

Sentence Level Recurrent Topic Model: Letting Topics Speak for Themselves

Fei Tian*

University of Science and Technology of China
tianfei@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Di He

Microsoft Research
dihe@microsoft.com

Bin Gao

Microsoft Research
bingao@microsoft.com

Tie-Yan Liu

Microsoft Research
tyliu@microsoft.com

Abstract

We propose Sentence Level Recurrent Topic Model (SLRTM), a new topic model that assumes the generation of each word within a sentence to depend on both the topic of the sentence and the whole history of its preceding words in the sentence. Different from conventional topic models that largely ignore the sequential order of words or their topic coherence, SLRTM gives full characterization to them by using a Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) based framework. Experimental results have shown that SLRTM outperforms several strong baselines on various tasks. Furthermore, SLRTM can automatically generate sentences given a topic (i.e., topics to sentences), which is a key technology for real world applications such as personalized short text conversation.

1 Introduction

Statistic topic models such as Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) and its variants [Landauer *et al.*, 1998; Hofmann, 1999; Blei *et al.*, 2003; McAuliffe and Blei, 2008; Hoffman *et al.*, 2010] have been proven to be effective in modeling textual documents. In these models, a word token in a document is assumed to be generated by a hidden mixture model, where the hidden variables are the topic indexes for each word and the topic assignments for words are related to document level topic weights. Due to the effectiveness and efficiency in modeling the document generation process, topic models are widely adopted in quite a lot of real world tasks such as sentiment classification [Mei *et al.*, 2007], social network analysis [Ramage *et al.*, 2010; Mei *et al.*, 2007], and recommendation systems [Godin *et al.*, 2013].

Most topic models take the *bag-of-words* assumption, in which every document is treated as an unordered set of words and the word tokens in such a document are sampled independently with each other. The *bag-of-words* assumption brings computational convenience, however, it sacrifices the characterization of sequential properties of words in a document

and the topic coherence between words belonging to the same language segment (e.g., sentence). As a result, people have observed many negative examples. Just list one for illustration [Wallach, 2006]: *the department chair couches offers* and *the chair department offers couches* have very different topics, although they have exactly the same bag of words.

There have been some works trying to solve the aforementioned problems, although still insufficiently. For example, several sentence level topic models [Gruber *et al.*, 2007; Du *et al.*, 2010; Wang *et al.*, 2011] tackle the topic coherence problem by assuming all the words in a sentence to share the same topic (i.e., every sentence has only one topic). In addition, they model the sequential information by assuming the transition between sentence topics to be Markovian. However, words within the same sentence are still exchangeable in these models, and thus the *bag-of-words* assumption still holds within a sentence. For another example, in [Yang *et al.*, 2015], the embedding based neural language model [Bengio *et al.*, 2003; Mikolov *et al.*, 2013; Le and Mikolov, 2014] and topic model are integrated. They assume the generation of a given word in a sentence to depend on its local context (including its preceding words within a fixed window) as well as the topics of the sentence and document it lies in. However, using a fixed window of preceding words, instead of the whole word stream within a sentence, could only introduce limited sequential dependency. Furthermore, there is no explicit coherence constraints on the word topics and sentence topics, since every word can have its own topics in their model.

We propose Sentence Level Recurrent Topic Model (SLRTM) to tackle the limitations of the aforementioned works. In the new model, we assume the words in the same sentence to share the same topic in order to guarantee topic coherence, and we assume the generation of a word to rely on the whole history in the same sentence in order to fully characterize the sequential dependency. Specifically, for a particular word w within a sentence s , we assume its generation depends on two factors: the first is the whole set of its historical words in the sentence and the second is the sentence topic, which we regard as a pseudo word and has its own distributed representations. We use Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) [Mikolov *et al.*, 2010], such as Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997] or Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) network [Cho *et al.*, 2014],

*This work was done when the two authors were visiting Microsoft Research Asia.

to model such a long term dependency.

