

To Recommend or Not: Recommendability Identification in Conversations with Pre-trained Language Models

Zhefan Wang^{1,2}, Weizhi Ma³✉, and Min Zhang^{2,1}✉

¹ Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

² Quan Cheng Laboratory

³ Institute for AI Industry Research (AIR), Tsinghua University
wzf23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, {mawz,z-m}@tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract. Most current recommender systems primarily focus on what to recommend, assuming users always require personalized recommendations. However, with the widely spread of ChatGPT and other chatbots, a more crucial problem in the context of conversational systems is how to minimize user disruption when we provide recommendation services for users. While previous research has extensively explored different user intents in dialogue systems, fewer efforts are made to investigate whether recommendations should be provided. In this paper, we formally define the recommendability identification problem, which aims to determine whether recommendations are necessary in a specific scenario. First, we propose and define the recommendability identification task, which investigates the need for recommendations in the current conversational context. A new dataset is constructed. Subsequently, we discuss and evaluate the feasibility of leveraging pre-trained language models (PLMs) for recommendability identification. Finally, through comparative experiments, we demonstrate that directly employing PLMs with zero-shot results falls short of meeting the task requirements. Besides, fine-tuning or utilizing soft prompt techniques yields comparable results to traditional classification methods. Our work is the first to study recommendability before recommendation and provides preliminary ways to make it a fundamental component of the future recommendation system.⁴

1 Introduction

In recent years, the rapid development of large-scale language models (LLMs) supported by massive model parameters and data has led to significant advancements in multilingual dialogue systems. Conversational interfaces are expected to become the primary mode of human-computer interaction. However, existing dialogue systems predominantly focus on answering user questions and fulfilling information requests, representing a passive interaction. In real-life scenarios,

⁴ Code is available at https://github.com/wzf2000/Recommendability_DASF2024.

the problem of information overload necessitates proactive information filtering, often facilitated by recommender systems. As for traditional dialog systems, proactively identifying and satisfying user needs is a desired capability. The lack of this capability will also limit overall user satisfaction.

Prior research has explored the integration of recommender and dialogue systems, such as conversational recommender systems and dialogue-based search and recommendation. However, these efforts are often similar to traditional recommender systems, assuming users actually need the recommendation results. Moreover, the research primarily concentrates on improving the recommendation performance by investigating what items to recommend. Nevertheless, in more general conversational contexts, users may have diverse needs beyond simple recommendation-seeking. For instance, in a mobile dialogue retrieval scenario, the system can provide recommendations and searches specific to mobile shopping. However, in the broader context of this study, making recommendations without careful consideration may disrupt the user’s experience. A dialogue system should determine when to offer recommendations during a conversation and when to address the user’s queries solely. While prior research has extensively studied user intents in dialogue systems, there has been limited investigation into “whether to recommend or not.”

This work aims to study the recognition of recommendability, which explores whether recommendations are necessary for general dialogue processes and identifies suitable moments to give recommendations. It is worth noting that recommendability is a dynamic characteristic that evolves throughout a conversation with the same user. For instance, once a user obtains satisfactory recommendation results, the system should adjust its identification of recommendability in real time. Hence, our research focuses on utterance-level recommendability identification rather than conversation-level analysis, which facilitates the evaluation of the system’s real-time dynamic identification capabilities.

In this work, we propose and define the task of recommendability identification based on conversational scenarios. To our knowledge, this task has not been previously proposed by other researchers. Due to the novelty of this task, there needs to be more publicly available dialogue datasets suitable for recommendability annotations. Therefore, we manually annotated the recommendability of sampled user dialogues from a real-world e-commerce customer service dialogue dataset, JDDC2.1, and created a processed JDDCRec dataset. Considering those pre-trained language models (PLMs) are widely adopted in dialogue scenarios, we primarily employ PLMs and prompt learning techniques for experimental evaluation. The main contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- We propose and formally define the recommendability identification task, which is crucial for applying recommendations on real conversational systems. We also construct the JDDCRec dataset for the evaluation of this task.
- We discuss and evaluate the potential of using PLMs and prompt-based methods, such as zero-shot prompt evaluation, prompt learning, and soft prompt tuning, for recommendability identification.

