

(12) **United States Patent**
Baldwin et al.

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 10,297,249 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent:** **May 21, 2019**

(54) **SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR A
COOPERATIVE CONVERSATIONAL VOICE
USER INTERFACE**

(71) Applicant: **VB Assets, LLC**, Bellevue, WA (US)

(72) Inventors: **Larry Baldwin**, Maple Valley, WA
(US); **Tom Freeman**, Mercer Island,
WA (US); **Michael Tjalve**, Bellevue,
WA (US); **Blane Ebersold**, Seattle, WA
(US); **Chris Weider**, Everett, WA (US)

(73) Assignee: **VB Assets, LLC**, Bellevue, WA (US)

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this
patent is extended or adjusted under 35
U.S.C. 154(b) by 289 days.

(21) Appl. No.: **14/691,445**

(22) Filed: **Apr. 20, 2015**

(65) **Prior Publication Data**

US 2015/0228276 A1 Aug. 13, 2015

Related U.S. Application Data

(60) Continuation of application No. 13/987,645, filed on
Aug. 19, 2013, now Pat. No. 9,015,049, which is a
(Continued)

(51) **Int. Cl.**
G06F 3/16 (2006.01)
G06F 17/27 (2006.01)
(Continued)

(52) **U.S. Cl.**
CPC **G10L 15/18** (2013.01); **G06F 3/167**
(2013.01); **G06F 17/2785** (2013.01);
(Continued)

(58) **Field of Classification Search**
CPC . G10L 15/22; G10L 15/1815; G10L 15/1822;
G10L 15/183; G10L 2015/225;
(Continued)

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

4,430,669 A 2/1984 Cheung 358/122
4,821,027 A 4/1989 Mallory et al. 340/521
(Continued)

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

CN 1433554 A 7/2003
CN 1860496 A 11/2006
(Continued)

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Kirchhoff, Katrin, "Syllable-Level Desynchronisation of Phonetic
Features for Speech Recognition", Proceedings of the Fourth Inter-
national Conference on Spoken Language, 1996, ICSLP 96, vol. 4,
IEEE, 1996, 3 pages.

(Continued)


Primary Examiner — Eric Yen

(74) *Attorney, Agent, or Firm* — Sheppard Mullin Richter
& Hampton LLP

(57) **ABSTRACT**

A cooperative conversational voice user interface is pro-
vided. The cooperative conversational voice user interface
may build upon short-term and long-term shared knowledge
to generate one or more explicit and/or implicit hypotheses
about an intent of a user utterance. The hypotheses may be
ranked based on varying degrees of certainty, and an adap-
tive response may be generated for the user. Responses may
be worded based on the degrees of certainty and to frame an
appropriate domain for a subsequent utterance. In one imple-
mentation, misrecognitions may be tolerated, and conversa-
tional course may be corrected based on subsequent utter-
ances and/or responses.

28 Claims, 3 Drawing Sheets



Related U.S. Application Data					
division of application No. 13/251,712, filed on Oct. 3, 2011, now Pat. No. 8,515,765, which is a continuation of application No. 11/580,926, filed on Oct. 16, 2006, now Pat. No. 8,073,681.		5,740,256	A	4/1998	Castello Da Costa et al.
					361/94.7
		5,742,763	A	4/1998	Jones 395/200.3
		5,748,841	A *	5/1998	Morin G06F 3/16
					704/257
		5,748,974	A	5/1998	Johnson 395/759
		5,752,052	A	5/1998	Richardson et al. 395/759
		5,754,784	A	5/1998	Garland et al. 395/200.49
		5,761,631	A	6/1998	Nasukawa 704/9
		5,774,841	A	6/1998	Salazar et al. 704/225
		5,774,859	A	6/1998	Houser et al. 704/275
		5,794,050	A	8/1998	Dahlgren et al. 395/708
		5,794,196	A	8/1998	Yegnanarayanan et al.
					704/255
		5,797,112	A	8/1998	Komatsu et al. 701/201
		5,799,276	A	8/1998	Komissarchik et al. 704/251
		5,802,510	A	9/1998	Jones 707/2
		5,829,000	A	10/1998	Huang
		5,832,221	A	11/1998	Jones 375/200.36
		5,839,107	A	11/1998	Gupta et al. 704/270
		5,848,396	A	12/1998	Gerace 705/10
		5,855,000	A	12/1998	Waibel et al. 704/235
		5,860,059	A *	1/1999	Aust G06F 3/16
					704/231
		5,867,817	A	2/1999	Catallo et al. 704/255
		5,878,385	A	3/1999	Bralich et al. 704/9
		5,878,386	A	3/1999	Coughlin 704/10
		5,892,813	A	4/1999	Morin et al. 379/88.01
		5,892,900	A	4/1999	Ginter et al. 395/186
		5,895,464	A	4/1999	Bhandari et al. 707/3
		5,895,466	A	4/1999	Goldberg et al. 707/5
		5,897,613	A	4/1999	Chan 704/210
		5,899,991	A *	5/1999	Karch G06F 21/55
					707/694
		5,902,347	A	5/1999	Backman et al. 701/200
		5,911,120	A	6/1999	Jarett et al. 455/417
		5,918,222	A *	6/1999	Fukui G06Q 10/10
		5,926,784	A	7/1999	Richardson et al. 704/9
		5,933,822	A	8/1999	Braden-Harder et al. 707/5
		5,950,167	A	9/1999	Yaker 704/275
		5,953,393	A	9/1999	Culbreth et al. 379/88.25
		5,960,384	A	9/1999	Brash
		5,960,397	A	9/1999	Rahim 704/244
		5,960,399	A	9/1999	Barclay et al. 704/270
		5,960,447	A	9/1999	Holt et al. 707/500
		5,963,894	A	10/1999	Richardson et al. 704/9
		5,963,940	A	10/1999	Liddy et al. 707/5
		5,982,906	A *	11/1999	Ono G10L 21/0208
					381/94.1
		5,983,190	A	11/1999	Trower, II
		5,987,404	A	11/1999	Della Pietra et al. 704/9
		5,991,721	A	11/1999	Asano et al. 704/257
		5,995,119	A	11/1999	Cosatto et al. 345/473
		5,995,928	A	11/1999	Nguyen et al. 704/251
		5,995,943	A	11/1999	Bull
		6,009,382	A	12/1999	Martino et al. 704/1
		6,014,559	A	1/2000	Amin 455/413
		6,018,708	A	1/2000	Dahan et al. 704/244
		6,021,384	A	2/2000	Gorin et al. 704/1
		6,028,514	A	2/2000	Lemelson et al. 340/539
		6,035,267	A	3/2000	Watanabe et al. 704/1
		6,044,347	A	3/2000	Abella et al. 704/272
		6,049,602	A	4/2000	Foladare et al. 379/265
		6,049,607	A	4/2000	Marash et al. 379/410
		6,058,187	A	5/2000	Chen 380/21
		6,067,513	A	5/2000	Ishimitsu 704/233
		6,073,098	A	6/2000	Buchsbaum
		6,076,059	A	6/2000	Glickman et al. 704/260
		6,078,886	A *	6/2000	Dragosh G10L 15/30
					704/243
		6,081,774	A	6/2000	De Hita et al. 704/9
		6,085,186	A	7/2000	Christianson et al. 707/3
		6,101,241	A	8/2000	Boyce et al. 379/88.01
		6,108,631	A	8/2000	Ruhl 704/270
		6,119,087	A	9/2000	Kuhn et al. 704/270
		6,119,101	A	9/2000	Peckover
		6,122,613	A	9/2000	Baker 704/235
		6,134,235	A	10/2000	Goldman et al. 370/352
		6,144,667	A	11/2000	Doshi et al. 370/401

(51) Int. Cl.

G10L 15/06 (2013.01)

G10L 15/18 (2013.01)

G10L 15/22 (2006.01)

G10L 17/22 (2013.01)

G10L 25/51 (2013.01)

G10L 15/183 (2013.01)

G10L 21/0216 (2013.01)

(52) U.S. Cl.

CPC G10L 15/1815 (2013.01); G10L 15/1822

(2013.01); G10L 15/22 (2013.01); G10L 17/22

(2013.01); G10L 25/51 (2013.01); G10L

15/183 (2013.01); G10L 2015/0631 (2013.01);

G10L 2015/225 (2013.01); G10L 2015/228

(2013.01); G10L 2021/02166 (2013.01)

(58) Field of Classification Search

CPC G10L 2015/228; G10L 2021/02166; G10L

25/51; G06F 17/27; G06F 17/2785

See application file for complete search history.

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

4,829,423	A	5/1989	Tennant et al.	364/200
4,887,212	A	12/1989	Zamora	
4,910,784	A	3/1990	Doddington et al.	381/43
5,027,406	A	6/1991	Roberts et al.	381/43
5,155,743	A	10/1992	Jacobs	375/28
5,164,904	A	11/1992	Sumner	364/436
5,208,748	A	5/1993	Flores et al.	364/419
5,265,065	A	11/1993	Turtle	
5,274,560	A	12/1993	LaRue	364/444
5,331,554	A	7/1994	Graham	
5,357,596	A	10/1994	Takebayashi et al.	395/2.84
5,369,575	A	11/1994	Lamberti	
5,377,350	A	12/1994	Skinner	395/600
5,386,556	A	1/1995	Hedin et al.	395/600
5,424,947	A	6/1995	Nagao et al.	364/419.08
5,471,318	A	11/1995	Ahuja et al.	358/400
5,475,733	A	12/1995	Eisdorfer et al.	379/52
5,479,563	A	12/1995	Yamaguchi	
5,488,652	A	1/1996	Bielby et al.	379/88
5,499,289	A	3/1996	Bruno et al.	379/220
5,500,920	A	3/1996	Kupiec	395/2.79
5,517,560	A	5/1996	Greenspan	379/114
5,533,108	A	7/1996	Harris et al.	379/201
5,537,436	A	7/1996	Bottoms et al.	375/222
5,539,744	A	7/1996	Chu et al.	370/60
5,557,667	A	9/1996	Bruno et al.	379/201
5,559,864	A	9/1996	Kennedy, Jr.	379/59
5,563,937	A	10/1996	Bruno et al.	379/201
5,577,165	A	11/1996	Takebayashi et al.	395/2.84
5,590,039	A	12/1996	Ikeda et al.	395/759
5,608,635	A	3/1997	Tamai	364/449.3
5,615,296	A *	3/1997	Stanford	G10L 15/22
				704/222
5,617,407	A	4/1997	Bareis	369/275.3
5,633,922	A	5/1997	August et al.	379/220
5,634,086	A	5/1997	Rtischev et al.	395/2.79
5,652,570	A	7/1997	Lepkofker	340/573
5,675,629	A	10/1997	Raffel et al.	379/58
5,696,965	A	12/1997	Dedrick	395/610
5,708,422	A	1/1998	Blonder et al.	340/825.34
5,721,938	A	2/1998	Stuckey	395/754
5,722,084	A	2/1998	Chakrin et al.	455/551

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

6,144,938 A	11/2000	Surace et al.	704/257	6,434,523 B1	8/2002	Monaco	704/257
6,154,526 A	11/2000	Dahlke et al.	379/88.03	6,434,524 B1	8/2002	Weber	704/257
6,160,883 A	12/2000	Jackson et al.	379/230	6,434,529 B1	8/2002	Walker et al.	704/275
6,167,377 A	12/2000	Gillick et al.	704/240	6,442,522 B1	8/2002	Carberry et al.	704/257
6,173,266 B1	1/2001	Marx et al.	704/270	6,446,114 B1	9/2002	Bulfer et al.	709/206
6,173,279 B1	1/2001	Levin et al.	707/5	6,453,153 B1	9/2002	Bowker et al.	455/67.4
6,175,858 B1	1/2001	Bulfer et al.	709/206	6,453,292 B2	9/2002	Ramaswamy et al.	704/235
6,185,535 B1	2/2001	Hedin et al.	704/270	6,456,711 B1	9/2002	Cheung et al.	379/265.09
6,188,982 B1	2/2001	Chiang	704/256	6,456,974 B1	9/2002	Baker et al.	704/270.1
6,192,110 B1	2/2001	Abella et al.	379/88.01	6,466,654 B1	10/2002	Cooper et al.	379/88.01
6,192,338 B1	2/2001	Haszto et al.	704/257	6,466,899 B1	10/2002	Yano et al.	704/1
6,195,634 B1	2/2001	Dudemaine et al.	704/231	6,470,315 B1	10/2002	Netsch et al.	704/256
6,195,651 B1	2/2001	Handel et al.	707/2	6,487,494 B2	11/2002	Odinak et al.	701/202
6,199,043 B1	3/2001	Happ	704/272	6,487,495 B1	11/2002	Gale et al.	701/209
6,208,964 B1	3/2001	Sabourin	704/244	6,498,797 B1	12/2002	Anerousis et al.	370/522
6,208,972 B1	3/2001	Grant et al.	704/275	6,499,013 B1	12/2002	Weber	704/257
6,219,346 B1	4/2001	Maxemchuk	370/338	6,501,833 B2	12/2002	Phillips et al.	379/88.07
6,219,643 B1	4/2001	Cohen et al.	704/257	6,501,834 B1	12/2002	Milewski et al.	379/93.24
6,219,645 B1 *	4/2001	Byers	G10L 15/02 381/91	6,505,155 B1	1/2003	Vanbuskirk et al.	704/246
6,226,612 B1	5/2001	Srenger et al.	704/256	6,510,417 B1	1/2003	Woods et al.	704/275
6,233,556 B1	5/2001	Teunen et al.	704/250	6,513,006 B2	1/2003	Howard et al.	704/257
6,233,559 B1	5/2001	Balakrishnan	704/275	6,522,746 B1	2/2003	Marchok et al.	379/406.03
6,233,561 B1	5/2001	Junqua et al.	704/277	6,523,061 B1	2/2003	Halverson et al.	709/202
6,236,968 B1	5/2001	Kanevsky et al.	704/275	6,532,444 B1	3/2003	Weber	704/257
6,243,679 B1	6/2001	Mohri		6,539,348 B1	3/2003	Bond et al.	704/9
6,246,981 B1 *	6/2001	Papineni	G10L 15/22 704/235	6,549,629 B2	4/2003	Finn et al.	381/92
6,246,990 B1	6/2001	Happ	704/275	6,553,372 B1	4/2003	Brassell et al.	707/5
6,266,636 B1	7/2001	Kosaka et al.	704/244	6,556,970 B1 *	4/2003	Sasaki	G01C 21/3608 382/100
6,269,336 B1	7/2001	Ladd et al.	704/270	6,556,973 B1	4/2003	Lewin	704/277
6,272,455 B1	8/2001	Hoshen et al.	704/1	6,560,576 B1	5/2003	Cohen et al.	704/270
6,272,461 B1 *	8/2001	Meredith	G10L 15/26 704/235	6,560,590 B1	5/2003	Shwe et al.	706/55
6,275,231 B1	8/2001	Obradovich	345/349	6,567,778 B1	5/2003	Chao Chang et al.	704/257
6,278,377 B1	8/2001	DeLine et al.	340/815.4	6,567,797 B1	5/2003	Schuetz et al.	707/2
6,278,968 B1	8/2001	Franz et al.	704/3	6,567,805 B1	5/2003	Johnson	
6,286,002 B1	9/2001	Axaopoulos		6,570,555 B1	5/2003	Prevost et al.	345/156
6,288,319 B1	9/2001	Catona	84/609	6,570,964 B1	5/2003	Murvet et al.	379/67.1
6,292,767 B1	9/2001	Jackson et al.	704/1	6,571,279 B1	5/2003	Herz et al.	709/217
6,301,560 B1	10/2001	Masters	704/251	6,574,597 B1	6/2003	Mohri et al.	704/251
6,308,151 B1	10/2001	Smith	704/235	6,574,624 B1	6/2003	Johnson et al.	707/5
6,311,159 B1	10/2001	Van Tichelen et al.	704/275	6,578,022 B1	6/2003	Foulger et al.	706/45
6,314,402 B1	11/2001	Monaco et al.	704/275	6,581,103 B1	6/2003	Dengler	709/231
6,321,196 B1	11/2001	Franceschi	704/243	6,584,439 B1	6/2003	Geilhufe et al.	704/270
6,356,869 B1	3/2002	Chapados et al.	704/275	6,587,858 B1	7/2003	Strazza	707/102
6,362,748 B1	3/2002	Huang	340/901	6,591,185 B1	7/2003	Polidi	
6,366,882 B1	4/2002	Bijl et al.	704/235	6,591,239 B1	7/2003	McCall et al.	704/275
6,366,886 B1	4/2002	Dragosh et al.	704/270.1	6,594,257 B1	7/2003	Doshi et al.	370/352
6,374,214 B1	4/2002	Friedland et al.	704/235	6,594,367 B1	7/2003	Marash et al.	381/92
6,374,226 B1 *	4/2002	Hunt	G10L 15/26 704/255	6,598,018 B1	7/2003	Junqua	704/251
6,377,913 B1	4/2002	Coffman et al.	704/8	6,601,026 B2	7/2003	Appelt et al.	704/9
6,377,919 B1 *	4/2002	Burnett	A61B 5/0507 704/231	6,601,029 B1 *	7/2003	Pickering	G10L 15/22 704/257
6,381,535 B1	4/2002	Durocher et al.	701/202	6,604,075 B1	8/2003	Brown et al.	704/270.1
6,385,596 B1	5/2002	Wiser et al.	705/51	6,604,077 B2	8/2003	Dragosh et al.	704/270.1
6,385,646 B1	5/2002	Brown et al.	709/217	6,606,598 B1	8/2003	Holthouse et al.	704/275
6,389,398 B1 *	5/2002	Lustgarten	G10L 15/22 379/88.01	6,611,692 B2	8/2003	Raffel et al.	455/552
6,393,403 B1	5/2002	Majaniemi	704/275	6,614,773 B1	9/2003	Maxemchuk	370/337
6,393,428 B1	5/2002	Miller et al.	707/102	6,615,172 B1	9/2003	Bennett et al.	704/257
6,397,181 B1	5/2002	Li et al.	704/256	6,622,119 B1	9/2003	Ramaswamy et al.	704/9
6,404,878 B1	6/2002	Jackson et al.	379/221.01	6,629,066 B1	9/2003	Jackson et al.	704/9
6,405,170 B1	6/2002	Phillips et al.	704/270	6,631,346 B1	10/2003	Karaorman et al.	704/9
6,408,272 B1	6/2002	White et al.	704/270.1	6,631,351 B1	10/2003	Ramachandran et al.	704/270
6,411,810 B1	6/2002	Maxemchuk	455/453	6,633,846 B1	10/2003	Bennett et al.	704/257
6,411,893 B2	6/2002	Ruhl	701/207	6,636,790 B1	10/2003	Lightner et al.	701/33
6,415,257 B1	7/2002	Junqua et al.	704/275	6,643,620 B1	11/2003	Contolini et al.	704/270
6,418,210 B1	7/2002	Sayko	379/142.15	6,647,363 B2	11/2003	Claassen	704/1
6,420,975 B1	7/2002	DeLine et al.	340/815.4	6,650,747 B1	11/2003	Bala et al.	379/265.06
6,429,813 B2	8/2002	Feigen	342/357.13	6,658,388 B1 *	12/2003	Kleindienst	G10L 13/00 704/270
6,430,285 B1	8/2002	Bauer et al.	379/265.01	6,678,680 B1	1/2004	Woo	707/6
6,430,531 B1	8/2002	Polish	704/257	6,681,206 B1	1/2004	Gorin et al.	704/243
				6,691,151 B1	2/2004	Cheyet et al.	709/202
				6,701,294 B1	3/2004	Ball et al.	704/257
				6,704,396 B2	3/2004	Parolkar et al.	379/88.17
				6,704,576 B1	3/2004	Brachman et al.	455/503
				6,704,708 B1	3/2004	Pickering	704/235
				6,707,421 B1	3/2004	Drury et al.	342/357.1
				6,708,150 B1	3/2004	Hirayama et al.	704/243
				6,721,001 B1	4/2004	Berstis	348/231.3

