

# Efficient Data Generation for Source-grounded Information-seeking Dialogs: A Use Case for Meeting Transcripts

Lotem Golany Filippo Galgani Maya Mamo Nimrod Parasol  
Omer Vandsburger Nadav Bar Ido Dagan

Google Research

{mlotem,galganif,mamom,nimrodp,omervan,nadavbar,idodagan}@google.com

## Abstract

Existing methods for creating source-grounded information-seeking dialog datasets are often costly and hard to implement due to their sole reliance on human annotators. We propose combining large language models (LLMs) prompting with human expertise for more efficient and reliable data generation. Instead of the labor-intensive Wizard-of-Oz (WOZ) method, where two annotators generate a dialog from scratch, role-playing agent and user, we use LLM generation to simulate the two roles. Annotators then verify the output and augment it with attribution data. We demonstrate our method by constructing MISeD – Meeting Information Seeking Dialogs dataset – the first information-seeking dialog dataset focused on meeting transcripts. Models finetuned with MISeD demonstrate superior performance on our test set, as well as on a novel fully-manual WOZ test set and an existing query-based summarization benchmark, suggesting the utility of our approach.

## 1 Introduction

Source-grounded information-seeking dialogs allow users to efficiently navigate within a given knowledge source and extract information of interest. In this conversational setting, a user interacts with an agent over multiple rounds of queries and responses regarding the source text (Reddy et al., 2019, Gopalakrishnan et al., 2019, Feng et al., 2020). To train effective agent models, quality dialog datasets are essential.

The prominent technique for creating dialog datasets is the Wizard-of-Oz (WOZ) method (Kelly, 1984, Budzianowski et al., 2018) in which, two human annotators work together to produce a dialog. One annotator acts as the user, asking questions about a text they cannot see. The second annotator acts as the agent, using the source text to provide answers. The fully manual WOZ methodology is often time-consuming and may lead to




Figure 1: Iterative dialog generation flow. In each turn, a query prompt guides the LLM to generate a user query given the transcript, the accumulated dialog history, and a query template. Then, a response prompt, accompanied by the full context so far, generates the agent response. Iterating this automatic process yields a full dialog, which is then validated by annotators, who further augment it with response attributions.

answers that vary in quality across annotators.

Our first contribution is a new methodology that partially automates the WOZ process by prompting pre-trained LLMs, extending a recent trend of automating dialog dataset generation (§2.1). We utilize separate prompts to guide the LLM’s generation of both the user queries and the agent responses. This is followed by annotator validation and manual generation of attributions (Figure 1).

Our second contribution is applying our methodology to create MISeD – the first dataset for information-seeking dialogs over meeting transcripts, supporting the use-case of users catching up on meetings they have missed. Existing datasets in this domain provide summarization and question-

answering data (e.g., [Zhong et al. 2021](#), [Prasad et al. 2023](#)), but none supports multi-turn dialogs over meeting content. We further present a few baseline models, and a novel fully-manual WOZ test dataset. Evaluations on these data, as well as on an existing query-based summarization benchmark (QMSum, [Zhong et al. 2021](#)) show the benefit of training with our MISeD data.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows: (1) presenting an LLM-based data generation methodology for information-seeking dialogs; (2) creating the MISeD dataset – the first dialog dataset over meeting transcripts, as well as an independently-created WOZ test set; (3) introducing baseline models and results, assessing our proposed approach and dataset.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 Related Work

This section provides background on the two areas of research which our work bridges: source-grounded information-seeking dialog datasets (§2.1) and summarization and question answering over meeting transcripts (§2.2).

### 2.1 Source-grounded Information-seeking Dialogs

Source-grounded information-seeking dialogs are multi-turn conversational interactions, where users seek information derived from a given source text. For each user query, the agent model provides a response, along with supporting references in the source (attributions).

Existing datasets for this task address different types of knowledge sources. Some retrieve answers from large textual corpora ([Dinan et al., 2019](#), [Campos et al., 2020](#), [Anantha et al., 2021](#), [Adlakha et al., 2022](#)), while others rely on provided short text passages ([Choi et al., 2018](#), [Saeidi et al., 2018](#), [Reddy et al., 2019](#), [Nakamura et al., 2022](#)). Other datasets rely on long texts, such as informative conversations ([Wu et al., 2022a](#)) and news articles ([Li et al., 2023](#)). Our work creates a dataset for dialogs over a long text – a transcript of a long meeting.

The prominent approach for creating such information-seeking dialog datasets is the Wizard-of-Oz (WOZ) methodology ([Kelley, 1984](#)). In this setup, two annotators roleplay as user and agent, where the user annotator asks questions about the given knowledge source, to which they are not ex-

posed. The agent annotator, who does have access to the source, provides corresponding answers.

WOZ can be time consuming and expensive due to its reliance solely on human annotators. Our method partially automates the dialog creation process by combining LLM-based generation with human verification and editing. This approach is related to recent works on automating dialog data generation with LLMs, which incorporate involved techniques such as reinforcement learning ([Lin et al., 2022](#)), user simulations ([Wu et al., 2022b](#)), and dialog flow modeling ([Bao et al., 2023](#)). Our approach, on the other hand, relies solely on prompting a pre-trained LLM, avoiding the need to finetune specialized models.

### 2.2 Summarization and Q&A over Meeting Transcripts

Meeting transcripts pose unique challenges due to their unstructured and lengthy nature and potential speech recognition errors. Existing datasets for inquiring meeting transcript content are limited to single-turn settings, focusing on summarization and question answering. Meeting summarization datasets include AMI ([Carletta et al., 2005](#)) and ICSI ([Janin et al., 2003](#)), which provide meeting transcripts alongside extractive and abstractive summaries. Meeting minuting datasets include ELITR ([Nedoluzhko et al., 2022](#)) and MeetingBank ([Hu et al., 2023](#)). Question-answering datasets include MUG ([Zhang et al., 2023](#)), MeeQA ([Apel et al., 2023](#)) and MeetingQA ([Prasad et al., 2023](#)), while ExplainMeetSum ([Kim et al., 2023](#)) incorporates attributions. To our knowledge, there is no dataset for information-seeking dialogs over meeting transcripts.