With the proposed SLRTM, we can not only model the document generation process more accurately, but also construct new natural sentences that are coherent with a given topic (we call it *topic2sentence*, similar to *image2sentence* [Vinyals *et al.*, 2015]). *Topic2sentence* has its huge potential for many real world tasks. For example, it can serve as the basis of personalized short text conversation system [Shang *et al.*, 2015; Serban *et al.*, 2015], in which once we detect that the user is interested in certain topics, we can let these topics speak for themselves using SLRTM to improve the user satisfactory.

We have conducted experiments to compare SLRTM with several strong topic model baselines on two tasks: generative model evaluation (i.e. test set perplexity) and document classification. The results on several benchmark datasets quantitatively demonstrate SLRTM’s advantages in modeling documents. We further provide some qualitative results on *topic2sentence*, the generated sentences for different topics clearly demonstrate the power of SLRTM in topic-sensitive short text conversations.

2 Related Work

One of the most representative topic models is Latent Dirichlet Allocation [Blei *et al.*, 2003], in which every word in a document has its topic drawn from document level topic weights. Several variants of LDA have been developed such as hierarchical topic models [Blei *et al.*, 2004] and supervised topic models [Mcauliffe and Blei, 2008]. With the recent development of deep learning, there are also neural network based topic models such as [Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2009; Larochelle and Lauly, 2012; Cao *et al.*, 2015; Das *et al.*, 2015], which use distributed representations of words to improve topic semantics.

Most of the aforementioned works take the *bag-of-words* assumption, which might be too simple according to our discussions in the introduction. That is, it ignores both sequential dependency of words and topic coherence of words.

There are some efforts trying to address the limitations of the *bag-of-words* assumption. For example, in [Griffiths *et al.*, 2004], both semantic (i.e., related with topics) and syntactic properties of words were modeled. After that, a hidden Markov transition model for topics was proposed [Gruber *et al.*, 2007], in which all the words in a sentence were regarded as having the same topic. Such a *one sentence, one topic* assumption was also used by some other works, including [Du *et al.*, 2010; Wang *et al.*, 2011]. Although these works have made some meaningful attempts on topic coherence and sequential dependency across sentences, they have not sufficiently model the sequential dependency of words within a sentence. To address this problem, the authors of [Yang *et al.*, 2015] adopted the neural language model technology [Bengio *et al.*, 2003] to enhance topic model. In particular, they assume that every document, sentence, and word have their own topics and the topical information is conveyed by their embedding vectors through a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) as a prior. In the GMM distribution, each topic corresponds to a mixture parameterized by the mean vector and covariance matrix of the Gaussian distribution. The embed-

ding vectors sampled from the GMM are further used to generate words in a sentence according to a feedforward neural network. To be specific, the preceding words in a fixed sized window, together with the sentence and document, act as the context to generate the next word by a softmax conditional distribution, in which the context is represented by embedding vectors. While this work has explicitly modeled the sequential dependency of words, it ignores the topic coherence among adjacent words.

Another line of research related to our model is Recurrent Neural Network (RNN), especially some recently developed effective RNN models such as Long Short Term Memory [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997] and Gated Recurrent Unit [Cho *et al.*, 2014]. These new RNN models characterize long range dependencies for a sequence, and has been widely adopted in sequence modeling tasks such as machine translation [Cho *et al.*, 2014] and short text conversation [Shang *et al.*, 2015]. In particular, for language modeling tasks, it has been shown that RNN (and its variants such as LSTM) is much more effective than simple feedforward neural networks with fixed window size [Mikolov *et al.*, 2010] given that it can model dependencies with nearly arbitrary length.

3 Sentence Level Recurrent Topic Model

In this section, we describe the proposed Sentence Level Recurrent Topic Model (SLRTM). First of all, we list three important design factors in SLRTM as below.

- SLRTM takes the *one sentence, one topic* assumption as in [Gruber *et al.*, 2007; Du *et al.*, 2010; Wang *et al.*, 2011]: all words within the same sentence share the same topic. This assumption guarantees the topic coherence within a sentence, and makes *topic2sentence* possible.
- To model long range dependencies between words, SLRTM uses RNN (specifically LSTM) with word embedding vectors as input. The purpose is to leverage word embeddings to enhance the semantics of words, as indicated by the previous neural network based topic models [Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2009; Larochelle and Lauly, 2012; Cao *et al.*, 2015; Das *et al.*, 2015].
- Each topic in SLRTM has its own distributed representation, which is fine-tuned through the training process and is used to generate the whole sentence. Topic representation vector plays a similar role to the source sentence representation in LSTM based machine translation [Cho *et al.*, 2014] and the image vector output by Convolutional Neural Network in image captioning [Vinyals *et al.*, 2015].

