

Characteristic AI Agents via Large Language Models

Xi Wang^{1,2}, Hongliang Dai^{1,2}, Shen Gao³, Piji Li^{1,2*}

¹ College of Computer Science and Technology,

Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China

² MIIT Key Laboratory of Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, Nanjing, China

³ School of Computer Science and Technology, Shandong University, China

{xiwang,hldai,pjli}@nuaa.edu.cn, shengao@sdu.edu.cn

Abstract

The advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs) has led to significant enhancements in the performance of chatbot systems. Many researchers have dedicated their efforts to the development of bringing characteristics to chatbots. While there have been commercial products for developing role-driven chatbots using LLMs, it is worth noting that academic research in this area remains relatively scarce. Our research focuses on investigating the performance of LLMs in constructing Characteristic AI Agents by simulating real-life individuals across different settings. Current investigations have primarily focused on act on roles with simple profiles. In response to this research gap, we create a benchmark for the characteristic AI agents task, including dataset, techniques, and evaluation metrics. A dataset called "Character100" is built for this benchmark, comprising the most-visited people on Wikipedia for language models to role-play. With the constructed dataset, we conduct comprehensive assessment of LLMs across various settings. In addition, we devise a set of automatic metrics for quantitative performance evaluation. The experimental results underscore the potential directions for further improvement in the capabilities of LLMs in constructing characteristic AI agents. The benchmark is available at <https://github.com/nuaa-nlp/Character100>.

Keywords: Characteristic AI agents, Chatbots, Large Language Models

1. Introduction

With the development of language models, chatbots have achieved great success in the improvement of performance. Many efforts have been devoted to making the chatbots more like human to enhance the interaction between humans and machines (Yin et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023b)

One prominent and currently trending research area within the chatbot domain is the incorporation of characteristics and personalities into chatbots to create **characteristic AI agents**. Several commercial products, such as Character.AI (Character.AI, 2022a) and AI-Utopia (LingxinAI, 2022a), have leveraged large language models (LLMs) to provide users with personalized chatbots (Character.AI, 2022b; LingxinAI, 2022b). With these products, users have the capability to craft their own characteristic AI agents by providing relevant background information. The agents will take on the character and respond to the users, which bridges the gap between users and AI by allowing individuals to define and shape their AI interactions according to their preferences and needs.

When it comes to investigating the technical solutions for the task of characteristic AI agents modeling based on LLMs, it is noteworthy that there remains a scarcity of academic research on this specific area. The above mentioned commercial products often lack technical reports and publicly available datasets, making it challenging to un-




Figure 1: An example of the characteristic AI agents task. Chatbots need to mimic the person and answer the query according to the information.

derstand the underlying mechanisms responsible for initializing characteristic AI agents, maintaining character consistency, and managing memory systems. Some may claim that LLMs like ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022), can easily perform this task by just feeding into some tailor-made prompt. In our preliminary experiment, we find that ChatGPT faces challenges in effectively functioning as a characteristic AI agent. This is illustrated in Figure 1, where we test ChatGPT and the famous commercial product Character.AI. Given the profile and the specific query to it, we build simple prompts incor-

* Corresponding author.

porating the name, profile, and the query to ask ChatGPT the specific query. ChatGPT’s response and Character.AI’s response, unfortunately, lack contextual relevance and are overly generic. This observation raises questions about the ability of LLMs for the characteristic AI agent task. It is necessary to conduct a comprehensive investigation into the performance of LLMs in this task.

Consequently, there is a pressing necessity to create a benchmark that enables the comprehensive investigation of characteristic AI agent performance in a systematic manner. The benchmark should include data for training and testing characteristic AI agents and evaluation metrics to it. We formulate the characteristic AI agents task as a dialogue task, where the AI agents try to mimic real individuals when provided with information about a particular role. This requires agents to absorb the background knowledge and embody the characteristics associated with the given role, potentially leading to more authentic and engaging interactions. The challenges of building the benchmark for this task lie in three parts: **dataset, techniques, and evaluation metrics**.

In terms of the dataset, given the absence of an established definition or publicly available dataset for this particular task, we have constructed a dataset named “Character100”. This dataset comprises profiles of 106 well-known individuals from various domains, sourced from Wikipedia pages. We have employed a set of heuristic rules and utilized ChatGPT to process these profiles to make sure that they are well-structured. Previous datasets, such as PERSONA-CHAT (Zhang et al., 2018), have been created to facilitate the integration of characteristics into chatbots, which typically consist of a set of abstract rules like facts or behaviors, representing a general category of roles rather than specific individuals.

In terms of the techniques, we explore different technical strategies to conduct initialization for the characteristic AI agents. Our examinations involve a range of settings in LLMs, encompassing zero-shot experiments (without In-context Learning, ICL) and few-shot experiments (with ICL). Additionally, we establish baseline performance benchmarks for this task by employing diverse training techniques, including fine-tuning LLMs on the dataset using various methodologies like LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) and QLoRA (Dettmers et al., 2023).

In terms of evaluation metrics, to effectively evaluate the capabilities of the proposed strategies for the characteristic AI agents task, we have devised a set of automatic evaluation metrics tailored to this dataset. These metrics focus on two critical aspects: background knowledge consistency and style consistency. The background knowledge consistency assesses the factual correctness of the

generated response relative to the ground-truth response. Meanwhile, the style consistency metric assesses whether the generated response’s speaking style aligns with the role being imitated.

