TOD generation based on four steps: identifying input sources as external knowledge, such as knowledge bases, schemas, and ontologies, or internal, such as knowledge extracted from training data, dialogue generation methods, training, and quality filtering. This multi-faceted analysis offers an intuition of TOD generation, emphasizing the critical roles of input handling, generation and training approaches, and quality control in their development and deployment.

The second paradigm, ODD, aims to facilitate casual conversations with users across a broad range of topics and domains, without being confined to specific tasks or objectives [45, 71]. ODD systems encounter several challenges, such as maintaining coherent and contextually appropriate responses [62], ensuring response diversity to engage users [124], displaying proactivity by steering discussions toward certain topics [11, 61, 115], personalizing responses based on user profiles [121], and generating informative replies from external knowledge bases [60]. Addressing these challenges requires systems to be trained with datasets that specifically include them, making synthetic data generation a promising approach. This survey proposes a taxonomy for synthetic dataset creation, structured in three steps: seed generation, turn generation, and quality filtering. This taxonomy is introduced to abstract choices in existing methods in the literature to produce diverse, coherent, informative [9, 45], multi-skill [46], and personalized conversational data [39, 49].

The third paradigm, known as CIS, is designed to assist users in seeking and retrieving information through natural language dialogue interactions. The primary objective of a CIS system is to satisfy the information needs of users by engaging in dynamic conversations, which may include text as well as other modalities such as voice, clicks, or touch [119]. CIS encompasses three main areas: conversational search, conversational question answering (QA), and conversational recommendation. *Conversational Search* and *Conversational QA* involve interacting with a system in natural language to find specific information, allowing users to pose multiple questions based on their interaction history, with the system providing relevant answers [1, 108]. *Conversational Recommendation Systems* suggest items to users based on their previous interactions, serving as personalized information-seeking tools [64, 102]. CIS systems face several challenges, including maintaining the conversation state to better respond to user needs, managing mixed-initiative interactions where the system sometimes leads the conversation and sometimes responds to user queries, and adapting to user preferences and profiles to enhance satisfaction by personalizing the conversation. Based on these challenges, tasks such as intent prediction, asking clarification questions, target-oriented recommendation, and topic switching are defined. These tasks help clarify uncertainties, lead conversations towards specific items, and adapt the discussion to cover various subjects and entities based on the user's informational needs [2]. Effective handling of these tasks requires a substantial amount of well-curated data for training the models. In this work, we systematically review the literature on information-seeking conversational datasets and provide a three-step framework similar to those used for ToD and ODD. The contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We present a comprehensive review of the methodologies employed in creating synthetic conversational datasets, highlighting the innovative techniques and processes that facilitate their generation.
- We introduce a general framework consisting of three steps: seed generation, turn generation, and quality filtering, which are used to abstract and describe for dialogue data generation across three distinct types of dialogue systems: open-domain, task-oriented, and information-seeking.
- We offer a detailed description of dataset creation evaluation methods, detailing the metrics and criteria used to assess the quality, relevance, and utility of conversational datasets.




Fig. 2. An overview of methods for evaluating generated multi-turn conversations.

- We discuss prospective areas of focus and recent research challenges that have emerged due to the growing demands for dataset generation.

2 EVALUATION

Before exploring data generation methods, it's essential to understand how we can evaluate the outcomes dialogue generation methods. While this paper does not focus on conversation evaluation, we find it necessary to provide a comprehensive overview of how generated conversations are evaluated. There are primarily two approaches for assessing synthetically generated conversational data: *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* evaluation, described below.

Extrinsic Evaluation measures the quality of the generated data based on the performance of downstream tasks they are used for. Given that the ultimate purpose of synthetic conversational data generation is to augment training data and improve the performance of conversational agents, a dialogue model is trained using all or part of the synthetic data and the final performance of the model is used to indirectly assess the quality of the data generation model [44, 110]. For example, AUGESC [125] and SODA [45] aim to create an ODD conversational dataset for fine-tuning an emotional support conversational system and a social conversational agent, respectively, using synthetically generated data. Similarly, within the CIS system, SOLID [5] focuses on enhancing the intent prediction task with a portion of the generated data and Inpainting [13] highlights that its generated dataset serves as a valuable training resource for ConvQA systems.

Intrinsic Evaluation measures synthetic data quality directly using human or automatic evaluation metrics, assessing various qualities of the generated conversations, such as naturalness, understandability, and coherence. the quality of the generated dialogue is directly evaluated either automatically using various evaluation metrics and through human evaluation. Automatic evaluation metrics of conversations are designed to either compare the model's output against a reference dataset (ground truth) or assess it based on inherent characteristics without reference. To demonstrate generality, existing studies often employ a combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation methodologies. In this section, we review existing methods for evaluating conversations, generated either during the data augmentation process or by a dialogue model. An overview of these methods is presented in Figure 2.

2.1 Automatic Evaluation

Conversations can be evaluated automatically using reference-based and reference-free approaches.

2.1.1 Reference-based. These methods assess the quality and relevance of generated text by comparing it against a set of predefined reference texts. These metrics are designed to measure how closely the generated dialogue aligns with expected responses, providing insights into the accuracy and coherence of the conversation. Dialogue data evaluation using these methods can be categorized into three main groups based on the metrics employed.

The first group, *Word Overlap Metrics*, assesses the n-gram similarity between the generated text and the ground truth, focusing on the overlap of word sequences to evaluate the quality of generated questions against a predefined standard. Some examples of these metrics include BLEU (1-3), ROUGE-L (R-L), and METEOR.

The second group, *Embedding-based Metrics*, relies on a score derived from comparing the embeddings of the generated text and the ground truth. Two examples from this group are BERTScore [122] and BARTScore [118]. BERTScore utilizes the BERT model to generate embeddings for words in both the reference and generated texts. It calculates the cosine similarity between the contextual embeddings of words in the reference text and the generated text [21]. This allows BERTScore to measure the semantic similarity between the texts rather than relying solely on lexical matches, making it suitable for tasks where the meaning of the words is more important than their exact order or choice. BARTScore [118] is based on the BART model [52], which is trained for both denoising and sequence-to-sequence tasks, giving it a unique approach to understand and generate text. BARTScore computes scores using a generative approach. It treats the evaluation of text as a text generation problem, where the score is derived from the likelihood of regenerating the reference given the candidate text as input, or vice versa. This can involve generating the likelihood of the reference text conditioned on the candidate text or scoring the candidate text directly based on its fluency and coherency. Compared to BERTScore, which focuses on semantic similarity using embeddings from BERT, BARTScore leverages the generative capabilities of BART to assess text quality from a more holistic perspective, incorporating fluency, coherence, and even factual accuracy [118, 122].

The last group, *Subtask Evaluation Metrics* includes specific metrics that assess how effectively dialogue models handle distinct components or subtasks of the conversation generation process. The first example is Exact Match [108], defined as a condition where the predicted span exactly aligns with the actual span in the document. This metric is primarily used in generation methods that use a document as the reference for conversation data. It is important to note that since answers in a conversation can be lengthy, the exact match may be too stringent criterion. Consequently, the F1 word overlap metric is often used as an alternative [44]. Another metric is Coverage [47, 108], which is used in both ToD and CIS conversation generation. In CIS, Span Coverage [108] assesses how effectively a model captures the rationale spans within a document. The premise here is that dialogues covering a larger portion of the document indicate a more effective data augmentation method. Span Coverage is calculated by measuring the proportion of the document that the generated dialogue spans cover. In the context of ToD, zero-shot coverage [47] is evaluated, which measures the accuracy ratio between zero-shot learning outcomes in a target domain and a fully trained model that includes that domain. Another metric in this group is Coreference Alignment [25], which is critical in conversational QA where using coreferences, such as pronouns 'he' and 'she', is common—almost half of the questions include explicit coreference markers [86]. Specifically, coreference alignment modeling instructs the decoder to focus on the correct non-pronominal coreferent mention in the conversation's attention distribution to accurately generate the pronominal reference word [25]. To evaluate this feature, the Precision (P), Recall (R), and F-score (F) of pronouns in the generated questions are calculated and compared with those in the ground truth questions.

2.1.2 Reference-free. These methods assess the generated dialogue without comparing them to ground truth data, evaluating inherent properties such as diversity [53, 123], semantic coherence [87], and user satisfaction [67]. These methods provide a flexible evaluation of the dialogue’s originality and engagement, allowing for a broader interpretation of quality without the constraint of matching to a specific ground truth.

For diversity-based metrics, Dist-n [53] calculates the diversity of generated text by determining the ratio of unique unigrams and bigrams to the total number of words generated [77]. Ent-n [123] measures the uniformity of the n-gram distribution across all generated text, revealing the variability in n-gram usage. Another metric for evaluating diversity is Self-BLEU [127]. While BLEU typically measures the similarity between two sentences, Self-BLEU uses one sentence from a set as a hypothesis and the rest as references, calculating a BLEU score for each sentence. The average of these scores is termed Self-BLEU. A higher Self-BLEU score indicates lower diversity among the sentences. Sent-BERT [87] assesses the semantic diversity of responses by computing the average negative cosine similarity between the SentenceBERT embeddings of each response pair, thus gauging how semantically varied the responses are. It should be noted that diversity metrics are often dependent on the length of the text, and tend to yield higher scores in texts with fewer total words due to the increased likelihood of repetitive words in longer texts compare to smaller ones. To address this disparity, LAPS [40] imposes a word cutoff for all evaluated datasets until the threshold of the word count is reached.

USR [67] is a reference-free measure designed to evaluate the quality of dialogue, incorporating five sub-metrics that together assess the overall quality of a conversation. These sub-metrics are: (1) Understandable, which evaluates the coherence of a response within its context; (2) Natural, which assesses whether a response mirrors natural human speech; (3) Maintains Context, which checks if a response appropriately continues the conversation; (4) Interesting, which determines whether a response is engaging or mundane; and (5) Uses Knowledge, which examines if a response appropriately includes relevant facts. The overall quality score is derived by aggregating these sub-metrics through a regression model trained on human evaluation.

UniEval [126] is another aspect-based reference-free evaluator that provides a unified, multi-dimensional method for evaluating Natural Language Generation (NLG) tasks. Specifically, UniEval utilizes T5 as a backbone model and cast each evaluation aspect (e.g., coherence or consistency) to a Boolean QA problem; e.g., to assess the coherence of a summary it poses a boolean question, such as "Is this a coherent summary of the document?" Furthermore, it performs an intermediate training phase on four types of NLG, building a single evaluator for each task. For the dialogue generation task, UniEval follows USR and considers the four aspects of Naturalness, Coherence, Engagingness, and Groundedness.

Another metric, G-EVAL [63], utilizes LLMs within a chain-of-thought (CoT) and form-filling framework to evaluate the quality of NLG outputs. By providing only the "Task Introduction" and "Evaluation Criteria" as prompts, G-EVAL prompts LLMs to generate a detailed CoT comprising Evaluation Steps. Subsequently, G-EVAL uses both the prompt and the generated CoT to assess the NLG outputs. The evaluation results are formatted as a form. Additionally, the probabilities associated with the output rating tokens can be leveraged to refine the final metric.

Simulation is another form of dialogue evaluation, which is primarily used for assessing target-guided open-domain dialogue systems [97, 115]. This method involves two dialogue agents engaging in a conversation, after which the success rate in reaching the predefined target is automatically calculated.

2.2 Human Evaluation

The analysis of a conversational model's performance becomes more comprehensive with the inclusion of human evaluations [94]. Although automatic metrics assess certain aspects of model performance and offer speed, efficiency, and reproducibility, they often correlate weakly with human judgment and may not capture all the nuances of conversational competence [18]. In human evaluation, raters evaluate how effectively models manage realistic and engaging conversations [17]. However, human evaluations have their own limitations. A significant challenge is the lack of comparability across different studies due to variations in experimental settings. These variations can include differing criteria such as naturalness, informativeness, context relevance, and answer accuracy.

A variety of methods are used for human evaluation of conversations. Smith et al. [94] proposed categorizing human evaluation techniques based on two key features and comparing them accordingly. The first feature assesses whether the evaluation is conducted per-turn or per-dialogue. Per-turn evaluations involve giving ratings after every model response, providing a detailed analysis that can highlight subtle differences. However, since the quality of a conversation is more than just the sum of its parts, global per-dialogue evaluations might be more effective as they gather ratings at the end of the entire conversation, capturing the overall conversational flow and coherence. The second feature distinguishes between pairwise evaluations and single-model evaluations. Pairwise evaluations, where an annotator directly compares two models, are useful for identifying subtle differences and addressing issues related to scoring distribution shifts. In contrast, single-model evaluations, where an annotator assesses one model at a time, are suitable when a direct comparison between models is not essential. Five evaluation techniques have been used by combining these features:

- **Pairwise Per-Turn Evaluation (PW-Turn):** This technique provides annotations for every turn of a conversation. It requires a crowdworker to choose between a pair of model responses after each message.
- **Pairwise Per-Dialogue Evaluation (PW-Dialog):** This method asks evaluators to choose between two models by presenting a pair of complete conversations.
- **Pairwise Per-Dialogue Self-Chat Evaluation:** This approach compares two conversations that involve only the two bots talking to each other, assessing their interaction without human input.
- **Single-Model Per-Turn Evaluation (SM-Turn):** In this technique, a crowdworker interacts with a conversational agent powered by a single model. The worker annotates each response from the model based on engagement, human-likeness, and interest.
- **Single-Model Per-Dialogue Evaluation (SM-Dialog):** Similar to SM-Turn, this method involves evaluating a single model's performance over an entire conversation, with the assessment occurring after the conversation has concluded.