With the three points in mind, let us introduce the detailed generative process of SLRTM, as well as the stochastic variational inference and learning algorithm for SLRTM in the following subsections.

3.1 The generative process

Suppose we have K topics, $|\mathcal{W}|$ words contained in dictionary \mathcal{W} , and M documents $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_M\}$. For any

document $d_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, it is composed of N_i sentences and its j th sentence s_{ij} consists of T_{ij} words. Similar to LDA, we assume there is a K -dimensional Dirichlet prior distribution $Dir(\alpha)$ for topic mixture weights of each document. With these notations, the generative process for document d_i can be written as below:

1. Sample the multinomial parameter θ_i from $Dir(\alpha)$;
2. For the j th sentence of document d_i $s_{ij} = (y_1, \dots, y_{T_{ij}})$, $j \in \{1, \dots, N_i\}$, where $y_t \in \mathcal{W}$ is the t th word for s_{ij} :
 - (a) Draw the topic index k_{ij} of this sentence from θ_i ;
 - (b) For $t = 1, \dots, T_{ij}$:
 - i. Compute LSTM hidden state $\mathbf{h}_t = f(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}; \mathbf{y}_{t-1}; \mathbf{k}_{ij})$;
 - ii. $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$, draw y_t from

$$P(w|y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1; k_{ij}) \propto g(\mathbf{w}'; \mathbf{h}_t; \mathbf{y}_{t-1}; \mathbf{k}_{ij}) \quad (1)$$

Here we use bold characters to denote the distributed representations for the corresponding items. For example, \mathbf{y}_t and \mathbf{k}_{ij} denote the embeddings for word y_t and topic k_{ij} , respectively. \mathbf{h}_0 is a zero vector and y_0 is a fake *starting* word. Function f is the LSTM unit to generate hidden states, for which we omit the details due to space restrictions. Function g typically takes the following form:

$$g(\mathbf{w}'; \mathbf{h}_t; \mathbf{y}_{t-1}; \mathbf{k}_{ij}) = \sigma(\mathbf{w}' \cdot (W_1 \mathbf{h}_t + W_2 \mathbf{y}_{t-1} + W_3 \mathbf{k}_{ij} + b)), \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-x))$, \mathbf{w}' denotes the *output* embedding for word w . W_1, W_2, W_3 are feedforward weight matrices and b is the bias vector.

Then the probability of observing document d_i can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} P(d_i|\alpha, \Theta) &= \int_{\theta \sim Dir(\alpha)} \prod_{j=1}^{N_i} \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{ik} P(s_{ij}|k, \Theta) d\theta \\ &= \int_{\theta \sim Dir(\alpha)} \prod_{j=1}^{N_i} \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{ik} \prod_{t=1}^{T_{ij}} P(y_t|y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1; k) d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $P(s_{ij}|k, \Theta)$ is the probability of generating sentence s_{ij} under topic k , and it is decomposed through the probability chain rule; $P(y_t|y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1; k)$ is specified in equation (1) and (2); Θ represents all the model parameters, including the distributed representations for all the words and topics, as well as the weight parameters for LSTM.

To sum up, we use Figure 1 to illustrate the generative process of SLRTM, from which we can see that in SLRTM, the historical words and topic of the sentence jointly affect the LSTM hidden state and the next word.