Our work leverages QMSum ([Zhong et al., 2021](#)), a widely used dataset for query-based summarization over meeting transcripts. This dataset includes user queries about a meeting and their corresponding summaries, along with attributed text spans from the meeting. Annotators generate general queries which address the meeting as a whole, as well as specific queries that refer to identified topics and participants. Query generation follows a predefined schema, which covers the most typical questions that might be asked about meetings (see Appendix A in QMSum paper). Finally, annotators write summary responses that address each of the generated queries. In our work, we modify the QMSum schema to suit LLM prompts (rather

<sup>1</sup>We make our datasets publicly available at <https://github.com/google-research-datasets/MISeD>.




Figure 2: An illustration of the agent model task. The agent receives the source text (meeting transcript), dialog history, and the current user query. It then generates a corresponding response along with supporting attributions in the source text. Each attribution is a sequence of consecutive transcript segments.

than human annotators) and extend it to generate multi-turn dialogs.

### 3 Source-grounded Information-seeking Dialogs: Task Definition

As described above, our goal is to generate datasets for agent models in source-grounded information-seeking dialogs. This section defines the agent model task in our setting, illustrated in Figure 2.

In each turn of the dialog, the user issues a query about the source text. Then, the agent model receives as input the source text, the preceding dialog history and the current query, and outputs a corresponding response. Additionally, the model outputs a set of attributions, where each attribution is a consecutive text span in the source that supports the response.

## 4 Dataset Creation Methodology

This section describes our semi-automated methodology dataset creation, as applied in our work over meeting transcripts (Figure 1). Its first stage automatically generates a dialog using LLMs (§4.1), simulating the typical WOZ process. This is followed by human verification and editing to ensure high data quality, as well as manual generation of attributions (§4.2).

### 4.1 Automatic Dialog Generation

We generate dialog turns iteratively, with each turn consisting of a user query and an agent response. These are generated via targeted LLM prompts, designed for queries (§4.1.1) and responses (§4.1.2).

#### 4.1.1 User query prompts

In each turn, a user query is generated by a "query prompt" (see Table 6 in Appendix A). This prompt incorporates the transcript, the dialog history so far, and a templated instruction. The instruction is chosen randomly from a pull of query templates, each designed to trigger the LLM to generate a particular type of query.

As mentioned in §2.2, in composing our templates we leverage the QMSum query schema, which was designed originally to guide human annotators. Following their query types and templates, we created a corresponding set of query templates adapted for guiding LLMs (rather than humans). Table 1 illustrates samples of our prompt templates, while Table 7 in Appendix A details the full set of query templates.

Adapted from QMSum, we include both *General* queries for overall meeting themes and key takeaways, and *Specific* queries which focus on particular topics or individuals. Following initial user studies, we added an *Unanswerable* variant for some of the Specific query templates in the schema (example 5 in Table 1), guiding the LLM to generate queries that cannot be answered from the meeting transcript. We also incorporate *Context-dependent* queries that draw on the existing dialog for context (example 6 in Table 1).

In each turn, we randomly pick a query template, following the QMSum proportions: 15% general and 40% specific. Inspired by the QuAC (Choi et al., 2018) dataset, we incorporate 20% unanswerable queries, leaving 25% for context-dependent queries.

Overall, while our set of templates does not cover all possible query types in the meetings domain, we suggest that it represents a sufficiently broad range to yield a useful dataset, as assessed later in our experiments (§7). Further, we propose that crafting domain-specific query template schemas can be similarly feasible and effective in other domains.

#### 4.1.2 Agent response prompt

After generating the user query, we provide the LLM with a prompt that includes the meeting tran-

<p><b>General queries</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The question should be a rephrase of asking for a summary of the meeting.</li> <li>2. The question should be a rephrase of asking what were the action items of the meeting.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Specific queries</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The question should be a rephrase of asking for a summary of &lt;Topic&gt;. &lt;Topic&gt; should be a topic that was discussed within the meeting.</li> <li>4. The question should be a rephrase of asking what did &lt;Speaker&gt; say regarding &lt;Topic&gt; in the meeting.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Unanswerable queries</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was decided regarding &lt;Topic&gt;. &lt;Topic&gt; should be a topic that was never discussed within the meeting.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Context-dependent queries</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The question should be an implicit follow-up question regarding the previous message in the dialog using demonstrative pronouns such as "It", "He", "She", "They", "That". Example: "What did he say about it?", "What was their conclusion?"</li> </ol>

Table 1: Query template examples.

script, dialog history, the current query, and an instruction on how to generate the agent response (see Table 8 in Appendix A for the full prompt). The instruction guides the LLM to generate an answer that aligns with certain length and format guidelines, and that is grounded in the meeting content. It further emphasizes ethical and unbiased communication by instructing the model to use neutral language and avoid direct quotes.

## 4.2 Dialog Annotation and Validation

Following the automatic generation of the dialog, we present it to trained annotators who assess the generated query and the response, and identify corresponding attributions within the source text.

### 4.2.1 Query assessment

Annotators first assess query validity, discarding nonsensical queries. If a query is marked as invalid, the following turns are also discarded from the dialog to avoid cascading errors. Valid queries are annotated for metadata by type ('general', 'specific', or 'yes/no') and dependence on prior turns ('context-dependent' or not).

### 4.2.2 Response annotation: validation, editing, and attribution

LLMs excel at generating natural-sounding textual responses, however, responses might lack factual support in the source text. To address this, annotators evaluate the response accuracy according to the transcript. If needed, they edit the response to make

it complete, faithful and well phrased. If it turns out that the query cannot be answered based on the information in the transcript (regardless of the original response generated the LLM), it is annotated as 'unanswerable'. In such cases, the response is expected to communicate the fact that the requested information is not present in the transcript (and will be modified accordingly by the annotator if needed).