These systematic experiments aim to provide a comprehensive assessment of LLMs’ capabilities in characteristic AI agents and facilitate an in-depth understanding of their performance across different conditions. Our findings can serve as valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of LLMs in simulating real-life individuals, offering a foundational basis for future research in this domain.

To sum up, our contributions are as follows:

- We investigate the problem of characteristic AI agents construction via large language models and propose a dataset named “Character100” for agent modeling and performance evaluation.
- We conduct characteristic AI agents construction across different settings utilizing different techniques like zero-shot prompting, in-context learning, and fine-tuning on various LLMs.
- We introduce a set of evaluation metrics in terms of background knowledge consistency and character style consistency, which serve as essential tools for quantitatively assessing the performance of the constructed characteristic AI agents.
- Experimental results show that background knowledge consistency can be improved by techniques we propose and that there is room for improvement in style consistency.

2. Related Work

2.1. Characteristic AI Agents

Many works have been done in attempting to make chatbots more like human (Ni et al., 2023). Li et al. (2016) is the pioneer to mention the character consistency problem in the domain of chatbots and proposes a sequence-to-sequence model. This work laid the foundation for addressing the challenge of bringing consistent and coherent roles to chatbots. An important milestone was achieved with the introduction of PERSONA-CHAT (Zhang et al., 2018). This work focused on making chatbots personality-consistent, thus significantly improving the overall user experience by ensuring that the chatbot’s responses align with a defined role. Earlier work use traditional models (Li et al., 2019), and recent research endeavors have shifted towards leveraging pre-trained language models (Wolf et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2022) and large language models (Shin et al., 2023).

There are also some academic research in characteristic AI agents these days, such as ChatHaruhi (Li et al., 2023) and Narrative-Play (Zhao et al., 2023). ChatHaruhi is a dataset

containing 32 characters and a technical report is provided about detailed chatbot design. However, the details of experiment in ChatHaruhi are still inaccessible till now. NarrativePlay primarily relies on human annotators and LLMs for evaluation, which may not be as reliable or reproducible as automated evaluation metrics. HPD (Chen et al., 2023) is a bilingual dataset from the Harry Potter series and a benchmark is constructed on it by fine-tuning and ICL. However, it’s important to recognize that HPD’s domain is restricted, and its reliance on human evaluation and GPT-4 assessment makes it hard to reproduce.

2.2. Large Language Models

As large language models (LLMs) continue to grow in both parameter size and training data, they exhibit a range of emerging capabilities (Wei et al., 2022). Among these capabilities, the concept of in-context learning (ICL) (Brown et al., 2020), stands out. In-context learning represents a paradigm wherein language models can perform specific tasks based on provided instructions or information without the need for additional training. There have been works aiming to analyze why ICL works. Xie et al. (2022) concluded ICL as a Bayesian inference, and Min et al. (2022b) used demonstrations with different labels to provide an in-depth analysis of ICL. ICL is a great boost for the model to act out as a specified person, as the model can easily use the given information according to instructions.

With the parameters of LLMs growing, conducting full-parameter fine-tuning cost too much. A feasible way is to freeze most of the parameters and only update some useful parameters. Therefore, many researches have been done to conduct parameter-efficient fine-tuning (Lester et al., 2021; Li and Liang, 2021). LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) and QLoRA (Dettmers et al., 2023) are the most popular techniques these days. LoRA is a parameter efficient fine-tuning approach that has much lower memory usage than full-parameter fine-tuning, but may offer competitive performance. QLoRA is an extension of LoRA. It enhances memory efficiency by loading models with quantized 4-bit weights, resulting in significantly reduced memory usage.

3. Task Formulation

We formulate the characteristic AI agents task as a profile-based dialogue task. In this task, a name \mathcal{N} of the person being imitated, a profile \mathcal{P} which contains a paragraph extracted from Wikipedia, corresponding to the person’s information in a specific period of time, a query \mathcal{Q} about the profile in the second person and the ground-truth dialogue utterance and response \mathcal{R} is provided. The aim of

this task is to stand in the perspective of \mathcal{N} and generate the response $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ to this query according to the information $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}$.

The primary goal of this task is minimize the cross entropy loss between \mathcal{R} and $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$. The secondary goal of this task is to mimic the style of the person. Different from the reading comprehension problem that only needs to answer the query correctly, the characteristic AI agents task not only needs to generate the correct response to the query but also needs to mimic the speaking style of the person. This requires the model to have a deep understanding of the person.

In total, we consider the quality of the responses in two aspects: background knowledge and style consistency. Background knowledge corresponds to the primary goal, focusing on the faithfulness of the generated responses concerning the ground-truth responses. Style consistency corresponds to the secondary goal, considering the style similarity between the generated responses and the speaking style of the individual.

The formulated characteristic AI agents task has three fundamental aspects: dataset construction, technical modeling and evaluation. Dataset construction involves the creation of data essential for developing characteristic AI agents. Technical modeling is related to different techniques in building characteristic AI agents. Evaluation encompasses the assessment of background knowledge consistency and style consistency in the context of characteristic AI agents. Each of these aspects will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

4. Character100 Dataset Construction

We construct Character100 \mathcal{C} which contains two primary subsets: the background knowledge corpus \mathcal{C}_{bg} and the utterance style corpus \mathcal{C}_{style} . The background knowledge corpus is the core dataset which includes profiles of various people. The corpus is essential for investigation, which serves as the training set for the LLMs and the basic information for the initialization and evaluation of the characteristic AI agents. An important part of the characteristic AI agents task is the style consistency. Utilizing the background knowledge corpus cannot evaluate the style consistency. In order to distinguish the utterance style of the responses, a utterance style corpus is created as a supplement to the Character100 to train the style discriminator for evaluation.