3.2 Stochastic Variational Inference and Learning

As the computation of the true posterior of hidden variables in equation (3) is intractable, we adopt mean field variational inference to approximate it. Particularly, we use multinomial distribution $q_{\phi_{ij}}(k_{ij})$ and Dirichlet distribution $q_{\gamma_i}(\theta_i)$ as the variational distribution for the hidden variables k_{ij} and θ_i , and we denote the variational parameters for document d_i as $\Phi_i = \{\phi_j, \gamma\}, \forall i, j$, with the subscript i omitted. Then the variational lower bound of the data likelihood [Blei *et al.*, 2003] can be written as:




Figure 1: The illustration of the SLRTM generative process.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(D; \Phi, \Theta, \alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \{E_q[\log P(s_{ij}|k_{ij}, \Theta)] + E_q[\log \frac{p(k_{ij}|\theta_i)}{q(k_{ij})}]\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^M E_q[\log p(\theta_i) - \log q(\theta_i)] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $p(\cdot)$ is the true distribution for corresponding variables.

The introduction of LSTM-RNN makes the optimization of (4) computationally expensive, since we need to update both the model parameters $\Theta = \{\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_D\}$ and variational parameters Φ after scanning the whole corpus. Considering that mini-batch (containing several sentences) inference and training are necessary to optimize the neural network, we leverage the stochastic variational inference algorithm developed in [Hoffman *et al.*, 2010; Hoffman *et al.*, 2013] to conduct inference and learning in a variational Expectation-Maximization framework.¹ The detailed algorithm is given in Algorithm 1. The execution of the whole inference and learning process includes several epochs of iteration over all documents $d_i, i = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ with Algorithm 1 (starting with $t = 0$).

In Algorithm 1, $\Psi(x)$ is the digamma function. Equation (5) guarantees the estimate of γ_k is unbiased. In equation (6), ρ_t is set as $\rho_t = (\tau_0 + t)^{-\kappa}$, where $\tau_0 \geq 0, \kappa \in (0.5, 1]$, to make sure $\gamma^{(t)}$ will converge [Hoffman *et al.*, 2010]. Due to space limit, we omit the derivation details for the updating equations in Algorithm 1, as well as the forward/backward pass details for LSTM [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997].

¹We did not use any recently developed algorithms for inference and learning under deep neural networks such as variational autoencoder [Kingma and Welling, 2013] because they are designed for continuous hidden states while our model includes discrete variables.

Algorithm 1 Stochastic Variational EM for SLRTM

Input: document d_i , variation parameters $\Phi_i^{(t)}$, and model weights $\Theta^{(t)}$.

for every sentence minibatch $S = (s_1, \dots, s_L)$ in d_i **do**
 $t = t + 1$

E-Step:

repeat

for $l \leftarrow 1, L$ **do**

$\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, i.e., every topic index:

 Obtain $\beta_{lk} = \log P(s_l|k, \Theta^{(t-1)})$ by LSTM

forward pass.

$$\phi_{lk}^{(t)} \propto \Psi(\gamma_k^{(t-1)}) + \beta_{lk}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_k = \alpha + \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M N_m}{L} \sum_l \phi_{lk}^{(t)} \quad (5)$$

$$\gamma_k^{(t)} = (1 - \rho_t) \gamma_k^{(t-1)} + (1 - \rho_t) \tilde{\gamma}_k \quad (6)$$

end for

until convergence

 Collect variational parameters $\Phi_i^{(t)} = \{\phi_{lk}^{(t)}, \gamma_k^{(t)}\}, \forall l, k$.

M-Step:

 Compute the gradient $grad^{(t)} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(S; \Phi_i^{(t)}, \Theta^{(t-1)}, \alpha)}{\partial \Theta^{(t-1)}}$ = $\sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_{lk}^{(t)} \frac{\partial \log P(s_l|k, \Theta^{(t-1)})}{\partial \Theta^{(t-1)}}$ by LSTM backward pass.

 Use $grad^{(t)}$ to obtain $\Theta^{(t)}$ by stochastic gradient descent methods such as Adagrad [Duchi *et al.*, 2011].

end for

4 Experiments

We report our experimental results in this section. Our experiments include two parts: (1) quantitative experiments, including a generative document evaluation task and a document classification task, on two datasets; (2) qualitative inspection, including the examination of the sentences generated under each topic, in order to test whether SLRTM performs well in the topic2sentence task.