In addition, annotators are asked to identify supporting segments (spans) as attributions for the response. Beyond obtaining the attribution data, this process also requires annotators to read the transcript thoroughly when evaluating the response, increasing overall annotation reliability. We chose to perform attribution identification in a fully-manual manner since we found that, currently, attribution detection by LLMs does not perform sufficiently well.

## 5 Datasets

This section describes the MISeD dataset (§5.1), which was constructed by applying our methodology, and includes a manual quality assessment of its dialog responses (§5.2). Next, we present an independent test dataset created using the (fully manual) Wizard-of-Oz methodology (§5.3). This test set was created in order to assess whether training models on the MISeD data leads to better performance also on data that was generated solely by humans.

### 5.1 MISeD Dataset

**Meeting sources** Our data creation methodology was applied on transcripts from the QMSum meeting corpus. We used 225 meetings across three domains: 134 Product Meetings (AMI; Carletta et al., 2005), 58 Academic Meetings (ICSI; Janin et al., 2003), and 33 public Parliamentary Committee Meetings sourced from the Welsh Parliament and the Parliament of Canada. Figure 3 in Appendix A presents the transcript lengths of meetings in MISeD.

**LLM** We used the public Gemini Pro model (Gemini Team Google, 2023) to automatically generate dialogs based on the meeting transcripts, as described in Section 4.1.

#### 5.1.1 Dataset structure

Each dataset instance includes a single dialog about a specific meeting transcript, containing up to

Overall MISeD Statistics	
# meetings	225
# dialogs	432
# query-response pairs	4161
query type: general	20.91%
query type: specific	52.37%
query type: yes/no	26.72%
context-dependent	13.17%
unanswerable	30.62%
avg. query-response pairs per dialog	9.63
avg. query length (# words)	15.22
avg. response length (# words)	40.80

Table 2: Overall statistics of the MISeD dataset. Each query is classified as either ‘general’, ‘specific’, or ‘yes/no’. Additionally, queries may be tagged as ‘context-dependent’ and ‘unanswerable’. Table 11 in the Appendix provides statistics by dataset split.

ten query-response turns with associated metadata (§4.2.1). When relevant, a response is accompanied by a set of attributing transcript spans.<sup>2</sup> In some cases, the response inherently lacks attributions, mostly for ‘unanswerable’ queries.

For training and evaluating an agent model, each dialog is divided into task instances. Each such instance represents a single current query, incorporating its preceding dialog history along with the corresponding target response and its attributions.

### 5.1.2 Dataset statistics

Statistics of the final MISeD dataset are presented in Table 2.

**Splits** We followed the dataset splits from QM-Sum, with train validation and test splits in an approximate ratio of 70:15:15. For each meeting, we aimed to generate two dialogs, each containing ten query-response pairs. Some pairs and dialogs were later filtered during the annotation process.

**Attribution** Nearly all (99%) MISeD responses for answerable queries are supported by transcript attribution, with a median of two attributing transcript spans per response. Attributing spans are relatively long and scattered, with a median length of 96 words, and a median distance of 350 words between subsequent spans. Additional attribution statistics are presented in Figure 3, Appendix A.

**Process** Following the process described in Section 4, we generated 443 dialogs comprising 4430

<sup>2</sup>Each span is a sequence of consecutive transcript segments.

Response evaluation categories	Count	Sum
MISeD ‘substantially better’	29	55
MISeD ‘slightly better’	26	
‘equally good’	2	
Human-only ‘slightly better’	21	43
Human-only ‘substantially better’	22	

Table 3: Results of MISeD answer quality assessment. Annotators compared 100 pairs of MISeD and fully-manual responses to the same query, determining the better response in each pair.

query-response turns. During validation, annotators eliminated 6% of the queries, yielding 4161 turns. Of these remaining turns, annotators corrected 11% of the responses. On average, the annotation process took 105 minutes per dialog (each dialog was reviewed by a single annotator).

## 5.2 MISeD Response Quality Assessment

MISeD dialogs were generated by an LLM and then validated and corrected by humans (§4). To assess the quality of the responses created through this semi-automatic process, we aimed to compare them with responses created fully-manually. To that end, we collected human responses to a randomly selected sample of 100 MISeD queries. Annotators were provided with the meeting transcript and the dialog history up to the selected query and were tasked with answering the query.

Next, we provided a new group of annotators with these manually-generated responses, alongside the original MISeD response for the each query (in randomized order, along with the corresponding query, dialog history, and transcript). Annotators assessed which response was overall superior, considering correctness, grounding, and clarity, using a scale of ‘Equally Good’, ‘Slightly Better’, or ‘Substantially Better’. Table 3 presents the results.

Overall, MISeD responses were ranked as better in 55 pairs, compared to 43 pairs for fully-manual responses. These results suggest that the quality of MISeD responses is comparable to, or potentially even better than, fully-manual responses.

## 5.3 Wizard-of-Oz Dataset

To objectively test the value of training models with the MISeD data, we also collected a test set of dialogs using the conventional (manual) Wizard-of-Oz (WOZ) methodology. As typical in similar WOZ processes (Choi et al., 2018, Adlakha et al., 2022), the ‘user’ annotators received a short

meeting description, simulating their prior knowledge about the meeting context. They were then instructed to ask questions aimed for understanding some aspects of choice about the meeting content. The ‘agent’ annotators received the full meeting transcript, and were tasked with providing free-form answers to the user queries, with attributions to supporting transcript spans.

The collected WOZ data comprises 70 dialogs based on meetings from the test split, with a total of 700 query-response pairs. This data is used in subsequent evaluations (Sections 6, 7) as an independent test set which allows for a more robust evaluation of model performance over data generated by humans only, with no model biases in the data creation.