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

6,721,633 B2	4/2004	Funk et al.	701/1	7,024,364 B2	4/2006	Guerra et al.	704/270
6,721,706 B1 *	4/2004	Strubbe	G10L 15/18	7,027,586 B2	4/2006	Bushey et al.	379/265.09
			704/257	7,027,974 B1	4/2006	Busch	
6,726,636 B2	4/2004	Der Ghazarian et al.	600/532	7,027,975 B1	4/2006	Pazandak et al.	704/9
6,732,088 B1 *	5/2004	Glance	G06F 17/30864	7,031,908 B1	4/2006	Huang	
6,735,592 B1	5/2004	Neumann et al.	707/101	7,035,415 B2	4/2006	Belt et al.	381/92
6,739,556 B1	5/2004	Langston	244/189	7,036,128 B1	4/2006	Julia et al.	719/317
6,741,931 B1	5/2004	Kohut et al.	701/209	7,043,425 B2	5/2006	Pao	704/211
6,742,021 B1	5/2004	Halverson et al.	709/218	7,054,817 B2	5/2006	Shao	704/270
6,745,161 B1	6/2004	Arnold et al.	704/7	7,058,890 B2	6/2006	George et al.	715/728
6,751,591 B1 *	6/2004	Gorin	G10L 15/22	7,062,488 B1	6/2006	Reisman	707/8
			379/88.01	7,069,220 B2	6/2006	Coffman et al.	704/275
6,751,612 B1	6/2004	Schuetze et al.	707/4	7,072,834 B2	7/2006	Zhou	704/244
6,754,485 B1	6/2004	Obradovich et al.	455/414.1	7,072,888 B1 *	7/2006	Perkins	G06F 17/30867
6,754,627 B2	6/2004	Woodward	704/235				
6,754,647 B1 *	6/2004	Tackett	G06F 17/279	7,076,362 B2	7/2006	Ohtsuji et al.	707/733
			700/246	7,082,469 B2	7/2006	Gold et al.	701/211
6,757,544 B2	6/2004	Rangarajan et al.	455/456.1	7,085,708 B2	8/2006	Manson	709/231
6,757,718 B1	6/2004	Halverson et al.	709/218	7,092,928 B1	8/2006	Elad et al.	704/9
6,785,651 B1 *	8/2004	Wang	G06F 9/4446	7,107,210 B2	9/2006	Deng et al.	706/60
			379/88.01	7,107,218 B1	9/2006	Preston	704/226
6,795,808 B1	9/2004	Strubbe et al.	704/275	7,110,951 B1	9/2006	Lemelson et al.	704/270
6,801,604 B2	10/2004	Maes et al.	379/88.17	7,127,395 B1	10/2006	Gorin et al.	704/257
6,801,893 B1	10/2004	Backfried et al.	704/257	7,127,400 B2	10/2006	Koch	704/270.1
6,804,330 B1 *	10/2004	Jones	H04M 3/4938	7,130,390 B2	10/2006	Abhuri	379/88.17
			379/88.01	7,136,875 B2	11/2006	Anderson et al.	707/104.1
6,810,375 B1	10/2004	Ejerhed		7,137,126 B1 *	11/2006	Coffman	G06F 17/30899
6,813,341 B1	11/2004	Mahoney	379/88.01				704/200
6,816,830 B1	11/2004	Kempe		7,143,037 B1	11/2006	Chestnut	704/251
6,823,308 B2 *	11/2004	Keiller	G10L 15/32	7,143,039 B1	11/2006	Stifelman et al.	704/270
			704/236	7,146,315 B2 *	12/2006	Balan	G10L 25/78
6,829,603 B1	12/2004	Chai et al.	707/5				704/233
6,832,230 B1	12/2004	Zilliaceus et al.	707/203	7,146,319 B2	12/2006	Hunt	704/254
6,833,848 B1	12/2004	Wolff et al.	345/719	7,149,696 B2	12/2006	Shimizu et al.	705/1
6,850,603 B1	2/2005	Eberle et al.	379/88.16	7,165,028 B2	1/2007	Gong	704/233
6,856,990 B2	2/2005	Barile et al.	707/10	7,170,993 B2	1/2007	Anderson et al.	379/265.09
6,865,481 B2	3/2005	Kawazoe et al.	701/211	7,171,291 B2	1/2007	Obradovich	701/29
6,868,380 B2	3/2005	Kroeker	704/240	7,174,300 B2	2/2007	Bush	704/275
6,868,385 B1	3/2005	Gerson	704/275	7,177,798 B2	2/2007	Hsu et al.	704/9
6,871,179 B1	3/2005	Kist		7,184,957 B2	2/2007	Brookes et al.	704/246
6,873,837 B1	3/2005	Yoshioka et al.	455/321	7,190,770 B2	3/2007	Ando et al.	379/88.01
6,877,001 B2	4/2005	Wolf et al.	707/3	7,197,069 B2	3/2007	Agazzi et al.	375/233
6,877,134 B1	4/2005	Fuller et al.	715/500.1	7,197,460 B1	3/2007	Gupta et al.	704/270.1
6,882,970 B1 *	4/2005	Garner	G06F 17/30746	7,203,644 B2	4/2007	Anderson et al.	704/246
			704/236	7,206,418 B2	4/2007	Yang et al.	381/92
6,901,366 B1	5/2005	Kuhn et al.	704/275	7,207,011 B2	4/2007	Mulvey et al.	715/812
6,910,003 B1	6/2005	Arnold et al.	704/4	7,215,941 B2	5/2007	Beckmann et al.	455/404.1
6,912,498 B2	6/2005	Stevens et al.	704/235	7,228,276 B2	6/2007	Omote et al.	704/243
6,915,126 B2	7/2005	Mazzara, Jr.	455/411	7,231,343 B1	6/2007	Treadgold et al.	704/9
6,928,614 B1	8/2005	Everhart	715/728	7,236,923 B1	6/2007	Gupta	704/9
6,934,756 B2	8/2005	Maes	709/227	7,254,482 B2	8/2007	Kawasaki et al.	701/211
6,937,977 B2	8/2005	Gerson	704/201	7,272,212 B2	9/2007	Eberle et al.	379/88.17
6,937,982 B2	8/2005	Kitaoka et al.	704/252	7,277,854 B2	10/2007	Bennett et al.	704/257
6,941,266 B1	9/2005	Gorin	704/257	7,283,829 B2	10/2007	Christenson et al.	455/461
6,944,594 B2	9/2005	Busayapongchai et al.		7,283,951 B2	10/2007	Marchisio et al.	704/9
			704/275	7,289,606 B2	10/2007	Sibal et al.	379/52
6,950,821 B2	9/2005	Faybishenko et al.	707/10	7,299,186 B2	11/2007	Kuzunuki et al.	704/270.1
6,954,755 B2	10/2005	Reisman	707/10	7,301,093 B2	11/2007	Sater et al.	84/615
6,959,276 B2	10/2005	Droppo et al.	704/226	7,305,381 B1	12/2007	Poppink et al.	
6,961,700 B2	11/2005	Mitchell et al.	704/235	7,321,850 B2	1/2008	Wakita	704/10
6,963,759 B1	11/2005	Gerson	455/563	7,328,155 B2	2/2008	Endo et al.	704/251
6,964,023 B2	11/2005	Maes et al.	715/811	7,337,116 B2	2/2008	Charlesworth et al.	704/254
6,968,311 B2	11/2005	Knockeart et al.	704/270	7,340,040 B1	3/2008	Saylor et al.	379/67.1
6,973,387 B2	12/2005	Masclet et al.	701/211	7,366,285 B2	4/2008	Parolkar et al.	379/88.17
6,975,983 B1 *	12/2005	Fortescue	G06F 3/038	7,366,669 B2	4/2008	Nishitani et al.	704/256
			704/257	7,376,645 B2	5/2008	Bernard	707/3
6,975,993 B1	12/2005	Keiller	704/275	7,380,250 B2	5/2008	Schechter	
6,980,092 B2	12/2005	Turnbull et al.	340/425.5	7,386,443 B1	6/2008	Parthasarathy et al.	704/201
6,983,055 B2	1/2006	Luo	381/313	7,398,209 B2	7/2008	Kennewick et al.	704/255
6,990,513 B2	1/2006	Belfiore et al.	709/203	7,406,421 B2	7/2008	Odinak et al.	704/275
6,996,531 B2	2/2006	Korall et al.	704/270	7,415,100 B2	8/2008	Cooper	
7,003,463 B1	2/2006	Maes et al.	704/270.1	7,415,414 B2	8/2008	Azara et al.	704/270
7,016,849 B2	3/2006	Arnold et al.	704/275	7,421,393 B1	9/2008	Di Fabbri et al.	704/275
7,020,609 B2	3/2006	Thrift et al.	704/270.1	7,424,431 B2	9/2008	Greene et al.	704/270
				7,447,635 B1	11/2008	Konopka et al.	704/275
				7,451,088 B1	11/2008	Ehlen et al.	704/270.1
				7,454,368 B2	11/2008	Stillman	
				7,454,608 B2	11/2008	Gopalakrishnan et al.	713/100
				7,461,059 B2	12/2008	Richardson et al.	707/5