4.1. Background Knowledge Corpus \mathcal{C}_{bg}

The primary consideration in constructing the characteristic AI agents dataset Character100 is the selection of individuals to be included. We want

Split	QR pairs	Min_Q	Max_Q	Avg_Q	Min_R	Max_R	Avg_R	Min_P	Max_P	Avg_P
Training	1983	13	149	57.36	7	492	84.09	174	3604	1060.27
Validation	661	18	148	58.04	5	318	82.46	174	3604	1040.04
Test	7965	12	180	52.29	2	588	70.95	50	3604	837.63

Table 1: Statistics of the background knowledge corpus C_{bg} . QR pairs denotes the number of query-and-response pairs in the corpus. Min, Max and Avg means minimum, maximum and average length. Q, R and P means query, response and profile respectively.

there to be abundant information about each simulated individual. Therefore, we choose the top-100 most viewed people on Wikipedia according to its popular pages¹. The background knowledge corpus contains people with various professions including singers, actors, athletes and political leaders, such as Michael Jackson, Leonardo DiCaprio, Michael Jordan and Donald Trump. Because there are seven individuals tied for the 100th position, the corpus comprises a total of 106 individuals. Having established the scope of the characters, we proceed with a five-step process to obtain the corpus:

1. Obtain the Wikipedia articles corresponding to the 106 individuals.
2. For each individual, we make use of the first 10 paragraphs as the foundational information. Subsequently, we apply the TextRank (Mihalcea and Tarau, 2004) algorithm to identify and select the top 10 ranked paragraphs from the rest paragraphs as supplementary information. As a result, a total of 20 paragraphs are collected and associated with each person.
3. We proceed to use ChatGPT for the purpose of generating a set of five query-response pairs for each of the collected paragraphs. For example, given the profile containing sentence “*At age ten, he developed an interest in computing and video games, teaching himself how to program from the VIC-20 user manual.*” A generated query-response pair is: “*Q:How did your son learn to program? A:My son taught himself how to program from the VIC-20 user manual.*”
4. To ensure the accuracy of person references in the generated content, a post-generation processing step is implemented. This step involves modifying the queries and responses to be in the right person, creating a consistent and natural conversational context. For example, in the previous step, the query and the answer are not in the right person. After processed by ChatGPT, the fixed query-response pair is “*Q:How did you learn to program? A:I taught myself how to program from the VIC-20 user manual.*”
5. Once the query-response pairs are generated for each person, we split the corpus into two subsets, the training set and the test set. The method of splitting is as follows. We first add all the query-response pairs generated based on

the foundational information to the test set. We then randomly shuffle the query-response pairs obtained from the supplementary information and divide them equally into two portions. One-half of these pairs is added to the training set, while the remaining half is assigned to the test set. In this manner, we ensure comprehensive coverage of all individuals in the corpus, and no omission of their basic information.

4.2. Utterance Style Corpus C_{style}

Utterance style corpus serves as a resource for training the discriminator that is used for evaluating the generated responses in terms of the style aspect. The creation of this corpus involves a three-step process:

1. For the individuals in the background knowledge corpus, we first manually collect their interviews or speeches from various sources on the Internet. In cases where certain individuals like William Shakespeare who lack such data, alternative sources like quotes or their published works are employed as substitutes.
2. Subsequently, the collected data undergoes a thorough process of preprocessing and cleaning based on heuristic rules. For interviews, only the statements attributed to the individuals are extracted, discarding any unrelated content. In the case of speeches, irrelevant elements such as applause are removed. Additionally, lengthy texts are divided into smaller paragraphs, with each consisting of 2 to 3 sentences.
3. In the final step, the processed data from interviews and speeches are integrated into a unified corpus. This integration is performed while ensuring that the corpus remains balanced among the different individuals. To achieve this balance, a maximum of 200 sentences is retained for every individual within the corpus.

4.3. Dataset Analysis

The background knowledge corpus contains 106 people with 10,605 entries in total. Each entry in the corpus is made up of the name of a person \mathcal{N} , a profile \mathcal{P} , a query to the profile \mathcal{Q} and a ground-truth response to the query \mathcal{R} .

For the purpose of model training, we further partition the initial training set into two subsets: the new

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Popular_pages

training set and the validation set, maintaining a ratio of 3:1. This division enables us to fine-tune and validate our models. Table 1 provides an overview of the statistics pertaining to the training, validation, and test sets.

The utterance style corpus comprises 17,119 sentences in total. These sentences are sourced from the 106 distinct individuals, each contributing a minimum of 20 sentences and a maximum of 200 sentences to the corpus. The sentences within this corpus exhibit a considerable variation in length, with examples ranging from as short as 16 characters to 2,218 characters, reflecting a diverse and comprehensive collection of textual content.