The average annotation time for each WOZ dialog was 161 minutes, making it 1.5 times more time-consuming than MISeD annotation. While in this work we show the feasibility of automating the generation of queries and responses, followed by annotator reviewing, we expect that higher speed-up ratios would be achieved once attribution automation of a reasonable quality is obtained in future research.

## 6 Evaluation Methodologies

We evaluate the agent models along two dimensions: the quality of the generated responses (§6.1), and the accuracy of the provided attributions (§6.2), through both automatic and human evaluations.

### 6.1 Response Quality Evaluation

Agent responses are evaluated against the gold responses in the test dataset.

#### 6.1.1 Human evaluation

We conduct human evaluation on a random subset of 100 queries. For each model response, the annotator is presented with the current user query, the gold response and the model response, as well as the meeting transcript and the dialog history for context. To quantify the content overlap between the model response and the gold response, annotators provide recall and precision scores. For recall, we ask how much of the gold response is covered by the model response, and conversely for precision – how much of the model response is covered by the gold response. Both scores are on a Likert scale of 1 to 4, corresponding to ‘Not Covered’, ‘Slightly Covered’, ‘Mostly Covered’ and ‘Fully Covered’.

#### 6.1.2 Automatic evaluation

To automatically score model responses we use the standard Rouge-1, Rouge-2 and Rouge-L scores<sup>3</sup> (Lin, 2004), for lexical overlap. To capture semantic overlap, we report BLEURT scores<sup>4</sup> (Sellam et al., 2020), a learned evaluation metric based on BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), which was trained to model human judgments for reference-based text generation evaluation.

## 6.2 Attribution Quality Evaluation

### 6.2.1 Human evaluation

To evaluate model attribution, we adopt the AIS protocol (Rashkin et al., 2023) as extended by (Liu et al., 2023) and (Gao et al., 2023). In this approach, attribution evaluation is modeled as a Textual Entailment (Natural Language Inference) task where the generated response text should be entailed by its attributions.

We sample 100 queries from each test set for human evaluation. As noted in (Gao et al., 2023), not all model responses require attributions. While in their settings responses not requiring attribution were rare and ignored, in the meeting domain we find this case to be more prevalent, particularly when the response indicates that no answer can be found in the transcript (see Section 4). Accordingly, for each model, we filter out from attribution evaluation those responses for which it was judged (manually) that attribution is not needed (20% of all responses).

Annotators assess recall and precision of attributions relative to each model response. For recall, annotators are given a response and the corresponding attributions. We break the response into sentences and ask for each sentence whether it is fully supported by the set of attributions (score of 1) or not (score of 0), reporting micro-average over all sentences. For precision, we ask for each attribution span whether it entails some piece of information in the model response (“partially supports” the response, score of 1), or not (score of 0), reporting micro-average over all attributions.

### 6.2.2 Automatic evaluation

Automatic evaluation of attribution is a recent research area with no established methods in the literature. We follow the methodology proposed recently by (Gao et al., 2023) which applies an NLI

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/google-research/google-research/tree/master/rouge>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/google-research/bleurt>

model to approximate human entailment judgments, automatically computing recall (the proportion of response sentences fully entailed by the attributions) and precision (the proportion of attributions which contribute to the entailment of the response). While they utilized the True NLI model (Honovich et al., 2022), we use the newer NLI model TrueTeacher (Gekhman et al., 2023).

Unlike the manual evaluation process, there is no available automatic method to filter out responses that do not need attribution, which remains a challenge for future research. Full details of the method implementation, and a discussion of its limitations, are given in Appendix B.

## 7 Baseline Models and Results

### 7.1 Models

As defined in Section 3, our task input contains the full meeting transcript and the dialog history, ending with the current user query. The output is a concatenation of the response and the set of attributions (indices of supporting segments within the meeting transcript). In the rare occurrences where the context exceeds the model input size capacity, the beginning of the meeting transcript is truncated. Results are compared for the following three model types.

**Finetuned Encoder-Decoder LongT5** (Guo et al., 2021) is a T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) variant that uses transient global attention (windowing token averaging) to handle longer input contexts efficiently. We finetuned the open-source<sup>5</sup> LongT5 XL (3 billion parameters) on the MISeD training set, using a context length of 16 thousand tokens.

**LLMs prompting** we use the Gemini Pro model and the much larger Gemini Ultra model (Gemini Team Google, 2023),<sup>6</sup> without any additional tuning. We construct a prompt that contains the meeting transcript, an instruction, and the dialog ending with the user query (see Table 9 in the Appendix). Context length is 28 thousand tokens.

**Finetuned LLM** we finetune the Gemini Pro model<sup>7</sup> on the MISeD training set, using the same prompt and context length as for the prompting approach. The target format is given in Table 10 in the Appendix.

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/google-research/longt5>

<sup>6</sup><https://gemini.google.com/app>

<sup>7</sup>[https://ai.google.dev/docs/model\\_tuning\\_guidance](https://ai.google.dev/docs/model_tuning_guidance)

### 7.2 Datasets

We train the finetuned agent models using the MISeD training set (2922 training examples), and test on the MISeD test set and the Wizard-of-Oz (§5.3) test set, results are shown in Section 7.3. Section 7.4 reports results on the QMSum query-based summarization (Zhong et al., 2021) test set (introduced in Section 2.2).

### 7.3 Results for Dialog Data

#### 7.3.1 Response quality

Table 4 reports response quality results on the MISeD and WOZ test sets. In both cases, automatic evaluation was computed on the full test set (628 MISeD queries, 700 WOZ queries), while manual evaluation was run on a random subset of 100 queries of each dataset. Our main takeaways from Table 4 are:

(1) The LongT5 model finetuned on MISeD achieves results close to the other much larger models (about 0.3 points difference in the 4-points human score). This suggests that a major benefit of the MISeD dataset is that it can nearly close the gap between the smaller and cheaper 3B-parameter model and the much larger Gemini models.