US 10,297,249 B2

Page 5

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

7,472,020 B2	12/2008	Brulle-Drews	701/211	8,069,046 B2	11/2011	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,472,060 B1	12/2008	Gorin et al.	704/240	8,073,681 B2	12/2011	Baldwin et al.	704/9
7,472,075 B2	12/2008	Odinak et al.	705/26	8,077,975 B2	12/2011	Ma et al.	382/187
7,477,909 B2	1/2009	Roth	455/466	8,082,153 B2	12/2011	Coffman et al.	704/270
7,478,036 B2	1/2009	Shen et al.	704/9	8,086,463 B2	12/2011	Ativanichayaphong et al.	704/275
7,487,088 B1	2/2009	Gorin et al.	704/240	8,103,510 B2	1/2012	Sato	
7,487,110 B2	2/2009	Bennett et al.	705/26	8,112,275 B2	2/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/240
7,493,259 B2	2/2009	Jones et al.	704/257	8,140,327 B2	3/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/226
7,493,559 B1	2/2009	Wolff et al.	715/727	8,140,335 B2	3/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,502,672 B1	3/2009	Kolls	701/29	8,145,489 B2	3/2012	Freeman et al.	704/257
7,502,730 B2	3/2009	Wang		8,150,694 B2	4/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,502,738 B2	3/2009	Kennewick et al.	704/257	8,155,962 B2	4/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,512,906 B1	3/2009	Baier		8,170,867 B2	5/2012	Germain	704/9
7,516,076 B2	4/2009	Walker et al.	704/275	8,180,037 B1	5/2012	Delker	
7,529,675 B2	5/2009	Maes	704/270.1	8,195,468 B2	6/2012	Weider et al.	704/275
7,536,297 B2	5/2009	Byrd et al.	704/10	8,200,485 B1	6/2012	Lee et al.	704/231
7,536,374 B2	5/2009	Au	706/55	8,204,751 B1 *	6/2012	Di Fabbriozio	G06F 17/271
7,542,894 B2	6/2009	Murata	704/9	8,219,399 B2	7/2012	Lutz et al.	704/256
7,546,382 B2	6/2009	Healey et al.	709/246	8,219,599 B2	7/2012	Tunstall-Pedoe	704/270
7,548,491 B2	6/2009	Macfarlane	367/198	8,224,652 B2	7/2012	Wang et al.	707/955
7,552,054 B1	6/2009	Stifelman et al.	704/270	8,255,224 B2	8/2012	Singleton et al.	704/275
7,558,730 B2	7/2009	Davis et al.	704/235	8,326,599 B2	12/2012	Tomeh	
7,574,362 B2	8/2009	Walker et al.	704/275	8,326,627 B2	12/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,577,244 B2	8/2009	Taschereau	379/218.01	8,326,634 B2	12/2012	Di Cristo et al.	704/270.1
7,606,708 B2	10/2009	Hwang	704/257	8,326,637 B2	12/2012	Baldwin et al.	704/275
7,606,712 B1 *	10/2009	Smith	G06F 3/167	8,332,224 B2	12/2012	Di Cristo et al.	704/257
7,620,549 B2	11/2009	Di Cristo et al.	704/257	8,340,975 B1	12/2012	Rosenberger	
7,634,409 B2	12/2009	Kennewick et al.	704/257	8,346,563 B1	1/2013	Hjelm	
7,640,006 B2	12/2009	Portman et al.	455/412.1	8,370,147 B2	2/2013	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,640,160 B2	12/2009	Di Cristo et al.	704/257	8,447,607 B2	5/2013	Weider et al.	704/250
7,640,272 B2	12/2009	Mahajan et al.	707/104.1	8,447,651 B1	5/2013	Scholl	
7,672,931 B2	3/2010	Hurst-Hiller		8,452,598 B2	5/2013	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,676,365 B2	3/2010	Hwang et al.	704/240	8,503,995 B2	8/2013	Ramer	
7,676,369 B2	3/2010	Fujimoto et al.	704/270	8,509,403 B2	8/2013	Chiu et al.	379/114.13
7,684,977 B2	3/2010	Morikawa	704/211	8,515,765 B2	8/2013	Baldwin et al.	704/275
7,693,720 B2	4/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/275	8,527,274 B2	9/2013	Freeman et al.	704/257
7,697,673 B2	4/2010	Chiu		8,577,671 B1	11/2013	Barve	
7,706,616 B2	4/2010	Kristensson		8,589,161 B2	11/2013	Kennewick et al.	704/252
7,729,913 B1 *	6/2010	Lee	G06F 17/30654	8,612,205 B2	12/2013	Hanneman	
7,729,916 B2	6/2010	Coffman et al.	704/251	8,612,206 B2	12/2013	Chalabi	
7,729,918 B2	6/2010	Walker et al.	704/275	8,620,659 B2	12/2013	Di Cristo et al.	704/257
7,729,920 B2	6/2010	Cheer et al.	704/275	8,719,005 B1	5/2014	Lee	
7,734,287 B2	6/2010	Ying	455/423	8,719,009 B2	5/2014	Baldwin et al.	704/9
7,748,021 B2	6/2010	Obradovich	725/105	8,719,026 B2	5/2014	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,788,084 B2	8/2010	Brun et al.	704/7	8,731,929 B2	5/2014	Kennewick et al.	704/257
7,792,257 B1	9/2010	Vanier		8,738,380 B2	5/2014	Baldwin et al.	704/257
7,801,731 B2	9/2010	Odinak et al.	704/275	8,849,652 B2	9/2014	Weider et al.	704/9
7,809,570 B2	10/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/257	8,849,670 B2	9/2014	Di Cristo et al.	704/270.1
7,818,176 B2	10/2010	Freeman et al.	704/270	8,849,696 B2	9/2014	Pansari	
7,831,426 B2	11/2010	Bennett	704/252	8,849,791 B1	9/2014	Hertschuh	
7,831,433 B1	11/2010	Belvin et al.	704/275	8,886,536 B2	11/2014	Freeman et al.	704/257
7,856,358 B2	12/2010	Ho	704/270	8,972,243 B1	3/2015	Strom	
7,873,519 B2	1/2011	Bennett	704/257	8,983,839 B2	3/2015	Kennewick et al.	704/254
7,873,523 B2	1/2011	Potter et al.	704/275	9,009,046 B1	4/2015	Stewart	
7,873,654 B2	1/2011	Bernard	707/769	9,015,049 B2	4/2015	Baldwin	
7,881,936 B2	2/2011	Longe et al.	704/257	9,037,455 B1	5/2015	Faaborg	
7,890,324 B2	2/2011	Bangalore et al.	704/231	9,070,366 B1	6/2015	Mathias	
7,894,849 B2	2/2011	Kass et al.	455/550.1	9,070,367 B1 *	6/2015	Hoffmeister	G10L 15/187
7,902,969 B2	3/2011	Obradovich	340/439	9,105,266 B2	8/2015	Baldwin	
7,917,367 B2	3/2011	Di Cristo et al.	704/270.1	9,171,541 B2	10/2015	Kennewick	
7,920,682 B2	4/2011	Byrne et al.	379/88.18	9,269,097 B2	2/2016	Freeman	
7,949,529 B2	5/2011	Weider et al.	704/270	9,305,548 B2	4/2016	Kennewick	
7,949,537 B2	5/2011	Walker et al.	704/275	9,308,445 B1	4/2016	Merzenich	
7,953,732 B2	5/2011	Frank et al.	707/724	9,318,108 B2	4/2016	Gruber	
7,974,875 B1	7/2011	Quilici et al.	705/14.4	9,406,078 B2	8/2016	Freeman	
7,983,917 B2	7/2011	Kennewick et al.	704/257	9,443,514 B1 *	9/2016	Taubman	G10L 15/22
7,984,287 B2	7/2011	Gopalakrishnan et al.	713/100	9,502,025 B2	11/2016	Kennewick	
8,005,683 B2	8/2011	Tessel et al.	704/275	2001/0021905 A1 *	9/2001	Burnett	A61B 5/0507
8,015,006 B2	9/2011	Kennewick et al.	704/236	2001/0039492 A1	11/2001	Nemoto	704/233
8,024,186 B1	9/2011	De Bonet		2001/0041980 A1	11/2001	Howard et al.	704/270
8,027,965 B2	9/2011	Takehara		2001/0047261 A1 *	11/2001	Kassan	G10L 15/30
8,032,383 B1	10/2011	Bhardwaj		2001/0049601 A1	12/2001	Kroeker et al.	704/270
8,060,367 B2	11/2011	Keaveney	704/247	2001/0054087 A1	12/2001	Flom et al.	709/218
				2002/0002548 A1 *	1/2002	Roundtree	G06F 17/30014

US 10,297,249 B2

Page 6

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

2002/0007267	A1 *	1/2002	Batchilo		G06F 17/30663	2003/0158731	A1	8/2003	Falcon et al.		704/231
					704/9	2003/0161448	A1	8/2003	Parolkar et al.		379/88.17
2002/0010584	A1	1/2002	Schultz			2003/0167167	A1 *	9/2003	Gong		G10L 15/22
2002/0015500	A1	2/2002	Belt et al.		381/66						704/250
2002/0022927	A1	2/2002	Lemelson et al.		701/301	2003/0174155	A1	9/2003	Weng		
2002/0022956	A1	2/2002	Ukrainczyk			2003/0182132	A1	9/2003	Niemoeller		704/275
2002/0029186	A1	3/2002	Roth			2003/0187643	A1	10/2003	VanThong		
2002/0029261	A1	3/2002	Shibata		709/219	2003/0204492	A1	10/2003	Wolf et al.		707/3
2002/0032752	A1	3/2002	Gold et al.		709/218	2003/0206640	A1	11/2003	Malvar et al.		381/93
2002/0035501	A1	3/2002	Handel et al.		705/10	2003/0212550	A1	11/2003	Ubale		704/215
2002/0040297	A1	4/2002	Tsiao et al.		704/257	2003/0212558	A1	11/2003	Matula		704/260
2002/0049535	A1	4/2002	Rigo et al.		701/211	2003/0212562	A1	11/2003	Patel et al.		704/275
2002/0049805	A1	4/2002	Yamada et al.		709/202	2003/0225825	A1	12/2003	Healey et al.		709/203
2002/0059068	A1	5/2002	Rose et al.		704/246	2003/0233230	A1 *	12/2003	Ammicht		G10L 15/183
2002/0065568	A1	5/2002	Silfvast et al.		700/94						704/235
2002/0067839	A1	6/2002	Heinrich		381/110	2003/0236664	A1	12/2003	Sharma		704/251
2002/0069059	A1	6/2002	Smith		704/257	2004/0006475	A1 *	1/2004	Ehlen		G10L 15/22
2002/0069071	A1	6/2002	Knockeart et al.		704/275						704/270.1
2002/0073176	A1	6/2002	Ikeda			2004/0010358	A1	1/2004	Oesterling et al.		701/49
2002/0082911	A1	6/2002	Dunn et al.		705/14	2004/0025115	A1	2/2004	Sienel et al.		715/513
2002/0087312	A1 *	7/2002	Lee		G06Q 30/06	2004/0030741	A1	2/2004	Wolton		
					704/251	2004/0036601	A1	2/2004	Obradovich		
2002/0087326	A1	7/2002	Lee et al.		704/270.1	2004/0044516	A1 *	3/2004	Kennewick		G10L 15/22
2002/0087525	A1	7/2002	Abbott et al.		707/3						704/5
2002/0107694	A1	8/2002	Lerg		704/273	2004/0093567	A1	5/2004	Schabes		
2002/0120609	A1	8/2002	Lang et al.		707/1	2004/0098245	A1	5/2004	Walker et al.		704/1
2002/0124050	A1	9/2002	Middeljans		709/203	2004/0102977	A1	5/2004	Metzler		
2002/0133347	A1 *	9/2002	Schoneburg		G06F 17/27	2004/0117179	A1	6/2004	Balasuriya		704/231
					704/257	2004/0117804	A1	6/2004	Scahill et al.		719/320
2002/0133354	A1 *	9/2002	Ross		G10L 15/30	2004/0122673	A1 *	6/2004	Park		G10L 15/24
					704/275						704/270
2002/0133402	A1	9/2002	Faber et al.		705/14	2004/0122674	A1	6/2004	Bangalore et al.		704/276
2002/0135618	A1 *	9/2002	Maes		G06F 3/0481	2004/0133793	A1	7/2004	Ginter		
					715/767	2004/0140989	A1	7/2004	Papageorge		345/700
2002/0138248	A1	9/2002	Corston-Oliver et al.		704/1	2004/0143440	A1	7/2004	Prasad		
2002/0143532	A1	10/2002	McLean et al.		704/235	2004/0148154	A1	7/2004	Acero		
2002/0143535	A1	10/2002	Kist et al.		704/251	2004/0148170	A1	7/2004	Acero		
2002/0152260	A1	10/2002	Chen			2004/0158555	A1	8/2004	Seedman et al.		707/3
2002/0161646	A1	10/2002	Gailey et al.		705/14	2004/0166832	A1	8/2004	Portman et al.		455/412.1
2002/0161647	A1	10/2002	Gailey			2004/0167771	A1	8/2004	Duan et al.		704/10
2002/0169597	A1 *	11/2002	Fain		G10L 15/22	2004/0172247	A1	9/2004	Yoon		
					704/9	2004/0172258	A1	9/2004	Dominach et al.		704/277
2002/0173333	A1	11/2002	Buchholz et al.		455/527	2004/0189697	A1	9/2004	Fukuoka		
2002/0173961	A1	11/2002	Guerra		704/258	2004/0193408	A1	9/2004	Hunt		704/209
2002/0178003	A1 *	11/2002	Gehrke		G10L 15/30	2004/0193420	A1 *	9/2004	Kennewick		G06F 17/30654
					704/246						704/257
2002/0184373	A1	12/2002	Maes		709/228	2004/0199375	A1	10/2004	Ehsani et al.		704/4
2002/0188455	A1 *	12/2002	Shioda		G10L 17/26	2004/0199389	A1 *	10/2004	Geiger		G10L 15/16
					704/275						704/254
2002/0188602	A1	12/2002	Stubler et al.		707/3	2004/0201607	A1 *	10/2004	Mulvey		G06F 3/0237
2002/0198714	A1	12/2002	Zhou		704/252						715/708
2003/0005033	A1 *	1/2003	Mohan		G06F 17/30899	2004/0204939	A1 *	10/2004	Liu		G10L 15/28
					709/202						704/239
2003/0014261	A1	1/2003	Kageyama		704/275	2004/0205671	A1	10/2004	Sukehiro et al.		715/532
2003/0016835	A1	1/2003	Elko et al.		381/92	2004/0220800	A1 *	11/2004	Kong		G10L 21/0208
2003/0036903	A1 *	2/2003	Konopka		G10L 15/065						704/205
					704/249	2004/0243393	A1 *	12/2004	Wang		G10L 15/22
2003/0046071	A1 *	3/2003	Wyman		G10L 15/22						704/9
					704/235	2004/0243417	A9	12/2004	Pitts, III et al.		704/276
2003/0046281	A1 *	3/2003	Son		G06F 17/30876	2004/0247092	A1	12/2004	Timmins		
2003/0046346	A1	3/2003	Mumick et al.		709/205	2004/0249636	A1 *	12/2004	Applebaum		G10L 15/1822
2003/0064709	A1	4/2003	Gailey et al.		455/412						704/231
2003/0065427	A1	4/2003	Funk et al.		701/1	2005/0015256	A1	1/2005	Kargman		704/272
2003/0069734	A1	4/2003	Everhart		704/275	2005/0021331	A1	1/2005	Huang et al.		704/231
2003/0069880	A1	4/2003	Harrison			2005/0021334	A1	1/2005	Iwahashi		704/240
2003/0088421	A1	5/2003	Maes et al.		704/270.1	2005/0021470	A1	1/2005	Martin et al.		705/51
2003/0093419	A1 *	5/2003	Bangalore		G01C 21/3664	2005/0021826	A1	1/2005	Kumar		709/232
2003/0097249	A1	5/2003	Walker et al.		704/1	2005/0033574	A1	2/2005	Kim et al.		704/251
2003/0110037	A1	6/2003	Walker et al.		704/257	2005/0033582	A1	2/2005	Gadd et al.		704/277
2003/0112267	A1	6/2003	Belrose		345/728	2005/0043940	A1	2/2005	Elder		704/9
2003/0115062	A1	6/2003	Walker et al.		704/258	2005/0060142	A1 *	3/2005	Visser		G10L 21/0208
2003/0120493	A1	6/2003	Gupta		704/270.1						704/201
2003/0135488	A1	7/2003	Amir et al.		707/3	2005/0080632	A1	4/2005	Endo et al.		704/277
2003/0144846	A1	7/2003	Denenberg et al.		704/277	2005/0102282	A1 *	5/2005	Linden		G06F 17/3053
						2005/0114116	A1	5/2005	Fiedler		704/201
						2005/0125232	A1	6/2005	Gadd		704/270.1
						2005/0131673	A1	6/2005	Koizumi et al.		704/2
						2005/0137850	A1	6/2005	Odell		704/4

