
MemSim: A Bayesian Simulator for Evaluating Memory of LLM-based Personal Assistants

Zeyu Zhang^{1†*♣♣}, Quanyu Dai^{2*}, Luyu Chen^{1♣♣}, Zeren Jiang³, Rui Li^{1♣♣}, Jieming Zhu²,
Xu Chen^{1§♣♣}, Yi Xie³, Zhenhua Dong², Ji-Rong Wen^{1♣♣}

¹Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Renmin University of China

²Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab ³Huawei Technologies Ltd.

{zeyuzhang, xu.chen}@ruc.edu.cn, daiquanyu@huawei.com

Abstract

LLM-based agents have been widely applied as personal assistants, capable of memorizing information from user messages and responding to personal queries. However, there still lacks an objective and automatic evaluation on their memory capability, largely due to the challenges in constructing reliable questions and answers (QAs) according to user messages. In this paper, we propose MemSim, a Bayesian simulator designed to automatically construct reliable QAs from generated user messages, simultaneously keeping their diversity and scalability. Specifically, we introduce the Bayesian Relation Network (BRNet) and a causal generation mechanism to mitigate the impact of LLM hallucinations on factual information, facilitating the automatic creation of an evaluation dataset. Based on MemSim, we generate a dataset in the daily-life scenario, named MemDaily, and conduct extensive experiments to assess the effectiveness of our approach. We also provide a benchmark for evaluating different memory mechanisms in LLM-based agents with the MemDaily dataset. To benefit the research community, we have released our project at <https://github.com/nuster1128/MemSim>.

1 Introduction

In recent years, large language model (LLM) based agents have been extensively deployed across various fields [1–6]. One of their most significant applications is serving as personal assistants [7, 8], where they engage in long-term interactions with users to address a wide range of issues [9, 10]. For LLM-based personal assistants, memory is one of the most significant capability [11]. To perform personal tasks effectively, these agents must be capable of storing factual information from previous messages and recalling relevant details to generate appropriate responses. For example, a user Alice might tell the agent, “*I will watch a movie at City Cinema this Friday in Hall 3, Row 2, Seat 9.*” When Friday arrives, she might ask the agent, “*Where is my movie seat?*” Then, the agent should recall the relevant information (i.e., the seat number) to generate an appropriate response to Alice.

Previous research has proposed methods for constructing the memory of LLM-based agents [12, 13, 9, 14, 15]. However, there remains a lack of objective and automatic methods to evaluate how well personal assistants can memorize and utilize factual information from previous messages. One conventional solution is to collect messages from real-world users, and manually annotate answers to human-designed questions based on these messages. However, it requires substantial human labor

[†] Work under the internship in Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab.

^{*} Co-first authors.

[§] Corresponding author.

[♣] Beijing Key Laboratory of Research on Large Models and Intelligent Governance.

^{♣♣} Engineering Research Center of Next-Generation Intelligent Search and Recommendation, MOE.




Figure 1: The overview of MemSim framework and MemDaily dataset.

that lacks **scalability**. Another solution is to generate user messages and question-answers (QAs) with LLMs. However, the hallucination of LLMs can severely undermine the **reliability** of generated datasets, particularly in complex scenarios [16]. Here, we refer to the reliability of a dataset as the correctness of its ground truths to factual questions given the corresponding user messages. Our research shows that due to the hallucination of LLMs, the correctness of ground truths generated by vanilla LLMs is less than 90% in most scenarios and can fall below 40% in some complex scenarios (see **Section 5.2**). Moreover, generating diverse user profiles through LLMs is also challenging, as they tend to produce the most plausible profiles that lack **diversity**.

To address these challenges, we propose MemSim, a Bayesian simulator designed to construct reliable QAs from generated user messages, keeping their diversity and scalability. It can be utilized to evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants. Specifically, we introduce the Bayesian Relation Network (BRNet) to generate the simulated users that are represented by their hierarchical profiles. Then, we propose a causal generation mechanism to produce various types of user messages and QAs for the comprehensive evaluation on memory mechanisms. Based on MemSim, we create a dataset in the daily-life scenario, named MemDaily, and perform extensive experiments to assess the quality of MemDaily. Finally, we construct a benchmark to evaluate different memory mechanisms of LLM-based agents with MemDaily. Our work is the first one that evaluates memory of LLM-based personal assistants in an objective and automatic way. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We analyze the challenges of constructing datasets for objective evaluation on the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants, focusing on the aspects of reliability, diversity, and scalability.
- We propose MemSim, a Bayesian simulator designed to generate reliable, diverse and scalable datasets for evaluating the memory of LLM-based personal assistants. We design BRNet to generate the simulated users, and propose a causal generation mechanism to construct user messages and QAs.
- We create the MemDaily dataset, which can be used to evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants. We perform extensive experiments to assess the quality of MemDaily, and provide a benchmark for different memory mechanisms of LLM-based agents. To support the research community, we release project available at <https://github.com/nuster1128/MemSim>.

The rest of our paper is organized as follows. In **Section 2**, we review the related works on the evaluation of memory in LLM-based agents and personal assistants. In **Section 3**, we introduce the details of MemSim, and the generation process of MemDaily. In **Section 4**, we assess the quality of MemDaily. **Section 5** provides a benchmark for evaluating different memory mechanisms of LLM-based agents. Finally, in **Section 6**, we discuss the limitations of our work and draw conclusions.

2 Related Works

LLM-based agents have been extensively utilized across various domains, marking a new era for artificial personal assistants [7, 17, 18]. For LLM-based personal assistants, memory is critical to

enable agents to deliver personalized services. This includes storing, managing, and utilizing users' personal and historical data [11, 12, 15, 19–23]. For instance, MPC [10] suggests storing essential factual information in a memory pool with a summarizer for retrieval as needed. MemoryBank [12] converts daily events into high-level summaries and organizes them into a hierarchical memory structure for future retrieval. These approaches primarily aim to enhance agents' memory capability.

Previous studies have also attempted to evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based agents. Some studies use subjective methods, employing human evaluators to score the effectiveness of retrieved memory [10, 12, 24]. Other studies use objective evaluations by constructing dialogues and question-answer pairs [14, 25, 26]. However, there exist limitations in higher cost and lower reliability. Some previous studies construct knowledge-based question-answering datasets to assess Retrieval-Augmented Generation [27, 28]. These studies either use knowledge graphs to generate QAs through templates or manually annotate QAs with human input [29–34]. However, most of them focus on common-sense questions rather than personal questions, and they do not include textual user messages and target indexes for retrieval evaluation [30–32, 35, 36]. They are also highly dependent on the entities extracted from the given corpus [30, 35]. Our work is the first that evaluate memory of LLM-based personal assistants in an objective and automatic way, which can generate user messages and QAs without human annotators, keeping reliability, diversity and scalability.

3 Methods

3.1 Overview of MemSim

In order to construct reliable QAs from generated user messages, we propose a Bayesian simulator named MemSim shown in **Figure 1**. First, we develop the Bayesian Relation Network to model the probability distribution of users' relevant entities and attributes, enabling the sampling of diverse hierarchical user profiles. Then, we introduce a causal mechanism to generate user messages and construct reliable QAs. We design various types of QAs for comprehensive memory evaluation, incorporating different noises to simulate real-world environments. Based on the constructed QAs and generated user messages, researchers can objectively and automatically evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants on factual information from previous messages.

3.2 Bayesian Relation Network

We introduce Bayesian Relation Network (BRNet) to model the probability distribution of users' relevant entities and attributes, where we sample hierarchical profiles to represent simulated users (see **Figure 1(a)**). Specifically, we define a two-level structure in BRNet, including the entity level and the attribute level. The entity level represents user-related entities, such as relevant persons, involved events, and the user itself. At the attribute level, each entity comprises several attributes, such as age, gender, and occupation. Here, BRNet actually serves as a predefined meta-user. Formally, let $\mathcal{A}^1, \dots, \mathcal{A}^N$ represent different entities, and each entity $\mathcal{A}^i$ comprises several attributes $\{A_1^i, A_2^i, \dots, A_{N_i}^i\}$, where N is the number of entities, and N_i is the number of attributes belonging to the entity $\mathcal{A}^i$. Each attribute A_j^i corresponds to a random variable X_j^i , which can be sampled in a value space. For example, the *college's* (entity $\mathcal{A}^i$) *age* (attribute A_j^i) is *28 years old* (value $x_j^i \sim X_j^i$).

We denote BRNet as a directed graph $G = \langle V, E \rangle$ at the attribute level, where the vertex set V includes all attributes, i.e., $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \{A_1^i, A_2^i, \dots, A_{N_i}^i\}$. The edge set E captures all the direct causal relations among these attributes, defined as $E = \{\langle A_j^i, A_l^k \rangle \mid \forall X_j^i, X_l^k \in \mathcal{X}, X_j^i \rightarrow X_l^k\}$, where $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \{X_1^i, X_2^i, \dots, X_{N_i}^i\}$. For better demonstration, in this subsection, we simplify the subscripts of the variables in $\mathcal{X}$ as $1, 2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^N N_i$. The conditional probability distribution among them can either be explicitly predefined or implicitly represented by LLM's generation with conditional prompts. It is important to note that we assume the causal structure is loop-free, ensuring that BRNet forms a directed acyclic graph (DAG), which is typical in most scenarios [37]. Additionally, the vertices (i.e., attributes), edges (i.e., causal relations), and conditional probability distributions (i.e., prior knowledge) can be easily scaled to different scenarios.

So far, we have constructed the BRNet, where the joint probability distribution $P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|})$ over all attributes can represent the user distribution in the given scenario. Then, we can sample different values of attributes on entities from BRNet to represent various user profiles. One straightforward approach is to compute the joint probability distribution and sample from it.

Assumption 1 (Local Markov Property). *BRNet satisfies the local Markov property, which states that*

$$X_t \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\overline{\text{des}}(X_t)} | \text{par}(X_t), \forall X_t \in \mathcal{X},$$

where $\overline{\text{des}}(X_t)$ denotes the non-descendant set of X_t , $\text{par}(X_t)$ denotes the parent set of X_t , and the notation $\cdot \perp\!\!\!\perp \cdot$ indicates the variables are conditionally independent.

Because the parents of an attribute can be extended to any non-descendant attributes of it by adding a new edge if they have a direct causal relation. Given these parent attributes, other non-descendant attributes are conditionally independent of that attribute according to Pearl [38].

Theorem 1 (Factorization). *The joint probability distribution of BRNet can be expressed as*

$$P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|}) = \prod_{X_t \in \mathcal{X}} P(X_t | \text{par}(X_t)),$$

where $\text{par}(X_t)$ denotes the set of parent attributes of X_t .