- Experimental results on existing dialogue-based recommendation datasets and annotated JDDCRec demonstrate the potential and feasibility of utilizing PLMs and prompt-based methods for recommendability identification.

2 Related Work

2.1 Conversational Search and Recommendation

Recently, the rise of pre-trained language models (PLMs) in NLP, especially LLMs, has made human-machine dialogues more popular in general scenarios. Integrating dialogue systems is a basic form of future development in search and recommendation.

Some studies[4,24] view conversational search and recommendation as task-oriented dialogue, aiming to meet user’s information needs. Compared to traditional dialogue systems, conversational search and recommendation can help users find products and items that align with their preferences and allow users to provide immediate feedback directly. Tran et al.[23] specifically summarize the critical components of the conversational recommender system (CRS), including understanding the user’s intention, providing personalized recommendations, and developing a suitable switch mechanism.

With the widespread application of LLMs, many researchers have attempted to integrate LLMs with Conversational Search Systems (CSS) and CRS. Friedman et al.[7] propose leveraging LLMs to build an end-to-end large-scale CRS roadmap. Mao et al.[19] introduce a framework called LLMCS (LLM-based Conversational Search), which leverages LLMs to perform few-shot conversational query rewriting for conversational search.

However, most existing research on CSS and CRS focuses on relatively single-domain dialogue scenarios, often assuming user’s purchase intent in e-commerce. In this work, we aim to study more mixed dialogue scenarios, where the topics and domains of the dialogue are more open-ended. Identifying user intent becomes crucial in such scenarios, as the system’s responses directly impact user experience and satisfaction.

2.2 Intent Detection for Dialogue System

Intent detection is a crucial task in dialogue systems, aiming to accurately understand the intentions expressed by users in conversations and provide appropriate responses accordingly.

Some commonly used methods for intent detection include statistical approaches such as Support Vector Machine (SVM)[9] and Naive Bayes[20], and some deep neural network methods, such as CNN[10], and RNN[12], etc. Compared to traditional statistical methods, deep learning approaches can better capture the semantics in dialogues, resulting in significant improvements in performance on intent detection.

In recent years, PLMs, such as BERT[5] and GPT[21], which have learned rich language representations through unsupervised pre-training on large-scale

textual corpora, have gained widespread attention. Researchers have attempted to apply PLMs to intent detection and achieved excellent results[2]. Compared to traditional deep learning methods, they excel in learning deep language representations from large-scale unsupervised data, exhibiting more robust performance across many downstream tasks.

In this work, recommendability cannot be treated purely as a user’s intent but should be regarded as opportunities to recommend within the conversation. A user without information-seeking intent might be interested in the recommendation results provided by the system. Conversely, users looking to retrieve relevant information may feel disturbed by the system’s abrupt intervention in recommendations.

2.3 Recommendation with Pre-trained Language Model

We have witnessed the growing power of PLMs in language modeling in recent years. Many studies have attempted to leverage the robust capabilities of PLMs for recommendation tasks. Some works encode the textual features of users and items, such as news articles and user reviews, using PLMs as encoders[28,11,27], benefiting from the powerful text comprehension abilities of PLMs to enhance recommendations. Other works directly utilize PLMs as backbones for recommendation[29,13,8,3]. For instance, Zhang et al. (2021) transformed the recommendation task into a language modeling task to address the issue of zero-shot recommendations, while Li et al. (2023) attempted to convert user and item ID information into continuous or discrete token representations, enabling PLMs to learn the recommendation task based on these representations. Geng et al. (2022) and Cui et al. (2022) focused on different tasks in various domains of recommendation systems, designing a unified framework to adapt to a wide range of possible recommendation scenarios.