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

2005/0137877 A1	6/2005	Oesterling et al.	704/275	2007/0179778 A1	8/2007	Gong et al.	704/9
2005/0143994 A1	6/2005	Mori et al.	704/235	2007/0185859 A1	8/2007	Flowers	
2005/0144013 A1 *	6/2005	Fujimoto	G10L 15/22 704/277	2007/0186165 A1	8/2007	Maislos et al.	715/728
				2007/0192309 A1	8/2007	Fischer	
2005/0144187 A1	6/2005	Che		2007/0198267 A1	8/2007	Jones et al.	704/257
2005/0149319 A1	7/2005	Honda		2007/0203699 A1	8/2007	Nagashima	
2005/0169441 A1 *	8/2005	Yacoub	H04M 3/4936 379/88.16	2007/0203736 A1	8/2007	Ashton	705/1
				2007/0208732 A1	9/2007	Flowers	
2005/0216254 A1	9/2005	Gupta et al.	704/9	2007/0214182 A1	9/2007	Rosenberg	707/104.1
2005/0222763 A1	10/2005	Uyeki		2007/0250901 A1	10/2007	McIntire et al.	725/146
2005/0234637 A1	10/2005	Obradovich		2007/0265850 A1	11/2007	Kennewick et al.	704/257
2005/0234727 A1	10/2005	Chiu	704/270.1	2007/0266257 A1	11/2007	Camaisa	
2005/0246174 A1	11/2005	DeGolia	704/270	2007/0276651 A1	11/2007	Bliss	
2005/0283364 A1 *	12/2005	Longe	G06K 9/00422 704/257	2007/0294615 A1 *	12/2007	Sathe	G06F 17/30702 707/803
2005/0283532 A1 *	12/2005	Kim	H04L 12/2803 709/225	2007/0299824 A1	12/2007	Pan et al.	707/3
				2008/0014908 A1	1/2008	Vasant	
2005/0283752 A1	12/2005	Fruchter et al.	717/100	2008/0034032 A1	2/2008	Healey et al.	709/203
2006/0041431 A1	2/2006	Maes	704/270.1	2008/0046311 A1	2/2008	Shahine	
2006/0046740 A1	3/2006	Johnson		2008/0059188 A1	3/2008	Konopka	
2006/0047509 A1	3/2006	Ding et al.	704/231	2008/0065386 A1	3/2008	Cross et al.	704/270
2006/0072738 A1	4/2006	Louis et al.	379/265.02	2008/0065389 A1	3/2008	Cross	
2006/0074670 A1 *	4/2006	Weng	G10L 15/22 704/257	2008/0065390 A1 *	3/2008	Ativanichayaphong	G06F 9/4446 704/270
2006/0074671 A1 *	4/2006	Farmaner	G10L 15/193 704/257	2008/0086455 A1	4/2008	Meisels	
				2008/0091406 A1	4/2008	Baldwin et al.	704/4
2006/0080098 A1 *	4/2006	Campbell	G10L 13/027 704/243	2008/0103761 A1	5/2008	Printz et al.	704/9
				2008/0103781 A1	5/2008	Wasson	
2006/0100851 A1	5/2006	Schonebeck		2008/0104071 A1	5/2008	Pragada	
2006/0106769 A1 *	5/2006	Gibbs	G06F 17/276	2008/0109285 A1	5/2008	Reuther et al.	705/7
2006/0129409 A1 *	6/2006	Mizutani	G06F 17/289 704/275	2008/0115163 A1	5/2008	Gilboa et al.	725/34
				2008/0126091 A1	5/2008	Clark	
2006/0130002 A1	6/2006	Hirayama		2008/0126284 A1	5/2008	Forbes	
2006/0182085 A1	8/2006	Sweeney		2008/0133215 A1	6/2008	Sarukkai	704/2
2006/0206310 A1	9/2006	Ravikumar et al.	704/9	2008/0140385 A1	6/2008	Mahajan et al.	704/9
2006/0217133 A1	9/2006	Christenson et al.	455/461	2008/0147396 A1	6/2008	Wang	704/246
2006/0236343 A1 *	10/2006	Chang	H04N 5/44543 725/61	2008/0147410 A1	6/2008	Odinak	704/270.1
				2008/0147637 A1	6/2008	Li	
2006/0242017 A1	10/2006	Libes		2008/0154604 A1	6/2008	Sathish et al.	704/257
2006/0253247 A1	11/2006	de Silva		2008/0162471 A1	7/2008	Bernard	707/5
2006/0253281 A1	11/2006	Letzt		2008/0177530 A1	7/2008	Cross et al.	704/4
2006/0285662 A1	12/2006	Yin et al.	379/88.16	2008/0184164 A1 *	7/2008	Di Fabbriozio	G06F 3/167 715/809
2007/0011159 A1 *	1/2007	Hillis	G06F 17/30353				
2007/0033005 A1	2/2007	Cristo et al.	704/9	2008/0189110 A1	8/2008	Freeman et al.	704/251
2007/0033020 A1	2/2007	(Kelleher) Francois et al.	704/226	2008/0189187 A1	8/2008	Hao	
				2008/0228496 A1	9/2008	Yu	
2007/0033526 A1	2/2007	Thompson		2008/0235023 A1	9/2008	Kennewick et al.	704/257
2007/0038436 A1	2/2007	Cristo et al.	704/9	2008/0235027 A1	9/2008	Cross	704/270.1
2007/0038445 A1	2/2007	Helbing et al.	704/235	2008/0269958 A1	10/2008	Filev	
2007/0043569 A1	2/2007	Potter, III et al.	704/270	2008/0270135 A1	10/2008	Goel	
2007/0043574 A1	2/2007	Coffman et al.	704/275	2008/0270224 A1	10/2008	Portman	
2007/0043868 A1	2/2007	Kumar et al.	709/226	2008/0294437 A1	11/2008	Nakano	
2007/0050191 A1	3/2007	Weider et al.	704/275	2008/0294994 A1	11/2008	Kruger	
2007/0050279 A1	3/2007	Huang		2008/0306743 A1 *	12/2008	Di Fabbriozio	G10L 15/22 704/275
2007/0055525 A1	3/2007	Kennewick et al.	704/257				
2007/0060114 A1	3/2007	Ramer		2008/0319751 A1	12/2008	Kennewick et al.	704/257
2007/0061067 A1	3/2007	Zeinstra et al.	701/200	2009/0006077 A1	1/2009	Keaveney	
2007/0061735 A1	3/2007	Hoffberg et al.	715/744	2009/0006194 A1	1/2009	Prashantidharan	
2007/0067310 A1	3/2007	Gupta		2009/0018829 A1 *	1/2009	Kuperstein	G10L 15/26 704/235
2007/0073544 A1	3/2007	Millett et al.	704/277				
2007/0078708 A1	4/2007	Yu et al.	705/14	2009/0024476 A1	1/2009	Baar	
2007/0078709 A1	4/2007	Rajaram	705/14	2009/0030686 A1	1/2009	Weng	
2007/0078814 A1	4/2007	Flowers		2009/0052635 A1	2/2009	Jones et al.	379/88.02
2007/0094003 A1	4/2007	Huang et al.	704/3	2009/0055176 A1	2/2009	Hu	
2007/0100797 A1 *	5/2007	Thun	G06F 17/30994	2009/0067599 A1	3/2009	Agarwal et al.	379/114.21
2007/0106499 A1	5/2007	Dahlgren		2009/0076827 A1	3/2009	Bulitta et al.	704/275
2007/0112555 A1	5/2007	Lavi		2009/0106029 A1	4/2009	DeLine et al.	704/275
2007/0112630 A1	5/2007	Lau		2009/0117885 A1	5/2009	Roth	455/414.3
2007/0118357 A1	5/2007	Kasravi et al.	704/10	2009/0144131 A1	6/2009	Chiu	
2007/0124057 A1	5/2007	Prieto		2009/0144271 A1	6/2009	Richardson et al.	707/5
2007/0135101 A1	6/2007	Ramati et al.	455/414.1	2009/0150156 A1	6/2009	Kennewick et al.	704/257
2007/0146833 A1	6/2007	Satomi et al.	358/537	2009/0157382 A1	6/2009	Bar	
2007/0162296 A1	7/2007	Altberg et al.	705/1	2009/0164216 A1	6/2009	Chengalvarayan	
2007/0174258 A1	7/2007	Jones		2009/0171664 A1	7/2009	Kennewick et al.	704/257
				2009/0171912 A1	7/2009	Nash	
				2009/0197582 A1	8/2009	Lewis	
				2009/0216540 A1	8/2009	Tessel et al.	704/275
				2009/0248565 A1	10/2009	Chuang	

(56)

References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

2009/0248605	A1	10/2009	Mitchell		2014/0012577	A1	1/2014	Freeman et al.	704/249
2009/0259561	A1	10/2009	Boys		2014/0025371	A1	1/2014	Min	
2009/0259646	A1	10/2009	Fujita et al.	707/5	2014/0108013	A1	4/2014	Di Cristo et al.	704/254
2009/0265163	A1	10/2009	Li		2014/0136187	A1	5/2014	Wolverton	
2009/0271194	A1	10/2009	Davis et al.	704/235	2014/0156278	A1	6/2014	Kennewick et al.	704/254
2009/0273563	A1	11/2009	Pryor	345/157	2014/0195238	A1	7/2014	Terao	
2009/0276700	A1	11/2009	Anderson et al.	715/700	2014/0236575	A1	8/2014	Tur	
2009/0287680	A1	11/2009	Paek		2014/0249821	A1	9/2014	Kennewick et al.	704/257
2009/0299745	A1	12/2009	Kennewick et al.	704/257	2014/0249822	A1	9/2014	Baldwin et al.	704/257
2009/0299857	A1	12/2009	Brubaker		2014/0278413	A1	9/2014	Pitschel	
2009/0304161	A1	12/2009	Pettyjohn		2014/0278416	A1	9/2014	Schuster	
2009/0307031	A1	12/2009	Winkler et al.	705/7	2014/0288934	A1	9/2014	Kennewick et al.	704/254
2009/0313026	A1	12/2009	Coffman et al.	704/275	2014/0330552	A1	11/2014	Bangalore	
2009/0319517	A1	12/2009	Guha		2014/0337007	A1	11/2014	Waibel	
2010/0023320	A1	1/2010	Di Cristo et al.	704/9	2014/0365222	A1	12/2014	Weider et al.	704/257
2010/0023331	A1	1/2010	Duta		2015/0019211	A1	1/2015	Simard	
2010/0029261	A1	2/2010	Mikkelsen et al.	455/419	2015/0019217	A1	1/2015	Di Cristo et al.	704/235
2010/0036967	A1	2/2010	Caine et al.	709/236	2015/0019227	A1	1/2015	Anandarajah	
2010/0049501	A1	2/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/9	2015/0066479	A1	3/2015	Pasupalak	
2010/0049514	A1	2/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/233	2015/0066627	A1	3/2015	Freeman et al.	705/14.41
2010/0057443	A1	3/2010	Di Cristo et al.	704/9	2015/0073910	A1	3/2015	Kennewick et al.	705/14.58
2010/0063880	A1	3/2010	Atsmon et al.	705/14.53	2015/0095159	A1	4/2015	Kennewick et al.	705/14.58
2010/0064025	A1	3/2010	Nelimarkka		2015/0142447	A1	5/2015	Kennewick	
2010/0094707	A1	4/2010	Freer	705/14.54	2015/0170641	A1	6/2015	Kennewick	
2010/0138300	A1	6/2010	Wallis		2015/0193379	A1	7/2015	Mehta	
2010/0145700	A1	6/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/257	2015/0199339	A1	7/2015	Mirkin	
2010/0185512	A1	7/2010	Borger et al.	705/14.49	2015/0293917	A1	10/2015	Bufe	
2010/0191856	A1	7/2010	Gupta		2015/0348544	A1	12/2015	Baldwin	
2010/0204986	A1	8/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/226	2015/0348551	A1	12/2015	Gruber	
2010/0204994	A1	8/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/257	2015/0364133	A1	12/2015	Freeman	
2010/0217604	A1	8/2010	Baldwin et al.	704/275	2016/0049152	A1	2/2016	Kennewick	
2010/0268536	A1	10/2010	Suendermann		2016/0078482	A1	3/2016	Kennewick	
2010/0286985	A1	11/2010	Kennewick et al.	704/257	2016/0078491	A1	3/2016	Kennewick	
2010/0299142	A1	11/2010	Freeman et al.	704/9	2016/0078504	A1	3/2016	Kennewick	
2010/0312547	A1	12/2010	Van Os		2016/0078773	A1	3/2016	Carter	
2010/0312566	A1	12/2010	Odinak et al.	704/275	2016/0110347	A1	4/2016	Kennewick	
2010/0318357	A1	12/2010	Istvan		2016/0148610	A1	5/2016	Kennewick	
2010/0331064	A1	12/2010	Michelstein		2016/0148612	A1	5/2016	Guo	
2011/0022393	A1	1/2011	Waller et al.	704/270	2016/0188292	A1	6/2016	Carter	
2011/0106527	A1	5/2011	Chiu		2016/0188573	A1	6/2016	Tang	
2011/0112827	A1	5/2011	Kennewick et al.	704/9	2016/0217785	A1	7/2016	Kennewick	
2011/0112921	A1	5/2011	Kennewick et al.	705/26.1	2016/0335676	A1	11/2016	Freeman	
2011/0119049	A1	5/2011	Ylonen						
2011/0131036	A1	6/2011	Di Cristo et al.	704/9					
2011/0131045	A1	6/2011	Cristo et al.	704/249					
2011/0231182	A1	9/2011	Weider et al.	704/9					
2011/0231188	A1	9/2011	Kennewick et al.	704/236					
2011/0238409	A1*	9/2011	Larcheveque	G06F 17/2785 704/9					
2011/0307167	A1	12/2011	Taschereau						
2012/0022857	A1	1/2012	Baldwin et al.	704/9					
2012/0041753	A1	2/2012	Dymetman						
2012/0046935	A1	2/2012	Nagao						
2012/0101809	A1	4/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/9					
2012/0101810	A1	4/2012	Kennewick et al.	704/9					
2012/0109753	A1	5/2012	Kennewick et al.	705/14.58					
2012/0150620	A1	6/2012	Mandyam						
2012/0150636	A1	6/2012	Freeman et al.	705/14.49					
2012/0239498	A1	9/2012	Ramer						
2012/0240060	A1	9/2012	Pennington						
2012/0265528	A1	10/2012	Gruber						
2012/0278073	A1	11/2012	Weider et al.	704/235					
2013/0006734	A1	1/2013	Ocko						
2013/0054228	A1	2/2013	Baldwin et al.	704/9					
2013/0060625	A1	3/2013	Davis						
2013/0080177	A1	3/2013	Chen	704/275					
2013/0211710	A1	8/2013	Kennewick et al.	701/419					
2013/0253929	A1	9/2013	Weider et al.	704/235					
2013/0254314	A1	9/2013	Chow						
2013/0297293	A1	11/2013	Di Cristo et al.	704/9					
2013/0304473	A1	11/2013	Baldwin et al.	704/257					
2013/0311324	A1	11/2013	Stoll						
2013/0332454	A1	12/2013	Stuhec						
2013/0339022	A1	12/2013	Baldwin et al.	704/257					
2014/0006951	A1	1/2014	Hunter						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EP	1 320 043	A2	6/2003
EP	1 646 037		4/2006
JP	H08263258		10/1996
JP	H11249773		9/1999
JP	2001071289		3/2001
JP	2006-146881		6/2006
JP	2008-027454		2/2008
JP	2008058465		3/2008
JP	2008-139928		6/2008
JP	2011504304		2/2011
JP	2012518847		8/2012
WO	WO 99/46763		9/1999
WO	WO 00/21232		4/2000
WO	WO 00/46792		8/2000
WO	0129742		4/2001
WO	0171609	A2	9/2001
WO	WO 01/78065		10/2001
WO	WO 2004/072954		8/2004
WO	2005010702	A2	2/2005
WO	WO 2007/019318		2/2007
WO	WO 2007/021587		2/2007
WO	WO 2007/027546		3/2007
WO	WO 2007/027989		3/2007
WO	WO 2008/098039		8/2008
WO	WO 2008/118195		10/2008
WO	WO 2009/075912		6/2009
WO	2009111721		9/2009
WO	WO 2009/145796		12/2009
WO	WO 2010/096752		8/2010
WO	2016044290		3/2016
WO	2016044316		3/2016
WO	2016044319		3/2016

(56)

References Cited

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

WO	2016044321	3/2016
WO	2016061309	4/2016

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Wu, Su-Lin, et al., "Incorporating Information from Syllable-Length Time Scales into Automatic Speech Recognition", Proceedings of the 1998 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 1998, vol. 2, IEEE, 1998, 4 pages.