4.1 Quantitative Results

We compare SLRTM with several state-of-the-art topic models on two tasks: generative document evaluation and document classification. The former task is to investigate the generation capability of the models, while the latter is to show the representation ability of the models.

We base our experiments on two benchmark datasets:

- **20Newsgroup**, which contains 18,845 emails categorized into 20 different topical groups such as *religion*, *politics*, and *sports*. The dataset is originally partitioned into 11,314 training documents and 7,531 test documents².
- **Wiki10+** [Zubiaga, 2012]³, which contains Web docu-

ments from Wikipedia, each of which is associated with several tags such as *philosophy*, *software*, and *music*. Following [Cao *et al.*, 2015], we kept the most frequent 25 tags and removed those documents without any of these tags, forming a training set and a test set with 11,164 and 6,161 documents, respectively. The social tags associated with each document are regarded as supervised labels in classification. Wiki10+ contains much more words per document (i.e., 1,704) than 20Newsgroup (i.e., 135).

We followed the practice in many previous works and removed infrequent words. After that, the dictionary contains about 32k unique words for 20Newsgroup and 41k for Wiki10+. We adopted the NLTK sentence tokenizer⁴ to split the datasets into sentences if sentence boundaries are needed.

The following baselines were used in our experiments:

- **LDA** [Blei *et al.*, 2003]. LDA is the classic topic model, and we used GibbsLDA++⁵ for its implementation.
- **Doc-NADE** [Larochelle and Lauly, 2012]. Doc-NADE is a representative neural network based topic model. We used the open-source code provided by the authors.
- **HTMM** [Gruber *et al.*, 2007]. HTMM models consider the sentence level Markov transitions. Similar to Doc-NADE, the implementation was provided by the authors.
- **GMNTM** [Yang *et al.*, 2015]. GMNTM considers models the order of words within a sentence by a feedforward neural network. We implemented GMNTM according to the descriptions in their papers by our own.

Experimental Setting

For SLRTM, we implemented it in C++ using Eigen⁶ and Intel MKL. For the sake of fairness, similar to [Yang *et al.*, 2015], we set the word embedding size, topic embedding size, and LSTM hidden layer size to be 128, 128, and 600 respectively. In the experiment, we tested the performances of SLRTM and the baselines with respect to different number of topics K , i.e., $K = 128, 256$. In initialization (values of $\Theta^{(0)}$ and $\Phi^{(0)}$), the LSTM weight matrices were initialized as orthogonal matrices, the word/topic embeddings were randomly sampled from the uniform distribution $(-0.015, 0.015)$ and are fine-tuned through the training process, $\gamma^{(0)}$ and α were both set to 0.5. The mini-batch size in Algorithm 1 was set as $L = 5$, and we ran the E-Step of the algorithm for only one iteration for efficiently consideration, which leads to the final convergence after about 6 epochs for both datasets. Gradient clipping with a clip value of 20 was used during the optimization of LSTM weights. Asynchronous stochastic gradient descent [Dean *et al.*, 2012] with Adagrad was used to perform multi-thread parallel training.

Generative Document Evaluation

We measure the performances of different topic models according to the perplexity per word on the test set, defined as

²<http://qwone.com/~jason/20Newsgroups/20news-bydate.tar.gz>

³<http://www.zubiaga.org/datasets/Wiki10/>

⁴<http://www.nltk.org/api/nltk.tokenize.html>

⁵<http://gibbslda.sourceforge.net/>

⁶<http://eigen.tuxfamily.org/>

Table 1: Average test perplexity per word of different models. Lower perplexity means better document modelling.