The proof of this theorem is provided in **Appendix A.1**. However, calculating the joint probability distribution and sampling from it may be impractical in our scenarios. First, the joint probability distribution is often high-dimensional, making its calculation and sampling costly. Second, some conditional probability distributions are difficult to represent in explicit forms, particularly when using LLMs for value generation through conditional prompts. To address these issues, we introduce the ancestral sampling process to obtain the values of attributes.

Assumption 2 (Conditional Sampling). *In BRNet, an attribute can be sampled from the conditional probability distribution given its parent attributes. Specifically, we have*

$$\tilde{x}_t \sim P(X_t | \text{par}(X_t)), \forall X_t \in \mathcal{X},$$

where the conditional probability distribution can be expressed in either explicit or implicit forms.

The ancestral sampling algorithm is outlined as follows. First, we obtain the topological ordering of BRNet using Kahn’s algorithm [39]. Next, we sample all attributes according to this ordering. For top-level attributes without parents, the sampling is performed based on their marginal probability distributions. For other variables like X_t , we sample their values using the conditional probability distribution $\tilde{x}_t \sim P(X_t | \text{par}(X_t))$ as specified in **Assumption 2**. Finally, we consider each sampling result $\{\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_{|\mathcal{X}|}\}$ as the attribute-level profiles of a user, which constitute different entities as the entity-level profiles of the user. These two levels represent the user in different grains, which are important to generate user messages and QAs subsequently.

Theorem 2 (Ancestral Sampling). *For BRNet, the result of ancestral sampling is equivalent to that of sampling from the joint probability distribution. Specifically, we have*

$$P(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_{|\mathcal{X}|}) = P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|}),$$

where $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|} \sim P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|})$ are sampled from the joint probability distribution.

The proof can be found in **Appendix A.2**. By employing ancestral sampling [38], we eliminate the need to compute the joint probability distribution, making the sampling process more efficient and practical. By utilizing BRNet, we introduce prior knowledge of the specific scenario into the graphical structure and sampling process, which can improve the diversity and scalability of user profiles, thereby enhancing the diversity and scalability of whole datasets.

3.3 Causal Generation Mechanism

Based on hierarchical user profiles, we propose a causal generation mechanism to generate user messages, and construct reliable QAs corresponding to them. Here, *causal* indicates that the generation of user messages and the construction of QAs are causally dependent on the same informative *hints* that are also causally derived from hierarchical user profiles. Specifically, we define a piece of hint as a triple $(\mathcal{A}^i, A_j^i, x_j^i)$ that provides factual information in a structural format. In other words, the hierarchical user profiles provide a structural foundation to get different hints, which then provide a set of relevant information as the causation of both user messages and QAs, shown in **Figure 1(b)**.

Construction of Informative Hints. We construct the hints of factual information based on hierarchical user profiles before creating the user messages and QAs. We select a target entity $\mathcal{A}^t$ at the

Table 1: Overview of comprehensive questions and answers.

Types	Descriptions	Examples	Causal Hints	Retrieval Target
Single-hop	Rely on one message to answer the question directly.	Q: When is Alice’s birthday ? A: June 1st.	$(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})$	$\{m_{(j)}\}$
Multi-hop	Require multiple messages to answer the question jointly.	Q: Where is the meeting that I will attend next week? A: Victoria Conference Center.	$(\mathcal{A}^t, K_{(j)}, x_{(j)}),$ $(\mathcal{A}^t, K_{(k)}, x_{(k)})$	$\{m_{(j)}, m_{(k)}\}$
Comparative	Compare two entities on a shared attribute with multiple messages.	Q: Who is younger between Alice and Bob? A: Bob.	$(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K, v_{(j)}),$ $(\mathcal{A}_{(k)}, K, v_{(k)})$	$\{m_{(j)}, m_{(k)}\}$
Aggregative	Aggregate messages about more than two entities on a common attribute.	Q: How many people are under 35 years old? A: Three.	$\{(\mathcal{A}_{(j_k)}, K, v_{(j_k)})\}_{k=1}^d$	$\{m_{(j_k)}\}_{k=1}^d$
Post-processing	Involve extra reasoning steps to answer with multiple messages.	Q: What season was the teacher that I know born in? A: Spring.	$(\mathcal{A}^t, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)}),$ $(\mathcal{A}^t, K_{(k)}, v_{(k)})$	$\{m_{(j)}, m_{(k)}\}$

Table 2: Summary of the MemDaily dataset.

Statistics	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy	Total
Trajectories	500	500	492	462	500	500	2,954
Messages	4215	4195	3144	5536	4438	4475	26,003
Questions	500	500	492	462	500	500	2,954
TPM	15.48	15.49	14.66	14.65	17.07	16.14	15.59

entity-level, and choose l^t attributes $\{K_1^t, K_2^t, \dots, K_{l^t}^t\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^t$ along with their corresponding values $\{v_1^t, v_2^t, \dots, v_{l^t}^t\}$ from the attribute-level profiles. Then, we reformulate them into a list of triple hints $H^t = [(\mathcal{A}^t, K_i^t, v_i^t)]_{i=1}^{l^t}$. For some complex types of QAs, we choose more than one target entities, and concatenate their lists of hints. For better demonstration, we re-index the final list of hints as $H = [(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})]_{j=1}^l$, where l is the number of hints in the final list.

Construction of User Messages. Based on the j -th hint $(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)}) \in H$, we construct the corresponding user message $m_{(j)}$ with LLM, where we have $m_{(j)} = LLM(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})$. Here, the LLM only serves the purpose of rewriting structural hints, without any reasoning process. For example, if the hint is *(my uncle Bob, occupation, driver)*, the generated user message might be *“The occupation of my uncle Bob is a driver”*. We generate user messages for all the hints in H , and we finally get the list of user messages $M = [m_{(j)}]_{j=1}^l$.

Construction of Questions and Answers. In order to evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants more comprehensively, we propose to construct five representative types of QAs to cover various complexities in real-world scenarios, as detailed in **Table 1**. For each question q , we provide three forms of ground truths: (1) the textual answer a that can correctly respond to q , (2) the correct choice a among confusing choices a' (generated by LLM) as a single-choice format, and (3) the correct retrieval target $h \subseteq M$ that contains the required factual information to the question.

(i.) *Single-hop QA.* Single-hop QA is the most basic type of QAs, relying on a single piece message to directly answer the question. In constructing QA, we randomly select the j -th hint $(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})$ and generate the question $q = LLM(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)})$ through LLM rewriting, where the answer is $a = v_{(j)}$. Correspondingly, the retrieval target is $h = \{m_{(j)}\}$.

(ii.) *Multi-hop QA.* Multi-hop QA necessitates the use of multiple messages to determine the correct answer, making it more complex than single-hop QA. In constructing Multi-hop QA, we first sample two hints $(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})$ and $(\mathcal{A}_{(k)}, K_{(k)}, v_{(k)})$ from the same bridge entity $\mathcal{A}^t$ (i.e., $\mathcal{A}^t = \mathcal{A}_{(j)} = \mathcal{A}_{(k)}$). We then mask this bridge entity and generate the question $q = LLM(K_{(j)}, v_{(j)}, K_{(k)})$ through LLM rewriting, where the answer is $a = v_{(k)}$. The target message set is $h = \{m_{(j)}, m_{(k)}\}$. By incorporating additional entities, the questions can be easily extended to more hops.

(iii.) *Comparative QA.* Comparative QA is an extensive type of multi-hop QA, which involves comparing two entities based on a shared attribute. We first select two hints $(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})$ and $(\mathcal{A}_{(k)}, K_{(k)}, v_{(k)})$ from different entities with the same meaning attribute K (i.e., $\mathcal{A}_j \neq \mathcal{A}_k$ and $K \cong$

$K_{(j)} \cong K_{(k)}$. We then rewrite the question $q = LLM(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, \mathcal{A}_{(k)}, K)$ by LLM, where the answer $a = f(K, v_{(j)}, v_{(k)})$ is derived from the function $f(\cdot)$. The retrieval target is $h = \{m_{(j)}, m_{(k)}\}$.

(iv.) *Aggregative QA*. Aggregative QA is a general type of comparative QA, which requires aggregating messages from more than two entities on a shared attribute. For construction, we choose d hints $\{(\mathcal{A}_{(j_k)}, K, v_{(j_k)})\}_{k=1}^d$ from different entities with the same meaning attribute K . Then, we construct the question $q = LLM(\{\mathcal{A}_{(j_k)}\}_{k=1}^d, K)$, where we obtain the answer $a = f(K, \{v_{(j_k)}\}_{k=1}^d)$. The target message set should include all these related references, that is, $h = \{m_{(j_k)}\}_{k=1}^d$.

(v.) *Post-processing QA*. Post-processing QA addresses situations where personal questions require additional reasoning steps for agents to answer, based on the retrieved messages. We first select two hints $(\mathcal{A}_{(j)}, K_{(j)}, v_{(j)})$ and $(\mathcal{A}_{(k)}, K_{(k)}, v_{(k)})$ from the same bridge entity $\mathcal{A}^t$. We then design a reasoning factor ψ to generate the question $q = LLM(K_{(j)}, v_{(j)}, K_{(k)}, \psi)$, and derive the answer $a = f(K_{(k)}, v_{(k)}, \psi)$, where ψ specifies the reasoning process. For example, it could be “the sum of the last five digits of the phone number $v_{(k)}$ ”. Similarly, the retrieval target will be $h = \{m_{(j)}, m_{(k)}\}$.

Infusion of Noise in User Messages. We integrate two types of noise in user messages by concatenation, in order to simulate real-world circumstances. The first type is entity-side noise, which refers to noisy messages that contain the selected attributes from unselected entities. The second type is attribute-side noise, which involves noisy messages that describe unselected attributes of the selected entities. Both types of noise can impact agents’ ability to retrieve messages and generate answers.

Eventually, we formulate the trajectory $\xi = (M, q, a, a', h)$ by discarding all hints, where each trajectory serves as a test instance for evaluating the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants. There are two insights into the causal generation mechanism. First, the factual information of messages and QAs are causally constructed from the shared hints that are sampled from user profiles, where LLMs are only responsible for rewriting based on the given information, rather than imagining or reasoning. This pipeline mitigates the impact of LLM hallucination on the factual information, keeping the reliability of QAs. It can also prevent contradictions among user messages from the same trajectory, because their hints are derived from the same user profile. Second, our method focuses on designing the asymmetric difficulty between constructing QAs (i.e., profiles $\rightarrow$ hints $\rightarrow$ messages, question and answer) and solving QAs (i.e., messages|question $\rightarrow$ answer), which is critical for the automatic generation of evaluation datasets.