5. Technical Modeling

We have designed different technical strategies to investigate the characteristic AI agents capability of LLMs across different settings. The technical modeling consists of two aspects: LLMs without fine-tuning and LLMs with fine-tuning. In the LLMs without fine-tuning setting, we construct two prompt templates: zero-shot template and few-shot/in-context learning template. The two templates are constructed by providing the profile about the person and asking the LLMs to imitate the style of the person. The difference between them is that few-shot/in-context learning template utilizes in-context learning by adding an example in the prompt so that the LLMs can get more information about the task.

5.1. Zero-shot Modeling

In the zero-shot setting, we will generate prompts with the following templates: *Imagine you are \mathcal{N} , you need to role-play as she/he, and your basic information is as follows: \mathcal{P} Now you need to answer the query \mathcal{Q} , and as the person you need to role-play, your answer is:*

In this prompt, \mathcal{N} means the name of the person, \mathcal{P} means the profile about this person, \mathcal{Q} means the query about the profile.

We investigate the performance of open-source and close-source LLMs in the few-shot setting. In the evaluation phase, we first generate prompt through populating the template with each entry in the test set. We then input the generated prompts into LLMs to generate the responses. After getting the responses, we compare them to the ground-truth response according to the evaluation metrics.

5.2. Few-shot/In-Context Learning

The difference between few-shot setting and zero-shot setting is that the prompts in few-shot setting contain an example of utilizing the profile to answer

the question. We expect the LLMs learn the way to use profile through this example. In the few-shot setting, the template is as follows: *Imagine you are \mathcal{N} , you need to role-play as she/he, and your basic information is as follows: \mathcal{P}*

*Example: *Imagine you are \mathcal{N}' , the basic information is \mathcal{P}' The query is \mathcal{Q}' The answer to this query is \mathcal{R}' Now you need to answer the query \mathcal{Q} , and as the person you need to role-play, your answer is:**

In this prompt, \mathcal{N} means the name of the person, \mathcal{P} means the profile about this person, \mathcal{Q} means the query about the profile. \mathcal{N}' means name of the example person, \mathcal{P}' means the profile about this example person, \mathcal{Q}' means the query about the example person's profile and \mathcal{R}' means the answer to the example person's query.

We investigate the performance of open-source and close-source LLMs in the few-shot setting. In the evaluation phase, we initially generate prompts by populating the template with each entry from the test set. Subsequently, we feed these generated prompts into LLMs to produce responses. Upon obtaining the responses, we compare them to the ground-truth response, utilizing our evaluation metrics to assess the performance.

5.3. Fine-tuning

To establish the baseline performance for the characteristic AI agents task, we fine-tune the open-source models on the training set of the background knowledge corpus.

During the training phase, we use data from the training set of the background knowledge corpus and utilize the template prompts from the zero-shot setting to get the training set and the evaluation set. We employ two fine-tuning techniques: LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) and QLoRA (Dettmers et al., 2023) with the aim of enhancing the LLMs' understanding and performance of the characteristic AI agents task. The training objective is to minimize the cross entropy loss between the generated response and the ground-truth response.

In the inference phase, we assess the fine-tuned LLMs in both zero-shot and few-shot settings by applying the templates mentioned above. This comprehensive evaluation helps us understand how these models perform under varying conditions and provides insights into their effectiveness in the characteristic AI agents task.

5.4. Style Discriminator

For the style discriminator, we use the following template to train and evaluate: *Below is an instruction that describes a task,*

Model	Setting	Background Knowledge Consistency						Style Consistency		
		BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-3	BLEU-4	ROUGE-L	SemanticSim	Hit@1	Hit@3	Hit@5
Llama 2-7B-Base	Zero-shot	0.080	0.043	0.028	0.019	0.114	0.435	0.365	0.447	0.485
	Few-shot	0.105	0.067	0.049	0.038	0.153	0.488	0.308	0.392	0.427
Llama 2-7B-Chat	Zero-shot	0.157	0.111	0.086	0.069	0.209	0.510	0.368	0.473	0.519
	Few-shot	0.258	0.208	0.176	0.152	0.373	0.666	0.411	0.517	0.566
ChatGLM2-6B	Zero-shot	0.331	0.271	0.232	0.202	0.361	0.636	0.338	0.429	0.473
	Few-shot	0.323	0.272	0.238	0.211	0.376	0.598	0.472	0.562	0.597
Vicuna-7B-v1.5	Zero-shot	0.263	0.208	0.173	0.146	0.287	0.547	0.322	0.406	0.444
	Few-shot	0.321	0.265	0.227	0.198	0.409	0.705	0.406	0.513	0.557
Baichuan2-7B-Base	Zero-shot	0.024	0.006	0.002	0.001	0.037	0.336	0.255	0.341	0.382
	Few-shot	0.025	0.007	0.003	0.001	0.040	0.359	0.173	0.240	0.273
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	Zero-shot	0.089	0.053	0.036	0.027	0.125	0.483	0.413	0.504	0.546
	Few-shot	0.101	0.062	0.043	0.032	0.152	0.534	0.326	0.411	0.450
ChatGPT	Zero-shot	0.105	0.086	0.072	0.061	0.312	0.723	0.593	0.671	0.704
	Few-shot	0.199	0.169	0.147	0.129	0.502	0.794	0.534	0.620	0.661

Table 2: The results of the seven models on the Character100 dataset in zero-shot and few-shot settings. SemanticSim means semantic similarity.

paired with an input that provides further context. Write a response that appropriately completes the request.

Instruction:

Based on the input, determine whose style of speaking this sentence is. Just give names, don't output other information. The outputs should be in the following format: <name>.