However, the works mentioned above assume that the system performs recommendations, while recommendability identification is a preliminary step before providing specific recommendation results. In other words, meaningful recommendation results can only be derived after ensuring that the system’s recommendations will not disturb the user, highlighting the significance of recommendability identification. Therefore, this study addresses the initial step in most recommendation system research. A certain level of understanding of the dialogue text is required in general dialogue scenarios. Hence, this paper explores the use of PLMs for recommendability identification.

3 Definition of Recommendability Identification Task

Let u_i be the i -th utterance during the conversation, and $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ represents whether giving a recommendation is appropriate when given the first $i - 1$ utterance (1 indicating appropriate while 0 indicating inappropriate; r_i is set to 0 for every user utterance u_i). Let \mathcal{P} represent the user’s profile, including

attributes such as age, gender, and interests, while \mathcal{C} represents additional contextual information during the conversation, such as time or locations. The goal of recommendability identification is to predict whether a recommendation is appropriate for each system response timing, i.e.,

$$\hat{r}_i = f_{\Theta}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1} [r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{i-1}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}]) \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (1)$$

where Θ denotes the parameters of the model. Inputs enclosed in [...] are optional, as their importance may vary depending on the specific application scenario.

4 Recommendability Identification with Pre-trained Language Model




Fig. 1. Flow comparison of the three methods. The red indicates the parameters involved in the training, and the blue indicates frozen parameters.

We compare the three methods mentioned in this section in Fig. 1.

4.1 Zero-Shot Validation with Manual Template

With powerful PLMs like BERT [5], RoBERTa [17], and DeBERTa [22], prompting the input text sequence with manual template [14] can convert various downstream tasks into the similar form. As illustrated in Fig. 1, taking the recommendability Identification task for e-commerce customer service conversation as an example, we manually construct a template as follows:

Assuming that you are an intelligent e-commerce customer service, you can intelligently determine the needs of customers in the process of communicating with customers, and give recommendations when needed. The following is the dialogue history between you and a customer: [x] You will choose? Options: 0: no recommendation; 1: recommendation. Answer: [Mask]

[x] will be replaced by the historical utterances, and the PLM will be required to predict the token at [Mask]. The optional space of the token consists of $\{0, 1\}$, indicating non-recommendable and recommendable, respectively.

According to Brown et al. [1] and Wei et al. [26], large-scale PLMs can obtain powerful few-shot and zero-shot capabilities through instruction tuning. Therefore, we evaluated the ability of PLMs with different scales on the recommendability identification task under zero-shot conditions.

4.2 Prompt Learning with Manual Template

To test the limits of the PLMs’ capabilities on the recommendability identification task, we further required the PLMs to predict the probability distribution of the token at [Mask]. As shown in the part of hard Prompt learning in Fig. 1, all PLMs’ parameters were fine-tuned using binary cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}}(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \mathbf{y}) = -\frac{1}{N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\mathbb{1}_{y_i=1} \ln \tilde{P}_{i,1} + \mathbb{1}_{y_i=0} \ln \tilde{P}_{i,0} \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{P}_{i,c}$ denotes the probability of c -th category ($c \in \{0, 1\}$) for the i -th data sample, y_i denotes the one-hot encoded representation of the ground truth data category for the i -th sample.

4.3 Soft Prompt Tuning

+

In addition to hard templates composed of natural language, some researchers [16] has also proposed to directly use continuous word vector representations instead of manual templates, which is known as *soft prompt*. For the original template in the form of "[x] [Prompt] [Mask]", after mapping through the embedding layer, the model’s input will be:

$$[\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{h}_0, \mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_m, \mathbf{e}(\text{"[Mask]"})].$$