3.4 MemDaily: A Dataset in the Daily-life Scenario

Based on MemSim, we create a dataset in the daily-life scenario, named MemDaily, which can be used to evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants, shown in **Figure 1(c)**. Specifically, MemDaily incorporates 11 entities and 73 attributes (see details in **Appendix G.1**), all of which are representative and closely related to users’ daily lives. We create 6 sub-datasets of different QA types mentioned previously: (1) **Simple (Simp.)**: single-hop QAs. (2) **Conditional (Cond.)**: multi-hop QAs with conditions. (3) **Comparative (Comp.)**: comparative QAs. (4) **Aggregative (Aggr.)**: aggregative QAs. (5) **Post-processing (Post.)**: post-processing QAs. (6) **Noisy**: multi-hop QAs with additional irrelevant noisy texts inside questions. The summary of MemDaily is shown in **Table 2**, where we present the number of trajectories, user messages, questions, and TPM (tokens per message). More details and examples can be found in **Appendix G**.

4 Experiments of Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the quality of MemDaily, which can reflect the effectiveness of MemSim. Specifically, the evaluations are conducted in three parts: the user profiles, the user messages, and the constructed QAs. Besides, we also conduct comprehensive case studies in **Appendix G**.

4.1 Evaluation on User Profiles

The generated user profiles are supposed to express both rationality and diversity, which also directly influence the creation of user messages and QAs. Therefore, we evaluate these two aspects to reflect their quality. Rationality means that the user profiles should possibly exist in the real world, with no internal contradictions in their descriptions. Diversity indicates that the descriptions among users are distinct, covering a wide range of user types.

Table 3: Results of the evaluation on user profiles.

Methods	R-Human	R-GPT	SWI-R	SWI-O	SWI-A
IndePL	1.35±0.53	4.32	0.464	0.231	0.347
SeqPL	1.64±0.73	4.40	1.471	1.416	1.443
JointPL	3.02±1.14	4.80	1.425	0.462	0.943
MemSim	4.91±0.30	4.68	3.206	2.895	3.050

Metrics. For rationality, we recruit six human evaluators to score the generated user profiles on a scale from 1 to 5 based on the guidelines in **Appendix H.1**. Additionally, we use GPT-4o¹ as a reference for scoring. These two metrics are denoted as R-Human and R-GPT. For diversity, we calculate the average Shannon-Wiener Index (SWI) [40] on key attributes, using the following formula:

$$\text{SWI-}\mathcal{W} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}|} \sum_{X_k \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{x_i \in X_k} p(x_i) \ln p(x_i),$$

where $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is the subset of attribute variables. Therefore, we calculate SWI-R, SWI-O, and SWI-A, corresponding to role-relevant attributes, role-irrelevant attributes, and all attributes, respectively.

Baselines. We design several baselines to generate user profiles: (1) **JointPL**: prompting an LLM to generate attributes jointly. (2) **SeqPL**: prompting an LLM to generate attributes sequentially, conditioned on previous attributes in linear order. (3) **IndePL**: prompting an LLM to generate attributes independently. We compare our method with these baselines on generating user profiles.

Results. As shown in **Table 3**, MemSim outperforms other baselines on R-Human, demonstrating the effectiveness of BRNet as an ablation study. However, we also observe an inconsistency between R-Human and R-GPT, which may be due to the inaccuracy of the LLM’s scoring [41]. Furthermore, our method achieves the highest diversity compared to the other baselines.

4.2 Evaluation on User Messages

We evaluate the quality of generated user messages in multiple aspects, including fluency, rationality, naturalness, informativeness, and diversity. The first four aspects are designed to assess the quality inside a trajectory, while the final one targets the variety across trajectories.

Metrics. For the inside-trajectory aspects, human evaluators score user messages on a scale from 1 to 5 based on the guidelines in **Appendix H.2**, denoted as **F-Human** (fluency), **R-Human** (rationality), **N-Human** (naturalness), and **I-Human** (informativeness). GPT-4o scores are also available and detailed in **Appendix D**. To assess the diversity across trajectories, we extract all entities and calculate their average Shannon-Wiener Index per 10,000 tokens of user messages, referred to as **SWIP**.

Baselines. We implement several baselines that generate messages under different constraints regarding user profiles and tasks: (1) **ZeroCons**: no constraints on attributes when prompting LLMs. (2) **PartCons**: partial attributes of user profiles are constrained in prompts for LLMs. (3) **SoftCons**: full attributes of user profiles are constrained in prompts but they are not forcibly for generation. Our MemSim method imposes the most strict constraints, requiring both the integration of specific attributes into user messages and ensuring that questions are answerable with established ground truths based on the shared hints. Generally, higher constraint commonly means sacrifice of fluency and naturalness, because it compulsively imposes certain information to benefit QA constructions.

Results. As shown in **Table 4**, our method maintains relatively high scores despite the rigorous constraints on constructing reliable QAs. Additionally, MemSim exhibits the highest diversity index, attributed to the BRNet and the causal generation mechanism that produces a wider variety of user messages based on the provided hierarchical user profiles.

4.3 Evaluation on Questions and Answers

The primary challenge for constructing a reliable dataset is ensuring the accuracy of ground truths for the constructed questions. To assess the reliability of MemDaily, we sample approximately 20% of all the trajectories in MemDaily and employ human evaluators to verify the correctness of their ground truths. Specifically, the evaluators are required to examine three parts of the ground truths: textual

¹<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

Table 4: Results of the evaluation on user messages.

Methods	F-Human	R-Human	N-Human	I-Human	SWIP
ZeroCons	4.94±0.24	4.94±0.24	4.85±0.35	2.82±1.15	2.712
PartCons	4.98±0.14	4.94±0.37	4.97±0.18	4.01±1.18	6.047
SoftCons	4.93±0.30	4.80±0.77	4.91±0.42	4.37±0.98	5.868
MemSim	4.93±0.30	4.93±0.39	4.90±0.41	3.61±1.19	6.125

answers, single-choice answers, and retrieval targets, and report their accuracy. Due to the page limitation, we put the evaluation details in **Appendix B**. According to the results, we find MemDaily can ensure the accuracy of the answers provided for constructed questions.

5 Experiments of Benchmark

In this section, we create a benchmark based on the MemDaily dataset, in order to evaluate the memory capability of LLM-based personal assistants. Our benchmark sets various levels of difficulty by introducing different proportions of question-irrelevant daily-life posts.

5.1 Experimental Settings

Levels of Difficulty. We utilize the MemDaily dataset as the basis of our benchmark. In order to set different levels of difficulty, we collect question-irrelevant posts from social media platforms, and randomly incorporate them into user messages by controlling their proportions. Specifically, we denote MemDaily-vanilla as the vanilla and easiest one without extra additions, and create a series of MemDaily- η , where we use η to represent the inverse percentage of original user messages. Larger η indicates a higher level of difficulty in the benchmark. We primarily focus on MemDaily-vanilla and MemDaily-100 as representatives. We also conduct evaluations on MemDaily-10, MemDaily-50, and MemDaily-200, putting their experimental results in **Appendix E**.

Baselines. We implement several common memory mechanisms for LLM-based agents according to previous studies [11], including (1) **Full Memory (FullMem)**: saves all previous messages and concatenates them into the prompt for LLM inference. (2) **Recent Memory (ReceMem)**: maintains the most recent k messages and concatenates them into the prompt for LLM inference, also known as short-term memory. (3) **Retrieved Memory (RetrMem)**: stores all previous messages using FAISS [42] and retrieves the top- k relevant messages for inclusion in the prompt for LLM inference, which is commonly used to construct long-term memory. Specifically, we use Llama-160m [43] to transform a message into a 768-dimensional embedding and compute relevance scores using cosine similarity [44]. (4) **None Memory (NonMem)**: does not use memory for LLM inference. Additionally, we include two special baselines for reference: (5) **Noisy Memory (NoisyMem)**: receives only untargeted messages. (6) **Oracle Memory (OracleMem)**: receives only targeted messages. Here, the targeted messages indicate the messages in the ground truth retrieval target. For all methods, we use the open-source GLM-4-9B [45] as the foundational model for its excellent ability in long-context scenarios, and experiments on more backbones can be found in **Appendix F**.

Metrics. We propose to evaluate the memory of LLM-based agents from two perspectives: effectiveness and efficiency. Effectiveness refers to the agent’s ability to store and utilize factual information. The metrics for effectiveness include: (1) **Accuracy**: The correctness of agents’ responses, measured by their ability to answer personal questions based on the factual information from historical user messages. (2) **Recall@5**: The percentage of messages in retrieval target successfully retrieved within the top-5 relevant messages. Efficiency mainly assesses the time cost associated with storing and utilizing information from memory. We use two metrics to evaluate efficiency: (1) **Response Time**: The time taken for an agent to respond after receiving a query, covering the retrieval and utilization processes. (2) **Adaptation Time**: The time required for an agent to store a new message.

5.2 Effectiveness of Memory Mechanisms

Accuracy of factual question-answering. The results of accuracy are presented in **Table 5**, including the response time for generating answers and adaptation time for storing messages. FullMem and RetrMem demonstrate superior performance compared to other memory mechanisms, achieving high accuracy across both datasets. ReceMem tends to underperform when a large volume of noisy messages is present, as target messages may fall outside the memory window. We observe

Table 5: Results of accuracy for factual question-answering.

MemDaily-vanilla						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.976±0.022	0.982±0.017	0.859±0.054	0.320±0.079	0.848±0.045	0.966±0.028
RetrMem	0.898±0.048	0.882±0.040	0.771±0.078	0.317±0.061	0.800±0.054	0.786±0.040
ReceMem	0.832±0.080	0.798±0.046	0.631±0.069	0.257±0.040	0.760±0.051	0.764±0.042
NonMem	0.508±0.032	0.452±0.059	0.157±0.049	0.254±0.055	0.594±0.073	0.380±0.060
NoisyMem	0.512±0.044	0.468±0.054	0.204±0.067	0.239±0.058	0.590±0.045	0.388±0.048
OracleMem	0.966±0.020	0.988±0.013	0.910±0.032	0.376±0.057	0.888±0.053	0.984±0.017

MemDaily-100						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.962±0.017	0.938±0.033	0.586±0.076	0.343±0.047	0.804±0.041	0.872±0.041
RetrMem	0.892±0.034	0.840±0.036	0.706±0.074	0.320±0.092	0.770±0.055	0.726±0.052
ReceMem	0.500±0.063	0.442±0.058	0.104±0.048	0.257±0.054	0.600±0.060	0.386±0.076
NonMem	0.508±0.032	0.454±0.065	0.159±0.052	0.252±0.043	0.594±0.032	0.380±0.057
NoisyMem	0.458±0.071	0.422±0.051	0.261±0.068	0.283±0.041	0.566±0.064	0.348±0.044
OracleMem	0.966±0.020	0.988±0.016	0.912±0.045	0.372±0.062	0.888±0.038	0.984±0.012

Table 6: Results of recall@5 for target message retrieval.