Input:

S

Response:

The sign S in the template means the sentence to be discriminated. In practice, we populate the template with the texts from the utterance style corpus to generate the discriminator training set and carry out the training process by fine-tuning the Llama 2-Chat-7B using LoRA on the generated training set. The training objective is to minimize the cross entropy loss between the predicted name and the ground-truth name.

In the evaluation phase, we fill the predicted sentences in the template and generate multiple responses for each input. Subsequently, we employ regular expressions to extract the predicted names.

6. Experimental Settings

6.1. Dataset

For the characteristic AI agents task, we use the background knowledge corpus we propose. The test set of the corpus is used to evaluate the performance of the LLMs. The training set and the validation set of it is used to fine-tune the LLMs. We will introduce the LLMs we use and the experiment details in the following sections.

We use the whole utterance style corpus as the training set to train the style discriminator.

6.2. Comparison Methods

We choose four open-source and one close-source LLMs in our experiments. For open-source LLMs, we choose Llama 2, ChatGLM2, Vicuna and Baichuan2. For close-source LLMs, we choose ChatGPT. The introduction of the models are as follows: **Llama 2** (Touvron et al., 2023) is a collection of pretrained and fine-tuned LLMs developed by Meta. We choose Llama 2-Base and Llama 2-Chat with 7B parameters for comparison in this paper. **ChatGLM2** (Du et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022) is an open-source bilingual language model based on the General Language Model (GLM) (Du et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022) framework, with 6.2B parameters. **Vicuna** (Chiang et al., 2023) is a chat assistant trained by fine-tuning Llama 2 on user-shared conversations with ChatGPT. We use Vicuna v1.5 with 7B parameters in this paper. **Baichuan2** (Yang et al., 2023) is a series of of large-scale multilingual language models developed by Baichuan Inc. In this paper, we use Baichuan2-7B-Base and Baichuan2-7B-Chat for comparison. **ChatGPT** (OpenAI, 2022) is a chatbot developed by OpenAI. Since its release in November 2022, it has gained great popularity due to its impressive language capabilities.

In total, we have 7 variants of LLMs: Llama 2-Base, Llama 2-Chat, ChatGLM2, Vicuna-7B-v1.5, Baichuan2-7B-Base, Baichuan2-7B-Chat and ChatGPT. These LLMs are all decoder-only language models, and we can fine-tune the first six models as they are open-source.

6.3. Evaluation Metrics

We devise a set of evaluation metrics to comprehensively assess the performance of different models. These metrics encompass two primary aspects: background knowledge consistency and style consistency.

Background Knowledge Consistency The aspect of background knowledge consistency evalu-

Model	Technique	Setting	Background Knowledge Consistency					Style Consistency			
			BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-3	BLEU-4	ROUGE-L	SemanticSim	Hit@1	Hit@3	Hit@5
Llama 2-7B-Base	LoRA	Zero-shot	0.215	0.175	0.148	0.126	0.313	0.662	0.403	0.507	0.552
		Few-shot	0.213	0.173	0.145	0.124	0.310	0.614	0.354	0.449	0.493
	QLoRA	Zero-shot	0.210	0.172	0.145	0.124	0.307	0.661	0.410	0.508	0.552
		Few-shot	0.210	0.169	0.141	0.120	0.284	0.578	0.326	0.406	0.443
Llama 2-7B-Chat	LoRA	Zero-shot	0.128	0.086	0.064	0.050	0.177	0.496	0.297	0.383	0.424
		Few-shot	0.199	0.149	0.118	0.097	0.287	0.602	0.272	0.359	0.404
	QLoRA	Zero-shot	0.378	0.331	0.295	0.266	0.509	0.762	0.364	0.466	0.509
		Few-shot	0.530	0.474	0.430	0.393	0.590	0.797	0.366	0.467	0.513
ChatGLM2-6B	LoRA	Zero-shot	0.052	0.021	0.010	0.004	0.083	0.435	0.161	0.237	0.275
		Few-shot	0.040	0.015	0.006	0.003	0.066	0.391	0.157	0.233	0.272
	QLoRA	Zero-shot	0.056	0.023	0.010	0.005	0.086	0.445	0.156	0.232	0.271
		Few-shot	0.042	0.016	0.007	0.003	0.069	0.399	0.146	0.222	0.261
Vicuna-7B-v1.5	LoRA	Zero-shot	0.344	0.291	0.252	0.220	0.459	0.754	0.367	0.466	0.514
		Few-shot	0.416	0.357	0.312	0.276	0.508	0.770	0.379	0.479	0.524
	QLoRA	Zero-shot	0.352	0.298	0.257	0.225	0.462	0.754	0.347	0.448	0.495
		Few-shot	0.407	0.346	0.301	0.264	0.500	0.770	0.373	0.473	0.524
Baichuan2-7B-Base	LoRA	Zero-shot	0.030	0.009	0.003	0.001	0.049	0.453	0.224	0.302	0.344
		Few-shot	0.027	0.008	0.002	0.000	0.043	0.419	0.167	0.240	0.279
	QLoRA	Zero-shot	0.051	0.025	0.015	0.009	0.082	0.509	0.305	0.396	0.439
		Few-shot	0.046	0.023	0.014	0.009	0.073	0.476	0.255	0.335	0.378
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	LoRA	Zero-shot	0.028	0.006	0.001	0.000	0.039	0.382	0.307	0.405	0.449
		Few-shot	0.032	0.009	0.002	0.000	0.049	0.420	0.238	0.315	0.359
	QLoRA	Zero-shot	0.078	0.044	0.029	0.021	0.116	0.486	0.401	0.501	0.548
		Few-shot	0.095	0.058	0.040	0.030	0.147	0.527	0.328	0.416	0.456

Table 3: The results of the open-source models fine-tuned by two training techniques on the Character100 dataset in zero-shot and few-shot settings. SemanticSim means semantic similarity.

ates the similarity between the generated response $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ and the ground-truth response \mathcal{R} . We evaluate background knowledge consistency with the following metrics: BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE (Lin, 2004) and semantic similarity.