Furthermore, Liu et al. [15] proposed P-Tuning V2 to alleviate the poor performance of P-Tuning on small-scale PLMs. P-Tuning V2 introduces similar

trainable continuous prompt parameters before the first layer of the encoder and multiple layers of the encoder. As illustrated in Fig. 1, only the newly introduced soft prompt parameters are involved in training. The specific computational process is outlined below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathbf{e}}^0 &= [\mathbf{h}_0^0, \mathbf{h}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{h}_m^0, \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x})], \\
 \mathbf{e}^i &= \begin{cases} f_{\text{encoder},i}(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{i-1}), & \text{Add soft prompt for } i\text{-th layer} \\ f_{\text{encoder},i}(\mathbf{e}^{i-1}), & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
 \tilde{\mathbf{e}}^i &= [\mathbf{h}_0^i, \mathbf{h}_1^i, \dots, \mathbf{h}_m^i, \mathbf{e}_{m+1}^i].
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

5 Experiments

5.1 Construction of JDDCRec Dataset

Dataset Construction Strategy According to the definition of the recommendability identification task, we selected the JDDC2.1[30] dataset as the foundation for manual annotation. JDDC2.1 is a large-scale multimodal multi-turn dialogue dataset collected from a mainstream Chinese E-commerce platform, containing 246K sessions, 3M utterances, and 507K images.

The cost of thoroughly labeling the JDDC2.1 dataset is significant since the identification of recommendability relies on a high level of understanding of conversation history. Besides, the ratio of recommendability in the general conversation scenarios is meager. Therefore, we first performed several rounds of rule-based filtering on JDDC2.1, e.g., dialogs containing information about returns, logistics, etc. Contexts containing such information have little possibility of recommendability. Based on this, we filtered JDDC2.1 to 22.3% of its original size.

We sampled 1000 data from the filtered dataset for final manual labeling (8:1:1 ratio of training, validation, and testing). For labeling, we employed three professional annotators. The annotators were required to browse each conversation and determine whether there was an opportunity to recommend at the utterance level according to our criteria. To maintain annotation consistency, we provided many examples, including detailed analytical explanations for several ambiguous cases.

Table 1. Dataset characteristics for DuRecDial 2.0 and JDDCRec. Train/Dev/Test indicates the number of train/development/test set samples.

Dataset	Train	Dev	Test	Positive ratio
DuRecDial 2.0	33079	4801	10456	15.2%
JDDCRec	1300	136	159	29.5%

Dataset Characteristics After the above construction process, we obtained 1000 conversations containing utterance-level annotations. As a result of our analysis, the filtered JDDC2.1 dataset (i.e., the JDDCRec dataset) contains 220 conversations and 471 utterances with recommendability annotations. We give some samples of the data in JDDCRec in Fig. 2.

Considering the imbalance of positive and negative cases in JDDCRec, we retained only the last of the consecutive negative examples for each conversation, encompassing a more comprehensive representation of the entire conversation. Following these preprocessing steps, the resulting JDDCRec dataset used for experimentation is summarized in Table 1.

Service	Yes, can I help you? Don't take it out.
Customer	Can it be washed?
Service	The water level sensing relies on the fluctuation of the white float inside the water tank, and it can be cleaned.
Customer	I just took it out. Is the same side still inside, or can both sides be used?
Service	Put it inside. Just align the float and insert it directly.
...	...
<i>No Recommendability</i>	
Customer	I don't see this color among the ones you have available for pre-order.
Service	Hello, there is currently no specific information available regarding restocking.
Customer	Can I make a reservation with what I provided?
Service	I'm sorry, but it's not supported.
Customer	That means there isn't any, then.
Service	Yes, indeed.
Customer	OK.
<i>Weak Recommendability</i>	
Customer	Teapot Category - Pre-purchase Inquiry
Service	Hello, I am your personal shopping assistant for this service. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.
Customer	<img-url>. Can this teapot be purchased separately as a standalone item?
Service	We do not sell accessories separately. The purchase of product accessories can be made through the following methods:
...	...
<i>Strong Recommendability</i>	

Fig. 2. Some conversation examples from JDDCRec. Bold red indicates that there is a possibility of recommendation. Here, we distinguish between the existence and the strength of the recommendability.