MemDaily-vanilla						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
LLM	0.888±0.025	0.851±0.020	0.947±0.018	0.544±0.021	0.800±0.028	0.846±0.036
Embedding	0.735±0.064	0.717±0.041	0.845±0.022	0.515±0.059	0.693±0.033	0.648±0.018
Recency	0.514±0.052	0.513±0.038	0.698±0.034	0.237±0.026	0.511±0.053	0.504±0.047

MemDaily-100						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
LLM	0.612±0.021	0.479±0.037	0.683±0.036	0.290±0.027	0.439±0.047	0.430±0.059
Embedding	0.698±0.049	0.653±0.061	0.778±0.048	0.490±0.037	0.567±0.042	0.543±0.034
Recency	0.002±0.003	0.003±0.004	0.002±0.003	0.000±0.001	0.002±0.003	< 0.001

that agents excel with simple, conditional, post-processing, and noisy questions but struggle with comparative and aggregative questions. By comparing with OracleMem, we find the primary difficulty possibly lies in retrieving target messages. Even with accurate retrieval, aggregative questions remain challenging, indicating a potential bottleneck in textual memory. An interesting phenomenon we notice is that NoisyMem shows higher accuracy than NonMem in MemDaily-vanilla but lower accuracy in MemDaily-100. Similarly, FullMem unexpectedly outperforms OracleMem on simple questions in MemDaily. We suspect that LLMs may perform better with memory prompts of medium length, suggesting a potential limitation of textual memory mechanisms for LLM-based agents.

Recall of target message retrieval. We implement three retrieval methods to obtain the most relevant messages and compare them with target messages to calculate Recall@5. **Embedding** refers to the retrieval process used in RetrMem. **Recency** considers the most recent k messages as the result. **LLM** directly uses the LLM to respond with the top- k relevant messages. The results are presented in Table 6. We find that LLM performs best in short-context scenarios, while Embedding achieves higher recall scores in longer contexts. Additionally, we notice that separating the retrieval and inference stages may exhibit different performances compared with integrating them.

5.3 Efficiency of Memory Mechanisms

We put the results in Appendix C due to the page limitation. We find that RetrMem consumes the most response time in short-context scenarios, and FullMem also requires more time for inference due to longer memory prompts. However, the response time of FullMem increases significantly faster than that of other methods as the context lengthens. Regarding adaptation time, we observe that RetrMem requires substantially more time because it needs to build indexes in the FAISS system.

6 Conclusions and Limitations

In this paper, we propose MemSim, a Bayesian simulator designed to generate reliable datasets for evaluating the memory capability of LLM-based agents. Utilizing MemSim, we generate MemDaily as a dataset in the daily-life scenario, and conduct extensive evaluations to assess its quality. We also provide a benchmark on different memory mechanisms of LLM-based agents and provide further analysis. However, as the very initial study, there are several limitations. Firstly, our work focuses on evaluating the memory capability of LLM-based agents on factual information, but does not address higher-level and abstract information, such as users' hidden preferences. Additionally, our evaluation does not include dialogue forms, which are more complex and challenging to ensure reliability. Besides, preventing the misuse of generated data is also an important consideration. In future works, we aim to address these issues to contribute to the social benefit.

Acknowledgment

This work is supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62422215 and No. 62472427), Huawei Innovation Research Programs, Major Innovation & Planning Interdisciplinary Platform for the "DoubleFirst Class" Initiative, Renmin University of China, Public Computing Cloud, Renmin University of China, fund for building world-class universities (disciplines) of Renmin University of China.

References

- [1] Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01680](#), 2024.
- [2] Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, et al. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6):186345, 2024.
- [3] Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864](#), 2023.
- [4] Yingqiang Ge, Yujie Ren, Wenyue Hua, Shuyuan Xu, Juntao Tan, and Yongfeng Zhang. Llm as os (llmao), agents as apps: Envisioning aios, agents and the aios-agent ecosystem. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03815](#), 2023.
- [5] Lei Wang, Jingsen Zhang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Ruihua Song, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Recagent: A novel simulation paradigm for recommender systems. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02552](#), 2023.
- [6] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Shaokun Zhang, Erkang Zhu, Beibin Li, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, and Chi Wang. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155](#), 2023.
- [7] Yuanchun Li, Hao Wen, Weijun Wang, Xiangyu Li, Yizhen Yuan, Guohong Liu, Jiacheng Liu, Wenxing Xu, Xiang Wang, Yi Sun, et al. Personal llm agents: Insights and survey about the capability, efficiency and security. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05459](#), 2024.
- [8] Jiahong Liu, Zexuan Qiu, Zhongyang Li, Quanyu Dai, Jieming Zhu, Minda Hu, Menglin Yang, and Irwin King. A survey of personalized large language models: Progress and future directions. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11528](#), 2025.
- [9] Junru Lu, Siyu An, Mingbao Lin, Gabriele Pergola, Yulan He, Di Yin, Xing Sun, and Yunsheng Wu. Memochat: Tuning llms to use memos for consistent long-range open-domain conversation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08239](#), 2023.
- [10] Gibbeum Lee, Volker Hartmann, Jongho Park, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. Prompted llms as chatbot modules for long open-domain conversation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04533](#), 2023.

- [11] Zeyu Zhang, Xiaohe Bo, Chen Ma, Rui Li, Xu Chen, Quanyu Dai, Jieming Zhu, Zhenhua Dong, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on the memory mechanism of large language model based agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13501, 2024.
- [12] Wanjun Zhong, Lianghong Guo, Qiqi Gao, He Ye, and Yanlin Wang. Memorybank: Enhancing large language models with long-term memory. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 38, pages 19724–19731, 2024.
- [13] Ali Modarressi, Ayyoob Imani, Mohsen Fayyaz, and Hinrich Schütze. Ret-llm: Towards a general read-write memory for large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14322, 2023.
- [14] Charles Packer, Vivian Fang, Shishir G Patil, Kevin Lin, Sarah Wooders, and Joseph E Gonzalez. Memgpt: Towards llms as operating systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08560, 2023.
- [15] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2024.
- [16] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232, 2023.
- [17] Xiaoyan Zhao, Juntao You, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Hong Cheng, Fuli Feng, See-Kiong Ng, and Tat-Seng Chua. Nextquill: Causal preference modeling for enhancing llm personalization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.02368, 2025.
- [18] Yilun Qiu, Tianhao Shi, Xiaoyan Zhao, Fengbin Zhu, Yang Zhang, and Fuli Feng. Latent inter-user difference modeling for llm personalization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.20849, 2025.
- [19] Weiran Yao, Shelby Heinecke, Juan Carlos Niebles, Zhiwei Liu, Yihao Feng, Le Xue, Rithesh Murthy, Zeyuan Chen, Jianguo Zhang, Devansh Arpit, et al. Retroformer: Retrospective large language agents with policy gradient optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02151, 2023.
- [20] Zeyu Zhang, Yang Zhang, Haoran Tan, Rui Li, and Xu Chen. Explicit vs implicit memory: Exploring multi-hop complex reasoning over personalized information. arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.13250, 2025.
- [21] Zeyu Zhang, Quanyu Dai, Rui Li, Xiaohe Bo, Xu Chen, and Zhenhua Dong. Learn to memorize: Optimizing llm-based agents with adaptive memory framework. arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.16629, 2025.
- [22] Zeyu Zhang, Quanyu Dai, Xu Chen, Rui Li, Zhongyang Li, and Zhenhua Dong. Memengine: A unified and modular library for developing advanced memory of llm-based agents. In Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025, pages 821–824, 2025.
- [23] Rui Li, Quanyu Dai, Zeyu Zhang, Xu Chen, Zhenhua Dong, and Ji-Rong Wen. Knowtrace: Bootstrapping iterative retrieval-augmented generation with structured knowledge tracing. In Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 2, pages 1470–1480, 2025.
- [24] Lei Liu, Xiaoyan Yang, Yue Shen, Binbin Hu, Zhiqiang Zhang, Jinjie Gu, and Guannan Zhang. Think-in-memory: Recalling and post-thinking enable llms with long-term memory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08719, 2023.
- [25] Chenxu Hu, Jie Fu, Chenzhuang Du, Simian Luo, Junbo Zhao, and Hang Zhao. Chatdb: Augmenting llms with databases as their symbolic memory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03901, 2023.
- [26] Adyasha Maharana, Dong-Ho Lee, Sergey Tulyakov, Mohit Bansal, Francesco Barbieri, and Yuwei Fang. Evaluating very long-term conversational memory of llm agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17753, 2024.