After comparing various evaluation techniques, Smith et al. [94] draws several conclusions. Firstly, the PW-Turn are effective when differences in models' responses are easily noticeable, such as when models are trained on different datasets. Secondly, PW-Dialog are most effective when differences between models become apparent over several conversation turns, for example, differences in the average length of conversations. Lastly, single-model evaluations are well-suited for comparing models that are similar but vary slightly in quality, such as models with different numbers of parameters.




Fig. 3. Two-sided simulation as presented in Simulated-Chat [69]

3 TASK-ORIENTED CONVERSATIONAL DATA GENERATION

Task-Oriented Dialogues (TOD) represent a specific type of conversational data that contains structured interactions aimed at accomplishing specific tasks or objectives, such as booking a flight ticket or making a restaurant reservation [22, 105]. These dialogues play a pivotal role in areas such as customer service and virtual assistance, where they must adhere to particular requirements and constraints. For instance, successfully booking a restaurant table requires verifying the location’s availability, matching the cuisine with the user’s preference, and securing a reservation that accommodates the size of the user’s party. Consequently, training TOD systems presents considerable challenges due to the need for highly specialized datasets that accurately capture diverse user goals, system actions, and constraints. These limitations not only reduce the breadth of available training data but also demand careful system design. In this context, we will explore two critical aspects of TOD systems, namely training and simulation.

Training. TOD generation relies on either rule-based systems (will be discussed in Section 3.2.1) or machine learning training strategies. TOD generation makes use of two predominant training strategies: 1) **Supervised training** with human-generated and annotated data (an example of such data is illustrated in Figure 7); this approach can be used for generating natural language around extracted slots and values (see Section 3.2.2), generating natural language conditioned on extracted slots and values (see Section 3.2.3), and for generating the entire dialogue turn including slots and values (see Sections 3.2.4-3.2.6). Supervised training faces several challenges, including i) limited availability of data, ii) high cost, and iii) significant time consumption. 2) **Reinforcement learning (RL)** enables the system to generate dialogue turns in real time. RL comes with its own set of challenges: i) traditional dialogues cannot be straightforwardly produced using RL due to complexities in simulating real-world interactions, and ii) since TOD is highly task-specific, it still necessitates a task-dependant corpus.

Simulation. A second aspect that is important to discuss is simulation. Since a conversation inherently involves at least two participants, any system designed to generate dialogues requires something akin to a user to produce part of the dialogue. The concept of simulating a user to interact with the dialogue system has been previously established [26, 38, 68, 70, 90]. The simulator can be a pre-trained dialogue system, or it can be co-trained alongside the system it is intended to help develop. In the first scenario, a pre-trained dialogue system acting as a user simulator utilizes its existing knowledge and capabilities to create realistic user turns. In the second scenario, it is possible to concurrently train a user simulator with the dialogue system itself. This is often referred to as a two-sided simulation, where the goal is to train both sides of the conversation simultaneously, whether the simulators share the same architecture or not.

This method is frequently used in conjunction with reinforcement learning policies, allowing the two simulators to iteratively enhance their performance through mutual interaction. An example of a two-sided simulator is illustrated in Figure 3, where the two sides are called the "User Bot" and "Agent Bot". While few approaches only use one side, the 2-player simulators are often referred to as "User" and "Agent", or "User" and "System". All TOD papers discussed in this study, but VHDA [117] (see Section 3.2.4), use simulation-based generation.

3.1 Input

TOD dialogues are often used in areas such as customer service and virtual assistance, consequently, they are constructed around an **entity** such as *Restaurant*, *Customer*, or *Movie*. As a result, factuality is a very important aspect of TOD systems, meaning all generated entity-centric facts must be constructed or verified using existing **predefined knowledge**. Entity-centric facts are monitored using a dialogue state tracking task, forming a list of entity-based **slots** and **slot values** that is stored in memory. A **slot** is a domain or task-specific predefined attribute, while the **slot value** is its associated piece of information. An example of slots and slot values for the restaurant reservation task is the following: *{party_size: two people, cuisine: french, date: January 25th, time: 7:00 PM}*. The **predefined knowledge** used for fact verification is represented using complex graphical structures, which in addition to entities, also contain information on the relationship between them. The relationship between entities shows dependencies of the task, for example, a *customer* must have at least one attribute clearly defined, such as *name*, before making a *reservation*. Relationships between entities are crucial for generating dialogue sequentially and logically, enhancing the system's ability to manage complex interactions and dependencies effectively. There are several key graphical representations that TOD systems use: (1) the **Schema** defines the entities, their attributes (slots) and which attributes link the entities; (2) the **Ontology** builds on top of the schema by adding information on the relationship between entities, and is often used for querying a knowledge graph; (3) the **Knowledge Graph (KG)** or **Data Base (DB)** serves as a repository of domain-specific information. The KG is an instantiation of an ontology with all available entities, while the DB is an instantiation of a schema. Understanding these elements is essential for developing robust and efficient TOD systems. We will outline each of these components, as they will re-appear in some of the methodologies we will further discuss in this study.

(1) Schema / Ontology

These are general structures that describe entities, such as *Restaurant* and *Reservation*, and entity attributes, such as *Location* for *Restaurant*, and *Party Size* for *Reservation*. We differentiate between two commonly used structures:

Schema: Represents a set of entities, where each entity has attributes (slots). The schema models the task in hand, e.g., a restaurant reservation involves information about the date, time, party size, and any special requests. An example is illustrated in Figure 4.

Ontology: Represents a set of entities, where each entity has attributes (slots), *and the relationship between entities*, for example *Reservation* "is made by" a *Customer*. Often ontologies are considered more semantic-forward than schemas, the reason being the added meaning they inherit through these entity relationships. An example is illustrated in Figure 5.

Goal: The dialog system can use these general structures to ask relevant questions. They contain more information about the semantics of the dialogue than about specific instantiations of entities.




Fig. 4. Example of a schema for the restaurant reservation task; each table represents a class (entity) with its attributes (slots); * indicates the primary key (mandatory for each class), and **boldface** indicates the foreigner key used to connect two classes.




Fig. 5. Example of an ontology for the restaurant reservation task.




Fig. 6. Example of a KG for the restaurant reservation task.

Limitation: General structures do not contain real-world data or restrictions on the possible slot values. For data generation, this means that a dialogue may evolve around combinations of slot values that do not exist, e.g. a restaurant called *Moeders* that specializes in *japanese cuisine*.

(2) Knowledge Graph / Data Base

Structured data representations that model real-world entities (instantiated entities), their attributes, and the relationship between them. Knowledge graphs can be class-specific, or integrated (multiple class objects in the same graph). Figure 6 shows an example of a KG.

Goal: Links to real entities and is updated in real-time.

Limitation: Difficult to build for every problem.

Key terms in TOD. Having introduced the main graphical representations used for entity-centric dialogue generation, we will now define additional key terms that will recurrently appear throughout this section. Figure 7 illustrates on the left side an example dialogue composed of three turns, and on the right side the associated values for key terms such as intent, dialogue act, user goal, dialog frame and belief state, which we will define as follows:

- **Intent** = Represents the possible actions that a user can pursue. Intents are task-specific. Examples are *Book Movie*, *Reserve Restaurant*, *Set Alarm*.
- **Dialogue Act** = A label showing the speech act of a conversational turn; A dialogue act can be associated to either the system or the user, i.e., they can be referred to as **System Act** or **User Act** respectively. Common values are *Inform*, and *Request*.
- **(User) Goal** = A set of slot and slot values that indicate what the user wants to achieve from the conversation. Example: `<date="tomorrow", time="8PM", restaurant="LaCongerie", cuisine="french", party_size="6">`.
- **Dialogue Frame** = A tuple containing a dialogue act and a slot-value map. Example: *Inform*`<date="tomorrow", time="8PM", restaurant="LaCongerie", cuisine="french">`.
- **Belief State / Dialogue State** = A tuple of dialogue acts (*Inform*, *Request*) that keeps track of what information has been achieved, and what yet has to be requested in order to reach the user goal. *Inform* represents a set of slots and slot values that indicate the user constraints. *Request* represents a set of slots, without the values, that indicate what the agent wants to extract in the remainder of the dialogue. Example: *Inform*`<date="tomorrow", time="8PM", restaurant="LaCongerie", cuisine="french">`, *Request*`<party_size>`.

User: Book a restaurant in Orlando for 4 people.

System: What type of food and price range should I look for?

User: I'd like a moderately priced taiwanese restaurant.

```

"user_intents": ["BOOK_RESTAURANT"],
"system_acts": [
  { "slot": "price_range", "type": "REQUEST" },
  { "slot": "category", "type": "REQUEST" } ],
"user_acts": [
  { "type": "INFORM" } ],
"user_goal": {
  "domain": "restaurant",
  "user_intent": ["BOOK_RESTAURANT"],
  "act": "inform",
  { "slot": "location", "value": "orlando" },
  { "slot": "price_range", "value": "moderately priced" },
  { "slot": "category", "value": "taiwanese" },
},
{ "act": "request",
  { "slot": "price_range" },
  { "slot": "category" },
} ]
"dialog_frame": [
  { "act": "request",
    { "slot": "date" },
    { "slot": "time" } } ]
"belief_state": [
  { "act": "inform",
    { "slot": "location", "value": "orlando" },
    { "slot": "price_range", "value": "moderately priced" },
    { "slot": "category", "value": "taiwanese" },
  },
  { "act": "request",
    { "slot": "date" },
    { "slot": "time" } } ]

```

Fig. 7. On the left, a TOD example; On the right, the associated key terms, slots and their values.




Fig. 8. Architecture of a Task-Oriented Dialogue (TOD) system, composed of four modules communicating in a pipeline-fashion. The input and output of each module are illustrated, indicating the process of receiving a user conversational turn, identifying intents, slots and values, extracting response attributes from the data store, and generating them into a natural language response.

TOD Pipeline Modules. TOD systems are roughly composed of 4 modules, namely Natural Language Understanding, Dialogue State Tracking, Dialogue Policy Learning, and Natural Language Generation. These modules can be either compressed into an end-to-end pipeline, or often follow a modular approach as shown in Figure 8. We will describe the function, input and output of each of these modules:

- **Natural Language Understanding (NLU)** this module receives as input a conversational turn in natural language form. The goal is to process the input and extract intents, slots and values for the identified slots.
- **Dialogue State Tracking (DST)** this module receives as input the conversation history and output of the NLU module (which corresponds to the current turn of the dialog) and produces the necessary slots that should be filled to approach the user goal.
- **Dialogue Policy Learning (DPL)** receives as input the slots that must be filled in, and outputs values that would be satisfactory next actions based on the current dialogue state.
- **Data store** when predefined knowledge is provided to the system (in the form of a DB, KB, ontology or schema), both the DST and DPL modules extract slots and values from these sources. If this predefined knowledge is not provided, extra modules are added to learn how to extract these slots and values from provided training data.
- **Natural Language Generation** receives as input the DPL output, and converts it into natural language representation.

TOD Split. Having defined the possible inputs, key notations, training methods and the importance of graphical structures for guiding TOD generation, identifying an effective system bottles down to addressing three base questions as presented in Figure 9. Moreover, we can outline three stages in the TOD generation process: 1) Input, 2) Generation Method, and 3) Quality Filtering. In Section 3.2 we will connect 2) Generation Method together with training and simulation, as they are strongly tied with each other. We will first split TOD approaches wrt. the external knowledge




Fig. 9. Key questions for effectively categorizing TOD systems, based on the input of the conversation system, the generation granularity, and the knowledge verification methods applied.

available, i.e., the input of the data generation system in the form of slots and their possible values. As presented in Section 3.1, this external knowledge appears under the form of a KB, DB, schema or ontology. If provided, the corresponding slots and slot values are plugged into the dialogue system and natural utterances are generated around them (see Sections 3.2.1-3.2.3). If they are not provided, the dialogue system learns them through training data (see Sections 3.2.4-3.2.6). It is important to note though that generating slots and values from the mapped latent space does not guarantee factual/truthful generations. Lastly, we will talk about 3) Quality Filtering. An overview alongside existing work is illustrated in Figure 10.

3.2 Utterance Generation

Various techniques for constructing dialog when **provided input** in the form of structured predefined knowledge have emerged, which can be clustered under three main approaches: (1) predefined language templates, (2) wrapping the slots and values in natural language, and (3) generating natural language conditioned on the input. There are also methods that **do not have input provided**. Instead, these methods adopt an approach centered around discovering entity-based slots and values through learning. These strategies typically leverage access to a training dataset, often curated by human annotators, although alternatively, systems can undergo training or fine-tuning on artificially generated dialogues. This study identifies three distinct approaches for achieving latent-space discovery of TOD-specific entity attributes, namely in (1) Section 3.2.4 through variational inference, (2) Section 3.2.5 few-shot learning and (3) Section 3.2.6 in-context learning.

3.2.1 Predefined Language Templates. Utilizing predefined language templates, referred to as an *agenda-based* or *schema-based* approach, ensures that the generated conversations follow a predetermined structure. In practice, this means that the system utilizes a series of responses that align with specific conversational goals or tasks, effectively guiding the dialogue according to a pre-established **outline** or **schema**. An **outline** or **schema** has pre-defined language templates for each intent and slot type. For example, the intent `<book_movie>` can be associated with the template *"Book movie with [name="value"] and [date="value"]"*. For a specific movie and date, such as *inform<intent=book_movie, name=Inside Out, date=tomorrow>*, the template is filled and generates the turn *"Book movie with name Inside Out and date is tomorrow."* Often, agenda- or schema-based TOD systems contain a human-centered paraphrasing step,




Fig. 10. Overview of approaches used for Task-Oriented Dialogue generation. The conversation generation process is composed of three components, described in sections 3.1 - 3.3.

or an NLG module, to convert these outline-based generations into more diverse and intelligible human dialogue. After paraphrasing, the above example can become *"I want to buy tickets for Inside Out for tomorrow."* This example is extracted from the M2M paper that we will discuss in this subsection [93].