5.2 Experimental Settings

Datasets. In addition to the JDDCRec dataset mentioned above, we also use another dataset, DuRecDial 2.0[18]. DuRecDial 2.0 is the first publicly available bilingual parallel dataset for conversational recommendation. It encompasses various domains, including movies, celebrities, cuisine, music, weather, and points of interest (POI), comprising 8241 conversations. The DuRecDial 2.0 dataset contains utterance-level topic annotations used as recommendability annotations in our experiments (based on whether the topic contains “recommendation” or not).

The original DuRecDial 2.0 dataset always had multiple rounds of the same topic. However, we tended to focus more on where the first recommendability appeared. Therefore, we retained only the first positive example for the same topics in our data processing.

After the above processing, the size of the DuRecDial2.0 dataset can be found in Table 1.

Baselines. We compared the three types of methods mentioned in this work with several baselines as follows,

- ConvBERT[32]: Conversation BERT. It is a topic prediction model for a topic-guided conversational recommender system. It simply concatenates all the historical utterances (with [SEP] tokens for separating) and encodes them with the BERT-base[5] model. To get a probability for recommendability identification, we apply a linear transformation to the obtained representation.
- ConvDeBERTa/ConvRoBERTa: Similar to ConvBERT, but uses DeBERTa-base[22] and RoBERTa-base[17] as the encoding model.

Metrics. We report accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 in the main experiment.

Implement details. Our experiments are conducted through OpenPrompt (Ding et al. [6]) and CRSLab (hou et al. [31]). We used the Fengshenbang Chinese Language Pre-training Model Open Source Project [25] as a valuable resource to find suitable Chinese pre-trained language models in our experiments.

5.3 Overall Evaluation Results

The overall performance for two datasets is shown in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4, which contains four metrics for the recommendability identification task. We divide each table into four parts: The first part is the baseline methods. The second and third parts are the method of zero-shot evaluation and classic prompt learning using the manual template. The last part shows the results of soft prompt tuning, which uses the P-Tuning V2 method.

From the results, we have several observations:

First, the three baseline methods achieved excellent performance on both datasets. The above results indicate the effectiveness of the traditional encoder plus classifier approach in the recommendability identification task.

Second, the zero-shot prompt evaluation method performed poorly on both datasets. Only a few models based on larger-scale backbones, such as GPT2-XL and ChatGLM-6B, showed good accuracy but performed poorly in the F1 score. These observations suggest that using simple manual templates to prompt PLMs does not directly lead to better performance in recommendability identification.

Third, the hard prompt learning and soft prompt tuning methods showed significant improvements compared to the second part and performed comparably

Table 2. Experimental results of three different methods and baseline methods on the JDDCRec dataset. The boldface indicates the best of the specific method type, and underlining indicates the best of all methods.

Method Type	Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
baseline	ConvBERT	0.8252	0.7058	0.6913	0.6922
	ConvDeBERTa	0.8226	0.7323	0.6304	0.6642
	ConvRoBERTa	0.8516	<u>0.7891</u>	0.6696	0.7205
Zero-shot Prompt Evaluation	BERT-base	0.4277	0.2581	0.5217	0.3453
	RoBERTa-base	0.2893	0.2893	1.0000	0.4488
	RoBERTa-large	0.2893	0.2893	1.0000	0.4488
	ChatGLM-6B	0.5597	0.3723	0.7609	0.5000
	ChatGLM2-6B	0.7170	0.5263	0.2174	0.3077
Hard Prompt Learning	BERT-base	0.8302	0.6922	0.7435	0.7168
	RoBERTa-base	0.8365	0.7796	0.6131	0.6837
	RoBERTa-large	0.8377	0.7857	0.6130	0.6861
Soft Prompt Tuning	BERT-base	0.8164	0.6679	0.7087	0.6835
	RoBERTa-base	0.8176	0.7049	0.6522	0.6709
	RoBERTa-large	<u>0.8654</u>	0.7336	0.8522	0.7856

to the baseline methods across all four metrics. The fourth part further indicates the possibility of directly eliciting PLMs’ identification ability by constructing templates, as soft prompt tuning only introduces additional prefix prompt parameters and freezes the backbone’s original parameters during the learning process.