Dataset \ Model	20Newsgroup		Wiki10+	
	$K = 128$	$K = 256$	$K = 128$	$K = 256$
LDA	1068	944	989	1007
Doc-NADE	966	930	926	884
HTMM	1013	892	869	927
GMNTM	933	805	790	734
SLRTM	407	395	323	309

$perp(D) = \exp\left\{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^M \log P(d_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^M N'_i}\right\}$, where N'_i is the number of words in document d_i . The experimental results are summarized in Table 1. Based on the table, we have the following discussions:

- Our proposed SLRTM consistently outperforms the baseline models by significant margins, showing its outstanding ability in modelling the generative process of documents. In fact, as tested in our further verifications, the perplexity of SLRTM is close to that of standard LSTM language model, with a small gap of about 100 (higher perplexity) on both datasets which we conjecture is due to the margin between the lower bound in equation (4) and true data likelihood for SLRTM.
- Models that consider sequential property within sentences (i.e., GMNTM and SLRTM) are generally better than other models, which verifies the importance of words' sequential information. Furthermore, LSTM-RNN is much better in modelling such a sequential dependency than standard feed-forward networks with fixed words window as input, as verified by the lower perplexity of SLRTM compared with GMNTM.

Document Classification

In this experiment, we fed the document vectors (e.g., the γ values in SLRTM) learnt by different topic models to supervised classifiers, to compare their representation power. For 20Newsgroup, we used the multi-class logistic regression classifier and used accuracy as the evaluation criterion. For Wiki10+, since multiple labels (tags) might be associated with each document, we used logistic regression for each label and the classification result is measured by Micro- F_1 score [Lewis *et al.*, 2004]. For both datasets, we use 10% of the original training set for validation, and the remaining for training.

All the classification results are shown in Table 2. From the table, we can see that SLRTM is the best model under each setting on both datasets. We can further find that the embedding based methods (Doc-NADE, GMNTM and SLRTM) generate better document representations than other models, demonstrating the representative power of neural networks based on distributed representations. In addition, when the training data is larger (i.e., with more sentences per document as Wiki10+), GMNTM generates worse topical information than Doc-NADE while our SLRTM outperforms Doc-NADE, showing that with sufficient data, SLRTM is more effective in topic modeling since topic coherence is further constrained for each sentence.

Table 2: Classification results of different models and different topic numbers K . For 20Newsgroup, the measure is accuracy; for Wiki10+, the measure is Micro- F_1 score. Higher values mean better classification results.

Dataset \ Model	20Newsgroup		Wiki10+	
	$K = 128$	$K = 256$	$K = 128$	$K = 256$
LDA	0.657	0.632	0.351	0.336
Doc-NADE	0.670	0.646	0.462	0.471
HTMM	0.665	0.631	0.389	0.371
GMNTM	0.731	0.695	0.416	0.425
SLRTM	0.739	0.722	0.483	0.489

4.2 Qualitative Results

In this subsection, we demonstrate the capability of SLRTM in generating reasonable and understandable sentences given particular topics. In the experiment, we trained a larger SLRTM with 128 topics on a randomly sampled 100k Wikipedia documents in the year of 2010⁷ with average 275 words per document. The dictionary is composed of roughly 50k most frequent words including common punctuation marks, with uppercase letters transformed into lowercase. The size of word embedding, topic embedding and RNN hidden layer are set to 512, 1024 and 1024, respectively.

We used two different mechanisms in sentence generating. The first mechanism is random sampling new word y_t at every time step t from the probability distribution defined in equation (3). The second is dynamic programming based beam search [Vinyals *et al.*, 2015], which seeks to generate sentences by globally maximized likelihood. We set the beam size as 30. The generating process terminates until a predefined maximum sentence length is reached (set as 25) or an *EOS* token is met. Such an *EOS* is also appended after every training sentence.

The generating results are shown in Table 3. In the table, the sentences generated by random sampling and beam search are shown in the second and the third columns respectively. In the fourth column, we show the most representative words for each topics generated by SLRTM. For this purpose, we constrained the maximum sentence length to 1 in beam search, and removed stop words that are frequently used to start a sentence such as *the*, *he*, and *there*.

From the table we have the following observations:

- Most of the sentences generated by both mechanisms are natural and semantically correlated with particular topics that are summarized in the first column of the table.
- The random sampling mechanism usually produces diverse sentences, whereas some grammar errors may happen (e.g., the last sampled sentence for Topic 4; re-ranking the randomly sampled words by a standalone language model might further improve the correctness of the sentence). In contrast, sentences outputted by beam search are *safer* in matching grammar rules, but are not diverse enough. This is consistent with the observations in [Serban *et al.*, 2015].