(2) Finetuning Gemini Pro on MISeD data improves its results significantly over the same model without finetuning. The finetuned Gemini Pro outperforms even the much bigger Gemini Ultra model. Therefore tuning on MISeD data can boost performance even for large models.

(3) The scores on WOZ test set are lower for all models than those on MISeD. This lower performance for the non-finetuned models suggests that fully-manual WOZ data is generically more challenging, being created freely by human annotators (vs. the templated methodology of MISeD). It is also expected that the finetuned models would perform better on the MISeD test set, as it was created by the same protocol as their MISeD training data.

#### 7.3.2 Attribution quality

Attribution evaluation results are presented in Table 5. As mentioned in Section 6, we have followed recent prominent work by (Gao et al., 2023) in terms of evaluation methods and the use of pre-trained LLMs. Their results suggest that citation quality varies notably with the complexity of the corpus used. Similarly, our results suggest that pre-trained LLMs do not excel at finding attributions

Model	Human scores		Automatic scores				
	recall	precision	Rouge-1	Rouge-2	Rouge-L	BLEURT	
MISeD	LongT5 Finetuned	2.38	2.52	44.59	27.30	37.62	0.47
	Gemini Pro	2.79	2.71	44.64	27.49	37.35	0.48
	Gemini Ultra	2.63	<b>2.87</b>	44.20	26.58	37.39	0.47
	Gemini Pro Finetuned	<b>2.96</b>	2.86	<b>51.02</b>	<b>33.38</b>	<b>43.03</b>	<b>0.52</b>
WOZ	LongT5 Finetuned	1.79	1.80	26.84	8.95	21.22	0.37
	Gemini Pro	2.10	2.08	27.82	10.08	22.03	0.38
	Gemini Ultra	1.98	<b>2.14</b>	28.57	10.99	23.64	0.38
	Gemini Pro Finetuned	<b>2.21</b>	2.13	<b>30.31</b>	<b>11.39</b>	<b>24.26</b>	<b>0.40</b>

Table 4: Average scores for response evaluation for the MISeD and WOZ test sets.

Model	Human scores			Automatic scores			
	recall	precision	F1	recall	precision	F1	
MISeD	Longt5 Finetuned	<b>0.76</b>	0.58	0.66	0.44	0.19	0.27
	Gemini Pro	0.20	0.69	0.31	0.26	<b>0.37</b>	0.31
	Gemini Ultra	0.19	<b>0.96</b>	0.32	0.12	0.34	0.18
	Gemini Pro Finetuned	0.68	0.69	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.50</b>	0.27	<b>0.35</b>
WOZ	Longt5 Finetuned	<b>0.77</b>	0.54	0.63	<b>0.51</b>	0.17	0.26
	Gemini Pro	0.43	<b>0.85</b>	0.57	0.31	0.37	<b>0.34</b>
	Gemini Ultra	0.19	0.71	0.30	0.13	<b>0.40</b>	0.20
	Gemini Pro Finetuned	0.74	0.67	<b>0.70</b>	0.50	0.25	0.33

Table 5: Average scores for attribution evaluation for the MISeD and WOZ test set.

over meeting transcripts.<sup>8</sup>

Observing the more reliable human scores, we see that the zero-shot models suffer from low recall, which stems from their tendency to provide attribution less frequently. Finetuning with MISeD data again improves performance, substantially increasing recall with a small drop in precision, notably increasing F1 scores for both test sets. The automatic scores show similar though weaker trends, but we regard them as less reliable because of the lack of filtering of responses for which attribution is not expected (as mentioned in §6.2.2; see Appendix B for a fuller discussion).

#### 7.4 Results for the QMSum Data

For comparison with existing results, and to further assess the utility of the MISeD dataset, we report results on the QMSum query-based summarization test set, modeled as single-turn dialogs. We compare the quality of the model responses when finetuned on (i) MISeD training data (ii) original QMSum training data (iii) both MISeD and QMSum training data together (attribution evaluation is not included in the original work). The full results are presented in Table 12 in Appendix.

Our results indicate that finetuning with MISeD data has additive benefits: when the model learns on both MISeD and QMSum data, it surpasses

zero-shot models, as well as models trained on just QMSum or just MISeD data. Our best model, Gemini Pro finetuned on both MISeD and QMSum data, surpasses the performances reported in the original QMSum study for Rouge-1 and Rouge-2.

## 8 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel methodology for generating source-grounded information-seeking dialog datasets. Our method automates the traditional WOZ process using targeted ‘user’ and ‘agent’ LLM prompts, followed by human verification and editing. We apply this method to create MISeD, the first dataset for information-seeking dialogs over meeting transcripts, demonstrating a speed-up in data generation.

Baseline models and experiments illustrate the MISeD dataset value: it enables the creation of modestly sized finetuned encoder-decoder models with performance approaching much larger pre-trained LLMs, as well as further improving the performance of such LLMs through finetuning. We suggest that our proposed methodology has potential applications in additional domains, for effective generation of useful training data for dialog models.

## 9 Limitations

**Attribution** Our work successfully automates query and response generation, but highlights the

<sup>8</sup>This is consistent with our findings when developing the MISeD annotation methodology (§4.2.2), which led us to leave attribution generation fully manual at this point.

challenge of attribution in both modeling and automatic evaluation. Future research on improving attribution generation models could enable fuller automation of dialogs generation, leading to an even more efficient process.

**Long texts depend on LLM context length** Our method’s reliance on LLM prompting for dialog generation poses challenges in case of long meeting transcripts, when they exceed the maximal context length of the model. For the agent task of response generation the same problem occurs. Possible solutions include using LLMs with larger context lengths (which may be computationally expensive) or integrating a retrieval system as a first stage in the response generation, to condense the transcript and provide the most relevant information to the LLM.

**Manually crafted prompt templates** Our method currently depends on manually crafted prompt templates to represent a broad spectrum of potential user queries in the given domain. Research into more flexible and diverse query generation strategies could reduce the effort of applying our method in new domains while increasing the generality of the obtained data.