Wu, Su-Lin, et al., "Integrating Syllable Boundary Information into Speech Recognition", IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, ICASSP-97, 1997, vol. 2, IEEE, 1997, 4 pages.

Reuters, "IBM to Enable Honda Drivers to Talk to Cars", Charles Schwab & Co., Inc., Jul. 28, 2002, 1 page.

Lin, Bor-shen, et al., "A Distributed Architecture for Cooperative Spoken Dialogue Agents with Coherent Dialogue State and History", ASRU'99, 1999, 4 pages.

Kuhn, Thomas, et al., "Hybrid In-Car Speech Recognition for Mobile Multimedia Applications", Vehicular Technology Conference, IEEE, Jul. 1999, pp. 2009-2013.

Belvin, Robert, et al., "Development of the HRL Route Navigation Dialogue System", Proceedings of the First International Conference on Human Language Technology Research, San Diego, 2001, pp. 1-5.

Lind, R., et al., "The Network Vehicle—A Glimpse into the Future of Mobile Multi-Media" *IEEE Aerosp. Electron. Systems Magazine*, vol. 14, No. 9, Sep. 1999, pp. 27-32.

Zhao, Yilin, "Telematics: Safe and Fun Driving", *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 17, Issue 1, 2002, pp. 10-14.

Chai et al., "MIND: A Semantics-Based Multimodal Interpretation Framework for Conversational System", *Proceedings of the International CLASS Workshop on Natural, Intelligent and Effective Interaction in Multimodal Dialogue Systems*, Jun. 2002, pp. 37-46.

Cheyen et al., "Multimodal Maps: An Agent-Based Approach", *International Conference on Cooperative Multimodal Communication* (CMC/95), May 24-26, 1995, pp. 111-121.

Elio et al., "On Abstract Task Models and Conversation Policies" in Workshop on Specifying and Implementing Conversation Policies, *Autonomous Agents '99*, Seattle, 1999, 10 pages.

Turunen, "Adaptive Interaction Methods in Speech User Interfaces", Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Seattle, Washington, 2001, pp. 91-92.

Mao, Mark Z., "Automatic Training Set Segmentation for Multi-Pass Speech Recognition", Department of Electrical Engineering, Stanford University, CA, copyright 2005, IEEE, pp. I-685 to I-688.

Vanhoecke, Vincent, "Confidence Scoring and Rejection Using Multi-Pass Speech Recognition", Nuance Communications, Menlo Park, CA, 2005, 4 pages.

Weng, Fuliang, et al., "Efficient Lattice Representation and Generation", Speech Technology and Research Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, 1998, 4 pages.

El Meliani et al., "A Syllabic-Filler-Based Continuous Speech Recognizer for Unlimited Vocabulary", Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering, vol. 2, Sep. 5-8, 1995, pp. 1007-1010.

Arrington, Michael, "Google Redefines GPS Navigation Landscape: Google Maps Navigation for Android 2.0", TechCrunch, printed from the Internet <<http://www.techcrunch.com/2009/10/28/google-redefines-car-gps-navigation-google-maps-navigation-android/>>, Oct. 28, 2009, 4 pages.

Bazzi, Issam et al., "Heterogeneous Lexical Units for Automatic Speech Recognition: Preliminary Investigations", *Processing of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, vol. 3, Jun. 5-9, 2000, XP010507574, pp. 1257-1260.

O'Shaughnessy, Douglas, "Interacting with Computers by Voice: Automatic Speech Recognition and Synthesis", *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 91, No. 9, Sep. 1, 2003, XP011100665, pp. 1272-1305.

Statement in Accordance with the Notice from the European Patent Office dated Oct. 1, 2007 Concerning Business Methods (OJ EPO Nov. 2007, 592-593), XP002456252.

Davis, Z., et al., A Personal Handheld Multi-Modal Shopping Assistant, IEEE, 2006, 9 pages.

* cited by examiner




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

1

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR A COOPERATIVE CONVERSATIONAL VOICE USER INTERFACE

CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS

This application is a continuation of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 13/987,645, entitled "System and Method for a Cooperative Conversational Voice User Interface," filed Aug. 19, 2013, which is a divisional of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 13/251,712, entitled "System and Method for a Cooperative Conversational Voice User Interface," filed Oct. 3, 2011 (which issued as U.S. Pat. No. 8,515,765 on Aug. 20, 2013), which is a continuation of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 11/580,926, entitled "System and Method for a Cooperative Conversational Voice User Interface," filed Oct. 16, 2006 (which issued as U.S. Pat. No. 8,073,681 on Dec. 6, 2011), each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety.

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

The invention relates to a cooperative conversational model for a human to machine voice user interface.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Advances in technology, particularly within the convergence space, have resulted in an increase in demand for voice recognition software that can exploit technology in ways that are intuitive to humans. While communication between human beings is most often "cooperative," in that information and/or context is shared to advance mutual conversational goals, existing Human-to-Machine interfaces fail to provide the same level of intuitive interaction. For example, each human participant in a conversation can contribute to an exchange for the benefit of the exchange. This is done through shared assumptions and expectations regarding various aspects of the conversation, such as the topic, participant knowledge about the topic, expectations of the other participant's knowledge about the topic, appropriate word usage for the topic and/or participants, conversational development based on previous utterances, the participants' tone or inflection, the quality and quantity of contribution expected from each participant, and many other factors. Participating in conversations that continually build and draw upon shared information is a natural and intuitive way for humans to converse.

In contrast, complex Human-to-Machine interfaces do not allow users to exploit technology in an intuitive way, which inhibits mass-market adoption for various technologies. Incorporating a speech interface helps to alleviate this burden by making interaction easier and faster, but existing speech interfaces (when they actually work) still require significant learning on the part of the user. That is, existing speech interfaces are unable to bridge the gap between archaic Human-to-Machine interfaces and conversational speech that would make interaction with systems feel normal. Users should be able to directly request what they want from a system in a normal, conversational fashion, without having to memorize exact words or phrases. Alternatively, when users are uncertain of particular needs, they should be able to engage the system in a productive, cooperative dialogue to resolve their requests. Instead, existing speech interfaces force users to dumb down their requests to match simple sets of instructions in simple languages in order to

2

communicate requests in ways that systems can understand. Using existing speech interfaces, there is virtually no option for dialogue between the user and the system to satisfy mutual goals.

Therefore, existing systems lack a conversational speech model that can provide users with the ability to interact with systems in ways that are inherently intuitive to human beings. Existing systems suffer from these and other problems.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

According to various embodiments and aspects of the invention, a cooperative conversational voice user interface may understand free form human utterances, freeing users from being restricted to a fixed set of commands and/or requests. Rather, users can engage in cooperative conversations with a machine to complete a request or series of requests using a natural, intuitive, free form manner of expression.

According to an aspect of the invention, an exemplary system architecture for implementing a cooperative conversational voice user interface is provided. The system may receive an input, which may include a human utterance received by an input device, where the utterance may include one or more requests. As used herein, an "utterance" may be words, syllables, phonemes, or any other audible sound made by a human being. As used herein, a "request" may be a command, directive, or other instruction for a device, computer, or other machine to retrieve information, perform a task, or take some other action. In one implementation, the input may be a multi-modal input, where at least part of the multi-modal input is an utterance. The utterance component of the input may be processed by a speech recognition engine (which may alternatively be referred to as an Automatic Speech Recognizer or ASR) to generate one or more preliminary interpretations of the utterance. The one or more preliminary interpretations may then be provided to a conversational speech engine for further processing, where the conversational speech engine may communicate with one or more databases to generate an adaptive conversational response, which may be returned to the user as an output. In one implementation, the output may be a multi-modal output. For example, the utterance may include a request to perform an action, and the output may include a conversational response reporting success or failure, as well as an execution of the action.

According to another aspect of the invention, an exemplary conversational speech engine may generate an adaptive conversational response to a request or series of requests. The conversational speech engine may include a free form voice search module that may understand an utterance made using typical, day-to-day language (i.e., in free form), and may account for variations in how humans normally speak, the vocabulary they use, and the conditions in which they speak. To account for intangible variables of human speech, the free form search module may include models of casual human speech. For example, in one implementation, the free form search module may understand specialized jargon and/or slang, tolerate variations in word order, and tolerate verbalized pauses or stuttered speech. For example, formalized English requests, where a verb precedes a noun, may be treated in an equivalent manner to requests where the noun precedes the verb. In another implementation, compound requests and/or compound tasks with multiple variables may be identified in a single utterance. By identifying all relevant information for completing

3

one or more tasks from a single utterance, advantages may be provided over existing voice user interfaces, such as Command and Control systems that use verbal menus to restrict information that a person can provide at a given point. In another implementation, inferring intended requests from incomplete or ambiguous requests may provide a conversational feel. By modeling what contextual signifiers, qualifiers, or other information may be required to perform a task in an identified context, an adaptive response may be generated, such as prompting a user for missing contextual signifiers, qualifiers, or other information. In one implementation, the response may ask for missing information in a way that most restricts possible interpretations, and the response may be framed to establish a domain for a subsequent user utterance. In another implementation, common alternatives for nouns and verbs may be recognized to reflect variations in usage patterns according to various criteria. Thus, variations in expression may be supported because word order is unimportant or unanticipated, and nouns and/or verbs may be represented in different ways to give simplistic, yet representative, examples. In another implementation, requests may be inferred from contradictory or otherwise inaccurate information, such as when an utterance includes starts and stops, restarts, stutters, run-on sentences, or other imperfect speech. For example, a user may sometimes change their mind, and thus alter the request in mid-utterance, and the imperfect speech feature may nonetheless be able to infer a request based on models of human speech. For example, various models may indicate that a last criterion is most likely to be correct, or intonation, emphasis, stress, use of the word "not," or other models may indicate which criterion is most likely to be correct.

According to another aspect of the invention, the conversational speech engine may include a noise tolerance module that may discard words or noise which has no meaning in a given context to reduce a likelihood of confusion. Moreover, the noise tolerance module may filter out environmental and non-human noise to further reduce a likelihood of confusion. In one implementation, the noise tolerance module may cooperate with other modules and features to filter out words that do not fit into an identified context. For example, the noise tolerance module may filter other human conversations and/or utterances within a range of one or more microphones. For example, a single device may include multiple microphones, or multiple devices may each include one or more microphones, and the noise tolerance module may collate inputs and cooperatively filter out sound by comparing a speech signal from the various microphones. The noise tolerance module may also filter out non-human environmental noise within range of the microphones, out-of-vocabulary words caused by speaker ambiguity or malapropisms, or other noise that may be unrelated to a target request. Performance benchmarks for the noise tolerance module may be defined by noise models based on human criteria. For example, if a driver of a car is 92% likely to be understood by a passenger when traveling at 65 miles-per-hour with windows cracked, then performance benchmarks for the noise tolerance module may have a similar performance under such conditions.

According to another aspect of the invention, the conversational speech engine may include a context determination process that determines one or more contexts for a request to establish meaning within a conversation. The one or more contexts may be determined by having one or more context domain agents compete to determine a most appropriate domain for a given utterance. Once a given domain agent "wins" the competition, the winning domain agent may be

4

responsible for establishing or inferring further contexts and updating short-term and long-term shared knowledge. If there is a deadlock between context domain agents, an adaptive conversational response may prompt the user to assist in disambiguating between the deadlocked agents. Moreover, the context determination process may infer intended operations and/or context based on previous utterances and/or requests, whereas existing systems consider each utterance independently, potentially making the same errors over and over again. For example, if a given interpretation turns out to be incorrect, the incorrect interpretation may be removed as a potential interpretation from one or more grammars associated with the speech recognition engine and/or from possible interpretations determined by the conversational speech engine, thereby assuring that a mistake will not be repeated for an identical utterance.

The context determination process may provide advantages over existing voice user interfaces by continually updating one or more models of an existing context and establishing context as a by-product of a conversation, which cannot be established a priori. Rather, the context determination process may track conversation topics and attempt to fit a current utterance into recent contexts, including switching between contexts as tasks are completed, partially completed, requested, etc. The context determination process may identify one or more context domains for an utterance by defining a collection of related functions that may be useful for users in various context domains. Moreover, each context domain may have relevant vocabularies and thought collections to model word groupings, which when evaluated together, may disambiguate one context domain from another. Thus, eliminating out-of-context words and noise words when searching for relevant combinations may enhance accuracy of inferences. This provides advantages over existing systems that attempt to assign meaning to every component of an utterance (i.e., including out-of-context words and noise words), which results in nearly infinite possible combinations and greater likelihood of confusion. The context determination process may also be self-aware, assigning degrees of certainty to one or more generated hypotheses, where a hypothesis may be developed to account for variations in environmental conditions, speaker ambiguity, accents, or other factors. By identifying a context, capabilities within the context, vocabularies within the context, what tasks are done most often historically in the context, what task was just completed, etc., the context determination process may establish intent from rather meager phonetic clues. Moreover, just as in human-to-human conversation, users may switch contexts at any time without confusion, enabling various context domains to be rapidly selected, without menu-driven dead ends, when an utterance is unambiguous.

According to another aspect of the invention, an exemplary cooperative conversational model may build upon free form voice search, noise tolerance, and context determination to implement a conversational Human-to-Machine interface that reflects human interaction and normal conversational behavior. That is, the cooperative conversational model enables humans and machines to participate in a conversation with an accepted purpose or direction, with each participant contributing to the conversation for the benefit of the conversation. By taking advantage of human presumptions about utterances that humans rely upon, both as speakers and listeners, a Human-to-Machine interface may be analogous to everyday human-to-human conversation. In one implementation, the exemplary cooperative conversation model may take incoming data (shared knowl-

5

edge) to inform a decision (intelligent hypothesis building), and then may refine the decision and generate a response (adaptive response building).

According to another aspect of the invention, shared knowledge may include both short-term and long-term knowledge. Short-term knowledge may accumulate during a single conversation, where input received during a single conversation may be retained. The shared knowledge may include cross-modality awareness, where in addition to accumulating input relating to user utterances, requests, locations, etc., the shared knowledge may accumulate a current user interface state relating to other modal inputs to further build shared knowledge models. The shared knowledge may be used to build one or more intelligent hypotheses using current and relevant information, build long-term shared knowledge by identifying information with long-term significance, and generate adaptive responses with relevant state and word usage information. Moreover, because cooperative conversations model human conversations, short-term session data may be expired after a psychologically appropriate amount of time, thereby humanizing system behavior, reducing a likelihood of contextual confusion based on stale data, while also adding relevant information from an expired session context to long-term knowledge models. Long-term shared knowledge may generally be user-centric, rather than session-based, where inputs may be accumulated over time to build user, environmental, cognitive, historical, or other long-term knowledge models. Long-term and short-term shared knowledge may be used simultaneously anytime a user engages in a cooperative conversation. Long-term shared knowledge may include explicit and/or implicit user preferences, a history of recent contexts, requests, tasks, etc., user-specific jargon related to vocabularies and/or capabilities of a context, most often used word choices, or other information. The long-term shared knowledge may be used to build one or more intelligent hypotheses using current and relevant information, generate adaptive responses with appropriate word choices when unavailable via short-term shared knowledge, refine long-term shared knowledge models, identify a frequency of specific tasks, identify tasks a user frequently has difficulty with, or provide other information and/or analysis to generate more accurate conversational responses. Shared knowledge may also be used to adapt a level of unprompted support (e.g., for novices versus experienced users, users who are frequently misrecognized, etc.) Thus, shared knowledge may enable a user and a voice user interface to share assumptions and expectations such as topic knowledge, conversation history, word usage, jargon, tone, or other assumptions and/or expectations that facilitate a cooperative conversation between human users and a system.