One paper that follows an agenda-based approach for TOD generation is ABUS [55]. The input of the system consists of a set of rules and example dialogues. The rules represent a stack-like representation of user states and provides a convenient mechanisms to follow and reach the user goal, while the dialogues are used for building an accompanying user simulator. The role of the simulator is to send real-time simulated utterances to the system, which is trained to reply using an RL policy. This approach addresses the challenge of training dialogue systems to respond accurately and effectively in real-world scenarios, facilitated by a publicly available simulation framework.

A main drawbacks of agenda-based approaches is that they are task-dependent. However, M2M [93] has access to multiple APIs alongside a task specification. Each API has access to a task schema provided by a developer, outlining the scope and restrictions of interactions for the task in question. The generation process of M2M can be divided into two parts: first, using a **task specification** that contains a schema corresponding to an API; second, using **task-independent information** that maps the task specification to a set of dialogues. This method addresses the challenge of enhancing the generalizability of the TOD generation system, allowing it to scale to new tasks and domains more effectively than systems with domain-specific rules, like ABUS [55].

SGD [85] addresses the fact that, in the real world, multiple services have overlapping functionality. The authors advocate for building a single unified dialogue model for all services and APIs by allowing access to a schema that provides a dynamic set of intents and slots, along with their natural language descriptors. Using dynamic schemas for each API allows for sharing knowledge between the services, also allowing for generalization over a new service. SGD builds on top of M2M [93] by generalizing it to multiple user-system simulations, called agents, spanning over 26 services covering 16 domains, and resulting in a 16k dialogue dataset. Similarly to M2M and ABUS [55], the framework leverages simulator interactions to generate dialogue outlines. While they still leverage crowd-sourcing for natural language generation, they introduce an intermediate step of converting the generated outlines into short utterances. More precisely, the set of generated outlines is first mapped to utterances such as “INFORM(location=“Los Angeles”)” to “Which city are you in?”. Then, the crowd workers paraphrase the list of utterances to ensure naturalness and coherence. This approach addresses the challenge of reducing API calls by leveraging overlapping functionalities among services, reducing redundancy, which minimizes costs and response times.

3.2.2 Natural Language Around Input. As a response to being limited by predefined language templates, Kim et al. [47] defines three strategies. First, augmenting the knowledge base (KB) to enrich the semantic complexity of the dialogue system without altering its operational constraints. Second, modifying the schema itself by either introducing new constraints, removing existing ones, or altering the values these constraints can assume; despite its potential for creating more flexible dialogue systems, this approach is noted for its operational complexity and the significant effort required to implement changes. Third, which is the focal point of this subsection, represents a paradigm shift from the conventional method of generating slots and their associated values. Compared to Section 3.2.1, this approach directly generates dialogues in natural language form, extending the functionality of dialogue systems to previously unseen domains. This method circumvents the limitations imposed by rigid schema constraints and opens future research directions for more dynamic and versatile interactions. It has been shown that plain sequence-to-sequence models that do state tracking outperform agenda-based user simulators, and require less human involvement.

The Neural User Simulator (NUS) [48] eliminates hand-crafted rules for natural language generation. While ABUS [55] generates dialogue by plugging slots and slot values into predefined natural language template sentences, NUS utilizes a corpus-driven approach to generate natural language utterances. NUS leverages dynamic goal generation, meaning that the system can dynamically change the user goal with more dialogue context, assuming the user would want to shift their goal mid-conversation. It uses the ontology created with the dialogue State Tracking Challenge 2 (DSTC2) [34] dataset’s evolving states, from which the system can extract different slots and, together with the dialogue history, can generate a dynamic goal. The fundamental distinction from ABUS lies in NUS’s ability to generate language: it does not resort to stitching predefined natural language templates to slot-value pairs but instead learns to construct utterances through a sequence-to-sequence model, aligning goal states with the ontology at every step.

NeuralWOZ [47] presents a novel system composed of two sequential neural models, namely the Collector and the Labeler. The Collector constructs dialogues given as input a user goal instruction, and API call results. These elements synthesize into a belief state encapsulating both informable and requestable slot and slot values. The Collector generates the dialogue, and Labeler then annotates it with possible slots and slot values from the belief state extracted from a pre-defined list, creating a coherent dataset for dialogue state tracking. However, the method of transitioning from the natural language goal instruction of to the schematic slot-value pairs in the state candidate is not explicitly detailed.

3.2.3 Natural Language Conditioned on Input. The Hierarchical User Simulator (HUS) [32] is part of the same family as the previously discussed ABUS and NUS. HUS employs a multifaceted encoding scheme, meaning it encodes different

dialogue features in different vector representations. Therefore, instead of relying on a single-dimensional representation, such as when concatenating all dialog-based inputs and mapping them to the output space, the authors compute a different representation for each input of the dialogue system: (1) the user goal, (2) the current dialogue turn, and (3) the entire dialogue history. Moreover, HUS has access to a KB from which it extracts information about the task and domain of the dialog. Although HUS has demonstrated competence in generating successful dialogues, the authors advocate for a process that is close to human-like dialogue generation. Due to the deterministic nature of HUS, the model will yield the same dialogue each time given identical user goals and system turns. To introduce variability, the authors propose a variational inference framework VHUS, by sampling an unobserved state from a latent space at each turn, with the latent space being positioned between the encoding of the dialogue history and the decoding of the user turn. Compared to VHDA, which is discussed in Section 3.2.4, the latent space in VHUS enriches the dialogue generation with diversity without modifying the underlying user state and goal generation. Therefore, while VHUS contributes to dialogue variety through latent sampling, it does not compromise the factuality of the generated slots and values.

While, similarly to VHUS [32], TUS [59] maps different inputs to different representations in the feature space, it distinguished itself by its unique domain-agnostic feature representations. The input feature representation of each turn-level slot consists of a set of subvectors, namely: the *basic information* models multiple aspects of the system, such as the belief state, user goal, whether there are constraints in the current turn generation if previous constraints have been fulfilled; *system action* models the current system action, and extra domain-specific values; *user action* encodes similar information with the system action, but also includes the history of the user system; and *domain and slot index features* to avoid the situation when the first three subvectors are the same for different domains, this vector adds an index. The authors address the challenge of having a domain-dependent dialogue system by separately modeling the domain-specific data with the *domain and slot index features*.

A similar work published around the same period is JOUST [99]. This method combines two simulator agents trained on a collection of source domain dialogues to converse with each other through natural language. The pre-trained agents are fine-tuned in a low resource setting on target domain data using RL. The authors study two aspects of JOUST: 1) capabilities of domain adaptation, and 2) single-to-multiple domain transfer. Although using two simulator agents has been previously proposed, this paper adds novelty by training them on multi-domain human-generated dialogues. Similarly to TUS, it is simulation-based, it has access to a knowledge base, it does not generate new values, and keeps track of the dialogue state simultaneously with the natural language dialogue turn generation.

Another paper that follows analogous work is Unified-US [100]. During both training and fine-tuning, the dialogue system has access to the following inputs: 1) a task description provided in natural language, 2) the dialogue context, and 3) the user goal in natural language. Unified-US leverages a simulator model composed of two parts, namely the user and system agents. They first pre-train both agents using a multi-domain dialogue dataset without user goals. Subsequently, they are further pre-trained on the same dialogue dataset, however, this time incorporating the user goals, and fine-tuning on a target domain (NeuralWOZ [47]). It is important to note that Unified-US distinguishes itself from prior works such as NeuralWOZ by removing API calls for extracting slots and values. Instead, it directly uses the slots and their values from annotated datasets.

IND [3] is a simulation-based generated dataset on negotiation dialogues using 1) negotiation-specific intents, 2) actions, and 3) user and agent simulator. The authors create the Integrative Negotiation Dataset (IND) using GPT-J with human-in-the-loop for quality check. This process is done in 5 steps. First, for background data, the system has inputs such as knowledge-grounded information, for which the system has access to a database consisting of data on 10 electronic items, each item having features such as Product Name, Product Description, Product Features, Price,

Accessory List, and Accessory Description. Then, a set of 11 negotiating intents are defined, such as Ask, Inform, Negotiate-Price-Increase, etc. For each intent, few-shot prompts are designed to describe the task and the product data. Then, the dialogue flow generation takes each intent and its prompt and associates the relevant information from the product background data. For example, for intent *Negotiate-Add-X*, the authors associate the item name, while for intent *Negotiate-Price-Decrease*, the proposed price is associated. Then, they prompt GPT-J with the intents, instructions, and associated product details to create dialogue turn-by-turn. In the end, data correction is applied by involving human-in-the-loop, where experienced experts make edits to the generated dialogue to ensure grounding in the provided background database. Moreover, the experts were tasked to correct or remove intent, action, and negotiation flow inconsistencies, as well as grammatical errors. dialogues with low fluency were finally dropped from the database. The second part of this study uses the IND dataset to train the negotiating agent INA, which is further discussed in Section 3.2.6. The challenge of this data generation problem is that negotiation strategies are highly context-dependent, involving interactions about aspects such as price, product, delivery, quality, etc, while also answering with knowledge-grounded information such as manufacturing details about the product, making it quite a challenge for generating high-quality dialogues. The authors construct the dialogues based on the “Integrative” approach to negotiation, i.e., a win-win situation where each party understands the other’s needs and the goal is to reach mutual satisfaction.

3.2.4 Variational Inference. VHDA [117] is a method that receives as input human-generated dialogues, and constructs the utterance-level natural language outputs together with the dialogue acts, modeling latent variables over all dialogue aspects to extrapolate and generate novel slot values. This characteristic allows the system to produce attributes beyond those encountered in the training data, thereby demonstrating an ability to innovate within the dialogue context and suggesting a higher degree of system adaptability and generative capacity. These features highly differentiate VHDA from the previous research. The authors build on top of the idea of Variational Hierarchical Conversational RNNs (VHCR [78]), encapsulating multiple encoder and decoder modules, where each models a specific dialogue feature. The encoder is employed as a self-attention bidirectional LSTM for mapping all previously mentioned latent spaces. As a training objective, the ELBO is optimized on the goal-oriented dialogue samples. VHDA can be closely compared to VHUS [32], however, the main and very important difference between the two is that VHUS samples from the latent space of natural language turn generation, while VHDA also models the user goal, and dialogue state in the latent space.

3.2.5 Few-shot learning. In this section we discuss papers that leverage the capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) to understand the underlying syntax and semantics of the dialogue data. Here we differentiate between learning with few-shot examples, and in-context learning. Both techniques require limited data.

- *Few-shot learning*: the ability of a model to generalize when provided a very small dataset for **training** or **fine-tuning**.
- *In-context learning*: the ability of a model to generalize when provided very few examples in the input prompt **without explicit training** or **fine-tuning**.

Simulated-Chat [69] sheds light on the abilities of large pre-trained models to follow instructions and generate synthetic conversations. The system is split, similarly to previous work, into user and agent simulators. The input of the user simulator is a set of instructions based on which it can generate a dialogue utterance. Meanwhile, the input of the agent simulator is a knowledge base. Given the current dialogue context, the agent generates a belief state, i.e., a query. The two simulators learn to hold a conversation conditioned on both the instructions and knowledge base, trained

by fine-tuning GPT-2 and Longformer, first on human-generated dialogues, and then on additionally self-generated simulated dialogues. The problem involves generating a dialogue \mathcal{D} based on a given set of instructions \mathcal{I} and a knowledge base \mathcal{KB} . The dialogue consists of user and agent utterances, and at each turn, both systems model their responses based on the dialogue context and available information. The joint distribution of the dialogue is determined by equations that model the user and agent systems' behavior. To use this framework for TOD generation, a belief state generator is added after the agent system. This generator produces key-value pairs that are matched against the knowledge base to retrieve relevant information, with the belief state updated using greedy methods.

3.2.6 In-context learning. ICL-US [98] presents a method to efficiently and effectively generate TOD dialogues through in-context learning. The model receives as input a few example dialogues to perform a new task, without needing any fine-tuning. The framework is composed of a *user simulator* and a *dialogue system* in the form of a generic black-box model. Given a user goal and a few in-context dialogue examples, ICL-US generates a user utterance per turn. Including the dialogue history, each turn is conditioned on 1) a set of example dialogues K shots examples, where each dialogue contains by the user goal and natural language dialogue, 2) a user goal, and 3) the conversation history. While this method eliminates the need for human annotations, the authors need to use an existing dataset for extracting the user goal and dialogue examples. In-context learning requires the dialogue examples to be similar to the desired generation. The authors apply two sampling techniques to select the few-shot dialogues for each generation: 1) random sampling, and 2) sampling based on Jaccard similarity between the user goal and the candidate dialogue goals.

Similarly, Dialogic [58] uses as input a few in-context dialogue examples, and a simulator to build TOD data using in-context learning. The authors demonstrate that on MultiWOZ2.3, their approach leads to better performance than when training on human-generated dialogue. The setup of Dialogic requires two inputs: a small dataset that contains a few annotated dialogues, and an ontology from which the user goal is extracted. Given the ontology, a model generates G_i which contains both the user goal and belief state, represented by a set of triplets $\{domain, slot_name, slot_value\}$. The authors sample dialogues from the dataset that have a similar user goal as G_i . To sample relevant dialogue examples from D_S , the authors maximize the similarity between goals G_i and G_j for all examples j in D_S . This is done by calculating the Jaccard similarities of two dialogues on domain, and slot levels, similarly to ICL-US. Dialogic applies a Controllable Dialogue Generation step: This is an auxiliary step to verify the reliability of the GPT-3 generated dialogue. Once prompted, GPT-3 will generate a belief state and user utterance. If the belief state contains something that the dialogue turn generated utterance does not, it is called over-generation. If the belief state lacks something in the utterance, it is called de-generation. For tackling de-generation, the authors apply an auxiliary TOD model. Overall, the two methods attack the TOD generation problem in a very similar way. The only obvious differences being sampling the user goal directly from the dataset, or using an ontology to extract it.