## Acknowledgements

We wish to thank David Karam, Michelle Tadmor Ramanovich, Eliya Nachmani, Benny Schlesinger, David Petru and Blaise Aguera y Arcas for their support and feedback on the research. We also would like to express our gratitude to Victor Cărbune, Lucas Werner and Ondrej Skopek for their help with the annotation framework, and to Riteeka Kapila for leading the annotators team.

## References

- Vaibhav Adlakha, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Kaheer Suleman, Harm de Vries, and Siva Reddy. 2022. [Topicqa: Open-domain conversational question answering with topic switching](#).
- Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. [Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting](#).
- Reut Apel, Tom Braude, Amir Kantor, and Eyal Kolman. 2023. [Meeqa: Natural questions in meeting transcripts](#).
- Jianzhu Bao, Rui Wang, Yasheng Wang, Aixin Sun, Yitong Li, Fei Mi, and Ruifeng Xu. 2023. [A synthetic](#)

[data generation framework for grounded dialogues](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10866–10882, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Paweł Budzianowski, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Iñigo Casanueva, Stefan Ultes, Osman Ramadan, and Milica Gašić. 2018. [MultiWOZ - a large-scale multi-domain Wizard-of-Oz dataset for task-oriented dialogue modelling](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5016–5026, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jon Ander Campos, Arantxa Otegi, Aitor Soroa, Jan Derru, Mark Cieliebak, and Eneko Agirre. 2020. [Doqa – accessing domain-specific FAQs via conversational QA](#).

Jean Carletta, Simone Ashby, Sebastien Bourban, Mike Flynn, Maël Guillemot, Thomas Hain, Jaroslav Kadlec, Vasilis Karaiskos, Wessel Kraaij, Melissa Kronenthal, Guillaume Lathoud, Mike Lincoln, Agnes Lisowska, Iain McCowan, Wilfried Post, Dennis Reidsma, and Pierre Wellner. 2005. [The AMI meeting corpus: A pre-announcement](#). In *Machine Learning for Multimodal Interaction, Second International Workshop, MLMI 2005, Edinburgh, UK, July 11-13, 2005, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3869 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 28–39. Springer.

Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wentau Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [QuAC: Question answering in context](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2174–2184, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. [Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents](#).

Song Feng, Hui Wan, Chulaka Gunasekara, Siva Patel, Sachindra Joshi, and Luis Lastras. 2020. [doc2dial: A goal-oriented document-grounded dialogue dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8118–8128, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Enabling large language models to generate text with citations](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14627*.

- Zorik Gekhman, Jonathan Herzig, Roei Aharoni, Chen Elkind, and Idan Szpektor. 2023. [Trueteacher: Learning factual consistency evaluation with large language models](#).
- Gemini Team Google. 2023. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Behnam Hedayatnia, Qiang Chen, Anna Gottardi, Sanjeev Kwatra, Anu Venkatesh, Raefer Gabriel, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. 2019. [Topical-Chat: Towards Knowledge-Grounded Open-Domain Conversations](#). In *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, pages 1891–1895.
- Mandy Guo, Joshua Ainslie, David Uthus, Santiago Ontanon, Jianmo Ni, Yun-Hsuan Sung, and Yinfei Yang. 2021. [LongT5: Efficient text-to-text transformer for long sequences](#).
- Or Honovich, Roei Aharoni, Jonathan Herzig, Hagai Taitelbaum, Doron Kukliansy, Vered Cohen, Thomas Scialom, Idan Szpektor, Avinatan Hassidim, and Yossi Matias. 2022. [TRUE: Re-evaluating factual consistency evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3905–3920, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yebowen Hu, Timothy Ganter, Hanieh Deilamsalehy, Franck Dernoncourt, Hassan Foroosh, and Fei Liu. 2023. [Meetingbank: A benchmark dataset for meeting summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 16409–16423. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adam Janin, Don Baron, Jane Edwards, Dan Ellis, David Gelbart, Nelson Morgan, Barbara Peskin, Thilo Pfau, Elizabeth Shriberg, Andreas Stolcke, and Chuck Wooters. 2003. [The ICSI meeting corpus](#). In *2003 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, ICASSP '03, Hong Kong, April 6-10, 2003*, pages 364–367. IEEE.
- J. F. Kelley. 1984. [An iterative design methodology for user-friendly natural language office information applications](#). *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 2(1):26–41.
- Hyun Kim, Minsoo Cho, and Seung-Hoon Na. 2023. [ExplainMeetSum: A dataset for explainable meeting summarization aligned with human intent](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13079–13098, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Siheng Li, Yichun Yin, Cheng Yang, Wangjie Jiang, Yiwei Li, Zesen Cheng, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Yujiu Yang. 2023. [Newsdialogues: Towards proactive news grounded conversation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Yen Ting Lin, Alexandros Papangelis, Seokhwan Kim, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2022. [Knowledge-grounded conversational data augmentation with generative conversational networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 26–38, Edinburgh, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nelson F Liu, Tianyi Zhang, and Percy Liang. 2023. [Evaluating verifiability in generative search engines](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09848*.
- Kai Nakamura, Sharon Levy, Yi-Lin Tuan, Wenhui Chen, and William Yang Wang. 2022. [HybridDialogue: An information-seeking dialogue dataset grounded on tabular and textual data](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 481–492, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anna Nedoluzhko, Muskaan Singh, Marie Hledíková, Tirthankar Ghosal, and Ondřej Bojar. 2022. [ELITR minuting corpus: A novel dataset for automatic minuting from multi-party meetings in English and Czech](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 3174–3182, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Archiki Prasad, Trung Bui, Seunghyun Yoon, Hanieh Deilamsalehy, Franck Dernoncourt, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. [MeetingQA: Extractive question-answering on meeting transcripts](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15000–15025, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(1).
- Hannah Rashkin, Vitaly Nikolaev, Matthew Lamm, Lora Aroyo, Michael Collins, Dipanjan Das, Slav Petrov, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Iulia Turc, and David Reitter. 2023. [Measuring attribution in natural language generation models](#). *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–64.
- Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. [CoQA: A conversational question answering challenge](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:249–266.