According to another aspect of the invention, a conversation type may be identified for any given utterance. Categorizing and developing conceptual models for various types of exchanges may consistently align user expectations and domain capabilities. One or more intelligent hypotheses may be generated as to a conversation type by considering conversational goals, participant roles, and/or an allocation of information among the participants. Based on the conversational goals, participant roles, and allocation of information, the intelligent hypotheses may consider various factors to classify a conversation (or utterance) into general types of conversations that can interact with one another to form many more variations and permutations of conversation types (e.g., a conversation type may change dynami-

6

cally as information is reallocated from one participant to another, or as conversational goals change based on the reallocation of information).

According to another aspect of the invention, the intelligent hypotheses may include one or more hypotheses of a user's intent in an utterance. In addition, the intelligent hypotheses may use short-term and/or long-term shared knowledge to proactively build and evaluate interaction with a user as a conversation progresses or over time. The hypotheses may model human-to-human interaction to include a varying degree of certainty for each hypothesis. That is, just as humans rely on knowledge shared by participants to examine how much and what kind of information was available, the intelligent hypotheses may leverage the identified conversation type and shared knowledge to generate a degree of certainty for each hypothesis.

According to another aspect of the invention, syntactically, grammatically, and contextually sensitive "intelligent responses" may be generated from the intelligent hypotheses that can be used to generate a conversational experience for a user, while also guiding the user to reply in a manner favorable for recognition. The intelligent responses may create a conversational feel by adapting to a user's manner of speaking, framing responses appropriately, and having natural variation and/or personality (e.g., by varying tone, pace, timing, inflection, word use, jargon, and other variables in a verbal or audible response).

According to another aspect of the invention, the intelligent responses may adapt to a user's manner of speaking by using contextual signifiers and grammatical rules to generate one or more sentences that may cooperate with the user. By taking advantage of shared knowledge about how a user utters a request, the responses may be modeled using similar techniques used to recognize requests. The intelligent responses may rate possible responses statistically and/or randomize responses, which creates an opportunity to build an exchange with natural variation and conversational feel. This provides advantages over existing voice user interfaces where input and output is incongruous, as the input is "conversational" and the output is "computerese."

According to another aspect of the invention, the intelligent responses may frame responses to influence a user reply utterance for easy recognition. For example, the responses may be modeled to illicit utterances from the user that may be more likely to result in a completed request. Thus, the responses may conform to a cooperative nature of human dialog and a natural human tendency to "parrot" what was just heard as part of a next utterance. Moreover, knowledge of current context may enhance responses to generate more meaningful conversational responses. Framing the responses may also deal with misrecognitions according to human models. For example, humans frequently remember a number of recent utterances, especially when one or more previous utterances were misrecognized or unrecognized. Another participant in the conversation may limit correction to a part of the utterance that was misrecognized or unrecognized, or over subsequent utterances and/or other interactions, clues may be provided to indicate the initial interpretation was incorrect. Thus, by storing and analyzing multiple utterances, utterances from earlier in a conversation may be corrected as the conversation progresses.

According to another aspect of the invention, the intelligent responses may include multi-modal, or cross-modal, responses to a user. In one implementation, responses may be aware of and control one or more devices and/or inter-

faces, and users may respond by using whichever input method, or combination of input methods, is most convenient.

According to another aspect of the invention, the intelligent responses may correct a course of a conversation without interrupting conversational flow. That is, even though the intelligent responses may be reasonably “sure,” the intelligent responses may nonetheless sometimes be incorrect. While existing voice user interfaces tend to fail on average conversational missteps, normal human interactions may expect missteps and deal with them appropriately. Thus, responses after misrecognitions may be modeled after clarifications, rather than errors, and words may chosen in subsequent responses to move conversation forward and establish an appropriate domain to be explored with the user.

Other objects and advantages of the invention will be apparent to those skilled in the art based on the following drawings and detailed description.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 1 is an exemplary block diagram of a system architecture according to one aspect of the invention.

FIG. 2 is an exemplary block diagram of a conversational speech engine according to one aspect of the invention.

FIG. 3 is an exemplary block diagram of a cooperative conversational model according to one aspect of the invention.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

Referring to FIG. 1, an exemplary system architecture for implementing a cooperative conversational voice user interface is illustrated according to one aspect of the invention. The system may receive an input **105** from a user, where in one implementation, input **105** may be an utterance received by an input device (e.g., a microphone), where the utterance may include one or more requests. Input **105** may also be a multi-modal input, where at least part of the multi-modal input is an utterance. For example, the input device may include a combination of a microphone and a touch-screen device, and input **105** may include an utterance that includes a request relating to a portion of a display on the touch-screen device that the user is touching. For instance, the touch-screen device may be a navigation device, and input **105** may include an utterance of “Give me directions to here,” where the user may be requesting directions to a desired destination on the display of the navigation device.

The utterance component of input **105** may be processed by a speech recognition engine **110** (which may alternatively be referred to herein as Automatic Speech Recognizer **110**, or as shown in FIG. 1, ASR **110**) to generate one or more preliminary interpretations of the utterance. The speech recognition engine **110** may process the utterance using any suitable technique known in the art. For example, in one implementation, the speech recognition engine **110** may interpret the utterance using techniques of phonetic dictation to recognize a phoneme stream, as described in U.S. patent application Ser. No. 11/513,269, entitled “Dynamic Speech Sharpening,” filed Aug. 31, 2006, which issued as U.S. Pat. No. 7,634,409 on Dec. 15, 2009, and which is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety. The one or more preliminary interpretations generated by the speech recognition engine **110** may then be provided to a conversational speech engine **115** for further processing. Conversational speech engine **115** may include a conversational language processor **120** and/or a voice search engine **125**, described in

greater detail in FIG. 2 below. Conversational speech engine **115** may communicate with one or more databases **130** to generate an adaptive conversational response, which may be returned to the user as an output **140**. In one implementation, output **140** may be a multi-modal output and/or an interaction with one or more applications **145** to complete the request. For example, output **140** may include a combination of an audible response and a display of a route on a navigation device. For example, the utterance may include a request to perform an action, and output **140** may include a conversational response reporting success or failure, as well as an execution of the action. In addition, in various implementations, the speech recognition engine **110**, conversational speech engine **115**, and/or databases **130** may reside locally (e.g., on a user device), remotely (e.g., on a server), or a hybrid model of local and remote processing may be used (e.g., lightweight applications may be processed locally while computationally intensive applications may be processed remotely).

Referring to FIG. 2, an exemplary block diagram is provided illustrating a conversational speech engine **215** according to one aspect of the invention. Conversational speech engine **215** may include a conversational language processor **220** that generates an adaptive conversational response to a request or series of requests using a free form voice search module **245**, a noise tolerance module **250**, and/or a context determination process **255**. According to one aspect of the invention, modules **245-255** may communicate with a voice search engine **225** that includes one or more context domain agents **230** and/or one or more vocabularies **235** to aid in interpreting utterances and generating responses, as described in “Enhancing the VUE™ (Voice-User-Experience) Through Conversational Speech,” by Tom Freeman and Larry Baldwin, which is herein incorporated by reference in its entirety. Conversational speech engine **215** may generate an adaptive conversational response to one or more requests, where the requests may depend on unspoken assumptions, incomplete information, context established by previous utterances, user profiles, historical profiles, environmental profiles, or other information. Moreover, conversational speech engine **215** may track which requests have been completed, which requests are being processed, and/or which requests cannot be processed due to incomplete or inaccurate information, and the response may be generated accordingly.

According to one aspect of the invention, free form voice search module **245** may understand an utterance made using typical, day-to-day language (i.e., in free form), and may account for variations in how humans normally speak, the vocabulary they use, and the conditions in which they speak. Because variables such as stress, distraction, and serendipity are always different and infinitely varied, free form search module **245** may be designed with a goal of understanding that no human will come to the same Human-to-Machine interface situation in the same way twice. Thus, free form search module **245** may implement one or more features that model casual human speech. In various implementations, free form search module **245** may include, among other things, a free form utterance feature, a one-step access feature, an inferencing intended operations feature, an alternative expression feature, and/or an imperfect speech feature.

The free form utterance feature may understand specialized jargon and/or slang, tolerate variations in word order (e.g., whether a subject of a request comes before or after a verb may be irrelevant), and tolerate verbalized pauses (e.g., “um,” “ah,” “eh,” and other utterances without meaning).

For example, the free form utterance feature may treat formalized English verb-before-noun requests in an equivalent manner to free form requests where a noun may precede a verb. For example, user utterances of “Change it to the Squizz” and “You know, um, that Squizz channel, ah, switch it there” may be treated equivalently (where Squizz is a channel on XM Satellite Radio). In either case, the free form utterance feature is able to identify “Squizz” as a subject of the utterance and “Change it” or “switch it” as a verb or request for the utterance (e.g., by cooperating with context determination process 255, or other features, and identifying a relevant context domain agent 230 and/or vocabulary 235 to interpret the utterance).

The one-step access feature may understand utterances that include compound requests with multiple variables. For example, a user utterance may be “What is the forecast for Boston this weekend?” The one-step access feature may identify “weather” as a context (e.g., by cooperating with context determination process 255, or other features, and identifying “forecast” as a synonym of “weather”), and search for a city equal to “Boston” and a time equal to “weekend.” By identifying all relevant information for completing a task from a single utterance, the one-step access feature may overcome drawbacks of existing voice user interfaces, such as Command and Control systems that use verbal menus to restrict information that a person can provide at a given point (e.g., a Command and Control system for a phone directory service may say: “State please,” . . . “City please,” . . . “What listing,” etc.). Moreover, some utterances may include compound requests, and the one-step access feature may decompose the compound requests into sub-tasks. For example, a user utterance of “I need to be at a meeting tomorrow in San Francisco at 8:00 am” may be decomposed into a set of sub-tasks such as (1) checking availability and reserving a flight on an evening before the meeting, (2) checking availability and reserving a hotel, (3) checking availability and reserving a car, etc., where users may further designate preferences for various tasks (e.g., first check availability on an airline for which the user is a frequent flyer). Depending on a level of shared knowledge about a user’s preferences and/or historical patterns, the one-step access feature may infer additional tasks from a request. For example, in the above example, the one-step access feature may also check a weather forecast, and if the weather is “nice” (as defined by the user preferences and/or as inferred from historical patterns), the one-step access feature may schedule a tee-time at a preferred golf course in San Francisco.

The inferencing intended operations feature may identify an intended request from incomplete or ambiguous requests. For example, when a user utters “Route <indecipherable> Chicago <indecipherable> here,” where the user intended to say “Route calculation to Chicago from here,” the inferencing intended operations feature may model what is required to calculate a route (an origination point and a destination point). Because the utterance includes the origination point and the destination point, a request to calculate a route from the user’s present location to Chicago may be inferred. Similarly, when the inferencing intended operations feature does not have sufficient information to infer a complete request, an adaptive conversational response may be generated to prompt the user for missing information. For example, when an utterance includes a request for a stock quote but not a company name (e.g., “Get me the stock price for <indecipherable>”), the response may be “What company’s stock quote do you want?” The user may then provide an utterance including the company name, and the

request may be completed. In one implementation, the response may ask for missing information in a way that most restricts possible interpretations (e.g., in a request for a task that requires both a city and a state, the state may be asked for first because there are fewer states than cities). Moreover, the inferencing intended operations feature may model compound tasks and/or requests by maintaining context and identifying relevant and/or missing information at both a composite and sub-task level.

The alternative expression feature may recognize common alternatives for nouns and verbs to reflect variations in usage patterns according to various criteria. For example, users may vary expression based on age, socio-economics, ethnicity, user whims, or other factors. Thus, the alternative expression feature may support variations in expression where word order is unimportant or unanticipated. Alternatives in expression based on various criteria or demographics may be loaded into context domain agents 230 and/or vocabularies 235, and the alternative expression feature may update context domain agents 230 and/or vocabularies 235 based on inferred or newly discovered variations. In one implementation, conversational speech engine 215 may include a subscription interface to update changes to context domain agents 230 and/or vocabularies 235 (e.g., a repository may aggregate various user utterances and deploy updates system wide). In operation, the alternative expression feature may allow nouns and/or verbs to be represented in different ways to give simplistic, yet representative, examples. For example, a user interested in a weather forecast for Washington, D.C. may provide any of the following utterances, each of which are interpreted equivalently: “What’s the weather like in DC,” “Is it raining inside the Beltway,” “Gimme the forecast for the capital,” etc. Similarly, utterances of “Go to my home,” “Go home,” “Show route to home,” and “I would like to know my way home” may all be interpreted equivalently, where a user profile may include the user’s home address and a navigation route to the home address may be calculated.

The imperfect speech feature may be able to infer requests from contradictory or otherwise inaccurate information, such as when an utterance includes starts and stops, restarts, stutters, run-on sentences, or other imperfect speech. For example, a user may sometimes change their mind, and thus alter the request in mid-utterance, and the imperfect speech feature may nonetheless be able to infer a request based on models of human speech. For example, for an utterance of “Well, I wanna . . . Mexi . . . no, steak restaurant please, I’m hungry,” existing voice user interfaces make no assumptions regarding models of human speech and would be unable to infer whether the user wanted a Mexican or steak restaurant. The imperfect speech feature overcomes these drawbacks by using various models of human understanding that may indicate that a last criterion is most likely to be correct, or intonation, emphasis, stress, use of the word “not,” or other models may indicate which criterion is most likely to be correct. Thus, in the above example, the imperfect speech feature may infer that the user wants a steak restaurant.

According to one aspect of the invention, noise tolerance module 250 may be closely related to the imperfect speech feature, and may operate to discard words or noise that has no meaning in a given context so as not to create confusion. Moreover, noise tolerance module 250 may filter out environmental and non-human noise to further reduce a likelihood of confusion. In one implementation, noise tolerance module 250 may cooperate with other modules and features to filter out words that do not fit into a context. For example, one or more contexts may be identified, and words that have

11

no meaning with respect to system capabilities, random human utterances without meaning and other noise may be filtered out. Thus, noise tolerance module 250 may model real-world conditions to identify meaningful requests. For example, noise tolerance module 250 may filter other human conversations and/or utterances within a range of one or more microphones. For example, a single device may include multiple microphones, or multiple devices may each include one or more microphones, and the noise tolerance module may collate inputs and cooperatively filter out sound by comparing a speech signal from the various microphones. Noise tolerance module 250 may also filter out non-human environmental noise within the range of the microphones, out-of-vocabulary words, which could be a result of speaker ambiguity or malapropisms, or other noise that may be unrelated to a target request. Noise models in noise tolerance module 250 may define performance benchmarks based on human criteria. For example, if a driver of a car, traveling at 65 miles-per-hour, with windows cracked is 92% likely to be understood by a passenger, then noise tolerance module 250 may have a similar performance under those conditions.