INA [3] leverages GPT-2 for in-context generation of dialogues, using as examples the IND dataset generated in the same paper. This is achieved by fine-tuning GPT-2 in a supervised fashion with a cross-entropy loss and with a novel RL reward function using the PPO loss. More details about both IND and INA are presented in Section 3.2.3.

3.3 Quality Filtering

In this subsection, we explore Quality Filtering with an emphasis on checking the accuracy of the generated data. Methods employing a schema, ontology, or knowledge graph in the generation process inherently ensure the accuracy of entities and entity attributes, as they are directly extracted from the input representations. This principle holds for

the majority of papers discussed in this study, including ABUS, M2M, SGD, NUS, NeuralWOZ, HUS, VHUS, JOUST and Unified-US [32, 47, 48, 55, 85, 93, 99, 100]. We consider these to have factuality granted.

On the other hand, methods that discover slots and values in the latent space do not have factuality covered. Dialogic [58] controls the generation through an extra step called automatic revision, correcting for potential annotation errors by comparing the GPT-3 generated belief state with the current utterance, and avoiding any de-generation or over-generation issues. ICL-US [98] adds an evaluation step by comparing the dialogue acts extracted from the generated System and User NLU components at each turn. INA [3] applies a human-in-the-loop component where experts make edits at the utterance level of the generated dialogue to ensure the information is grounded in the provided background database. Meanwhile, VHDA [117] ensures the semantic logic of the dialogue turns but does not constrict generation to factually plausible interactions.

4 OPEN DOMAIN CONVERSATIONAL DATA GENERATION

Open-domain dialogue (ODD) systems facilitate conversations across a wide variety of topics without being confined to specific tasks or domains. When developing a synthetic dataset for these systems, it is essential to incorporate key features of ODD interactions [20]. Firstly, conversational coherence must be ensured, meaning each turn in the conversation should meaningfully connect to previous ones [71]. Secondly, the dataset should promote response diversity, avoiding bland and repetitive replies like "I don't know" to foster more engaging interactions [124]. Additionally, the dataset should encompass a broad spectrum of topics, enhancing the system's generality. Lastly, it is crucial to generate conversations that aim to elicit informative responses, ensuring that conversations are both knowledgeable and relevant. For example, in knowledge-grounded dialogue systems, responses should draw on external knowledge bases, while in personalized dialogue systems, they should align with user profiles [21, 30, 36, 37].

This section reviews existing work on generating conversational data for ODD systems and systematically outlines the generation process in three components: input generation, utterance generation, and quality filtering. The first component, *input generation*, is tasked with providing the fundamental information necessary to initiate conversations. It processes a set of unstructured data and produces structured information cards, each serving as the basis for a conversation. In the literature on data generation, these information cards are referred to as "conversation seeds." For instance, when creating a conversational dataset from a knowledge graph (KG) [45], the input generation component ingests a large KG, samples a triple, and through several steps, transforms it into a concise description that forms the foundation of a sample conversation. The second component, *utterance generation*, utilizes the conversation seed to generate a multi-turn conversation. For example, using the description obtained from a KG triplet, this component instructs an LLM to generate a multi-turn conversation. The third component, *quality filtering*, aims to eliminate samples that do not meet the required quality standards and could potentially degrade the performance of the conversational system trained on this dataset. For instance, if conversation seeds or the resulting dialogue samples fail to meet quality criteria, they are discarded using heuristic or automated tools.

This section provides a detailed explanation of each component and discusses the methods associated with them. Figure 11 illustrates the complete generation process with an example, and Figure 12 summarizes the methods employed in the literature for the aforementioned components.

4.1 Input Generation




Fig. 11. Conversation generation process in ODD systems. This process consists of three main components. The input and output for each component are displayed, along with an example from SODA [45]. In this example, a knowledge graph is fed into the *input generation* component, which then creates a conversation seed. This seed includes the names of the conversation participants and a description of the conversation. In the subsequent component, *utterance generation*, the seed prompts an LLM to generate a multi-turn conversation sample.




Fig. 12. Overview of approaches used for Open-domain conversation generation. The conversation generation process is comprised of three main components, described in subsections 4.1–4.3.

Everyday dialogues usually revolve around specific topics, starting with a general question that gradually moves to more specific aspects of the topic [45]. Therefore, to create a conversation sample, it is necessary to first define an information card, referred to as "conversation seed," which specifies the main topic, subtopics, and key topic details for a




Fig. 13. Conversation seed and the corresponding dialogue from the ESConv Dataset [62]. This dataset focuses on emotional support conversations. The example shows a conversation seed that outlines the emotional problem and current situation of a support seeker. The corresponding dialogue develops around the information provided in the seed.

conversation. Figure 13 from the ESConv dataset [62] shows a conversation seed next to the corresponding conversation. Thus, the seed generation component processes the data source with the goal of producing conversation seeds. The differences among seed generation methods stem from the types of input sources used, the techniques employed in the generation process, and the specific content of each conversation seed. The subsequent sections will discuss various methods for generating conversation seeds.

4.1.1 Existing Dialogues. In this method, information from existing crowdsourced conversation datasets is used to generate conversation seeds. These datasets typically include background information for each conversation, which serves as an effective starting point for creating new synthetic conversations. The process involves selecting a crowdsourced dataset that is well-suited to the specific end task. As a result, conversation seeds in this approach primarily consist of task descriptions, background knowledge, and the initial one or two turns of the conversation.

In this realm, WEAKDAP [10] focuses on classifying emotions and conversational actions and detecting intentions in Spanish, and it utilizes the DailyDialog [56] and FBTOD [91] datasets for building its conversation seeds. AUGESC [125] aims to generate conversations for Emotional Support Conversation (ESC) task. It employs the EmpatheticDialogues (ED) [84] dataset, which offers a rich variety of dialogue descriptions tagged with emotions and detailed descriptions of emotional states. GCN [60] is dedicated to creating knowledge-based conversations and uses the TopicalChat dataset [29], where each conversation is linked to relevant facts or articles found on Wikipedia, Reddit, or in The Washington Post. BOTSTALK [46], designed for multi-skill conversational systems, integrates multiple behaviors and skills into a single conversation to enable appropriate interactions with diverse users and situations. BOTSTALK selects ConvAI2 [18], WoW (Wizard of Wikipedia) [19], and ED [84] datasets and combines them, using the conversation description and the first turn of the conversation sample as seeds.

Unlike previous approaches that use utterances from existing conversational datasets, PLACES [9] creates background information and conversations using human workers. Initially, it compiles a list of topics and tasks from the Feedback for Interactive Talk & Search (FITS) Dataset [111], which includes 52 conversational topics (e.g., "nutrition," "philosophy") and 315 subtopics (e.g., "Italian food," "Soren Kierkegaard"). For each subtopic, PLACES manually generates background information. Additionally, it constructs a series of ten dialogues between two speakers for selected topics, illustrating everyday conversations with proper grammar. Consequently, the conversation seed in PLACES comprises the topic, background information, and a selection of sample conversations, all produced by human effort.

4.1.2 Triplet from KG. In addition to existing conversational datasets, other types of resources, such as knowledge graphs (KGs), can be used to construct conversation seeds. Each triplet in a KG comprises two entities, referred to as the head and the tail, connected by a relation. The motivation for using textual resources beyond conversational datasets stems from the scarcity of conversational material in some domains. This makes it beneficial to leverage other textual resources, like KGs, for generating conversations. This approach effectively enhances the use of available textual resources in creating conversation datasets.

SODA [45] utilizes KG triplets [107] to generate a concise description. The process involves several steps. Initially, SODA samples a socially relevant triplet, since the goal is to generate social conversations. It then transforms the triplet into a simple sentence using predefined templates tailored to each type of relation. To enhance the naturalness of the sentences, SODA substitutes variables representing individuals with the most common names from U.S. Social Security Number applicants.¹ Lastly, using GPT-3.5 [74], SODA expands this sentence into a short description of two or three sentences. This generated description then serves as the conversation seed.

4.1.3 Personalized Profile. Personalized chat systems are a distinct type of chat system that tailors responses based on a user profile (UP). Each UP consists of multiple profile sentences (PSs) that contain personalized information about the user. These PSs enable a dialogue system to generate personalized responses. To generate conversational data for such systems, the fundamental approach involves developing UPs for two agents and then generating conversations based on these profiles. As a result, the conversation seed primarily consists of UPs. The process of generating these seeds begins with a list of topics and unfolds in two main steps. The first step is the preparation or creation of a set of PSs. The second step involves grouping several PSs together to form a complete UP. Ultimately, these user profiles comprise the conversation seed and serve as the foundation for generating personalized conversations.

PERSONACHATGEN [49] generates conversational data for personalized systems. Initially, it defines a taxonomy of hierarchical persona topics. Following this, they use GPT-3 to generate PSs based on the defined topics. Once a set of PSs is established, PERSONACHATGEN groups them by calculating a contradiction score to select relevant PSs, and creates UPs. The process includes quality assurance measures for the UPs created. Firstly, heuristic filters are applied to remove samples that do not adhere to the key-value pattern and eliminate duplicates. Secondly, PERSONACHATGEN employs automatic scoring to assess the compatibility between the topic and the PS or among PSs within a UP. Synthetic-Persona-Chat (SPC) [39] starts by obtaining PSs from the PersonaChat dataset [121]. It then prompts an LLM to generate additional PSs. Subsequently, SPC organizes these PSs using an NLI classifier to create the UP, ensuring that the profiles are coherent and contextually relevant.

4.2 Utterance Generation

The primary goal of this step is to transform a conversation seed into a complete conversation. Thus, the input for this component consists of conversation seeds generated by the previous component, and its output is synthetically generated conversations. Figure 14 illustrates an example input and output of this component.

For ODD systems, the primary method for generating a conversation involves prompting an LLM with a conversation seed to generate a multi-turn conversation at once. This approach is referred to as *One Go* in this paper. Some studies, however, employ a *Turn by Turn* generation approach, where the conversation is constructed sequentially, one turn at a time. We will discuss the reasons why the turn-by-turn method is used.

¹catalog.data.gov/dataset/baby-names-from-social-security-card-applications-national-data




Fig. 14. Examples of generated dialogue from PersonaChatGen [49] based on a conversation seed containing two user profiles. Utterances in orange are directly related to Person 1, while those in magenta relate to Person 2.

4.2.1 One GO. This method generates a multi-turn conversation from a conversation seed, primarily by prompting an LLM. There distinct methods are used to generate conversation in one go. The first method uses In-context Learning (ICL), where a pre-trained LLM is directly prompted without any fine-tuning [9, 45]. PLACES [9] generates conversations by using a prompt that initially includes a topic along with its human-written background information and a few randomly selected conversation samples as few-shot examples. Subsequently, another topic along with its corresponding background information is added to the prompt, and the LLM is tasked with generating a conversation for it. SODA [45] employs GPT-3.5 to create multi-turn conversations from descriptions generated based on a triplet from a KG.

In the second method, an LLM is first fine-tuned and then used to generate conversations. For instance, AUGESC [125] initially fine-tuned GPT-J [101] on a dialogue completion task using 100 samples from the ESConv dataset [62] in one epoch. After fine-tuning, a conversation description along with the first utterance is provided to the LLM, which is then tasked with generating the remainder of the conversation.

The third method employs a Generator-Critic Architecture [65] and uses a combination of prompting and fine-tuning iteratively for generation. In this method, an LLM first generates multiple conversation candidates. Then, a Critic, which is another LLM, evaluates these candidates based on predetermined policies and selects the best ones. These top conversations are then incorporated into the dataset for the next generation cycle. This iterative process of selecting and adding the best candidates gradually enhances the Generator's performance. Similarly, SPC [39] utilizes this approach for personalized conversation generation, prompting the LLM with a pair of user profiles.

4.2.2 Turn By Turn. Some studies generate conversations incrementally, often involving the interaction of two or more LLMs. There are several reasons for using the turn-by-turn method. The first reason is to generate a personalized conversation based on two user profiles. In this scenario, two LLMs, each equipped with a user profile, engage in a dialogue with each other, generating the conversation turn by turn. PERSONACHATGEN [49] utilizes this approach by employing two GPT-3 models prompted by user profiles. The second reason involves merging multiple datasets. In this approach, the choice of which dataset to use is determined turn by turn, based on the dialogue history. BOTSTALK [46] uses this method as it merges three datasets to create a multi-skill conversational dataset. The third reason is to increase the quantity and diversity of the data. By generating dialogues turn by turn, various scenarios can be created




Fig. 15. Conversation generation process in CIS. This process comprises three main components. Inputs and outputs for each component are depicted, alongside an example from SOLID [5]. In this example, a list of intents from the MSDialog dataset [81] is fed into the input generation component. This component sequentially prompts an LLM to generate the necessary background information and selects a random sequence of intents. After constructing the conversation seed with the background information and intent sequence, it prompts an LLM to generate intent-aware conversation turns sequentially.

for generation. For example, WEAKDAP [10] defines three strategies for generation: First, Conversation Trajectory Augmentation (CTA) starts with the initial turn and substitutes the subsequent turns with generated ones. Second, All Turn Augmentation (ATA) generates a turn, considers the current subset as a conversation sample, then retains the original turn and generates the next. This results in $n - 1$ new conversations of varying lengths, from 2 to n , for a conversation with n turns. Third, Last Turn Augmentation (LTA), a specific instance of ATA, focuses on replacing only the last turn of a conversation with a generated utterance.