- [27] Yunshi Lan, Gaole He, Jinhao Jiang, Jing Jiang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on complex knowledge base question answering: Methods, challenges and solutions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.11644, 2021.
- [28] Boci Peng, Yun Zhu, Yongchao Liu, Xiaohe Bo, Haizhou Shi, Chuntao Hong, Yan Zhang, and Siliang Tang. Graph retrieval-augmented generation: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08921, 2024.
- [29] Lingxi Zhang, Jing Zhang, Xirui Ke, Haoyang Li, Xinmei Huang, Zhonghui Shao, Shulin Cao, and Xin Lv. A survey on complex factual question answering. AI Open, 4:1–12, 2023.
- [30] Shulin Cao, Jiaxin Shi, Liangming Pan, Lunyiu Nie, Yutong Xiang, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Bin He, and Hanwang Zhang. Kqa pro: A dataset with explicit compositional programs for complex question answering over knowledge base. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03875, 2020.
- [31] Bowen Jin, Chulin Xie, Jiawei Zhang, Kashob Kumar Roy, Yu Zhang, Suhang Wang, Yu Meng, and Jiawei Han. Graph chain-of-thought: Augmenting large language models by reasoning on graphs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07103, 2024.
- [32] Wenyu Huang, Guancheng Zhou, Mirella Lapata, Pavlos Vougiouklis, Sebastien Montella, and Jeff Z Pan. Prompting large language models with knowledge graphs for question answering involving long-tail facts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06524, 2024.
- [33] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 7:453–466, 2019.
- [34] Xiao Yang, Kai Sun, Hao Xin, Yushi Sun, Nikita Bhalla, Xiangsen Chen, Sajal Choudhary, Rongze Daniel Gui, Ziran Will Jiang, Ziyu Jiang, et al. Crag-comprehensive rag benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04744, 2024.
- [35] Wen-tau Yih, Matthew Richardson, Christopher Meek, Ming-Wei Chang, and Jina Suh. The value of semantic parse labeling for knowledge base question answering. In Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers), pages 201–206, 2016.
- [36] Alon Talmor and Jonathan Berant. The web as a knowledge-base for answering complex questions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06643, 2018.
- [37] Christina Heinze-Deml, Marloes H Maathuis, and Nicolai Meinshausen. Causal structure learning. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 5(1):371–391, 2018.
- [38] Judea Pearl. Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems: networks of plausible inference. Elsevier, 2014.
- [39] Arthur B Kahn. Topological sorting of large networks. Communications of the ACM, 5(11): 558–562, 1962.
- [40] E Kathryn Morris, Tancredi Caruso, François Buscot, Markus Fischer, Christine Hancock, Tanja S Maier, Torsten Meiners, Caroline Müller, Elisabeth Obermaier, Daniel Prati, et al. Choosing and using diversity indices: insights for ecological applications from the german biodiversity exploratories. Ecology and evolution, 4(18):3514–3524, 2014.
- [41] KuanChao Chu, Yi-Pei Chen, and Hideki Nakayama. A better llm evaluator for text generation: The impact of prompt output sequencing and optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09972, 2024.
- [42] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. IEEE Transactions on Big Data, 7(3):535–547, 2019.
- [43] Xupeng Miao, Gabriele Oliaro, Zhihao Zhang, Xinhao Cheng, Zeyu Wang, Zhengxin Zhang, Rae Ying Yee Wong, Alan Zhu, Lijie Yang, Xiaoxiang Shi, et al. Specinfer: Accelerating generative large language model serving with tree-based speculative inference and verification. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09781, 2023.

- [44] Amit Singhal et al. Modern information retrieval: A brief overview. IEEE Data Eng. Bull., 24 (4):35–43, 2001.
- [45] GLM Team, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, Hanyu Lai, et al. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. arXiv e-prints, pages arXiv–2406, 2024.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: The abstract and introduction include our main claims, which can reflect the contribution and scope of our paper. Specifically, they are present in the abstract as well as the last but one paragraph of introduction.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: We discuss the limitations of our work in the last section.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory assumptions and proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: We provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof in Section 3 and Appendix A.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental result reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: We fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce our methods in the appendix of our paper. We also provide the source code and datasets (see the link in the introduction section).

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide the source code and datasets (see the link in the introduction section).

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental setting/details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce our methods in the appendix of our paper. We also provide the source code and datasets (see the link in the introduction section).

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment statistical significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We report error bars suitably and correctly defined in Section 4 and Section 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.

- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments compute resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide sufficient information on the computer resources in Section 5.2.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code of ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: This research conforms with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics in every respect.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss positive societal impacts in Section 1 and Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.

- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. **Safeguards**

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: We discuss positive societal impacts in Section 1 and Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. **Licenses for existing assets**

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Please see Section 4 and Section 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.

- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset’s creators.

13. **New assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Please see Section 4 and Section 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Please see Section 4, Section 5, and the Appendix.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Please see Section 4, Section 5, and the Appendix.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

16. Declaration of LLM usage

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does not impact the core methodology, scientific rigorousness, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [NA]

Justification: N/A

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy (<https://neurips.cc/Conferences/2025/LLM>) for what should or should not be described.

A Proof in Bayesian Relation Network

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 (Factorization). *The joint probability distribution of BRNet can be expressed as*

$$P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|}) = \prod_{X_t \in \mathcal{X}} P(X_t | \text{par}(X_t)),$$

where $\text{par}(X_t)$ denotes the set of parent attributes of X_t .

Proof. Because BRNet is DAG, we can certainly find a topological ordering

$$O = [o_1, o_2, \dots, o_{|\mathcal{X}|}].$$

Then, we inverse the sequence to get a reversed topologically ordering

$$\tilde{O} = [\tilde{o}_1, \tilde{o}_2, \dots, \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}].$$

Then, we utilize the theorem of conditional probability according to the order $\tilde{O}$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|}) &= P(X_{\tilde{o}_1} | X_{\tilde{o}_2}, \dots, X_{\tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}}) \cdot P(X_{\tilde{o}_2} | X_{\tilde{o}_3}, \dots, X_{\tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}}) \dots P(X_{\tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}}). \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P(X_{\tilde{o}_i} | \mathbf{X} [\tilde{o}_{i+1} : \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}]), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{X} [\tilde{o}_{i+1} : \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}]$ means all the variables after $\tilde{o}_{i+1}$ in the reversed topologically ordering, and there are no descendant variables inside. According to **Assumption 1**, we have

$$P(X_{\tilde{o}_i} | \mathbf{X} [\tilde{o}_{i+1} : \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}]) = P(X_{\tilde{o}_i} | \text{par}(X_{\tilde{o}_i})).$$

Finally, we rewrite it and obtain

$$P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|}) = \prod_{X_t \in \mathcal{X}} P(X_t | \text{par}(X_t)).$$

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2 (Ancestral Sampling). *For BRNet, the result of ancestral sampling is equivalent to that of sampling from the joint probability distribution. Specifically, we have*

$$P(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_{|\mathcal{X}|}) = P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|}),$$

where $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|} \sim P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{X}|})$ are sampled from the joint probability distribution.

Proof. We first calculate the reversed topologically ordering

$$\tilde{O} = [\tilde{o}_1, \tilde{o}_2, \dots, \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}].$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_{|\mathcal{X}|}) &= \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P(\tilde{x}_{\tilde{o}_i} | \tilde{\mathbf{x}} [\tilde{o}_{i+1} : \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}]) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P(\tilde{x}_{\tilde{o}_i} | \text{par}(\tilde{x}_{\tilde{o}_i})). \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} [\tilde{o}_{i+1} : \tilde{o}_{|\mathcal{X}|}]$ means the values of all the variables after $\tilde{o}_{i+1}$ in the reversed topologically ordering. According to **Assumption 2**, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_{|\mathcal{X}|}) &= \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P(x_{\tilde{o}_i} | \text{par}(x_{\tilde{o}_i})) \\ &= P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|}). \end{aligned}$$

Table 7: Results of the evaluation on questions and answers.

Question Types	Textual Answers	Single-choice Answers	Retrieval Target
Simple	100%	98%	100%
Conditional	100%	100%	100%
Comparative	100%	100%	100%
Aggregative	99%	99%	100%
Post-processing	100%	100%	99%
Noisy	100%	100%	100%
Average	99.8%	99.5%	99.8%

B Evaluation on Questions and Answers

The primary challenge for constructing a reliable dataset is ensuring the accuracy of ground truths for the constructed questions. To assess the reliability of MemDaily, we sample approximately 20% of all the trajectories in MemDaily and employ human evaluators to verify the correctness of their ground truths. Specifically, the evaluators are required to examine three parts of the ground truths: textual answers, single-choice answers, and retrieval targets, and report their accuracy. The guidelines of human evaluators are provided in **Appendix H.3**.

Metrics. The accuracy of textual answers assesses whether an answer correctly responds to the question based on the user messages within the same trajectory. The accuracy of single-choice answers indicates whether the ground truth choice is the sole correct answer for the question, given the user messages, while other choices are incorrect. The accuracy of retrieval targets evaluates whether the messages of the retrieval target are sufficient and necessary to answer the question.

Results. As shown in **Table 7**, MemDaily significantly ensures the accuracy of the answers provided for constructed questions. In the few instances where accuracy is compromised, it is attributed to the rewriting process by LLMs, which occasionally leads to information deviation. The results also demonstrate that MemSim can effectively mitigate the impact of LLM hallucinations on factual information, addressing a critical challenge in generating reliable questions and answers for memory evaluation. Another baseline method that directly generates answers through LLMs based on targeted user messages and questions performs much lower reliability. We implement this method and present the results as *OracleMem* in our constructed benchmarks in **Section 5.2**.

C Benchmark on the Efficiency of Memory Mechanisms

The results of efficiency are presented in **Table 8** and **Table 9**.

Table 8: Results of response time for generating answers (seconds per query).

MemDaily-vanilla						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.139±0.001	0.141±0.001	0.132±0.001	0.154±0.002	0.152±0.002	0.150±0.003
RetrMem	0.290±0.007	0.277±0.007	0.267±0.009	0.236±0.009	0.257±0.004	0.284±0.007
ReceMem	0.126±0.001	0.127±0.001	0.125±0.000	0.125±0.001	0.135±0.001	0.134±0.001
NonMem	0.118±0.000	0.119±0.000	0.118±0.000	0.118±0.000	0.121±0.001	0.121±0.000
NoisyMem	0.118±0.000	0.119±0.000	0.118±0.001	0.118±0.000	0.121±0.001	0.121±0.000
OracleMem	0.122±0.001	0.122±0.001	0.122±0.000	0.131±0.001	0.129±0.002	0.128±0.001
MemDaily-100						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	1.632±0.097	1.648±0.101	1.196±0.077	2.522±0.129	1.782±0.136	1.799±0.102
RetrMem	0.207±0.020	0.223±0.005	0.228±0.011	0.205±0.008	0.228±0.029	0.284±0.022
ReceMem	0.120±0.000	0.125±0.008	0.121±0.001	0.120±0.000	0.125±0.001	0.124±0.001
NonMem	0.119±0.001	0.119±0.000	0.119±0.000	0.119±0.001	0.123±0.000	0.122±0.001
NoisyMem	1.578±0.124	1.591±0.187	1.153±0.073	2.424±0.138	1.717±0.095	1.735±0.158
OracleMem	0.122±0.001	0.123±0.001	0.123±0.001	0.132±0.001	0.130±0.001	0.129±0.001

Table 9: Results of adaptation time for storing messages (seconds per message).

MemDaily-vanilla						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
RetrMem	0.222±0.009	0.182±0.004	0.151±0.009	0.136±0.010	0.133±0.004	0.112±0.005
Others	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
MemDaily-100						
Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
RetrMem	0.064±0.008	0.072±0.004	0.066±0.007	0.064±0.006	0.056±0.002	0.066±0.005
Others	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

D Extensive Evaluation on User Messages by GPT-4o

We also let GPT-4o score on user messages as a reference, and the results are shown in **Table 10**.

Table 10: Results of evaluation on user messages by GPT-4o.