According to one aspect of the invention, conversational speech engine 215 may include a context determination process 255 that determines one or more contexts for a request to establish meaning within a conversation. The one or more contexts may be determined by having one or more context domain agents compete to determine a most appropriate domain for a given utterance, as described in U.S. patent application Ser. No. 11/197,504, entitled "Systems and Methods for Responding to Natural Language Speech Utterance," filed Aug. 5, 2005, which issued as U.S. Pat. No. 7,640,160 on Dec. 29, 2009 and U.S. patent application Ser. No. 11/212,693, entitled "Mobile Systems and Methods of Supporting Natural Language Human-Machine Interactions," filed Aug. 29, 2005, which issued as U.S. Pat. No. 7,949,529 on May 24, 2011, both of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety. Once a given context domain agent "wins" the competition, the winning agent may be responsible for establishing or inferring further contexts and updating short-term and long-term shared knowledge. If there is a deadlock between context domain agents, an adaptive conversational response may prompt the user to assist in disambiguating between the deadlocked agents. For example, a user utterance of "What about traffic?" may have a distinct meaning in various contexts. That is, "traffic" may have a first meaning when the user is querying a system's media player (i.e., "traffic" would be a Rock and Roll band led by singer/songwriter Steve Winwood), a second meaning when the user is querying a search interface regarding Michael Douglas films (i.e., "traffic" would be a film directed by Steven Soderbergh), a third meaning when the user is querying a navigation device for directions to an airport (i.e., "traffic" would be related to conditions on roads along a route to the airport).

Moreover, context determination process 255 may infer intended operations and/or context based on previous utterances and/or requests, whereas existing systems consider each utterance independently, potentially making the same errors over and over again. For example, if a given interpretation turns out to be incorrect, the incorrect interpretation may be removed as a potential interpretation from one or more grammars associated with the speech recognition engine and/or from possible subsequent interpretations determined by context determination process 255, thereby assuring that a mistake will not be repeated for an identical utterance.

12

Context determination process 255 may overcome drawbacks of existing systems by continually updating one or more models of an existing context, where establishing context may be a by-product of a conversation, which cannot be established a priori. Context determination process 255 may establish a first context domain, change to a second context domain, change back to the first context domain, and so on, as tasks are completed, partially completed, requested, etc., and a context stack may track conversation topics and attempt to fit a current utterance into a most-recent context, next-most-recent topic, etc., traversing the context stack until a most likely intent can be established. For example, a user may utter "What's the traffic report," and context determination process 255 may establish Traffic as a context, and return an output including a traffic report, which does not happen to mention traffic on Interstate-5. The user may then utter "What about I-5?" and context determination process 255 may know that the current context is Traffic, a traffic report including information about Interstate-5 may be searched for, and the traffic report indicating that Interstate-5 is crowded may be returned as an output. The user may then utter "Is there a faster way?" and context determination module 255 may know that the current context is still Traffic, and may search for routes to a specified destination with light traffic and avoiding Interstate-5. Moreover, context determination process 255 may build context based on user profiles, environmental profiles, historical profiles, or other information to further refine the context. For example, the profiles may indicate that Interstate-5 is a typical route taken Monday through Friday.

The profiles may be particularly meaningful when attempting to disambiguate between contexts where a word has different meanings in different contexts. For example, a user may utter "What's the weather in Seattle?" and context determination process 255 may establish Weather as a context, as well as establishing Seattle as an environmental context. The user may then utter "and Portland?" and context determination process 255 may return a weather report for Portland, Ore. based on the Weather and an environmental proximity between Portland, Ore. and Seattle, Wash. The user may then ask "What time does the game start?" and a search for sports events with teams from Seattle and/or Portland may occur, with results presented conversationally according to methods described in greater detail below in FIG. 3. Correlatively, had user originally uttered "What's the weather in Portsmouth, N.H.," in the second utterance, context determination process 255 may instead retrieve a weather report for Portland, Me. based on an environmental proximity to New Hampshire. Moreover, when environmental profiles, contextual shared knowledge, and/or other short-term and/or long-term shared knowledge does not provide enough information to disambiguate between possibilities, responses may prompt the user with a request for further information (e.g., "Did you mean Portland, Me., or Portland, Ore.?).

Context determination process 255 may cooperate with context domain agents 230, where each context domain agent 230 may define a collection of related functions that may be useful for users. Moreover, each context domain agent 230 may include a relevant vocabulary 235 and thought collections that model word groupings, which when evaluated together, may disambiguate one context domain from another (e.g., a Music context domain agent 230 may include a vocabulary 235 for songs, artists, albums, etc., whereas a Stock context domain agent 230 may include a vocabulary 235 for company names, ticker symbols, financial metrics, etc.). Thus, accuracy in identifying meaning

13

may be enhanced by eliminating out-of-context words and noise words when searching for relevant combinations. In contrast, existing systems attempt to assign meaning to every component of an utterance (e.g., including out-of-context words and noise words), which results in nearly infinite possible combinations and greater likelihood of confusion. Moreover, context domain agents **230** may include metadata for each criteria to further assist in interpreting utterances, inferring intent, completing incomplete requests, etc. (e.g., a Space Needle vocabulary word may include metadata for Seattle, landmark, tourism, Sky City restaurant, etc.). Given a disambiguated criterion, context determination process **255** may thus be able to automatically determine other information needed to complete a request, discard importance of word order, and perform other enhancements for conversational speech.

Context domain agents **230** may also be self-aware, assigning degrees of certainty to one or more generated hypotheses, where a hypothesis may be developed to account for variations in environmental conditions, speaker ambiguity, accents, or other factors. Conceptually, context domain agents **230** may be designed to model utterances as a hard-of-hearing person would at a noisy party. By identifying a context, capabilities within the context, vocabularies within the context, what tasks are done most often historically in the context, what task was just completed, etc., a context domain agent **230** may establish intent from rather meager phonetic clues. Moreover, the context stack may be one of a plurality of components for establishing context, and thus not a constraint upon the user. All context domains may be accessible, allowing the user to switch contexts at any time without confusion. Thus, just as in human-to-human conversation, context domains may be rapidly selected, without menu-driven dead ends, when an utterance is unambiguous. For example, a user may utter, "Please call Rich Kennewick on his cell phone," and a system response of "Do you wish me to call Rich Kennewick on his cell?" may be generated. The user may decide at that point to call Rich Kennewick later, and instead, listen to some music. Thus, the user may then utter, "No, play the Louis Armstrong version of Body and Soul from my iPod," and a system response of "Playing Body and Soul by Louis Armstrong" may be generated as Body and Soul is played through a media player. In this example, the later utterance has no contextual connection to the first utterance, yet because request criteria in the utterances are unambiguous, contexts can be switched easily without relying on the context stack.

Referring to FIG. 3, an exemplary cooperative conversational model **300** is illustrated according to an aspect of the invention. Cooperative conversational model **300** may build upon free form voice search **245**, noise tolerance **250**, and context determination **255** to implement a conversational Human-to-Machine interface that reflects how humans interact with each other and their normal behavior in conversation. Simply put, cooperative conversational model **300** enables humans and machines to participate in a conversation with an accepted purpose or direction, with each participant contributing to the conversation for the benefit of the conversation. That is, cooperative conversational model **300** incorporates technology and process-flow that takes advantage of human presumptions about utterances that humans rely upon, both as speakers and listeners, thereby creating a Human-to-Machine interface that is analogous to everyday human-to-human conversation. In one implementation, a cooperative conversation may take incoming data (shared knowledge) **305** to inform a decision (intelligent hypothesis

14

building) **310**, and then may refine the decision and generate a response (adaptive response building) **315**.

According to one aspect of the invention, shared knowledge **305** includes both short-term and long-term knowledge about incoming data. Short-term knowledge may accumulate during a single conversation, while long-term knowledge may accumulate over time to build user profiles, environmental profiles, historical profiles, cognitive profiles, etc.

Input received during a single conversation may be retained in a Session Input Accumulator. The Session Input Accumulator may include cross-modality awareness, where in addition to accumulating input relating to user utterances, requests, locations, etc., the Session Input Accumulator may accumulate a current user interface state relating to other modal inputs to further build shared knowledge models and more accurate adaptive responses (e.g., when a user utters a request relating to a portion of a touch-screen device, as described above). For example, the Session Input Accumulator may accumulate inputs including recognition text for each utterance, a recorded speech file for each utterance, a list-item selection history, a graphical user interface manipulation history, or other input data. Thus, the Session Input Accumulator may populate Intelligent Hypothesis Builder **310** with current and relevant information, build long-term shared knowledge by identifying information with long-term significance, provide Adaptive Response Builder **315** with relevant state and word usage information, retain recent contexts for use with Intelligent Hypothesis Builder **310**, and/or retain utterances for reprocessing during multi-pass evaluations. Moreover, because cooperative conversations **300** model human conversations, short-term session data may be expired after a psychologically appropriate amount of time, thereby humanizing system behavior. For example, a human is unlikely to recall a context of a conversation from two years ago, but because the context would be identifiable by a machine, session context is expired after a predetermined amount of time to reduce a likelihood of contextual confusion based on stale data. However, relevant information from an expired session context may nonetheless be added to user, historical, environmental, cognitive, or other long-term knowledge models.

Long-term shared knowledge may generally be user-centric, rather than session-based. That is, inputs may be accumulated over time to build user, environmental, cognitive, historical, or other long-term knowledge models. Long-term and short-term shared knowledge (collectively, shared knowledge **305**) may be used simultaneously anytime a user engages in a cooperative conversation **300**. Long-term shared knowledge may include explicit and/or implicit user preferences, a history of most recently used agents, contexts, requests, tasks, etc., user-specific jargon related to vocabularies and/or capabilities of an agent and/or context, most often used word choices, or other information. The long-term shared knowledge may be used to populate Intelligent Hypothesis Builder **310** with current and relevant information, provide Adaptive Response Builder **315** with appropriate word choices when the appropriate word choices are unavailable via the Session Input Accumulator, refine long-term shared knowledge models, identify a frequency of specific tasks, identify tasks a user frequently has difficulty with, or provide other information and/or analysis to generate more accurate conversational responses.

As described above, shared knowledge **305** may be used to populate Intelligent Hypothesis Builder **310**, such that a user and a voice user interface may share assumptions and expectations such as topic knowledge, conversation history,

15

word usage, jargon, tone (e.g., formal, humorous, terse, etc.), or other assumptions and/or expectations that facilitate interaction at a Human-to-Machine interface.

According to an aspect of the invention, one component of a successful cooperative conversation may be identifying a type of conversation from an utterance. By categorizing and developing conceptual models for various types of exchanges, user expectations and domain capabilities may be consistently aligned. Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may generate a hypothesis as to a conversation type by considering conversational goals, participant roles, and/or an allocation of information among the participants. Conversational goals may broadly include: (1) getting a discrete piece of information or performing a discrete task, (2) gathering related pieces of information to make a decision, and/or (3) disseminating or gathering large amounts of information to build expertise. Participant roles may broadly include: (1) a leader that controls a conversation, (2) a supporter that follows the leader and provides input as requested, and/or (3) a consumer that uses information. Information may be held by one or more of the participants at the outset of a conversation, where a participant may hold most (or all) of the information, little (or none) of the information, or the information may be allocated roughly equally amongst the participants. Based on the conversational goals, participant roles, and allocation of information, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may consider various factors to classify a conversation (or utterance) into general types of conversations that can interact with one another to form many more variations and permutations of conversation types (e.g., a conversation type may change dynamically as information is reallocated from one participant to another, or as conversational goals change based on the reallocation of information).

For example, in one implementation, a query conversation may include a conversational goal of getting a discrete piece of information or performing a particular task, where a leader of the query conversation may have a specific goal in mind and may lead the conversation toward achieving the goal. The other participant may hold the information and may support the leader by providing the information. In a didactic conversation, a leader of the conversation may control information desired by a supporter of the conversation. The supporter's role may be limited to regulating an overall progression of the conversation and interjecting queries for clarification. In an exploratory conversation, both participants share leader and supporter roles, and the conversation may have no specific goal, or the goal may be improvised as the conversation progresses. Based on this model, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may broadly categorize a conversation (or utterance) according to the following diagram:

	Participant A User	Participant B Voice User Interface
QUERY		
GOAL	Get information/action	Provide information/action
ROLE	Leader/Consumer	Supporter/Dispenser
INFORMATION	Less	More
ALLOCATION		
DIDACTIC		
GOAL	Get information	Provide information
ROLE	Follower/Consumer	Leader/Dispenser
INFORMATION	Less	More
ALLOCATION		

16

-continued

	Participant A User	Participant B Voice User Interface
EXPLORATORY		
GOAL	Gather/share information	Gather/share information
ROLE	Follower/Consumer and Leader/Dispenser	Follower/Consumer and Leader/Dispenser
INFORMATION	Equal or alternating	Equal or alternating
ALLOCATION		

Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may use an identified conversation type to assist in generating a set of hypotheses as to a user's intent in an utterance. In addition, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may use short-term shared knowledge from the Session Input Accumulator to proactively build and evaluate interaction with a user as a conversation progresses, as well as long-term shared knowledge to proactively build and evaluate interaction with the user over time. Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may thus adaptively arrive at a set of N-best hypotheses about user intent, and the N-best hypotheses may be provided to an Adaptive Response Builder 315. In addition, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may model human-to-human interaction by calculating a degree of certainty for each of the hypotheses. That is, just as humans rely on knowledge shared by participants to examine how much and what kind of information was available, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may leverage the identified conversation type and short-term and long-term shared knowledge to generate a degree of certainty for each hypothesis.

According to another aspect of the invention, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may generate one or more explicit hypotheses of a user's intent when an utterance contains all information (including qualifiers) needed to complete a request or task. Each hypothesis may have a corresponding degree of certainty, which may be used to determine a level of unprompted support to provide in a response. For example, a response may include a confirmation to ensure the utterance was not misunderstood or the response may adaptively prompt a user to provide missing information.

According to another aspect of the invention, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may use short-term knowledge to generate one or more implicit hypotheses of a user's intent when an utterance may be missing required qualifiers or other information needed to complete a request or task. Each hypothesis may have a corresponding degree of certainty. For instance, when a conversation begins, short-term knowledge stored in the Session Input Accumulator may be empty, and as the conversation progresses, the Session Input Accumulator may build a history of the conversation. Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may use data in the Session Input Accumulator to supplement or infer additional information about a current utterance. For example, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may evaluate a degree of certainty based on a number of previous requests relevant to the current utterance. In another example, when the current utterance contains insufficient information to complete a request or task, data in the Session Input Accumulator may be used to infer missing information so that a hypothesis can be generated. In still another example, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may identify syntax and/or grammar to be used by Adaptive Response Builder 315 to formulate personalized and conversational response. In yet another example, when the current utterance contains a threshold amount of information

17

needed to complete a request or task, data in the Session Input Accumulator may be relied upon to tune a degree of certainty.

According to another aspect of the invention, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may use long-term shared knowledge to generate one or more implicit hypotheses of a user's intent when an utterance is missing qualifiers or other information needed to complete a request or task. Each hypothesis may have a corresponding degree of certainty. Using long-term knowledge may be substantially similar to using short-term shared knowledge, except that information may be unconstrained by a current session, and an input mechanism may include information from additional sources other than conversational sessions. For example, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may use information from long-term shared knowledge at any time, even when a new conversation is initiated, whereas short-term shared knowledge may be limited to an existing conversation (where no short-term shared knowledge would be available when a new conversation is initiated). Long-term shared knowledge may come from several sources, including user preferences or a plug-in data source (e.g., a subscription interface to a remote database), expertise of a user (e.g., based on a frequency of errors, types of tasks requested, etc., the user may be identified as a novice, intermediate, experienced, or other type of user), agent-specific information and/or language that may also apply to other agents (e.g., by decoupling information from an agent to incorporate the information into other agents), frequently used topics passed in from the Session Input Accumulator, frequently used verbs, nouns, or other parts of speech, and/or other syntax information passed in from the Session Input Accumulator, or other sources of long-term shared knowledge may be used.