Marzieh Saeidi, Max Bartolo, Patrick Lewis, Sameer Singh, Tim Rocktäschel, Mike Sheldon, Guillaume Bouchard, and Sebastian Riedel. 2018. [Interpretation of natural language rules in conversational machine reading](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2087–2097, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur P Parikh. 2020. [Bleurt: Learning robust metrics for text generation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04696*.

Chien-Sheng Wu, Andrea Madotto, Wenhao Liu, Pascale Fung, and Caiming Xiong. 2022a. [QAConv: Question answering on informative conversations](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5389–5411, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Qingyang Wu, Song Feng, Derek Chen, Sachindra Joshi, Luis Lastras, and Zhou Yu. 2022b. [DG2: Data augmentation through document grounded dialogue generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 204–216, Edinburgh, UK. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Qinglin Zhang, Chong Deng, Jiaqing Liu, Hai Yu, Qian Chen, Wen Wang, Zhijie Yan, Jinglin Liu, Yi Ren, and Zhou Zhao. 2023. [Mug: A general meeting understanding and generation benchmark](#).

Ming Zhong, Da Yin, Tao Yu, Ahmad Zaidi, Mutethia Mutuma, Rahul Jha, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Asli Celikyilmaz, Yang Liu, Xipeng Qiu, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2021. [Qmsum: A new benchmark for query-based multi-domain meeting summarization](#). *CoRR*, abs/2104.05938.

## A Prompts additional information

Our prompt structure consists of generic instructions that provide guidance to the LLM, helping it formulate user queries based on the provided meeting transcript and the conversational history (Table 6), followed by the user query template to use in the specific turn (Table 7).

Adapted from QMSum, we include both *General* queries for overall meeting themes and key takeaways, and *Specific* queries which focus on particular topics or individuals discussed. We expanded the QMSum schema based on a preliminary user study, which allowed volunteers to upload their meeting recordings and inquire a prototype agent model about them. Analyzing this interaction data, we added an *Unanswerable* and *Context-dependent* query templates.

Unlike human annotators who can create tailored queries for a given transcript, our model is

guided to always generate queries from any prompt. Thus, we adapt the schema towards more generic prompts to ensure the model always produces relevant queries.

For example, QMSum authors suggest the following query in their schema: *"Why did A agree / disagree with B when discussing X?"*. This assumes a disagreement between speaker A and B around some topic X. This assumption will not necessarily be true for any given meeting. Therefore we changed the prompt to be: *"The question should be a rephrase of asking if anyone disagreed with <Speaker> about <Topic>".*

## B Automatic Evaluation of Attribution Implementation

Adopting the method from (Gao et al., 2023), we compute precision and recall scores for attribution in the following way.

**Recall:** recall measures to what extent the generated text is entailed by the attribution. For each sentence  $s$  in the response  $S$ , and given an attribution set  $A$  (the concatenation of all transcript spans  $a$  provided by the model as attribution), we compute  $NLI(A, s)$  as the TrueTeacher-computed score of  $A$  entailing  $s$  (either 1 or 0). We then average this score over all sentences (micro-average).

**Precision:** precision measures whether the attribution only includes citations needed to entail the response. We compute citation precision for each citation  $a$  of the attribution set  $A$ . The precision of  $a$  is either 0 or 1. We first determine if  $a$  is relevant or irrelevant with respect to every sentence  $s$  in the response  $S$ : the citation  $a$  should be considered irrelevant wrt  $s$  if it does not entail  $s$  by itself ( $NLI(a, s) = 0$ ) and the overall NLI score of  $A$  vs  $s$  does not change removing  $a$  from  $A$  ( $NLI(A \setminus \{a\}, s) = NLI(A, s)$ ).  $a$  has a precision of 1 if  $a$  is relevant for at least a sentence  $s$  which has recall=1 ( $NLI(A, s) = 1$ ). We then average the precision of all attributions (micro-average).

As pointed out in (Gao et al., 2023), a limitation of this citation precision evaluation is that it cannot detect a citation that partially supports the statement, therefore resulting in lower scores compared to human evaluation. We see this effect in Table 5 which shows a gap between human-computed and automatically-computed attribution precision. As previously discussed another limitation of the method is that it includes also responses which

do not require attribution (an example being "*The meeting participants did not discuss specific ideas for the remote control's shape and size .*"). This increases the gap between the automatic and manual scores as in the manual evaluation we can filter out those responses.

Finally we note that while the attribution format is consistent for fine-tuned models, zero-shot models present some inconsistency in how they list attribution and thus they require more complex parsing logic.

---

### User query full prompt

<Meeting transcript>

Instruction: Generate a multi turn dialog between a user and a chatbot about the provided meeting. Every turn the user asks a question about the meeting and the chatbot respond with an answer based on the meeting

<Dialog history>

<Query template>

---

Table 6: Our query prompt includes generic instructions that guide the LLM in formulating user queries, given the meeting transcript and dialog history. This is followed by a randomly chosen query template, from a pool of templates that are based on the QMSum schema and our edits and additions.




Figure 3: Transcript and attribution statistic. (a) Distribution of transcript length across the meetings used for MISeD. (b) Number of attribution spans in MISeD responses (among responses with attribution). (c) Distribution of attribution span length. (d) Distances between subsequent response attribution spans.

---

**General query templates**

1. The question should be a rephrase of asking for a summary of the meeting.
2. The question should be a rephrase of asking for a summary of the things <Speaker> said in the meeting.
3. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was the conclusion of the meeting.
4. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was the purpose of the meeting.
5. The question should be a rephrase of asking what were the action items of the meeting.
6. The question should be a rephrase of asking to identify questions raised during the meeting that were left unresolved.