Methods	F-GPT	R-GPT	N-GPT	I-GPT
ZeroCons	4.04	4.80	4.60	3.04
PartCons	4.28	4.88	4.80	4.28
SoftCons	4.20	5.00	5.00	3.96
MemSim	4.04	4.84	4.68	3.60

E Extensive Benchmark on More Composite Datasets

E.1 Results on MemDaily-10

The results of accuracy are shown in **Table 11**. The results of recall@5 are shown in **Table 12**. The results of response time are shown in **Table 13**. The results of adaptation time are shown in **Table 14**.

Table 11: Results of accuracy on MemDaily-10.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.962±0.040	0.966±0.028	0.665±0.058	0.243±0.072	0.810±0.036	0.922±0.029
RetrMem	0.896±0.033	0.882±0.047	0.759±0.068	0.315±0.045	0.782±0.065	0.764±0.053
ReceMem	0.534±0.047	0.482±0.064	0.147±0.049	0.248±0.067	0.604±0.088	0.430±0.048
NonMem	0.510±0.090	0.450±0.078	0.159±0.041	0.254±0.065	0.594±0.032	0.380±0.057
NoisyMem	0.428±0.068	0.402±0.059	0.169±0.046	0.280±0.046	0.584±0.090	0.350±0.077
OracleMem	0.966±0.022	0.988±0.010	0.910±0.031	0.372±0.037	0.888±0.030	0.888±0.030

Table 12: Results of recall@5 on MemDaily-10.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
LLM	0.794±0.035	0.872±0.019	0.518±0.027	0.732±0.036	0.756±0.038	0.846±0.036
Embedding	0.704±0.039	0.833±0.026	0.506±0.052	0.643±0.043	0.609±0.027	0.648±0.018
Recency	0.032±0.017	0.011±0.010	0.013±0.011	0.030±0.012	0.009±0.007	0.504±0.047

Table 13: Results of response time on MemDaily-10 (seconds per query).

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.243±0.008	0.243±0.008	0.208±0.003	0.306±0.008	0.263±0.006	0.262±0.010
RetrMem	0.213±0.002	0.230±0.005	0.246±0.008	0.212±0.002	0.240±0.004	0.292±0.014
ReceMem	0.120±0.000	0.121±0.000	0.120±0.000	0.119±0.002	0.126±0.001	0.124±0.001
NonMem	0.119±0.000	0.119±0.001	0.119±0.000	0.117±0.002	0.122±0.000	0.119±0.002
NoisyMem	0.205±0.005	0.207±0.007	0.181±0.004	0.253±0.010	0.223±0.005	0.222±0.006
OracleMem	0.121±0.001	0.123±0.001	0.122±0.000	0.131±0.001	0.130±0.001	0.128±0.001

Table 14: Results of adaptation time on MemDaily-10 (seconds per message).

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
RetrMem	0.073±0.003	0.079±0.006	0.084±0.006	0.069±0.003	0.073±0.003	0.075±0.006
ReceMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
NonMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
NoisyMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
OracleMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

E.2 Results of MemDaily-50

The results of accuracy are shown in **Table 15**. The results of recall@5 are shown in **Table 16**. The results of response time are shown in **Table 17**. The results of adaptation time are shown in **Table 18**.

Table 15: Results of accuracy on MemDaily-50.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.962±0.027	0.948±0.020	0.602±0.065	0.296±0.072	0.802±0.046	0.880±0.041
RetrMem	0.886±0.035	0.864±0.037	0.724±0.062	0.320±0.071	0.780±0.059	0.748±0.049
ReceMem	0.508±0.042	0.434±0.052	0.108±0.044	0.237±0.054	0.588±0.066	0.376±0.099
NonMem	0.510±0.061	0.452±0.055	0.159±0.039	0.254±0.066	0.594±0.078	0.380±0.055
NoisyMem	0.454±0.040	0.416±0.083	0.229±0.071	0.272±0.073	0.568±0.078	0.360±0.084
OracleMem	0.966±0.025	0.988±0.010	0.910±0.053	0.376±0.042	0.888±0.032	0.984±0.012

Table 16: Results of recall@5 on MemDaily-50.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
LLM	0.725±0.047	0.640±0.053	0.773±0.018	0.373±0.031	0.591±0.039	0.561±0.050
Embedding	0.710±0.041	0.674±0.021	0.790±0.037	0.497±0.039	0.591±0.037	0.564±0.053
Recency	0.011±0.009	0.005±0.004	0.006±0.006	0.001±0.002	0.003±0.004	0.001±0.003

Table 17: Results of response time on MemDaily-50 (seconds per query).

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.776±0.031	0.783±0.067	0.596±0.021	1.134±0.054	0.841±0.032	0.847±0.062
RetrMem	0.203±0.003	0.206±0.004	0.215±0.004	0.204±0.003	0.229±0.005	0.324±0.020
ReceMem	0.120±0.001	0.121±0.002	0.118±0.000	0.118±0.001	0.123±0.002	0.123±0.001
NonMem	0.118±0.001	0.118±0.002	0.117±0.002	0.118±0.001	0.121±0.001	0.119±0.001
NoisyMem	0.728±0.037	0.737±0.041	0.562±0.027	1.060±0.055	0.787±0.028	0.794±0.058
OracleMem	0.121±0.001	0.122±0.001	0.121±0.001	0.131±0.001	0.129±0.001	0.128±0.001

Table 18: Results of adaptation time on MemDaily-50 (seconds per message).

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
RetrMem	0.059±0.001	0.057±0.003	0.057±0.004	0.060±0.003	0.062±0.003	0.089±0.005
ReceMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
NonMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
NoisyMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
OracleMem	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

E.3 Results of MemDaily-200

The results of accuracy are shown in **Table 19**. The results of recall@5 are shown in **Table 20**. The results of response time are shown in **Table 21**. The results of adaptation time are shown in **Table 22**.

Table 19: Results of accuracy on MemDaily-200.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.932±0.040	0.932±0.036	0.563±0.061	0.309±0.056	0.782±0.045	0.866±0.044
RetrMem	0.874±0.052	0.844±0.034	0.704±0.061	0.315±0.065	0.766±0.046	0.714±0.052
ReceMem	0.486±0.046	0.420±0.057	0.114±0.036	0.272±0.054	0.570±0.055	0.366±0.051
NonMem	0.470±0.057	0.454±0.077	0.157±0.045	0.257±0.069	0.592±0.082	0.380±0.048
NoisyMem	0.398±0.052	0.398±0.068	0.282±0.058	0.276±0.068	0.564±0.037	0.350±0.035
OracleMem	0.990±0.013	0.988±0.013	0.910±0.034	0.374±0.063	0.888±0.056	0.984±0.012

Table 20: Results of recall@5 on MemDaily-200.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
LLM	0.457±0.066	0.356±0.051	0.556±0.035	0.176±0.022	0.342±0.048	0.322±0.043
Embedding	0.674±0.052	0.641±0.044	0.753±0.036	0.484±0.050	0.544±0.054	0.508±0.052
Recency	0.001±0.003	0.001±0.002	0.001±0.002	0.000±0.001	0.001±0.003	0.000±0.000

Table 21: Results of response time on MemDaily-200 (seconds per query).

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	4.028±0.161	3.914±0.213	2.697±0.100	6.365±0.374	4.252±0.328	4.307±0.283
RetrMem	0.236±0.023	0.241±0.018	0.238±0.024	0.585±0.230	1.012±0.690	1.252±0.427
ReceMem	0.130±0.002	0.120±0.002	0.118±0.001	0.119±0.001	0.124±0.001	0.123±0.001
NonMem	0.139±0.006	0.119±0.001	0.119±0.001	0.117±0.001	0.121±0.001	0.121±0.001
NoisyMem	3.947±0.209	3.832±0.203	2.637±0.118	6.221±0.325	4.158±0.226	4.214±0.288
OracleMem	0.141±0.003	0.122±0.001	0.121±0.001	0.131±0.002	0.128±0.002	0.128±0.001

Table 22: Results of adaptation time on MemDaily-200 (seconds per message).

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
RetrMem	0.080±0.011	0.080±0.013	0.080±0.010	0.220±0.076	0.264±0.089	0.420±0.120
ReceMem	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
NonMem	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
NoisyMem	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
OracleMem	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

F Supplementary Experiments on More Backbones

To better compare the performance across different models, we conduct supplementary experiments with Qwen2.5-7B on MemDaily-vanilla. The results are shown in **Table 23** and **Table 24**.

Table 23: Results of accuracy with Qwen2.5-7B on MemDaily-vanilla.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.980±0.008	0.974±0.017	0.876±0.029	0.312±0.045	0.853±0.003	0.966±0.006
RetrMem	0.880±0.005	0.878±0.010	0.709±0.019	0.229±0.027	0.787±0.024	0.799±0.008
ReceMem	0.809±0.023	0.797±0.010	0.512±0.026	0.145±0.012	0.739±0.033	0.743±0.046
NonMem	0.526±0.017	0.424±0.027	0.183±0.005	0.255±0.013	0.629±0.033	0.376±0.010
NoisyMem	0.512±0.017	0.424±0.050	0.262±0.017	0.301±0.017	0.637±0.032	0.373±0.020
OracleMem	0.982±0.005	0.976±0.005	0.909±0.023	0.450±0.089	0.880±0.020	0.978±0.008

Table 24: Results of recall with Qwen2.5-7B on MemDaily-vanilla.

Methods	Simp.	Cond.	Comp.	Aggr.	Post.	Noisy
FullMem	0.939±0.006	0.884±0.007	0.918±0.009	0.601±0.016	0.863±0.003	0.872±0.019
RetrMem	0.726±0.013	0.717±0.023	0.846±0.008	0.516±0.029	0.691±0.014	0.649±0.014
ReceMem	0.596±0.001	0.524±0.025	0.700±0.010	0.223±0.012	0.501±0.023	0.503±0.031
NonMem	0.319±0.013	0.391±0.019	0.414±0.048	0.183±0.008	0.319±0.006	0.562±0.017
NoisyMem	0.575±0.025	0.525±0.014	0.725±0.012	0.454±0.007	0.487±0.025	0.660±0.019
OracleMem	0.406±0.021	0.609±0.035	0.782±0.016	0.562±0.025	0.605±0.009	0.585±0.023

Based on the experimental results for Qwen2.5-7B, a clear performance hierarchy emerges across different memory mechanisms, with FullMem and OracleMem consistently achieving the highest accuracy scores, followed by moderate performance from RetrMem and ReceMem, while NonMem and NoisyMem demonstrate substantially degraded performance (0.183-0.637 range). The results reveal task-specific challenges, particularly evident in the Aggregation task where all methods show reduced accuracy, and demonstrate a trade-off between accuracy and recall metrics, with some methods like OracleMem showing lower recall despite high accuracy, suggesting potential overfitting or conservative prediction behavior. This is consistent with the conclusions drawn from GLM-4-9B.