⁷<http://www.psych.ualberta.ca/~westburylab/downloads/westburylab.wikicorp.download.html>

Table 3: Sentences and words generated under five topics. The first letters of each sentence are changed into capital form.

Topic	Sampled Sentences	Top 5 Beam Search Sentences	Words
Topic 1: Politics	The labour party was a regional political party in south africa. The general election was held in five days later. She lost 10,400 votes in the canada general election for 1974. He was named to chief chairman of serbia. He founded the new cabinet on 29 may 2009.	He was elected to the parliament. He was a member of parliament. He was elected to the democratic party. He was elected to the legislative assembly. He was a member of the council.	elections liberal parliamentary national party
Topic 2: Movie	The film was written and made for comedy directed by paul. "King of drama" was the first novel by claude wayne miller. In 1994 , she won the national stars by winning oscar. The film was written and made for comedy directed by paul. Thomas (born 5 april 1981) is an american actor.	The film is based on a 2007 movie. The film is based on a 2006 movie. The film was directed by cameron. The film is released after the 2000 film "Traffi". He is well known as well as the film.	film films director oscar movie
Topic 3: Religion	Joseph henry is the archbishop of vanuatu. Church of st. elizabeth is great. He moved to castle school, where he was curator of the church. In the early nineteenth centuries, the society became a colony of teutonic. He was the patron of saint mary.	He is a member of the church. It was founded by the church. He was a member of roman catholic church. It was founded by the diocese. He is a member of the roman catholic diocese.	bishop saint church st. roman
Topic 4: Military	Seven major paratroopers fight for this battle. Recently, joseph was transferred to the british convoy. List of foreign military journals. In 1980 he started his position at raf college. During world war ii, became a surgeon at the royal irish catholic.	The second world war. It was part of the united states. The first battle of the united states. It was part of the united states army. He was a member of the united states army.	general battle military lieutenant colonel
Topic 5: Location	It is the highest historic place in the 2012 scrapped maps. The lake on the southeast. It has been a high tower in the rim of the guerre river. Secondary temple. It is located approximately in a section of hallway.	It is one of the craters. It is part of the river. It is a part of the crater. It is located on the eastern. It is found in the river.	located lower crater river surface

- In addition to topic2sentece, SLRTM maintains the capability of generating words for topics (shown in the last column of the table), similar to conventional topic models.

Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel topic model called Sentence Level Recurrent Topic Model (SLRTM), which models the sequential dependency of words and topic coherence within a sentence using Recurrent Neural Networks, and shows superior performance in both predictive document modeling and document classification. In addition, it makes topic2sentence possible, which can benefit many real world tasks such as personalized short text conversation (STC).

In the future, we plan to integrate SLRTM into RNN-based STC systems [Shang *et al.*, 2015] to make the dialogue more topic sensitive. We would also like to conduct large scale SLRTM training on bigger corpus with more topics by specially designed scalable algorithms and computational platforms.

References

- [Bengio *et al.*, 2003] Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and Christian Janvin. A neural probabilistic language model. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:1137–1155, 2003.
- [Blei *et al.*, 2003] David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 3:993–1022, 2003.
- [Blei *et al.*, 2004] David M Blei, Thomas L Griffiths, Michael I Jordan, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese restaurant process. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2004.
- [Cao *et al.*, 2015] Ziqiang Cao, Sujian Li, Yang Liu, Wenjie Li, and Heng Ji. A novel neural topic model and its supervised extension. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [Cho *et al.*, 2014] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart V Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder–decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on EMNLP*, pages 1724–1734, October 2014.
- [Das *et al.*, 2015] Rajarshi Das, Manzil Zaheer, and Chris Dyer. Gaussian lda for topic models with word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 795–804, July 2015.
- [Dean *et al.*, 2012] Jeffrey Dean, Greg Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Mark Mao, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, Ke Yang, Quoc V Le, et al. Large scale distributed deep networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1223–1231, 2012.
- [Du *et al.*, 2010] Lan Du, Wray Buntine, and Huidong Jin. Sequential latent dirichlet allocation: Discover underlying topic structures within a document. In *Data Mining*