According to another aspect of the invention, knowledge-enabled utterances, as generated by Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310, may include one or more explicit (supplied by a user), and one or more implicit (supplied by Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310) contextual signifiers, qualifiers, criteria, and other information that can be used to identify and evaluate relevant tasks. At that point, Intelligent Hypothesis Builder 310 may provide an input to Adaptive Response Builder 315. The input received by Adaptive Response Builder 315 may include at least a ranked list of hypotheses, including explicit and/or implicit hypotheses, each of which may have a corresponding degree of certainty. A hypothesis may be assigned one of four degrees of certainty: (1) "sure," where contextual signifiers and qualifiers relate to one task, context and qualifiers relate to one task, and a confidence level associated with a preliminary interpretation generated at the speech recognition engine exceeds a predetermined threshold; (2) "pretty sure," where contextual signifiers and qualifiers relate to more than one task (select top-ranked task) and criteria relates to one request, and/or the confidence level associated with the preliminary interpretation generated at the speech recognition engine is below the predetermined threshold; (3) "not sure," where additional contextual signifiers or qualifiers are needed to indicate or rank a task; and (4) "no hypothesis," where little or no information can be deciphered. Each degree of certainty may further be classified as explicit or implicit, which may be used to adjust a response. The input received by Adaptive Response Builder 310 may also include a context, user syntax and/or grammar, context domain agent specific information and/or preferences (e.g., a travel context domain agent may know a user frequently requests information about France, which may be shared

18

with a movie context domain agent so that responses may occasionally include French movies).

According to another aspect of the invention, Adaptive Response Builder 315 may build syntactically, grammatically, and contextually sensitive "intelligent responses" that can be used with one or more agents to generate a conversational experience for a user, while also guiding the user to reply in a manner favorable for recognition. In one implementation, the intelligent responses may include a verbal or audible reply played through an output device (e.g., a speaker), and/or an action performed by a device, computer, or machine (e.g., downloading a web page, showing a list, executing an application, etc.). In one implementation, an appropriate response may not require conversational adaptation, and default replies and/or randomly selected response sets for a given task may be used.

According to another aspect of the invention, Adaptive Response Builder 310 may draw on information maintained by Intelligence Hypothesis Builder 310 to generate responses that may be sensitive to context, task recognition of a current utterance, what a user already knows about a topic, what an application already knows about the topic, shared knowledge regarding user preferences and/or related topics, appropriate contextual word usage (e.g., jargon), words uttered by the user in recent utterances, conversational development and/or course correction, conversational tone, type of conversation, natural variation in wording of responses, or other information. As a result, Adaptive Response Builder 315 may generate intelligent responses that create conversational feel, adapt to information that accumulates over a duration of a conversation, maintain cross-modal awareness, and keep the conversation on course.

According to another aspect of the invention, Adaptive Response Builder 315 may create a conversational feel by adapting to a user's manner of speaking, framing responses appropriately, and having natural variation and/or personality (e.g., by varying tone, pace, timing, inflection, word use, jargon, and other variables in a verbal or audible response). Adapting to a user's manner of speaking may include using contextual signifiers and grammatical rules to generate one or more sentences for use as response sets that may cooperate with the user. By taking advantage of short-term (from the Session Input Accumulator) and long-term (from one or more profiles) shared knowledge about how a user utters a request, the responses may be modeled using techniques used to recognize requests. Adaptive Response Builder 315 may rate possible responses statistically and/or randomize responses, which creates an opportunity to build an exchange with natural variation and conversational feel. This may be a significant advantage over existing voice user interfaces with incongruous input and output, where the input is "conversational" and the output is "computerese." The following examples may demonstrate how a response may adapt to a user's input word choices and manner of speaking:

User	Do you know [mumbled words] Seattle [more mumbled words]?
Voice User Interface	Did you want Seattle sports scores, weather, traffic, or news?
User	Find me [mumbled words] Seattle [more mumbled words]?
Voice User Interface	I found Seattle, did you want sports scores, weather, traffic, or news?

19

-continued

User	Get me [mumbled words] Seattle [more mumbled words]?
Voice	I've got Seattle, did you want me to get sports scores,
User	weather, traffic, or news?
Interface	

According to another aspect of the invention, Adaptive Response Builder 315 may frame responses to influence a user to reply with an utterance that may be easily recognized. For example, a user may utter, "Get me the news" and a voice user interface response may be "Which of these categories? Top news stories, international news, political news, or sports news?" The response may be likely to illicit utterances from the user, such as "Top news stories" or "International news," which are more likely to result in a completed request. Thus, the responses may conform to a cooperative nature of human dialog, and a natural human tendency to "parrot" what was just heard as part of a next utterance. Moreover, knowledge of current context may enhance responses to generate more meaningful conversational responses, such as in the following exchange:

User	What's the weather like in Dallas?
Voice	In Dallas, it's sunny and 90 degrees.
User	
Interface	
User	What theaters are showing the movie "The Fantastic Four" there?
Voice	10 theaters in Dallas are showing "The Fantastic Four." Do
User	you want show times for a particular theater?
Interface	

Framing the responses may also deal with misrecognitions according to human models. For example, humans frequently remember a number of recent utterances, especially when one or more previous utterances were misrecognized or unrecognized. Another participant in the conversation may limit correction to a part of the utterance that was misrecognized or unrecognized, or over subsequent utterances and/or other interactions, clues may be provided to indicate the initial interpretation was incorrect. Thus, by storing and analyzing multiple utterances, utterances from earlier in a conversation may be corrected as the conversation progresses.

According to another aspect of the invention, Adaptive Response Builder 315 may generate multi-modal, or cross-modal, responses to a user. In one implementation, responses may be aware of and control one or more devices and/or interfaces, and users may respond by using whichever input method, or combination of input methods, is most convenient. For example, a response asking the user to direct an utterance with a "Yes" or "No" in a multi-modal environment may also display alternatives visually.

According to another aspect of the invention, Adaptive Response Builder 315 may correct a course of a conversation without interrupting conversational flow. Adaptive Response Builder 315 may generate intelligent responses based on the ranked list of hypotheses and corresponding degrees of certainty, which may be used to correct a course of a conversation without interrupting conversational flow. That is, even though the intelligent responses may be reasonably "sure," the intelligent responses may nonetheless sometimes be incorrect. While existing voice user interfaces tend to fail on average conversational missteps, normal human interactions may expect missteps and deal with them appropriately. Thus, responses after a misrecognition may be

20

modeled after clarifications, rather than errors, and words may chosen in subsequent responses that move conversation forward and establish an appropriate domain to be explored with the user. For example, course correction may result in the following exchange:

User	Can you get [mumbled words here] Mariners [more mumbled words]?
Voice	I've got the score for the Mariners game? 4-2 Mariners.
User	
Interface	
User	No, the start time for tomorrow's game.
Voice	Oh, 7:05.
User	
Interface	

The above disclosure has been described in terms of specific exemplary aspects, implementations, and embodiments of the invention. However, those skilled in the art will recognize various changes and modifications that may be made without departing from the scope and spirit of the invention. Therefore, the specification and drawings are to be regarded as exemplary only, and the scope of the invention is to be determined solely by the appended claims.

What is claimed is:

1. A computer-implemented method of facilitating natural language system responses using short-term knowledge generated based on one or more prior multi-modal device interactions, the method being implemented by a computer system that includes one or more physical processors executing one or more computer program instructions which, when executed, perform the method, the method comprising:

receiving, by the computer system during a first conversation, a first voice input via a first input device, the first voice input comprising a first natural language utterance;

receiving, by the computer system, a second voice input comprising the first natural language utterance via a second input device;

comparing, by the computer system, the first voice input with the second voice input;

filtering, by the computer system, sound from the first voice input and the second voice input based on the comparison;

obtaining, by the computer system during the first conversation, a user interface state related to one or more non-voice inputs associated with the first voice input, the one or more non-voice inputs comprising at least a first non-voice input;

generating, by the computer system, the short-term knowledge based on at least the first voice input and the first non-voice input;

determining, by the computer system, based on the short-term knowledge, a first context for the first natural language utterance;

determining, by the computer system, based on the first context, an interpretation of the first natural language utterance; and

generating, by the computer system, based on the interpretation of the first natural language utterance, a first response to the first natural language utterance.

2. The method of claim 1, the method further comprising: receiving, at the computer system, a second natural language utterance via the first input device;

21

determining, by the computer system, based on the short-term knowledge, whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to the first context;

determining, by the computer system, responsive to the second natural language utterance not corresponding to the first context, a second context for the second natural language utterance based on the short-term knowledge;

determining, by the computer system, based on the second context, an interpretation of the second natural language utterance; and

generating, by the computer system, based on the interpretation of the second natural language utterance, a response to the second natural language utterance.

3. The method of claim 1, the method further comprising: tracking, by the computer system, contexts identified for multiple consecutive natural language user utterances to generate a context stack, the context stack including the contexts identified for the multiple consecutive natural language user utterances;

receiving, at the computer system, a second natural language utterance via the first input device; and

determining, by the computer system, based on the short-term knowledge, whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to one or more individual ones of the contexts included in the context stack.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein determining whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to one or more individual ones of the contexts included in the context stack includes:

determining whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to a most recent context included in the context stack; and

responsive to the second natural language utterance not corresponding to the most recent context, determining whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to a second most recent context included in the context stack.

5. The method of claim 3, further comprising:

determining, by the computer system, responsive to the second natural language utterance not corresponding to one or more individual ones of the contexts included in the context stack, a second context for the second natural language utterance based on the short-term knowledge; and

determining, by the computer system, based on the second context, an interpretation of the second natural language utterance.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein determining the interpretation of the first natural language utterance comprises determining, based on the first context, an interpretation of one or more recognized words of the first natural language utterance.

7. The method of claim 1, the method further comprising: expiring, by the computer system, one or more items of short-term knowledge that are based on one or more natural language utterances received during conversations occurring prior to the first conversation.

8. The method of claim 7, further comprising: accumulating, by the computer system, long-term knowledge based on the one or more items of short-term knowledge that are expired.

9. The method of claim 1, the method further comprising: accumulating, by the computer system, long-term knowledge, wherein the long-term knowledge is accumulated based on one or more natural language utterances received during conversations occurring prior to the

22

first conversation, wherein the first context is determined based on the short-term knowledge and the long-term knowledge.

10. The method of claim 1, further comprising: determining, by the computer system, based on the short-term knowledge, a manner in which the first natural language utterance is spoken, wherein the first response is generated based on the determined manner and the interpretation of the first natural language utterance.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein the manner in which the first natural language utterance is spoken includes at least one of a tone, a pace, an inflection, or a timing.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein the second input device is included with the first input device in a single device.

13. The method of claim 1, wherein generating the first response comprises generating, by the computer system, a non-voice response in a graphical user interface and/or a voice response via a speaker.

14. The method of claim 1, wherein the first natural language utterance relates to a request and the first response is intended to be responsive to the request, the method further comprising:

receiving, by the computer system, a second natural language utterance in response to the first response, wherein the second natural language utterance comprises a clarification related to the interpretation of the first natural language utterance; and

responsive to receipt of the second natural language utterance, generating, by the computer system, a response to the second natural language utterance based on the interpretation of the first natural language utterance and the clarification related to the interpretation of the first natural language utterance.

15. The method of claim 1, wherein the first non-voice input is received via a non-voice input device comprising a touch screen device, the method further comprising:

receiving, by the computer system, information indicating a location on the touch screen device that received the first non-voice input.

16. A system for facilitating natural language system responses via short-term knowledge generated based on one or more prior multi-modal device interactions, the system comprising:

one or more physical processors programmed with one or more computer program instructions which, when executed, cause the one or more physical processors to:

receive, during a first conversation, a first voice input via a first input device, the first voice input comprising a first natural language utterance;

receive a second voice input comprising the first natural language utterance via a second input device;

compare the first voice input with the second voice input;

filter sound from the first voice input and the second voice input based on the comparison;

obtain, during the first conversation, a user interface state related to one or more non-voice inputs associated with the first voice input, the one or more non-voice inputs comprising at least a first non-voice input;

generate the short-term knowledge based on at least the first voice input and the first non-voice input;

determine, based on the short-term knowledge, a first context for the first natural language utterance;

determine, based on the first context, an interpretation of the first natural language utterance; and generate,

23

based on the interpretation of the first natural language utterance, a first response to the first natural language utterance.

17. The system of claim 16, wherein the one or more physical processors are further caused to:

receive a second natural language utterance via the first input device;

determine, based on the short-term knowledge, whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to the first context;

determine, responsive to the second natural language utterance not corresponding to the first context, a second context for the second natural language utterance based on the short-term knowledge;

determine, based on the second context, an interpretation of the second natural language utterance; and

generate, based on the interpretation of the second natural language utterance, a response to the second natural language utterance.

18. The system of claim 16, wherein the one or more physical processors are further caused to:

track contexts identified for multiple consecutive natural language user utterances to generate a context stack, the context stack including the contexts identified for the multiple consecutive natural language user utterances; receive a second natural language utterance via the first input device; and

determine, based on the short-term knowledge, whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to one or more individual ones of the contexts included in the context stack.

19. The system of claim 18, wherein determining whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to one or more individual ones of the contexts included in the context stack includes:

determining whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to a most recent context included in the context stack; and

responsive to the second natural language utterance not corresponding to the most recent context, determining whether the second natural language utterance corresponds to a second most recent context included in the context stack.

20. The system of claim 18, wherein the one or more physical processors are caused to:

determine, responsive to the second natural language utterance not corresponding to one or more individual ones of the contexts included in the context stack, a second context for the second natural language utterance based on the short-term knowledge; and determine, based on the second context, an interpretation of the second natural language utterance.

21. The system of claim 16, wherein determining the interpretation of the first natural language utterance com-

24

prises determining, based on the first context, an interpretation of one or more recognized words of the first natural language utterance.

22. The system of claim 16, wherein the one or more physical processors are caused to:

expire one or more items of accumulated short-term knowledge that are based on one or more natural language utterances received during conversations occurring prior to the first conversation; and

accumulate long-term knowledge based on the one or more items of accumulated short-term knowledge that are expired, wherein the first context is determined based on short-term knowledge and the long-term knowledge.

23. The system of claim 16, wherein the one or more physical processors are caused to:

determine, based on the short-term knowledge, a manner in which the first natural language utterance is spoken, wherein the first response is generated based on the determined manner and the interpretation of the first natural language utterance.

24. The system of claim 23, wherein the manner in which the first natural language utterance is spoken includes at least one of a tone, a pace, an inflection, or a timing.

25. The system of claim 16, wherein the second input device is included with the first input device in a single device.

26. The system of claim 16, wherein to generate the first response, the one or more physical processors are caused to: generate a non-voice response in a graphical user interface and/or a voice response via a speaker.

27. The system of claim 16, wherein the first natural language utterance relates to a request and the first response is intended to be responsive to the request, wherein the one or more physical processors are further caused to:

receive a second natural language utterance in response to the first response, wherein the second natural language utterance comprises a clarification related to the interpretation of the first natural language utterance; and responsive to receipt of the second natural language utterance, generate a response to the second natural language utterance based on the interpretation of the first natural language utterance and the clarification related to the interpretation of the first natural language utterance.

28. The system of claim 16, wherein the first non-voice input is received via a non-voice input device comprising a touch screen device, and wherein the one or more physical processors are further caused to:

receive information indicating a location on the touch screen device that received the first non-voice input.

* * * * *