Both BLEU and ROUGE both use n-gram similarity to evaluate the similarity between the generated response and ground-truth response. The difference between BLEU and ROUGE is that BLEU uses precision, but ROUGE uses recall. In this task, we choose the ROUGE-L score to assess the comprehensiveness of content coverage in the generated response. For semantic similarity, we utilize the all-MiniLM-L6-v2² model to generate sentence embeddings. To compute semantic similarity between the generated response and the ground-truth response, we calculate the cosine similarity of the embeddings for the two sentences. This process involves a pairwise comparison of the predicted sentences with their corresponding ground-truth sentences, and the mean of these values is computed as the final semantic similarity score. These metrics collectively provide a comprehensive assessment of background knowledge consistency between generated responses and ground-truth responses.

Style Consistency The aspect of style consistency evaluates the manner in which the generated sentences are phrased. To this end, we use the discriminator we train to distinguish the style. We generate 5 candidate names for each generated response and then calculate hit@k accuracy as comparison between models. In this paper, we consider k of 1, 3 and 5. The training details of

discriminator will be discussed in the following sections.

7. Results and Analysis

We first evaluate all the models on the Character100 dataset. The results of both open-source and close-source models under the two different settings are presented in Table 2. The results of fine-tuning open-source models using LoRA and QLoRA training techniques are presented in Table 3, with the performance of these six models across zero-shot and few-shot settings.

7.1. Background Knowledge Consistency

We can conclude some interesting findings based on the results: (1) **Few-shot learning improves background knowledge consistency.** LLMs perform better in background knowledge consistency in the few-shot setting compared to in the zero-shot setting. Notably, there is a significant improvement in scores for BLEU, ROUGE-L, and semantic similarity in the few-shot setting. (2) **Instruction tuning helps.** LLMs that undergo instruction tuning exhibit significantly better performance. In contrast, base models that are not instruction-tuned, including Llama 2-7B-Base and Baichuan2-7B-Base, perform less effectively across all evaluation metrics, highlighting the effectiveness of instruction tuning. (3) **Poor performance of some LLMs.** The performance of bilingual LLMs appears to decline after fine-tuning. ChatGLM2-6B, Baichuan2-7B-Base, and Baichuan2-7B-Chat exhibit notably low background knowledge consistency scores, particularly in BLEU. (4) **LoRA vs. QLoRA.** Both LoRA and

²<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2>

QLoRA demonstrate an ability to enhance the performance of LLMs, but QLoRA appears to be more effective. Large language models fine-tuned with QLoRA yield superior results in ROUGE-L and semantic similarity scores.

7.2. Style Consistency

We make the following observations from Table 2 and Table 3: (1) **Few-shot settings weaken the style of the generated responses.** While background knowledge consistency scores improve, the style consistency of certain LLMs may decline in the few-shot setting. This phenomenon could be attributed to the discrepancy between the style consistency of example outputs and the ground-truth responses, leading to a potential conflict. (2) **ChatGPT shows amazing language capabilities.** Despite ChatGPT’s relatively lower performance in background knowledge consistency, it excels in terms of style consistency. This phenomenon can be attributed to the significant language capabilities of ChatGPT, which have been enhanced by Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022). Consequently, ChatGPT is proficient at generating high-quality responses. (3) **Fine-tuning techniques have impact on style.** Both fine-tuning techniques lead to a slight drop in style consistency scores. This outcome is expected, as fine-tuning primarily focuses on content and may not explicitly address style consistency enhancements.

7.3. Case Study

Upon analyzing the responses generated by LLMs, we have identified several typical problems that may shed light on potential directions for improvement. To demonstrate these problems, an example is provided in Figure 2, where the responses generated by LLMs in the few-shot setting are presented. The correct answer to the query in this example is “five”, as it is clearly presented in the profile.

Among the LLMs evaluated, Llama 2-7B-Base, Llama 2-7B-Chat, and ChatGPT provide the correct response. However, the LLMs in the Llama 2 series exhibit hallucination issues, as their responses include album titles that do not exist in the profile. ChatGLM2-6B and Vicuna-7B-v1.5 generate ambiguous responses which contain redundant information unrelated to the query. Moreover, ChatGLM2-6B suffers the bilingual switching problem. It uses the Chinese punctuation in the profile. In other cases, there are even a mix of Chinese and English or plain Chinese responses.

In contrast, LLMs in the Baichuan series all provide incorrect responses. Baichuan-7B-Base lacks proper punctuation and generates hallucinations in the omitted sentences following its response.