G Case Studies

In this section, we present several case studies to illustrate the effectiveness of the data generated by MemDaily. First, we will display the hierarchical user profiles generated from BRNet. Next, we will present examples of user messages created by our method. Finally, we will provide examples of questions and answers for each type.

G.1 Case Study on Generated User Profiles

In MemDaily, we incorporate 11 entities that cover 7 types, with 73 attributes of them. The summary of entities and attributes of MemDaily are provided in **Table 25**.

We introduce prior knowledge as several rules according to our scenarios to constrain among attributes. For example, a relative role is highly possible to share the same hometown with the user, because they are likely to come from the same place. All of these constraints are expressed in BRNet with causal relations. We generate 50 graphical user profiles and conduct observations, finding that most profiles align well with real-world users without contradictions.

Here is a case of user profiles, and we translate them into English for better demonstration:

An example of Generated User Profiles

User Profiles:

(Gender) Male; (Name) Qiang Wang; (Age) 38; (Height) 166cm; (Birthday) December 1st.; (Hometown) Beijing; (Workplace) Shenzhen, Guangdong; (Education) High School; (Occupation) Bank Teller; (Position) Head Teller; (Company) Huayin Financial Service Center; (Hobbies) Model Making; (Personality) Outgoing; (Phone) 13420824898; (Email) wangqiang1201@huayinfinance.com; (ID Number) 640168198612016598; (Passport Number) NZ0448096; (Bank Card Number) 6222022612177604; (Driver's License Number) 640168198612012730;

College Role 1:

(Gender) Female; (Relationship) Supervisor; (Name) Yalin Zhao; (Age) 44; (Height) 165cm; (Birthday) February 5th.; (Hometown) Chongqing; (Workplace) Shenzhen, Guangdong; (Education) High School; (Occupation) Bank Teller; (Position) Bank Manager; (Company) Huayin Financial Service Center; (Hobbies) Sports; (Personality) Patient; (Phone) 13651039007; (Email) zhaoyalin0205@szfinancecenter.com;

College Role 2:

(Gender) Male; (Relationship) Colleague; (Name) Zhihong Sun; (Age) 39; (Height) 164cm; (Birthday) April 24th.; (Hometown) Chengdu, Sichuan; (Workplace) Shenzhen, Guangdong; (Education) High School; (Occupation) Bank Teller; (Position) Senior Teller; (Company) Huayin Financial Service Center; (Hobbies) Attending concerts; (Personality) Enthusiastic; (Phone) 15391721618; (Email) sunzhihong0421@huayinfinance.com;

Relative Role 1:

(Gender) Male; (Relationship) Cousin; (Name) Wei Zhang; (Age) 36; (Height) 169cm; (Birthday) July 15th.; (Hometown) Beijing; (Workplace) Hangzhou, Zhejiang; (Education) Doctor; (Occupation) Doctor; (Position) Chief Physician; (Company) West Lake Hospital; (Hobbies) Playing Video Games; (Personality) Patient; (Phone) 13225162475; (Email) zhangwei0715@westlakehospital.com;

Relative Role 2:

(Gender) Female; (Relationship) Cousin; (Name) Tingting Li; (Age) 36; (Height) 164cm; (Birthday) June 23rd.; (Hometown) Beijing; (Workplace) Shanghai; (Education) Master; (Occupation) Teacher; (Position) Middle School Language Teacher; (Company) Pudong No.1 Middle School; (Hobbies) Yoga; (Personality) Patient; (Phone) 13401551341; (Email) litingting0623@pdxzyz.com;

Work Event 1:

(Type) Job Fair; (Content) Job Fair for Bank Teller Supervisors in the Shenzhen area, sharing professional experience, recruiting talented individuals, and jointly creating a brilliant future for the banking industry.; (Location) Shenzhen, Guangdong; (Time) At 7 PM on the Sunday after next; (Title) Bank Teller Job Fair; (Scale) Around 500 People; (Duration) Eight Weeks;

An example of Generated User Profile

Work Event 2:

(Type) Academic Exchange Conference; (Content) Discuss the development trends of financial technology, share experiences in innovative banking services, and promote communication and cooperation among industry elites.; (Location) Beijing; (Time) Next Saturday at 2 PM; (Title) Financial Technology Elite Forum; (Scale) Around 3000 People; (Duration) Seven days;

Entertainment Event 1:

(Type) Art Exhibition; (Content) Displaying selected model works, exchanging making techniques, experiencing creative handicrafts, and feeling the charm of art.; (Location) Beijing; (Time) At 7 PM on the coming Monday; (Title) Model Art Feast; (Scale) Around 900 People; (Duration) Seven Days; (Relationship) Live;

Entertainment Event 2:

(Type) Outdoor Hiking; (Content) Conduct outdoor hiking activities, combined with model making, taking natural scenery along the way, creating outdoor landscape models, and sharing modeling techniques.; (Location) Guangdong, Shenzhen; (Time) The Wednesday evening at seven in two weeks; (Title) Outdoor Hiking Model Creation Journey; (Scale) Around 900 People; (Duration) Seven Days; (Relationship) Eight weeks;

Place:

(Type) Residential Community; (Name) Oasis Home; (Comment) Oasis Home is really a nice place to live, with a high green coverage rate and a beautiful environment. It's especially great to walk and relax here after work every day. However, the commercial facilities are slightly lacking, and it would be perfect if there were more convenience stores and restaurants.; (Relationship) Use;

Item:

(Type) Sports Shoes; (Name) ASICS Gel-Kayano 26; (Comment) These ASICS Gel-Kayano 26 shoes are really great, especially for their stability and support, which is perfect for standing work for long periods. Wearing them, my feet feel much more comfortable. However, it would be perfect if they had better breathability.;

From the case profile in MemDaily, we find that our generated user profiles can greatly align with that in real-world scenarios.

Table 25: Summary of entities and attributes of MemDaily.

Entity	Attribute	Entity	Attribute
User (self)	Gender Name Age Height Birthday Hometown Workplace Education Occupation Position Company Hobbies Personality Phone Email ID Number Passport Number Bank Card Number Driver's License Number	Relative Roles	Name Age Height Birthday Hometown Workplace Education Occupation Position Company Hobbies Personality Phone Email
		Work Events	Type Content Location Time Title Scale Duration
College Roles	Gender Relationship Name Age Height Birthday Hometown Workplace Education Occupation Position Company Hobbies Personality Phone Email	Entertainment Events	Type Content Location Time Title Scale Duration
		Places	Relationship Type Name Comment
		Items	Relationship Type Name Comment
		Total (7)	Total (73)
Relative Roles	Gender Relationship		

G.2 Case Study on User Messages

Based on the generated user profiles, we further generate user messages without inside contradictory according to **Section 3.3**. Here is a case of message list (translated into English) in **Table 26**.

Table 26: A case of user messages.

Index	Message	Time	Place
0	My colleague's email is sunzhihong0421@huayinfinance.com.	April 1, 2024, Monday, 08:07	Guangdong Shenzhen
1	My colleague really likes to attend concerts.	April 2, 2024, Tuesday, 07:01	Guangdong Shenzhen
2	My colleague's phone number is 15391721618.	April 2, 2024, Tuesday, 08:23	Guangdong Shenzhen
3	My colleague's birthday is on April 21st.	April 2, 2024, Tuesday, 17:02	Guangdong Shenzhen
4	My colleague's name is Zhihong Sun.	April 3, 2024, Wednesday, 07:49	Guangdong Shenzhen
5	Wei Zhang's email address is zhangwei0715@westlakehospital.com.	April 3, 2024, Wednesday, 19:07	Guangdong Shenzhen
6	Tingting Li's email address is litingting0623@pdxzyz.com.	April 4, 2024, Thursday, 07:16	Guangdong Shenzhen
7	Yalin Zhao's email address is zhaoyalin0205@szfinancecenter.com.	April 4, 2024, Thursday, 13:38	Guangdong Shenzhen
8	I am going to attend the bank teller job fair.	April 5, 2024, Friday, 16:21	Guangdong Shenzhen
9	The time for the bank teller job fair is at seven o'clock in the evening on the next Sunday.	April 6, 2024, Saturday, 07:18	Guangdong Shenzhen
10	The location of the bank teller job fair is in Guangdong Shenzhen.	April 6, 2024, Saturday, 16:58	Guangdong Shenzhen
11	The main content of the bank teller job fair is the job fair: Shenzhen area bank head teller, sharing professional experience, recruiting talent, creating a brilliant bank career together.	April 7, 2024, Sunday, 07:21	Guangdong Shenzhen
12	The time for the Financial Technology Elite Forum is at two o'clock in the afternoon next Saturday.	April 7, 2024, Sunday, 21:33	Guangdong Shenzhen
13	The time for the Model Art Banquet is at seven o'clock in the evening next Monday.	April 8, 2024, Monday, 12:45	Guangdong Shenzhen
14	The time for the Outdoor Hiking Model Creation Journey is at seven o'clock in the evening on the next Wednesday.	April 9, 2024, Tuesday, 07:36	Guangdong Shenzhen

By utilizing our mechanisms, we can ensure that there is no contradiction among user messages. We further demonstrate the list of hints that correspond to the above messages in **Table 27**.

Table 27: A case of the hint list.

Index	Entity	Attribute	Value
0	Colleague Role 2	Email	sunzhihong0421@huayinfinance.com
1	Colleague Role 2	Hobbies	Attend Concerts
2	Colleague Role 2	Phone	15391721618
3	Colleague Role 2	Birthday	April 21st
4	Colleague Role 2	Name	Zhihong Sun
5	Relative Role 1	Email	zhangwei0715@westlakehospital.com
6	Relative Role 2	Email	litingting0623@pdxxyz.com
7	Colleague Role 1	Email	zhaoyalin0205@szfinancecenter.com
8	Work Event 1	Title	Bank Teller Job Fair;
9	Work Event 1	Time	At 7 PM on the Sunday after next
10	Work Event 1	Location	Shenzhen, Guangdong
11	Work Event 1	Content	Job Fair for Bank Teller Supervisors in the Shenzhen area, sharing professional experience, recruiting talented individuals, and jointly creating a brilliant future for the banking industry
12	Work Event 2	Time	Next Saturday at 2 PM; (Title) Financial Technology Elite Forum
13	Entertainment Event 1	Time	At 7 PM on the coming Monday
14	Entertainment Event 2	Time	The Wednesday evening at seven in two weeks

G.3 Case Study on Questions and Answers

In this section, we will show the cases of questions and answers of different types. We leave out the time and place of each message in this section, where they do not influence the QA in these cases. We have translated all texts into English for better demonstration.