---

**Specific query templates**

1. The question should be a rephrase of asking for a summary of <Topic>. <Topic> should be a topic that was discussed within the meeting.
2. The question should be a rephrase of asking why <Decision> was made.
3. The question should be a rephrase of asking what did <Speaker> say regarding <Topic> in the meeting.
4. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was the advantage of <Solution>.
5. The question should be a rephrase of asking why <Speaker> held an <Opinion>.
6. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was decided regarding <Topic>.
7. The question should be a rephrase of asking if anyone disagreed with <Speaker> about <Topic>.
8. The question should be a rephrase of asking what did <Speaker> recommend to do when discussing <Topic>.
9. The question should be a Yes/No question where the answer is "Yes" based on the meeting.
10. The question should be a Yes/No question where the answer is "No" based on the meeting.
11. The question should be a Yes/No question where the answer can not be found within the meeting.

---

**Unanswerable query templates**

1. The question should be a rephrase of asking for a summary of <Topic>. <Topic> should be a topic that was never discussed within the meeting.
2. The question should be a rephrase of asking what <Speaker> said regarding to <Topic> in the meeting. <Topic> should be a topic that was never discussed by <Speaker> within the meeting.
3. The question should be a rephrase of asking what <Speaker> said regarding <Topic> in the meeting. <Speaker> should be a name of a person that did not participate in the meeting.
4. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was the advantage of <Solution>. <Solution> should be something that was never discussed within the meeting.
5. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was decided regarding <Topic>. <Topic> should be a topic that was never discussed within the meeting.
6. The question should be a rephrase of asking what was decided regarding <Topic>. <Topic> should be a topic that was discussed within the meeting but never got to any conclusion.

---

**Context-dependent query templates**

1. The question should be an implicit follow-up question regarding the previous message in the dialog using demonstrative pronouns such as "It", "He", "She", "They", "That". Example: "What did he say about it?", "What was their conclusion?"
  2. The question should include a word with the same meaning as "else"/"other"/"besides".
- 

Table 7: All query templates. The bracketed placeholders (e.g., <Topic>) signal where relevant meeting-specific topics should be inserted. Empirical evidence indicates that the LLM demonstrates a capacity to interpret these bracketed instructions, successfully generating contextually appropriate queries.

---

### Agent response full prompt

<Meeting transcript>

<Dialog history>

<User query>

Instructions: The response should answer the user's question based on the meeting.

The response should follow the rules:

- The response should be always directly derived from the meeting. It should not include any opinion or fact that was not presented within the meeting.
- The response should take one of two forms:
  1. Up to 3 sentences of free text.
  2. Up to 2 intro sentence and between 3 and 5 bullet points. Mark each bullet point with a single asterisk (\*). for example:

"Here are the topics discussed in the meeting:  
\* <Topic1>  
\* <Topic2>  
\* <Topic3>",

"The participants raised few concerns regarding the timeline:  
\* <Concern1>  
\* <Concern2>  
\* <Concern3>"

Choose the form that best suit the answer.
- When referencing the participants of the meeting as a group, the response should refer to them as "The participants".
- When referencing to a single person, use gender neutral pronouns such as "They" or "Them".
- When referencing to the meeting, refer to it as "the meeting" and NOT "the meeting transcript".

---

Table 8: Full system's response prompts

<Meeting transcript>	T#0 Grad C said: Nice. T#1 Grad D said: OK. T#2 Grad A said: to to handle. T#3 Grad D said: Is that good? T#4 Grad C said: Right. Yeah, I've have never handled them. ...
<Instructions>	<Markers instructions> Generate the next response in the dialog between user and bot, adding a reference to the indices the answer comes from.
<Dialog history>	user: What did the meeting participants decide to do to move the project forward? bot: The participants decided to create a middle layer in their belief-net model...
<User query>	user: What did Grad C suggest to do when discussing the middle layer for the belief net model? bot:

Table 9: Prompt for LLM agents at training and inference time.

(T#734,T#759) Grad C suggested that values could be expanded...

Table 10: Example target format for fine-tuning. It includes the attribution spans and the expected response.

	<b>Train</b>	<b>Validation</b>	<b>Test</b>	<b>Overall</b>
# meetings	157	34	34	225
# dialogs	303	63	66	432
# query-response pairs	2922	611	628	4161
context-dependent	388 (13.28%)	81 (13.26%)	79 (12.58%)	548 (13.17%)
unanswerable	927 (31.72%)	149 (24.39%)	198 (31.53%)	1274 (30.62%)
query type: general	644 (22.04%)	88 (14.40%)	138 (21.97%)	870 (20.91%)
query type: specific	1515 (51.85%)	358 (58.27%)	308 (49.04%)	2179 (52.37%)
query type: yes/no	763 (26.11%)	167 (27.33%)	182 (28.98%)	1112 (26.72%)

Table 11: Statistics of the MISeD dataset by split.

Model	Rouge-1	Rouge-2	Rouge-L	BLEURT
QMSum paper with retriever	32.29	8.67	<b>28.17</b>	
Gemini Pro	29.78	8.91	19.52	<b>0.37</b>
Gemini Ultra	31.52	9.89	20.88	0.36
LongT5 Finetuned on QMSum	35.34	12.15	23.87	0.35
LongT5 Finetuned on MISeD	29.64	8.19	20.07	0.34
LongT5 Finetuned on both MISeD and QMSum	35.84	12.73	24.37	0.36
Gemini Pro Finetuned on QMSum	36.88	12.83	24.52	<b>0.37</b>
Gemini Pro Finetuned on MISeD	32.07	9.19	21.14	0.36
Gemini Pro Finetuned on both MISeD and QMSum	<b>36.98</b>	<b>13.62</b>	25.21	<b>0.37</b>

Table 12: Response evaluation for the QMSum test set. The QMSum paper reports results both using a custom retriever to extract meeting segments used to derive the answer, as well as providing golden spans of sentences.