- (ICDM), 2010 IEEE 10th International Conference on, pages 148–157. IEEE, 2010.
- [Duchi *et al.*, 2011] John Duchi, Elad Hazan, and Yoram Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2121–2159, 2011.
- [Godin *et al.*, 2013] Frédéric Godin, Viktor Slavkovikj, Wesley De Neve, Benjamin Schrauwen, and Rik Van de Walle. Using topic models for twitter hashtag recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 593–596, 2013.
- [Griffiths *et al.*, 2004] Thomas L Griffiths, Mark Steyvers, David M Blei, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Integrating topics and syntax. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 537–544, 2004.
- [Gruber *et al.*, 2007] Amit Gruber, Yair Weiss, and Michal Rosen-Zvi. Hidden topic markov models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 163–170, 2007.
- [Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2009] Geoffrey E Hinton and Ruslan R Salakhutdinov. Replicated softmax: an undirected topic model. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1607–1614, 2009.
- [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- [Hoffman *et al.*, 2010] Matthew Hoffman, Francis R Bach, and David M Blei. Online learning for latent dirichlet allocation. In *advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 856–864, 2010.
- [Hoffman *et al.*, 2013] Matthew D Hoffman, David M Blei, Chong Wang, and John Paisley. Stochastic variational inference. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):1303–1347, 2013.
- [Hofmann, 1999] Thomas Hofmann. Probabilistic latent semantic indexing. In *Proceedings of the 22nd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 50–57. ACM, 1999.
- [Kingma and Welling, 2013] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [Landauer *et al.*, 1998] Thomas K Landauer, Peter W Foltz, and Darrell Laham. An introduction to latent semantic analysis. *Discourse processes*, 25(2-3):259–284, 1998.
- [Larochelle and Lauly, 2012] Hugo Larochelle and Stanislas Lauly. A neural autoregressive topic model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2708–2716, 2012.
- [Le and Mikolov, 2014] Quoc Le and Tomas Mikolov. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 1188–1196, 2014.
- [Lewis *et al.*, 2004] David D Lewis, Yiming Yang, Tony G Rose, and Fan Li. Rcv1: A new benchmark collection for text categorization research. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5:361–397, 2004.
- [Mcauliffe and Blei, 2008] Jon D Mcauliffe and David M Blei. Supervised topic models. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 121–128, 2008.
- [Mei *et al.*, 2007] Qiaozhu Mei, Xu Ling, Matthew Wondra, Hang Su, and ChengXiang Zhai. Topic sentiment mixture: modeling facets and opinions in weblogs. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 171–180. ACM, 2007.
- [Mikolov *et al.*, 2010] Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *11th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, 2010*, pages 1045–1048, 2010.
- [Mikolov *et al.*, 2013] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [Ramage *et al.*, 2010] Daniel Ramage, Susan Dumais, and Dan Liebling. Characterizing microblogs with topic models. In *Proc. ICWSM 2010*. American Association for Artificial Intelligence, May 2010.
- [Serban *et al.*, 2015] Iulian V Serban, Alessandro Sordoni, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Joelle Pineau. Building end-to-end dialogue systems using generative hierarchical neural network models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.04808*, 2015.
- [Shang *et al.*, 2015] Lifeng Shang, Zhengdong Lu, and Hang Li. Neural responding machine for short-text conversation. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1577–1586, July 2015.
- [Vinyals *et al.*, 2015] Oriol Vinyals, Alexander Toshev, Samy Bengio, and Dumitru Erhan. Show and tell: A neural image caption generator. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3156–3164, 2015.
- [Wallach, 2006] Hanna M Wallach. Topic modeling: beyond bag-of-words. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 977–984. ACM, 2006.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2011] Hongning Wang, Duo Zhang, and ChengXiang Zhai. Structural topic model for latent topical structure analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1526–1535, 2011.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2015] Min Yang, Tianyi Cui, and Wenting Tu. Ordering-sensitive and semantic-aware topic modeling. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [Zubiaga, 2012] Arkaitz Zubiaga. Enhancing navigation on wikipedia with social tags. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.5469*, 2012.