Simple (*Simp.*) Simple QAs in single-hop.

A Case of Simple Questions and Answers

Messages:

- [0] My cousin's email address is zhangwei0715@westlakehospital.com.
- [1] My cousin works in Hangzhou, Zhejiang.
- [2] My cousin is 169 cm tall.
- [3] My cousin is from Beijing.
- [4] My cousin is 36 years old this year.
- [5] My sister is of her 36 age as well.
- [6] My boss is 44 years old.
- [7] My colleague is 39 years old this year.

Question:

How old is my cousin now?

Answer(Text):

36 years old.

Choices:

- A. 35 years old.
- B. 37 years old.
- C. 34 years old.
- D. 36 years old.

Answer(Choice): D

Answer(Retrieval): [4]

Time: April 5, 2024, Friday 07:54

Conditional (*Cond.*) Conditional QAs in multi-hop.

A Case of Conditional Questions and Answers

Messages:

- [0] My boss only has a high school education.
- [1] My boss works as a bank teller.
- [2] My boss's contact phone number is 13651039007.
- [3] My boss is 165cm tall.
- [4] My boss works in Shenzhen, the one in Guangdong.
- [5] My cousin works in Hangzhou, Zhejiang.
- [6] My cousin works in Shanghai.
- [7] My colleague works in Shenzhen, in Guangdong.

Question:

Where does the person with only a high school education work now?

Answer(Text):

Shenzhen, Guangdong.

Choices:

- A. Zhuhai, Guangdong.
- B. Shenzhen, Guangdong.
- C. Shenzhen, Guangzhou.
- D. Xiamen, Fujian.

Answer(Choice): B

Answer(Retrieval): [0, 4]

Time: April 6, 2024, Saturday 07:24

Comparative (Comp.) Comparative QAs in multi-hop.

A Case of Comparative Questions and Answers

Messages:

- [0] Yalin Zhao is my boss, who is 44 years old.
- [1] Wei Zhang is my cousin, and he is 36 years old.
- [2] Tingting Li is my cousin, and she is 36 years old.
- [3] Zhihong Sun is my colleague, and he is 39 years old.

Question:

Who is older, Yalin Zhao or Wei Zhang?

Answer(Text):

Yalin Zhao.

Choices:

- A. Yalin Zhao.
- B. Wei Zhang.
- C. Both are the same age.
- D. Neither is correct.

Answer(Choice): A

Answer(Retrieval): [0, 1]

Time: April 3, 2024, Wednesday 14:38

Aggregative (Aggr.) Aggregative QAs in multi-hop.

A Case of Aggregative Questions and Answers

Messages:

- [0] Wei Zhang is my cousin, and his educational background is a Ph.D.
- [1] Tingting Li is my cousin, and her educational background is a master's degree.
- [2] Yalin Zhao is my boss, and her educational background is high school.
- [3] Zhihong Sun is my colleague, and his educational background is high school.
- [4] Wei Zhang is my cousin, and his hometown is Beijing.
- [5] Tingting Li is my cousin, and her hometown is Beijing.
- [6] Yalin Zhao is my boss, and her hometown is Chongqing.
- [7] Zhihong Sun is my colleague, and his hometown is Chengdu, Sichuan.

Question:

How many people have an educational background of high school or below?

Answer(Text):

2 people.

Choices:

- A. 3 people.
- B. 1 people.
- C. 4 people.
- D. 2 people.

Answer(Choice): D

Answer(Retrieval): [0, 1, 2, 3]

Time: April 5, 2024, Friday 07:27

Post-processing (*Post.*) Multi-hop QAs that requires extra reasoning steps.

A Case of Post-processing Questions and Answers

Messages:

- [0] My cousin works in Hangzhou, Zhejiang.
- [1] My cousin likes to play video games.
- [2] My cousin's birthday is July 15th.
- [3] My cousin's email address is zhangwei0715@westlakehospital.com.
- [4] My cousin's phone number is 13225162475.
- [5] Tingting Li works in Shanghai.
- [6] Yalin Zhao works in Shenzhen, Guangdong.
- [7] Zhihong Sun works in Shenzhen, Guangdong.

Question:

Which of the following descriptions matches the work location of the person whose birthday is July 15th?

Answer(Text):

A city with beautiful West Lake scenery and a developed internet industry.

Choices:

- A. Capital, political and cultural center.
- B. International metropolis, economic and financial center
- C. A city with beautiful West Lake scenery and a developed internet industry.
- D. Special economic zone, an important city for technological innovation.

Answer(Choice): C

Answer(Retrieval): [0, 2]

Time: April 6, 2024, Saturday 07:51

Noisy (*Nois.*) Multi-hop QAs that add extra noise in questions.

A Case of Noisy Questions and Answers

Messages:

- [0] My boss is 44 years old this year.
- [1] My boss is the head of a bank.
- [2] My boss works in Shenzhen, Guangdong.
- [3] My boss really likes sports.
- [4] My boss's phone number is 13651039007.
- [5] My cousin really likes to play video games.
- [6] My cousin likes to practice yoga.
- [7] My colleague really likes to attend concerts.

Question:

Oh, the weather has been so unpredictable lately, it was hot enough to wear short sleeves yesterday, but today I had to put on a jacket. Speaking of which, my favorite season is autumn, not too cold, not too hot, it's the most comfortable time for a walk. By the way, that coffee shop recommended by a friend last time seems pretty good, I should find some time to try it. What I wanted to ask is, what are the hobbies of the person who works in Shenzhen, Guangdong?

Answer(Text):

Sports.

Choices:

- A. Traveling.
- B. Photography.
- C. Sports.
- D. Reading.

Answer(Choice): C

Answer(Retrieval): [2, 3]

Time: April 4, 2024, Thursday 18:08

H Description of Human Evaluation Guidelines

H.1 Guideline of Evaluation on User Profiles

Guideline: You will see some user profiles in the left column of the questionnaire. Please assess whether these user profiles are reasonable, and rate the rationality of them ranging from 1 to 5. Score 1 means the least reasonable, while score 5 means the most reasonable.

Here, reasonableness refers to: (1) Likely to exist in the real world, resembling a real user (realistic); (2) No inside conflicts or contradictions (consistent).

Here are some examples of unreasonable cases for reference:

- (1) [1 point] The user's age is 24, but the related person is his grandson. (Logical error: A 24-year-old cannot have a grandson.)
- (2) [2 points] The user's height is "(1) 175cm (2) 168cm (3) 172cm". (Generation error: Multiple values are given for a single attribute that can only have one value, like height.)
- (3) [2-4 points] The user's phone number is 01234567891. (Unrealistic: The phone number does not seem real.)
- (4) [2-4 points] The user's company name is Shanghai XX Company. (Unrealistic: The company name XX does not seem real.)

Tips: If there are no obvious unreasonable aspects, a score of 5 can be given; if there are serious errors, a score of 1-2 can be given; for other unrealistic elements, points can be deducted accordingly.

H.2 Guideline of Evaluation on User Messages

Guideline: You will see some messages in the left column of the questionnaire. These messages are what the user said to the personal assistant while using it, i.e., the recorded user messages. Please assess the fluency, rationality, naturalness, and informativeness of these user messages, and score them ranging from 1 to 5.

[Fluency] The fluency of user messages refers to the correctness of the message text in terms of words, sentences, and grammar; whether the message text is coherent and conforms to language and expression habits, allowing for colloquial expressions. Score 1 means the least fluent, while score 5 means the most fluent.

Here are some examples that lack of fluency for reference:

- (1) [1-2 point] Today day day day upwards to juggle night, I ate meat pork and or but rice. (Hardly understand due to lack of fluency.)
- (2) [2-3 point] This night, I pork and rice, delicious. (Requires effort to guess due to lack of fluency, but can realize what it means.)

Tips: No obvious issues in fluency can be given a score of 5; serious errors can receive a score of 1 2; other elements affecting fluency can lead to a deduction of points as appropriate.

[Rationality] The rationality of the user message refers to: (1) it can be existed in the real world (2) without inside conflict and contradiction. Score 1 means the least rational, while score 5 means the most rational.

Here are some examples that lack of fluency for reference:

- (1) [1 point] I am 24 years old, and my grandson is 2 years old. (It is impossible for a 24-year-old to have a grandson.)
- (2) [2-3 point] Today is Monday, tomorrow is Wednesday. (Tomorrow cannot be Wednesday as the day after Monday is Tuesday.)

Tips: If there are no obvious unreasonable points, a score of 5 can be given; for serious errors, a score of 1-2 can be given; for other unreasonable elements, corresponding points can be deducted at discretion.

[Naturalness] The naturalness of a user message refers to whether the message closely resembles a real user message. Score 1 means the least natural, while score 5 means the most natural.

[Informativeness] The informativeness of user messages refers to whether these messages can provide rich and valuable information points. Information points are those points that can be queried about. Score 1 means the least informative, while score 5 means the most informative.

The following are some examples:

- (1) [Low Informativeness] How is the weather today?
- (2) [Medium Informativeness] How is the weather today? I plan to go to the park this afternoon.
- (3) [High Informativeness] Today's weather is overcast turning to cloudy, it won't rain, I plan to go to the park this afternoon.

Highlight: You should have a general sense of the informativeness in the user's message during the pre-evaluation phase.

Additional Requirement: You should indicate the reason at the above critical points for deduction. If no major points for deduction exist, then there is no need to fill in this requirement.

H.3 Guideline of Evaluation on Questions and Answers

Guideline: In the left column of the questionnaire, you will see (1) a list of user messages (2) a question (3) the textual answer (4) the multiple choices with the correct answer (5) the index list of retrieval targets. You should check the three aspects of the QAs, including the accuracy of textual answers, the accuracy of multiple-choice answers, and the accuracy of retrieval targets.

[Accuracy of Textual Answers] You need to check whether the textual answer is correct relative to the question based on the user's message list. If it is correct, please select the button [Correct], otherwise, please select the button [Incorrect].

[Accuracy of Retrieval Targets] Please judge the correctness of the retrieval targets in the Q&A. Retrieval targets refer to which messages (given in index form) from the user's message list are needed to obtain the textual answer to the question. Determine whether the retrieval targets are correct. If it is uniquely correct, please select the button [Correct], otherwise, please select the button [Incorrect].

Additional Requirement: You should indicate the reason for choosing [Incorrect]. If all of the above are correct, then there is no need to fill in this requirement.