4.3 Quality Filtering

The primary goal of the filtering component is to eliminate conversations that lack key ODD features such as correctness, consistency, diversity, and informativeness. The existing filtering methods can be broadly categorized into two types. The first type, Noise & Lexical Filtering, primarily focuses on assessing correctness and diversity. In this type, the filter removes samples that exhibit various issues, such as unfinished conversations [125], deviations from desired patterns [45, 49], repetitive patterns [49], inappropriate turn lengths (either too short or too long) [125], conversations with more than two participants [45], dangerous content [49], toxic content with social biases, and offensive material [45, 49]. In the second type of filtering, the focus is on checking the consistency of conversations. BOTSTALK [46] ensures dialogue consistency by examining each newly added turn to verify that it aligns with the rest of the conversation. Similarly, in personalized-based models [39, 49], the consistency between persona sentences in one user profile is also assessed. To achieve this, a Natural Language Inference (NLI) classifier is primarily utilized.

5 INFORMATION SEEKING CONVERSATIONAL DATA GENERATION

The main goal of Conversational Information Seeking (CIS) systems is to fulfill users' information needs. These systems allow users to search information using natural language dialogue, instead of traditional search queries [119]. However,




Fig. 16. Overview of methods for information seeking conversational data generation. The conversation generation process is comprised of three main components, described in subsections 5.1–5.3.

such systems face several challenges in accurately addressing a user’s request. The first challenge to address is ensuring the system maintains control of the conversation, allowing it to progress coherently until it meets the user’s needs, while also offering users the flexibility to specify what they want to find or how they want the information to be presented [119]. The challenge intensifies when the user’s queries are about various subjects or responses need to be drawn from different resources during the conversation. In such scenarios, the conversation may experience topic shifts, necessitating the system’s ability to recognize when the topic changes and accordingly switch the response source [2]. Additionally, users may pose complex questions that require multi-hop reasoning across multiple sources to formulate a response. This demands more sophisticated retrieval models and reasoning capabilities, as the system needs to synthesize information from diverse resources [57, 120]. Another major challenge is query ambiguity, where the system may not understand the user’s request or might have multiple potential responses but cannot determine which one is most relevant. In such cases, the system need to ask clarifying questions. This interaction, where both the user and the system can initiate queries and drive the conversation, is known as a mixed-initiative system [16, 109]. To effectively develop a CIS system capable of handling these challenges, it is essential to generate training data that encapsulates these scenarios.

This section reviews existing work on generating conversational data for CIS systems and systematically describes the generation process through three main components: input generation, utterance generation, and quality filtering; see Figure 15. The first component, *input generation*, is responsible for providing the fundamental information needed to initiate conversations; e.g., topic and evidence document. It also defines a conversation flow, which is used to guide the conversation to address users’ information needs. Both elements, fundamental information and conversation flow, constitute what is referred to as a "Conversation Seed." For example, a conversation seed may include an entity name with relevant background information, followed by a sequence of intents like [original question, clarifying question, further




Fig. 17. Conversation Seed and Corresponding Dialogue from the Doc2Dial Dataset [23]. This dataset is dedicated to generating conversations based on governmental documents. The displayed example features a conversation seed comprising a title, a document, and a sequence of dialogue acts. In the corresponding conversation sample, each turn is labeled with a specific dialogue act.

details]. The second component, *utterance generation*, aims to generate a conversation based on the "Conversation Seed." The third component, *quality filtering*, seeks to eliminate samples that do not meet the required quality standards, which could potentially degrade the performance of the conversational system trained on this dataset. This section provides a detailed explanation of each component and discusses the methods associated with them. The methods employed for these components are illustrated in Figure 16.

5.1 Input Generation

Information seeking conversations are designed to respond to queries or gather information about a topic, typically following a structured sequence. In the literature on conversation generation, it is generally assumed that an information-seeking conversation starts with the user's query, progresses through a series of interactions between the agent and the user, and concludes with the delivery of the final answer. Therefore, each turn in these conversations can be labeled with an act name, resulting in a multi-turn conversation being categorized by a sequence of dialogue acts, commonly referred to as "dialogue flow." In other words, the dialogue flow offers a comprehensive perspective of the conversation, outlining the role of each turn and how it contributes to reaching the final answer. Thus, a dialogue flow, coupled with information about the topic of conversation and corresponding background information, forms the "Conversation Seed" for CIS systems. Figure 17 illustrates an example of a conversation seed alongside its conversation sample from the Doc2Dial dataset [23]. The conversation sample is generated based on the title and document and is structured around the dialogue flow to meet the user's information needs. In the following, we discuss existing approaches for input generation and categorize them into two main categories of document-driven and sequence-grounded.

5.1.1 Document-driven. High-quality documents, such as those found on platforms like Wikipedia or PubMed, are typically written or edited by experts, who invest significant effort in refining their content and addressing potential reader questions preemptively [13]. These documents often begin with broad overviews of general concepts and gradually delve into more detailed aspects of the subject [21, 25, 30, 108]. The sequential organization of documents

coupled with the rich background information of documents serve as a valuable resource for modeling dialogue flow of information-seeking conversations. Therefore, in the document-driven approach, the implicit flow of a document or a ranked list of document passages is used to guide the dialogue. In what follows, we discuss three methods of constructing a dialogue flow in a document-driven manner.

The first method of document-driven input generation segments documents into passages and then selects a passage to generate a conversation turn, thereby creating a dialogue flow based on the sequence of passages. The DG2 method [108] employs a turn by turn retrieval-based approach for dialogue flow generation. For each turn, it utilizes a "passage selector" component responsible for ranking these passages and selecting the most relevant one based on the conversation history to generate the current turn. SynDG [6] utilizes "knowledge pieces" instead of mere passages. A knowledge piece can be any textual segment; e.g., a sentence from a Wikipedia article or a persona sentence used in a personalized dialogues to describe a user's preferences.

Segmenting a document into pieces poses a challenge: it risks losing the document's positional context. As a dialogue unfolds, there tends to be a natural progression toward focusing on the latter parts of a document, where more detailed information about the topic is usually found [13, 25, 77, 108]. It is therefore crucial to integrate both the turn information in the dialogue and the positional information of the passages into the model. DG2 employs a straightforward but effective technique to merge dialogue turn positional information with passage positional information. For indicating speaker turns, DG2 utilizes prompts such as "usernum:" or "agentnum:", with "num" indicating the current number of turns. This helps the model keep track of the dialogue progression, promoting a more structured dialogue. For passage positioning, DG2 assigns an index to each passage to signify its position within the document. By synthesizing these two types of information, the model is designed to initially focus conversations around the beginning of the document and gradually shift attention toward the end as the dialogue continues. SynDG [6] initially defines a sequence of knowledge pieces as a pre-defined dialogue flow. It applies this pre-defined dialogue flow in two instances: the first instance uses the persona sentences from the PersonaChat dataset [121] as knowledge pieces, and the second instance utilizes passages from the Wizards of Wikipedia (WoW) dataset [19].

In the second method of document-driven input generation, documents are conceptualized as dialogues between the writer and an imaginary reader, where each sentence in the document is viewed as the writer's response to a hypothetical question from the reader. Thus, in this approach, the dialogue flow consists of the document's sentences. This concept, called Inpainting, was first introduced by Dai et al. [13], and subsequently adopted in other studies [50, 51].

As the third method, a specific flow for the conversation is not defined. Instead, a complete document or background information is provided, and it is left to the "utterance generation" component to decide which part of the document to use for dialogue generation [1, 36, 37, 44].

5.1.2 Sequence-Grounded. In this approach, the conversation seed comprises a topic, its corresponding background information, and a sequence of dialogue acts [64, 102], sometimes referred to as intents [5, 81]. The conversation seed closely resembles that used in ODD systems but additionally includes the sequence of acts. For this setup, two types of input resources are necessary: a collection of topics with their background knowledge and a list of dialogue acts. Furthermore, given that a sequence of dialogue acts is selected from a pool, verifying the validity of this sequence is crucial.

TopDial [102] proposes a method for generating a synthetic dataset for recommendation systems by creating a role-playing framework in which two LLMs interact, playing system and agent roles. It generates distinct conversation seeds for each role. The system's seed includes background information, the initial utterance, dialogue acts, and the

target derived from the crowdsourced dataset, DuRecDial 2.0 [64]. For the user agent, the conversation seed comprises user profile attributes from DuRecDial 2.0, along with personality features. Inspired by the Big-5 personality traits [28] – openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism – TopDial randomly assigns a positive or negative description to each trait. These descriptions are combined to simulate the user’s personality. In this work, only the final point of the dialogue flow, the target, is predefined. However, it has been observed that the system often asks about preferences or poses other questions at the very beginning. As the dialogue progresses, the system introduces topic-related attributes and elicits the user’s interest.

SOLID [5] proposes a method for generating data for intent-aware information-seeking dialogues. It involves sequentially prompting an LLM to generate entity types and corresponding entities for each type, background documents, and the first utterance in a conversation, which collectively form the necessary information for the conversation seed. For the dialogue flow, SOLID employs a list of intents from MSdialog [81], adhering to the same intent distribution found in the main dataset. Similarly, MusicSyn [51] and TtWMusic [50] use fixed sequences of dialogue acts. They are designed to generate information-seeking conversations for music recommendation systems and make use of the CPCD dataset [8], which contains background information on artist playlists. To create a sequence of playlists that serves as the dialogue flow, they compute the embedding vectors of these playlists. They then sample a sequence based on closeness, utilizing cosine distance to ensure consistency.

Some studies do not specify a fixed sequence; instead, outline a set of actions and select one before generating each turn. These studies focus on collaboration between LLM and humans, employing semi-synthetic methods for conversation generation. LAPS [40] uses a set of primary dialogue acts for personalized recommendation tasks, (1) greeting, (2) preference elicitation, (3) recommendation, (4) follow-up questions, and (5) goodbye. It then guides the conversation follow by generating a guidance for each turn, specifying the next action that should be taken in the conversation based on the conversation history and user preferences. This guidance is then utilized by a crowd worker to compose the next utterance for the conversation.

5.2 Utterance Generation

The primary goal of this component is to transform a conversation seed into a multi-turn conversation. However, the content of the seed in CIS differs from that in ODD. The input for this component is the conversation seeds containing a topic and dialogue flow, and its output is a conversational dataset. In the following, we will explore the approaches used for utterance generation.

5.2.1 Answer Extraction and Question Generation. This approach utilizes two sequential components, known as Answer Extraction and Question Generation, which are based on the pipeline method for question-answering (QA) generation introduced by Alberti et al. [4]. Typically, the first component extracts a text span that could potentially serve as an answer, and the second component generates a question corresponding to the extracted answer. DG2 [108] retrieves a passage to use as a conversation seed for generating a turn. It then employs a span extraction component to identify a rationale that could potentially serve as an answer to a question. Following this, it sequentially generates user and agent utterances based on the extracted rationale and the conversation history. MultiCQAG [36] and CQAG-AR [37] employ a similar approach, with the distinction that after extracting the span, they determine which type of question to generate: open-ended, closed-ended, or unanswerable. SimSeek [44] explores two scenarios of generating synthetic conversations from documents. In the first scenario, called "SimSeek-sym," an evidence passage is provided from which an answer is extracted first, followed by the generation of a question based on the extracted answer. In the second

scenario, "SimSeek-asym," only a topic and background information are supplied to the question generator component. Then an answer finder component attempts to identify the answer within the evidence passage. In this approach, the full Wikipedia passage is considered as the conversation seed.

5.2.2 Dialogue Inpainting. The core concept of dialogue inpainting is to reconstruct missing parts of a dialogue [13]; e.g., given a conversation containing agent's responses, the inpainting method generates the corresponding user's questions. Dai et al. [13] train a dialogue inpainting model by fine tuning an LLM on dialogues with randomly masked utterances. The inpainter then learns to predict the missing utterances of a dialogue. Assuming that sentences of a document represent agent responses in an imaginary conversation, the trained inpainter model then generates user questions for all system responses and transforms a document to an information seeking conversation. The concept of inpainting can be also seen in SynDG [6], where a fine-tuned sequence-to-sequence converts knowledge pieces (e.g., Wikipedia passages or sentences from a user's profile) into consistent turns of a conversation. Additionally, MusicSyn [51] and TtWMusic [50] apply this technique to generate conversations for a music recommendation system. The system's responses consist of a list of playlists, and the inpainting model is tasked with generating the user's questions to complement these responses.

5.2.3 LLM guided/simulated. The third category of CIS utterance generation methods employs LLMs to steer the conversation generation process either by guiding humans or by directly simulating user/agent roles to generate utterances.

In the first approach, the LLM generates guidance, and humans create conversation utterances based on this guidance. LAPS [40] utilizes this approach to generate large scale human-written conversational data for preference elicitation and personalized recommendation. It generates multi-session conversations using an LLM to dynamically provide personal guidance for crowd workers who play both roles of user and agent. The personal guidance is generated dynamically per turn based on the conversation history and elicited preferences of the crowd worker in previous conversation sessions. It enables crowd workers to overcome the high cognitive load of generating conversational utterances in complex and lengthy conversations and craft their own utterances through dialogue self-play. LAPS consists of four key components: dialogue act classification, guidance generation, utterance composition, and preference extraction. For dialogue act classification, LAPS utilizes an LLM to identify the next act that should be taken in the dialogue. The primary dialogue acts in this framework are: (1) greeting, (2) preference elicitation, (3) recommendation, (4) follow-up questions, and (5) goodbye. In the guidance generation component, it uses GPT-3.5-turbo to create personalized guidance, with the template for guidance prompts incorporating dialogue history, preference memory, and the identified dialogue act. The utterance composition is handled by a human agent who crafts the conversation utterances for both the user and the assistant, using dialogue self-play. After the completion of a dialogue session, the preference extraction process extracts user preferences from the dialogue and verify them by the same human agent who managed the conversation.