Profile	... He has had ten number-one albums on the Billboard 200—which all consecutively debuted at number one on the chart, making him the first artist to achieve this—and five number-one singles on the Billboard Hot 100. The Marshall Mathers LP, The Eminem Show, Curtain Call: The Hits (2005), “Lose Yourself”, “Love the Way You Lie” and “Not Afraid” have all been certified Diamond or higher by the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA). . . .
Question	How many number-one singles have you had on the Billboard Hot 100?
Ground Truth	I have had five number-one singles on the Billboard Hot 100.
Llama 2 -7B-Base*	I have had five number-one singles on the Billboard Hot 100. These include “Lose Yourself,” “Love the Way You Lie,” “Not Afraid,” “Rap God,” and “God’s Plan.” . . .
Llama 2 -7B-Chat*	I have had five number-one singles on the Billboard Hot 100. These include “Lose Yourself,” “Love the Way You Lie,” “Not Afraid,” “Rap God,” and “Godzilla.”
ChatGLM2 -6B*	I am not sure about that specific issue since there may be other songs released more recently than those mentioned, but my total list includes seven single releases from now. Now the relevant sentence in whole setup reads : So far , however I include only two - Losing myself -’s second album song On My Own / Nervous Breakdown. . . .
Vicuna -7B-v1.5*	I am one of the few artists who have had multiple songs debuting at number one on the Billboard Hot 100. My hits such as “Lose Yourself,” “Love the Way You Lie,” and “Not Afraid” have also achieved diamond status from the RIAA.
Baichuan2 -7B-Base*	I’ve had eleven single songs that topped out No. One spot here within these charts, they include Lose Your Self Love Them Away Like A lie Not afraid And also my most recent hit song . . .
Baichuan2 -7B-Chat*	I’ve had nine number-one singles on the Billboard Hot 100 throughout my career so far
ChatGPT	As Eminem, I have had five number-one singles on the Billboard Hot 100.

Figure 2: The output of open-source and close-source models in the few-shot setting. LLMs with “*” denotes that they have been fine-tuned by QLoRA techniques. We have omitted some unnecessary contents for saving space.

Baichuan2-7B-Chat offers a concise but entirely incorrect response.

In conclusion, LLMs still face problems like hallucination, producing ambiguous or incorrect responses, and the bilingual switching problem. These challenges present areas for future research and improvement in the field of natural language processing and large language model development. Addressing these problems will be essential in advancing the reliability, accuracy, and overall quality of LLM-generated responses and enhance the user experience in chatbots.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a novel task called characteristic AI agents which focuses on the personalized chatbots that are able to imitate an individual given profile about her/him. Despite the existence of successful commercial products in this domain, academic research has been relatively lim-

ited. To address this gap, we present the Character100 dataset, encompassing 106 individuals, and customize automatic evaluation metrics tailored to this dataset. We systematically assess the performance of both open-source and close-source large language models (LLMs) on this dataset. Additionally, we establish baselines by fine-tuning open-source models using LoRA and QLoRA techniques. Our paper offers a detailed presentation of the experimental results and derives insightful conclusions regarding this task.

9. Ethical Considerations

We have cited all the sources related our work. All experiments are conducted by ourselves, and the data presented in this study are not fabricated. The dataset we utilize in our research is devoid of any form of discrimination based on various characteristics, including but not limited to age, color, disability, ethnicity, family status, gender identity, labor union membership, military status, nationality, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, or any other inappropriate factor.

10. Limitations

There are two limitations to this work. First, it's a pity that we can't reproduce all the LLMs due to limited resources, so we can't make a full contrast with LLMs across different settings. Secondly, the construction of templates may influence large language model performance, but constraints on time prevented the testing of all template variants for LLMs. These limitations provide avenues for future research and exploration in the field of characteristic AI agents.

11. Acknowledgements

We express our sincere gratitude to all the reviewers for generously dedicating their valuable time and providing us with professional advice. This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.62106105), the CCF-Baidu Open Fund (No.CCF-Baidu202307), the CCF-Zhipu AI Large Model Fund (No.CCF-Zhipu202315), the Scientific Research Starting Foundation of Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics (No.YQR21022), and the High Performance Computing Platform of Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

12. Bibliographical References

Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#).

Character.AI. 2022a. [Introducing character](#).

Character.AI. 2022b. [Introducing character](#). Blog post.

Mingda Chen, Jingfei Du, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Todor Mihaylov, Srini Iyer, Veselin Stoyanov, and Zornitsa Kozareva. 2022. [Improving in-context few-shot learning via self-supervised training](#).

Nuo Chen, Yan Wang, Haiyun Jiang, Deng Cai, Yuhan Li, Ziyang Chen, Longyue Wang, and Jia Li. 2023. [Large language models meet harry potter: A bilingual dataset for aligning dialogue agents with characters](#).

Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).

Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Sam Shleifer, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. 8-bit optimizers via block-wise quantization. *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*.

Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. [Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms](#).

Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335.

Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#).

Gibbeum Lee, Volker Hartmann, Jongho Park, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. 2023.