In the second approach, multiple LLMs serve as both participants of the conversation, with no human involvement. TopDial [102] proposes generating conversations for a target-guided recommendation system. It employs three LLMs: one representing the user, another for the system, and a third to manage and supervise the dialogue. The user's conversation seed includes their profile and personality, while the system's seed comprises domain knowledge, dialogue acts, and the final target. For these roles, three instances of ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo version) are utilized. SimQuAC [1] developed to emulate the crowdsourcing methodology originally used for creating the QuAC dataset [12], replacing human participants with LLMs. It employs zero-shot learning LLMs to simulate teacher-student interactions. The dialogue revolves around a wikipedia topic; the student only has access to the topic and background information and

asks questions pertinent to it. The teacher, with full access to the article text, responds by selecting relevant text spans from the article to answer the student’s questions, focusing on providing information directly from the source rather than generating responses from memory.

In the final approach, a single LLM is responsible for generating all utterances in a conversation. For example, SOLID [5] uses one LLM to create a dataset for intent-aware information seeking dialogues. The conversation seed for this project includes topic information and an intent sequence. SOLID defines an instruction for each intent. To generate each turn, an instruction is automatically created based on dialogue history, current intent, and the background information, prompting the LLM to produce an utterance. While turn-by-turn generation is commonly used for creating CIS datasets, an extension of SOLID, named SOLID-RL, employs a one-go generation method. SOLID-RL, a variant of the original method, underscores the benefits of one-go generation, such as improved naturalness and consistency in the conversation, as well as faster generation speeds. Furthermore, SOLID-RL introduces a reinforcement learning (RL)-guided approach to train LLMs in a zero-shot manner, enabling the generation of conversation data in a single step.

5.3 Quality Filtering

The primary goal of the filtering component is to remove conversations that lack key CIS features, particularly correctness and consistency, whether at the turn level or throughout the entire conversation. This step improves the quality of synthetic data and prevents the introduction of noise into downstream tasks. We categorize the filtering methods into two groups.

5.3.1 Noise & Lexical Filtering. The first type primarily focuses on ensuring correctness and maintaining diversity. This filtering is typically applied using heuristic methods to check correctness [5, 40, 102]. For instance, TopDial [102] implements fact-checking and makes corrections based on domain-specific knowledge.

5.3.2 Factuality Check. In this type of filtering, the consistency of the generated utterances is evaluated. Document-driven methods predominantly include a factuality checking step to assess the performance of the utterance generator components. A notable technique is roundtrip consistency, initially introduced for QA generation [4] and later adapted for conversation data generation [44, 108]. This method uses a model to verify whether the answer span remains consistent with the original span that prompted the question.

DG2 [108] incorporates passage selector and span extractor components in the utterance generation part. To implement filtering, DG2 develops additional passage selector and rationale extractor models. It then compares the turns generated by the two models and eliminates inconsistent samples. SimSeek [44] also employs additional answer extractor and question generator models but relaxes the filtering criteria from an exact match to word-level similarity (i.e., F1 score) to better accommodate the typically longer answers found in conversational QA as opposed to those in single-turn QA. CQAG-AR [37] focuses on the consistency between an answer and a question after the generation of each turn to avoid propagation errors in subsequent turns of a conversation. It introduces *answer revision* module, which immediately revises the extracted answer after a question is generated. Similarly, MultiCQAG [36] proposes a *Hierarchical Answerability Classification* module to address the error propagation issue by determining whether a question can be answered based on the given passage. If a question is deemed unanswerable, the module substitutes the answer with "unknown" to prevent erroneous continuations of conversation.

SimQuAC [1] incorporates *Question Validation* and *Answer Validation & Regeneration* components to enhance the conversation’s quality, generated by two LLMs. The question validation step ensures the structural integrity of the questions generated by the LLM, focusing on their syntactical correctness and coherence. The answer validation &

regeneration component reinforces the criteria for answer generation, prompting the teacher to produce responses that are consistent with the discussed topic.

SynDG [6] implements a *two-stage filtering* process, which includes flow-level and conversation-level checks. At the conversation level, another T5 model [83] is fine-tuned for a task that involves predicting masked utterances, similar to roundtrip consistency. Additionally, another model is fine-tuned to verify the consistency of the dialogue flow before generating the conversation turns.

6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

In this survey paper, we extensively review the body of work on creating conversational data. Given the vast array of research related to data generation for dialogue systems, we narrow our focus to methods that generate complete multi-turn dialogues. We adopt the taxonomy of dialogue systems from previous surveys [72, 116, 119], organizing our discussion around Task-oriented (ToD), Open Domain (ODD), and Conversational Information Seeking (CIS) dialogue systems.

Within the domain of TOD, the advancement and effectiveness of conversational systems, for example in performing specific tasks like booking a flight or making a reservation, heavily rely on the generation of robust and factually accurate dialogues. To address these constraints, research has focused on developing sophisticated data generation and augmentation methodologies that leverage structures such as entities, entity attributes, dialog acts, and intents within complex graphical representations, such as Ontologies, Schemas, and Knowledge Graphs, ensuring the generation of diverse, plausible, and relevant dialogues.

In ODD, general-purpose chatbots such as ChatGPT and GPT-4 have exhibited high quality and performance primarily in general tasks and concepts, rather than in specialized domains [14, 66]. Moreover, access to these models is usually restricted via APIs. To overcome these limitations and improve the performance of LLMs in specific domains and languages, such as emotional support [125], Spanish intent detection [9], and multi-skill conversations [46], data augmentation followed by fine-tuning has been suggested as an effective approach [76, 96]. Additionally, some crowdsourced datasets may contain outdated concepts and lack newer ones. Synthetic data generation has been proposed to update the knowledge stored in LLMs and mitigate these issues [49].

CIS systems represent a promising type of dialogue systems that encompasses a wide range of tasks, challenges, and applications. The significant number of studies proposing methods for generating conversational data suggests that CIS systems have attracted considerable interest. Various approaches to creating dialogue data have been explored, including document-driven and sequence-grounded methodologies for tasks such as intent prediction, negotiation systems, and recommendation systems. Overall, researchers aim to manage the conversation generation process to better respond to users' needs. They achieve this by defining control variables such as the initial topic utterance and the dialogue flow [1, 5, 40].

A crucial aspect of the conversation generation process is the control over the output data, which pertains to the extent to which the generation can be monitored and how many variables can be actively managed. Current research shows that the primary variables controlled are typically the topic and the dialogue flow. Despite the large volume of synthetic data produced, its quality often remains inadequate when evaluated through downstream tasks. This highlights the need to improve the quality of generated data so that even smaller datasets can yield results comparable to or better than those from human-generated data. Enhanced controllability could also increase data diversity, fairness, and safety [73], reduce bias [27], and create datasets that pose more significant challenges for dialogue systems [89].

This capability is particularly valuable in developing proactive systems that involve clarification questions, dialogues with shifting targets, mixed-initiative interactions, and reasoning over complex questions centered around entities and knowledge graphs [41–43]. Therefore, future research should enhance existing challenges of conversational AI such as knowledge groundedness, personalization, safety and bias, and focus on refining the quality and control of the generation process to ensure that the resulting datasets align more closely with the desired characteristics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zahra Abbasianteab, Yifei Yuan, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Mohammad Aliannejadi. 2024. Let the llms talk: Simulating human-to-human conversational qa via zero-shot llm-to-llm interactions. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 8–17.
- [2] Vaibhav Adlakha, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Kaheer Suleman, Harm de Vries, and Siva Reddy. 2022. TopiOCQA: Open-domain Conversational Question Answering with Topic Switching. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), 468–483. https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00471
- [3] Zishan Ahmad, Suman Saurabh, Vaishakh Menon, Asif Ekbal, Roshni Ramnani, and Anutosh Maitra. 2023. INA: An Integrative Approach for Enhancing Negotiation Strategies with Reward-Based Dialogue Agent. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 2536–2549. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.166>
- [4] Chris Alberti, Daniel Andor, Emily Pitler, Jacob Devlin, and Michael Collins. 2019. Synthetic QA Corpora Generation with Roundtrip Consistency. In *ACL*. 6168–6173.
- [5] Arian Askari, Roxana Petcu, Chuan Meng, Mohammad Aliannejadi, Amin Abolghasemi, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Suzan Verberne. 2024. Self-seeding and Multi-intent Self-instructing LLMs for Generating Intent-aware Information-Seeking dialogs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11633* (2024).
- [6] Jianzhu Bao, Rui Wang, Yasheng Wang, Aixin Sun, Yitong Li, Fei Mi, and Ruifeng Xu. 2023. A Synthetic Data Generation Framework for Grounded Dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 10866–10882. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.608>
- [7] Pawel Budzianowski, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Iñigo Casanueva, Stefan Ultes, Osman Ramadan, and Milica Gasic. 2018. MultiWOZ - A Large-Scale Multi-Domain Wizard-of-Oz Dataset for Task-Oriented Dialogue Modelling. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun'ichi Tsujii (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 5016–5026. <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1547/>
- [8] Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Megan Leszczynski, Shu Zhang, Ravi Ganti, Krisztian Balog, and Filip Radlinski. 2023. Beyond Single Items: Exploring User Preferences in Item Sets with the Conversational Playlist Curation Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2023, Taipei, Taiwan, July 23-27, 2023*. ACM, 2754–2764. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3539618.3591881>
- [9] Maximilian Chen, Alexandros Papangelis, Chenyang Tao, Seokhwan Kim, Andy Rosenbaum, Yang Liu, Zhou Yu, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2023. PLACES: Prompting Language Models for Social Conversation Synthesis. In *EACL*. 814–838.
- [10] Maximilian Chen, Alexandros Papangelis, Chenyang Tao, Andy Rosenbaum, Seokhwan Kim, Yang Liu, Zhou Yu, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2022. Weakly Supervised Data Augmentation Through Prompting for Dialogue Understanding. *arXiv:2210.14169* [cs.CL]
- [11] Maximilian Chen, Xiao Yu, Weiyan Shi, Urvi Awasthi, and Zhou Yu. 2023. Controllable Mixed-Initiative Dialogue Generation through Prompting. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 951–966. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-short.82>
- [12] Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wen-tau Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. QuAC: Question Answering in Context. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun'ichi Tsujii (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 2174–2184. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D18-1241>
- [13] Zhuyun Dai, Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Vincent Y. Zhao, Aida Amini, Qazi Mamunur Rashid, Mike Green, and Kelvin Guu. 2022. Dialog Inpainting: Turning Documents into Dialogs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato (Eds.). PMLR, 4558–4586. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/dai22a.html>
- [14] Maria Angels de Luis Balaguer, Vinamra Benara, Renato Luiz de Freitas Cunha, Roberto de M. Estevão Filho, Todd Hendry, Daniel Holstein, Jennifer Marsman, Nick Mecklenburg, Sara Malvar, Leonardo O. Nunes, Rafael Padilha, Morris Sharp, Bruno Silva, Swati Sharma, Vijay Aski, and Ranveer Chandra. 2024. RAG vs Fine-tuning: Pipelines, Tradeoffs, and a Case Study on Agriculture. *CoRR abs/2401.08406* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.08406> arXiv:2401.08406
- [15] Yang Deng, Wenqiang Lei, Minlie Huang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2023. Goal Awareness for Conversational AI: Proactivity, Non-collaborativity, and Beyond. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 6: Tutorial Abstracts)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-tutorials.1>

- [16] Yang Deng, Wenqiang Lei, Lizi Liao, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2023. Prompting and Evaluating Large Language Models for Proactive Dialogues: Clarification, Target-guided, and Non-collaboration. *CoRR* abs/2305.13626 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.13626> arXiv:2305.13626
- [17] Jan Deriu, Álvaro Rodrigo, Arantxa Otegi, Guillermo Echegoyen, Sophie Rosset, Eneko Agirre, and Mark Cieliebak. 2021. Survey on evaluation methods for dialogue systems. *Artif. Intell. Rev.* 54, 1 (2021), 755–810. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10462-020-09866-X>
- [18] Emily Dinan, Varvara Logacheva, Valentin Malykh, Alexander H. Miller, Kurt Shuster, Jack Urbanek, Douwe Kiela, Arthur Szlam, Iulian Serban, Ryan Lowe, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Alan W. Black, Alexander I. Rudnicky, Jason D. Williams, Joelle Pineau, Mikhail S. Burtsev, and Jason Weston. 2019. The Second Conversational Intelligence Challenge (ConvAI2). *CoRR* abs/1902.00098 (2019). arXiv:1902.00098 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.00098>
- [19] Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. Wizard of Wikipedia: Knowledge-Powered Conversational Agents. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1l73iRqKm>
- [20] Ning Ding, Yulin Chen, Bokai Xu, Yujia Qin, Shengding Hu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Bowen Zhou. 2023. Enhancing Chat Language Models by Scaling High-quality Instructional Conversations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3029–3051. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.183>
- [21] Xuan Long Do, Bowei Zou, Liangming Pan, Nancy F. Chen, Shafiq Joty, and Ai Ti Aw. 2022. CoHS-CQG: Context and History Selection for Conversational Question Generation. In *COLING*. 580–591.
- [22] Ryan Fellows, Hisham Ihsaish, Steve Battle, Ciaran Haines, Peter Mayhew, and Juan Ignacio Deza. 2021. Task-oriented Dialogue Systems: performance vs. quality-optima, a review. *CoRR* abs/2112.11176 (2021). arXiv:2112.11176 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.11176>
- [23] Song Feng, Kshitij P. Fadnis, Q. Vera Liao, and Luis A. Lastras. 2020. Doc2Dial: A Framework for Dialogue Composition Grounded in Documents. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*. AAAI Press, 13604–13605. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i09.7089>
- [24] Song Feng, Siva Sankalp Patel, Hui Wan, and Sachindra Joshi. 2021. MultiDoc2Dial: Modeling Dialogues Grounded in Multiple Documents. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 6162–6176. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.498>
- [25] Yifan Gao, Piji Li, Irwin King, and Michael R. Lyu. 2019. Interconnected Question Generation with Coreference Alignment and Conversation Flow Modeling. In *ACL*. 4853–4862.
- [26] Kallirroi Georgila, James Henderson, and Oliver Lemon. 2006. User simulation for spoken dialogue systems: learning and evaluation. In *INTERSPEECH 2006 - ICSLP, Ninth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, September 17-21, 2006*. ISCA. <https://doi.org/10.21437/INTERSPEECH.2006-160>
- [27] Emma J Gerritse, Faegheh Hasibi, and Arjen P de Vries. 2020. Bias in Conversational Search: The Double-Edged Sword of the Personalized Knowledge Graph. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGIR on International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval (ICTIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 133–136. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409256.3409834>
- [28] Lewis R Goldberg. 1993. The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American psychologist* 48, 1 (1993), 26.
- [29] Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Behnam Hedayatnia, Qinlang Chen, Anna Gottardi, Sanjeev Kwatra, Anu Venkatesh, Raefer Gabriel, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. 2019. Topical-Chat: Towards Knowledge-Grounded Open-Domain Conversations. In *Interspeech 2019, 20th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Graz, Austria, 15-19 September 2019*, Gernot Kubin and Zdravko Kacic (Eds.). ISCA, 1891–1895. <https://doi.org/10.21437/INTERSPEECH.2019-3079>
- [30] Jing Gu, Mostafa Mirshekari, Zhou Yu, and Aaron Sisto. 2021. ChainCQG: Flow-Aware Conversational Question Generation. In *EACL*. 2061–2070.
- [31] Aman Gupta, Anup Shirgaonkar, Angels de Luis Balaguer, Bruno Silva, Daniel Holstein, Dawei Li, Jennifer Marsman, Leonardo O Nunes, Mahsa Rouzbahman, Morris Sharp, et al. 2024. RAG vs Fine-tuning: Pipelines, Tradeoffs, and a Case Study on Agriculture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08406* (2024).
- [32] Izzeddin Gur, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Gökhan Tür, and Pararth Shah. 2018. User Modeling for Task Oriented Dialogues. In *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop, SLT 2018, Athens, Greece, December 18-21, 2018*. IEEE, 900–906. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SLT.2018.8639652>
- [33] He He, Derek Chen, Anusha Balakrishnan, and Percy Liang. 2018. Decoupling Strategy and Generation in Negotiation Dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun'ichi Tsujii (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 2333–2343. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/D18-1256>
- [34] Matthew Henderson, Blaise Thomson, and Jason D. Williams. 2014. The Second Dialog State Tracking Challenge. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue (SIGDIAL)*, Kallirroi Georgila, Matthew Stone, Helen Hastie, and Ani Nenkova (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Philadelphia, PA, U.S.A., 263–272. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/W14-4337>
- [35] Seonjeong Hwang, Yunsu Kim, and Gary Geunbae Lee. 2022. Multi-Type Conversational Question-Answer Generation with Closed-ended and Unanswerable Questions. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2022 - Volume 2: Short Papers, Online only, November 20-23, 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 169–177. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-short.22>

- [36] Seonjeong Hwang, Yunsu Kim, and Gary Geunbae Lee. 2022. Multi-Type Conversational Question-Answer Generation with Closed-ended and Unanswerable Questions. In *AAACL*. 169–177.
- [37] Seonjeong Hwang and Gary Geunbae Lee. 2022. Conversational QA Dataset Generation with Answer Revision. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2022, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 12-17, 2022*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, 1636–1644. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.140>
- [38] Max Jaderberg, Volodymyr Mnih, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, Tom Schaul, Joel Z. Leibo, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2017. Reinforcement Learning with Unsupervised Auxiliary Tasks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SJ6yPD5xg>
- [39] Pegah Jandaghi, XiangHai Sheng, Xinyi Bai, Jay Pujara, and Hakim Sidahmed. 2023. Faithful Persona-based Conversational Dataset Generation with Large Language Models. *CoRR* abs/2312.10007 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2312.10007> arXiv:2312.10007
- [40] Hideaki Joko, Shubham Chatterjee, Andrew Ramsay, Arjen P. de Vries, Jeff Dalton, Faegheh Hasibi, Krisztian Balog, and Arjen P. de Vries. 2024. Doing Personal LAPS: LLM-Augmented Dialogue Construction for Personalized Multi-Session Conversational Search. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*.
- [41] Hideaki Joko and Faegheh Hasibi. 2022. Personal Entity, Concept, and Named Entity Linking in Conversations. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM '22)*. 4099–4103. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3511808.3557667>
- [42] Hideaki Joko, Faegheh Hasibi, Krisztian Balog, and Arjen P de Vries. 2021. Conversational Entity Linking: Problem Definition and Datasets. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '21)*. 2390–2397. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3463258>
- [43] Magdalena Kaiser, Rishiraj Saha Roy, and Gerhard Weikum. 2021. Reinforcement Learning from Reformulations in Conversational Question Answering over Knowledge Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '21)*. 459–469. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462859>
- [44] Gangwoo Kim, Sungdong Kim, Kang Min Yoo, and Jaewoo Kang. 2022. Generating Information-Seeking Conversations from Unlabeled Documents. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 2362–2378. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2022.EMNLP-MAIN.151>
- [45] Hyunwoo Kim, Jack Hessel, Liwei Jiang, Peter West, Ximing Lu, Youngjae Yu, Pei Zhou, Ronan Le Bras, Malihe Alikhani, Gunhee Kim, Maarten Sap, and Yejin Choi. 2023. SODA: Million-scale Dialogue Distillation with Social Commonsense Contextualization. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 12930–12949. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.799>
- [46] Minju Kim, Chaehyeong Kim, Yong Ho Song, Seung-won Hwang, and Jinyoung Yeo. 2022. BotsTalk: Machine-sourced Framework for Automatic Curation of Large-scale Multi-skill Dialogue Datasets. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 5149–5170. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.344>
- [47] Sungdong Kim, Minsuk Chang, and Sang-Woo Lee. 2021. NeuralWOZ: Learning to Collect Task-Oriented Dialogue via Model-Based Simulation. In *ACL*. 3704–3717.
- [48] Florian Kreyszig, Inigo Casanueva, Pawel Budzianowski, and Milica Gašić. 2018. Neural User Simulation for Corpus-based Policy Optimisation of Spoken Dialogue Systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, Kazunori Komatani, Diane Litman, Kai Yu, Alex Papangelis, Lawrence Cavedon, and Mikio Nakano (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 60–69. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W18-5007>
- [49] Young-Jun Lee, Chae-Gyun Lim, Yunsu Choi, Ji-Hui Lm, and Ho-Jin Choi. 2022. PERSONACHATGEN: Generating Personalized Dialogues using GPT-3. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Customized Chat Grounding Persona and Knowledge*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, 29–48. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.ccgpk-1.4>
- [50] Megan Leszczynski, Shu Zhang, Ravi Ganti, Krisztian Balog, Filip Radlinski, Fernando Pereira, and Arun Tejasvi Chaganty. 2023. Talk the Walk: Synthetic Data Generation for Conversational Music Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11489* (2023).
- [51] Megan Eileen Leszczynski, Ravi Ganti, Shu Zhang, Krisztian Balog, Filip Radlinski, Fernando Pereira, and Arun Tejasvi Chaganty. 2022. Conversational Music Retrieval with Synthetic Data. In *Second Workshop on Interactive Learning for Natural Language Processing at NeurIPS*, Vol. 2022.
- [52] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (Eds.). 7871–7880. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.703>
- [53] Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. 2016. A Diversity-Promoting Objective Function for Neural Conversation Models. In *NAACL HLT 2016, The 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, San Diego California, USA, June 12-17, 2016*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/N16-1014>
- [54] Siheng Li, Yichun Yin, Cheng Yang, Wangjie Jiang, Yiwei Li, Zesen Cheng, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Yujiu Yang. 2023. NewsDialogues: Towards Proactive News Grounded Conversation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 3634–3649. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/>

[2023.findings-acl.224](#)

- [55] Xiujun Li, Zachary C. Lipton, Bhuwan Dhingra, Lihong Li, Jianfeng Gao, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2016. A User Simulator for Task-Completion Dialogues. *CoRR* abs/1612.05688 (2016). arXiv:1612.05688 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.05688>
- [56] Yanran Li, Hui Su, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Shuzi Niu. 2017. DailyDialog: A Manually Labelled Multi-turn Dialogue Dataset. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Greg Kondrak and Taro Watanabe (Eds.). Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Taipei, Taiwan, 986–995. <https://aclanthology.org/I17-1099>
- [57] Yiming Li and Zhao Zhang. 2024. The First Place Solution of WSDM Cup 2024: Leveraging Large Language Models for Conversational Multi-Doc QA. *CoRR* abs/2402.18385 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.18385> arXiv:2402.18385
- [58] Zekun Li, Wenhu Chen, Shiyang Li, Hong Wang, Jing Qian, and Xifeng Yan. 2022. Controllable Dialogue Simulation with In-context Learning. In *EMNLP*. 4330–4347.
- [59] Hsien-chin Lin, Nurul Lubis, Songbo Hu, Carel van Niekerk, Christian Geisbauer, Michael Heck, Shutong Feng, and Milica Gasic. 2021. Domain-independent User Simulation with Transformers for Task-oriented Dialogue Systems. In *SIGDIAL*. 445–456.
- [60] Yen Ting Lin, Alexandros Papangelis, Seokhwan Kim, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2022. Knowledge-Grounded Conversational Data Augmentation with Generative Conversational Networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue, SIGDIAL 2022, Edinburgh, UK, 07-09 September 2022*, Oliver Lemon, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Junyi Jessy Li, Arash Ashrafzadeh, Daniel Hernández García, Malihe Alikhani, David Vandyke, and Ondrej Dusek (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 26–38. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.sigdial-1.3>
- [61] Anqi Liu, Bo Wang, Yue Tan, Dongming Zhao, Kun Huang, Ruifang He, and Yuexian Hou. 2023. MTGP: Multi-turn Target-oriented Dialogue Guided by Generative Global Path with Flexible Turns. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 259–271. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-ACL.18>
- [62] Siyang Liu, Chujie Zheng, Orianna Demasi, Sahand Sabour, Yu Li, Zhou Yu, Yong Jiang, and Minlie Huang. 2021. Towards Emotional Support Dialog Systems. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3469–3483. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2021.ACL-LONG.269>
- [63] Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. G-Eval: NLG Evaluation using Gpt-4 with Better Human Alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2511–2522. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2023.EMNLP-MAIN.153>
- [64] Zeming Liu, Haifeng Wang, Zheng-Yu Niu, Hua Wu, and Wanxiang Che. 2021. DuRecDial 2.0: A Bilingual Parallel Corpus for Conversational Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 4335–4347. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.356>
- [65] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. 2023. Self-Refine: Iterative Refinement with Self-Feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*. http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/91edff07232fb1b55a505a9e9f6c0ff3-Abstract-Conference.html
- [66] Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When Not to Trust Language Models: Investigating Effectiveness of Parametric and Non-Parametric Memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 9802–9822. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.546>
- [67] Shikib Mehri and Maxine Eskénazi. 2020. USR: An Unsupervised and Reference Free Evaluation Metric for Dialog Generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel R. Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 681–707. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2020.ACL-MAIN.64>
- [68] Helen M. Meng, Carmen Wai, and Roberto Pieraccini. 2003. The use of belief networks for mixed-initiative dialog modeling. *IEEE Trans. Speech Audio Process.* 11, 6 (2003), 757–773. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSA.2003.814380>
- [69] Biswesh Mohapatra, Gaurav Pandey, Danish Contractor, and Sachindra Joshi. 2021. Simulated Chats for Building Dialog Systems: Learning to Generate Conversations from Instructions. In *EMNLP*. 1190–1203.
- [70] Srinu Narayanan and Sheila A. McIlraith. 2002. Simulation, verification and automated composition of web services. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2002, May 7-11, 2002, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, David Lassner, David De Roure, and Arun Iyengar (Eds.). ACM, 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1145/511446.511457>
- [71] Jinjie Ni, Tom Young, Vlad Pandealea, Fuzhao Xue, and Erik Cambria. 2023. Recent advances in deep learning based dialogue systems: a systematic survey. *Artif. Intell. Rev.* 56, 4 (2023), 3055–3155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-022-10248-8>
- [72] Jinjie Ni, Tom Young, Vlad Pandealea, Fuzhao Xue, and Erik Cambria. 2023. Recent advances in deep learning based dialogue systems: a systematic survey. *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, 3055–3155.
- [73] Alexandra Olteanu, Jean Garcia-Gathright, Maarten de Rijke, Michael D. Ekstrand, Adam Roegiest, Aldo Lipani, Alex Beutel, Alexandra Olteanu, Ana Lucic, Ana-Andreea Stoica, Anubrata Das, Asia Biega, Bart Voorn, Claudia Hauff, Damiano Spina, David Lewis, Douglas W. Oard, Emine