- Prompted LLMs as chatbot modules for long open-domain conversation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 4536–4554, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. [The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning](#).
- Cheng Li, Ziang Leng, Chenxi Yan, Junyi Shen, Hao Wang, Weishi MI, Yaying Fei, Xiaoyang Feng, Song Yan, HaoSheng Wang, Linkang Zhan, Yaokai Jia, Pingyu Wu, and Haozhen Sun. 2023. [Chatharuhi: Reviving anime character in reality via large language model](#).
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Georgios Spithourakis, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. 2016. [A persona-based neural conversation model](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 994–1003, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Piji Li, Zihao Wang, Lidong Bing, and Wai Lam. 2019. [Persona-aware tips generation](#). In *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW '19*, page 1006–1016, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. [Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation](#).
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhaojiang Lin, Peng Xu, Genta Indra Winata, Farhad Bin Siddique, Zihan Liu, Jamin Shin, and Pascale Fung. 2020. [Caire: An end-to-end empathetic chatbot](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(09):13622–13623.
- LingxinAI. 2022a. [Ai utopia description](#).
- LingxinAI. 2022b. [Creating agi companions for everyone](#).
- Qian Liu, Yihong Chen, Bei Chen, Jian-Guang Lou, Zixuan Chen, Bin Zhou, and Dongmei Zhang. 2020. [You impress me: Dialogue generation via mutual persona perception](#).
- Rada Mihalcea and Paul Tarau. 2004. [TextRank: Bringing order into text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 404–411, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022a. [MetalCL: Learning to learn in context](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2791–2809, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Xinxi Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022b. [Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work?](#)
- Xuanfan Ni, Hongliang Dai, Zhaochun Ren, and Piji Li. 2023. [Multi-source multi-type knowledge exploration and exploitation for dialogue generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12522–12537, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- OpenAI. 2022. [Introducing chatgpt](#). Blog post.
- OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4 technical report](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#).
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Iulian V. Serban, Alessandro Sordani, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Joelle Pineau. 2016. [Building end-to-end dialogue systems using generative hierarchical neural network models](#).
- Lifeng Shang, Zhengdong Lu, and Hang Li. 2015. [Neural responding machine for short-text conversation](#).
- Donghoon Shin, Gary Hsieh, and Young-Ho Kim. 2023. [Planfitting: Tailoring personalized exercise plans with large language models](#).
- Michael Shum, Stephan Zheng, Wojciech Kryściński, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. [Sketch-fill-a-r: A persona-grounded chit-chat generation framework](#).

- Kurt Shuster, Mojtaba Komeili, Leonard Adolphs, Stephen Roller, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2022. [Language models that seek for knowledge: Modular search & generation for dialogue and prompt completion.](#)
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucu-rull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Rannan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models.](#)
- Oriol Vinyals and Quoc Le. 2015. [A neural conversational model.](#)
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022. [Emergent abilities of large language models.](#)
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023a. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models.](#)
- Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, and Tengyu Ma. 2023b. [Larger language models do in-context learning differently.](#)
- Thomas Wolf, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, and Clement Delangue. 2019. [Transfertransfo: A transfer learning approach for neural network based conversational agents.](#)
- Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. 2022. [An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference.](#)
- Chen Xu, Piji Li, Wei Wang, Haoran Yang, Siyun Wang, and Chuangbai Xiao. 2022. [Cosplay: Concept set guided personalized dialogue generation across both party personas.](#) In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, SIGIR '22, page 201–211, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Jie Xu, Lu Lu, Sen Yang, Bilin Liang, Xinwei Peng, Jiali Pang, Jinru Ding, Xiaoming Shi, Lingrui Yang, Huan Song, Kang Li, Xin Sun, and Shaoting Zhang. 2023a. [Medgpteval: A dataset and benchmark to evaluate responses of large language models in medicine.](#)
- Jing Xu, Da Ju, Joshua Lane, Mojtaba Komeili, Eric Michael Smith, Megan Ung, Morteza Behrooz, William Ngan, Rashel Moritz, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Y-Lan Boureau, Jason Weston, and Kurt Shuster. 2023b. [Improving open language models by learning from organic interactions.](#)
- Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, Fan Yang, Fei Deng, Feng Wang, Feng Liu, Guangwei Ai, Guosheng Dong, Haizhou Zhao, Hang Xu, Haoze Sun, Hongda Zhang, Hui Liu, Jiaming Ji, Jian Xie, Jun-Tao Dai, Kun Fang, Lei Su, Liang Song, Lifeng Liu, Liyun Ru, Luyao Ma, Mang Wang, Mickel Liu, MingAn Lin, Nuolan Nie, Peidong Guo, Ruiyang Sun, Tao Zhang, Tianpeng Li, Tianyu Li, Wei Cheng, Weipeng Chen, Xiangrong Zeng, Xiaochuan Wang, Xiaoxi Chen, Xin Men, Xin Yu, Xuehai Pan, Yanjun Shen, Yiding Wang, Yiyu Li, Youxin Jiang, Yuchen Gao, Yupeng Zhang, Zenan Zhou, and Zhiying Wu. 2023. [Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models.](#)
- Congchi Yin, Piji Li, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. [Ctrlstruct: Dialogue structure learning for open-domain response generation.](#) In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, WWW '23, page 1539–1550, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. 2022. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*.
- Saizheng Zhang, Emily Dinan, Jack Urbanek, Arthur Szlam, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2018. [Personalizing dialogue agents: I have a](#)

[dog, do you have pets too?](#) In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2204–2213, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Runcong Zhao, Wenjia Zhang, Jiazheng Li, Lixing Zhu, Yanran Li, Yulan He, and Lin Gui. 2023. Narrativeplay: Interactive narrative understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01459*.

Xueliang Zhao, Chongyang Tao, Wei Wu, Can Xu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2019. [A document-grounded matching network for response selection in retrieval-based chatbots](#).