- Yilmaz, Faegheh Hasibi, Gabriella Kazai, Graham McDonald, Hinda Haned, Iadh Ounis, Ilse van der Linden, Jean Garcia-Gathright, Joris Baan, Kamuela N. Lau, Krisztian Balog, Maarten de Rijke, Mahmoud Sayed, Maria Panteli, Mark Sanderson, Matthew Lease, Michael D. Ekstrand, Preethi Lahoti, and Toshihiro Kamishima. 2021. FACTS-IR: fairness, accountability, confidentiality, transparency, and safety in information retrieval. *SIGIR Forum* 53, 2 (mar 2021), 20–43. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458553.3458556>
- [74] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, Sammi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.). http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/b1efde53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html
- [75] Oded Ovadia, Menachem Brief, Moshik Mishaeli, and Oren Elisha. 2023. Fine-tuning or retrieval? comparing knowledge injection in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05934* (2023).
- [76] Oded Ovadia, Menachem Brief, Moshik Mishaeli, and Oren Elisha. 2023. Fine-Tuning or Retrieval? Comparing Knowledge Injection in LLMs. *CoRR* abs/2312.05934 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2312.05934> arXiv:2312.05934
- [77] Boyuan Pan, Hao Li, Ziyu Yao, Deng Cai, and Huan Sun. 2019. Reinforced Dynamic Reasoning for Conversational Question Generation. In *ACL*.
- [78] Yookoon Park, Jaemin Cho, and Gunhee Kim. 2018. A Hierarchical Latent Structure for Variational Conversation Modeling. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, Marilyn A. Walker, Heng Ji, and Amanda Stent (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 1792–1801. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/N18-1162>
- [79] Gustavo Penha, Alexandru Balan, and Claudia Hauff. 2019. Introducing MANTIS: a novel Multi-Domain Information Seeking Dialogues Dataset. *CoRR* abs/1912.04639 (2019). arXiv:1912.04639 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.04639>
- [80] Peng Qi, Nina Du, Christopher Manning, and Jing Huang. 2023. PragmaticCQA: A Dataset for Pragmatic Question Answering in Conversations. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 6175–6191. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.385>
- [81] C. Qu, L. Yang, W. B. Croft, J. Trippas, Y. Zhang, and M. Qiu. 2018. Analyzing and Characterizing User Intent in Information-seeking Conversations. In *SIGIR '18*.
- [82] Chen Qu, Liu Yang, W. Bruce Croft, Johanne R. Trippas, Yongfeng Zhang, and Minghui Qiu. 2018. Analyzing and Characterizing User Intent in Information-seeking Conversations. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2018, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, July 08-12, 2018*, Kevyn Collins-Thompson, Qiaozhu Mei, Brian D. Davison, Yiqun Liu, and Emine Yilmaz (Eds.). ACM, 989–992. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209978.3210124>
- [83] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 140:1–140:67. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>
- [84] Hannah Rashkin, Eric Michael Smith, Margaret Li, and Y-Lan Boureau. 2019. Towards Empathetic Open-domain Conversation Models: A New Benchmark and Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy, 5370–5381. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1534>
- [85] Abhinav Rastogi, Xiaoxue Zang, Srinivas Sunkara, Raghav Gupta, and Pranav Khaitan. 2020. Towards Scalable Multi-Domain Conversational Agents: The Schema-Guided Dialogue Dataset. In *AAAI* 8689–8696.
- [86] Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. CoQA: A Conversational Question Answering Challenge. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics* 7 (2019), 249–266. https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00266
- [87] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3980–3990. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1410>
- [88] Federico Ruggeri, Mohsen Mesgar, and Iryna Gurevych. 2023. A Dataset of Argumentative Dialogues on Scientific Papers. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 7684–7699. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.425>
- [89] Chris Samarinas, Pracha Promthaw, Atharva Nijasure, Hansi Zeng, Julian Killingback, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Simulating Task-Oriented Dialogues with State Transition Graphs and Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14772* (2024).
- [90] Jost Schatzmann, Blaise Thomson, and Steve J. Young. 2007. Statistical User Simulation with a Hidden Agenda. In *Proceedings of the 8th SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue, SIGdial 2007, Antwerp, Belgium, September 1-2, 2007*, Harry Bunt, Simon Keizer, and Tim Paek (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 273–282. <https://aclanthology.org/2007.sigdial-1.48/>
- [91] Sebastian Schuster, Sonal Gupta, Rushin Shah, and Mike Lewis. 2019. Cross-lingual Transfer Learning for Multilingual Task Oriented Dialog. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3795–3805. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/N19-1380>

- [92] Karin Sevegnani, David M. Howcroft, Ioannis Konstas, and Verena Rieser. 2021. OTTers: One-turn Topic Transitions for Open-Domain Dialogue. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2492–2504. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.194>
- [93] Pararth Shah, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Gökhan Tür, Abhinav Rastogi, Ankur Bapna, Neha Nayak, and Larry P. Heck. 2018. Building a Conversational Agent Overnight with Dialogue Self-Play. *Arxiv*.
- [94] Eric Michael Smith, Orion Hsu, Rebecca Qian, Stephen Roller, Y-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2022. Human Evaluation of Conversations is an Open Problem: comparing the sensitivity of various methods for evaluating dialogue agents. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI, ConvAI@ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 27, 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2022.NLP4CONVAI-1.8>
- [95] Heydar Soudani, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Faegheh Hasibi. 2023. Data Augmentation for Conversational AI. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2023, Birmingham, United Kingdom, October 21-25, 2023*, Ingo Frommholz, Frank Hopfgartner, Mark Lee, Michael Oakes, Mounia Lalmas, Min Zhang, and Rodrygo L. T. Santos (Eds.). ACM, 5220–5223. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3583780.3615291>
- [96] Heydar Soudani, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Faegheh Hasibi. 2024. Fine Tuning vs. Retrieval Augmented Generation for Less Popular Knowledge. *CoRR abs/2403.01432* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2403.01432> arXiv:2403.01432
- [97] Jianheng Tang, Tiancheng Zhao, Chenyan Xiong, Xiaodan Liang, Eric Xing, and Zhiting Hu. 2019. Target-Guided Open-Domain Conversation. In *ACL*. 5624–5634.
- [98] Silvia Terragni, Modestas Filipavicius, Nghia Khau, Bruna Guedes, André Manso, and Roland Mathis. 2023. In-Context Learning User Simulators for Task-Oriented Dialog Systems. *arXiv*.
- [99] Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Yinpei Dai, Florian Kreyszig, and Bill Byrne. 2021. Transferable Dialogue Systems and User Simulators. In *ACL, IJCNLP*. 152–166.
- [100] Dazhen Wan, Zheng Zhang, Qi Zhu, Lizi Liao, and Minlie Huang. 2022. A Unified Dialogue User Simulator for Few-shot Data Augmentation. In *EMNLP*. 3788–3799.
- [101] Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. 2021. GPT-J-6B: A 6 Billion Parameter Autoregressive Language Model. <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>.
- [102] Jian Wang, Yi Cheng, Dongding Lin, Chak Tou Leong, and Wenjie Li. 2023. Target-oriented Proactive Dialogue Systems with Personalization: Problem Formulation and Dataset Curation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 1132–1143. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.72>
- [103] Weiyang Wang, Yuxiang Wu, Yu Zhang, Zhongqi Lu, Kaixiang Mo, and Qiang Yang. 2017. Integrating User and Agent Models: A Deep Task-Oriented Dialogue System. *CoRR abs/1711.03697* (2017). arXiv:1711.03697 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.03697>
- [104] Joseph Weizenbaum. 1966. ELIZA—a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Commun. ACM* 9, 1 (1966), 36–45.
- [105] Tsung-Hsien Wen, David Vandyke, Nikola Mrksic, Milica Gasic, Lina Maria Rojas-Barahona, Pei-Hao Su, Stefan Ultes, and Steve J. Young. 2017. A Network-based End-to-End Trainable Task-oriented Dialogue System. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, EACL 2017, Valencia, Spain, April 3-7, 2017, Volume 1: Long Papers*, Mirella Lapata, Phil Blunsom, and Alexander Koller (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 438–449. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/E17-1042>
- [106] Tsung-Hsien Wen, David Vandyke, Nikola Mrksic, Milica Gasic, Lina Maria Rojas-Barahona, Pei-Hao Su, Stefan Ultes, and Steve J. Young. 2017. A Network-based End-to-End Trainable Task-oriented Dialogue System. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, EACL 2017, Valencia, Spain, April 3-7, 2017, Volume 1: Long Papers*, Mirella Lapata, Phil Blunsom, and Alexander Koller (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 438–449. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/E17-1042>
- [107] Peter West, Chandra Bhagavatula, Jack Hessel, Jena D. Hwang, Liwei Jiang, Ronan Le Bras, Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, and Yejin Choi. 2022. Symbolic Knowledge Distillation: from General Language Models to Commonsense Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Iván Vladimir Meza Ruiz (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 4602–4625. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2022.NAACL-MAIN.341>
- [108] Qingyang Wu, Song Feng, Derek Chen, Sachindra Joshi, Luis Lastras, and Zhou Yu. 2022. DG2: Data Augmentation Through Document Grounded Dialogue Generation. In *SIGDIAL*. 204–216.
- [109] Zeqiu Wu, Ryu Parish, Hao Cheng, Sewon Min, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. INSCIT: Information-Seeking Conversations with Mixed-Initiative Interactions. *CoRR abs/2207.00746* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2207.00746> arXiv:2207.00746
- [110] Canwen Xu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, and Julian McAuley. 2023. Baize: An Open-Source Chat Model with Parameter-Efficient Tuning on Self-Chat Data. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 6268–6278. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.385>
- [111] Jing Xu, Megan Ung, Mojtaba Komeili, Kushal Arora, Y-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2023. Learning New Skills after Deployment: Improving open-domain internet-driven dialogue with human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.).

- Association for Computational Linguistics, 13557–13572. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.758>
- [112] Liu Yang, Minghui Qiu, Chen Qu, Jiafeng Guo, Yongfeng Zhang, W. Bruce Croft, Jun Huang, and Haiqing Chen. 2018. Response Ranking with Deep Matching Networks and External Knowledge in Information-seeking Conversation Systems. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2018, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, July 08–12, 2018*, Kevyn Collins-Thompson, Qiaozhu Mei, Brian D. Davison, Yiqun Liu, and Emine Yilmaz (Eds.). ACM, 245–254. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209978.3210011>
- [113] Shiquan Yang, Rui Zhang, and Sarah M. Erfani. 2020. GraphDialog: Integrating Graph Knowledge into End-to-End Task-Oriented Dialogue Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16–20, 2020*, Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 1878–1888. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2020.EMNLP-MAIN.147>
- [114] Yiben Yang, Chaitanya Malaviya, Jared Fernandez, Swabha Swayamdipta, Ronan Le Bras, Ji-Ping Wang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Yejin Choi, and Doug Downey. 2020. G-DAug: Generative Data Augmentation for Commonsense Reasoning. In *EMNLP*. 1008–1025.
- [115] Zhitong Yang, Bo Wang, Jinfeng Zhou, Yue Tan, Dongming Zhao, Kun Huang, Ruifang He, and Yuxian Hou. 2022. TopKG: Target-oriented Dialog via Global Planning on Knowledge Graph. In *COLING*. 745–755.
- [116] Zihao Yi, Jiarui Ouyang, Yuwen Liu, Tianhao Liao, Zhe Xu, and Ying Shen. 2024. A Survey on Recent Advances in LLM-Based Multi-turn Dialogue Systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18013* (2024).
- [117] Kang Min Yoo, Hanbit Lee, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, Walter Chang, and Sang-goo Lee. 2020. Variational Hierarchical Dialog Autoencoder for Dialog State Tracking Data Augmentation. In *EMNLP*. 3406–3425.
- [118] Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. BARTScore: Evaluating Generated Text as Text Generation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6–14, 2021, virtual*, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan (Eds.). 27263–27277. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/e4d2b6e6fdeca3e60e0f1a62fee3d9dd-Abstract.html>
- [119] Hamed Zamani, Johanne R. Trippas, Jeff Dalton, and Filip Radlinski. 2022. Conversational Information Seeking. *Arxiv*.
- [120] Jiahao Zhang, Haiyang Zhang, Dongmei Zhang, Yong Liu, and Shen Huang. 2023. Beam Retrieval: General End-to-End Retrieval for Multi-Hop Question Answering. *CoRR abs/2308.08973* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2308.08973> arXiv:2308.08973
- [121] Saizheng Zhang, Emily Dinan, Jack Urbanek, Arthur Szlam, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2018. Personalizing Dialogue Agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too?. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 2204–2213. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-1205>
- [122] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26–30, 2020*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkeHuCVFDR>
- [123] Yizhe Zhang, Michel Galley, Jianfeng Gao, Zhe Gan, Xiujun Li, Chris Brockett, and Bill Dolan. 2018. Generating Informative and Diverse Conversational Responses via Adversarial Information Maximization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3–8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*. 1815–1825. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/23ce1851341ec1fa9e0c259de10bf87c-Abstract.html>
- [124] Tiancheng Zhao, Kaige Xie, and Maxine Eskenazi. 2019. Rethinking Action Spaces for Reinforcement Learning in End-to-end Dialog Agents with Latent Variable Models. In *NAACL-HLT*. 1208–1218.
- [125] Chujie Zheng, Sahand Sabour, Jiaxin Wen, Zheng Zhang, and Minlie Huang. 2023. AugESC: Dialogue Augmentation with Large Language Models for Emotional Support Conversation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9–14, 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 1552–1568. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-ACL.99>
- [126] Ming Zhong, Yang Liu, Da Yin, Yuning Mao, Yizhu Jiao, Pengfei Liu, Chenguang Zhu, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. 2022. Towards a Unified Multi-Dimensional Evaluator for Text Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2023–2038. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.131>
- [127] Yaoming Zhu, Sidi Lu, Lei Zheng, Jiaxian Guo, Weinan Zhang, Jun Wang, and Yong Yu. 2018. Texus: A Benchmarking Platform for Text Generation Models. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2018, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, July 08–12, 2018*. ACM, 1097–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209978.3210080>