5.4 Further Analyses

Few-shot Performance One of the key findings in our main experiment is that the zero-shot prompt evaluation method performs poorly on both datasets. Regardless of the backbone PLM used, it falls far behind the baseline methods and the latter two types of methods. However, it has been mentioned in previous work [1] that PLMs possess a certain level of few-shot learning capability. Hence, we further conducted few-shot testing on the DuRecDial 2.0 dataset using the prompt learning method with BERT-base as the backbone. To ensure sufficient learning under few-shot conditions, we adjusted the experimental settings for 30-shot and 300-shot conditions to train for 100 and 10 times the number of epochs, respectively. The 3000-shot condition remained consistent with the main experiment.

As illustrated in Fig. 3 and the first part of Table 5, the increase in data samples results in improved performance in recommendability identification. Notably, under the 30-shot condition, BERT-base’s accuracy has reached a rel-

Table 3. Experimental results of three different methods and baseline methods on DuRecDial 2.0 English dataset.

Method Type	Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
baseline	ConvBERT	0.9779	0.9550	0.9053	0.9288
	ConvDeBERTa	0.9797	0.9618	0.9129	0.9344
	ConvRoBERTa	0.9795	0.9549	0.9184	0.9345
Zero-shot Prompt Evaluation	BERT-base	0.7244	0.0444	0.0353	0.0393
	BERT-large	0.5484	0.1706	0.4731	0.2508
	RoBERTa-base	0.4717	0.1925	0.7222	0.3040
	RoBERTa-large	0.1600	0.1598	1.0000	0.2756
	GPT2-base	0.1622	0.1600	0.9994	0.2758
	GPT2-medium	0.2091	0.1679	0.9988	0.2875
	GPT2-large	0.6812	0.1761	0.2707	0.2134
	GPT2-XL	0.8209	0.1988	0.0401	0.0667
	ChatGLM-6B	0.8168	0.3016	0.1120	0.1633
ChatGLM2-6B	0.8183	0.0472	0.0072	0.0125	
Hard Prompt Learning	BERT-base	0.9777	0.9633	0.8969	0.9277
	BERT-large	0.9765	0.9691	0.8822	0.9226
	RoBERTa-base	0.9791	0.9732	0.8950	0.9315
	RoBERTa-large	0.9783	0.9677	0.8959	0.9290
	GPT2-base	0.9780	0.9865	0.8740	0.9268
	GPT2-medium	0.9778	0.9810	0.8783	0.9266
Soft Prompt Tuning	BERT-base	0.9767	0.9730	0.8787	0.9232
	BERT-large	0.9772	0.9765	0.8786	0.9248
	RoBERTa-base	0.9780	0.9855	0.8753	0.9271
	RoBERTa-large	0.9780	0.9853	0.8752	0.9270
	DeBERTa-base	0.9783	0.9866	0.8761	0.9280

actively stable level. Under the 300-shot condition, all four metrics have achieved higher levels than the zero-shot scenario.

Considering that only four positive instances exist in the 30-shot data, it is challenging for the model to learn broad recommendability features from these four positive instances. Therefore, we conducted further experiments to balance the positive and negative instances under the 30-shot and 300-shot conditions (with an equal number of positive and negative samples). As shown in the second part of Table 5, BERT-base achieved a significantly better recall rate and F1 scores under the 30-shot condition. These experiments demonstrate PLMs’ few-shot learning capability for recommendability identification under appropriate positive sample ratios.

Influence of Manual Template Considering the impact of manual templates on the model’s results, we designed a second template (including both Chinese and English versions) for the DuRecDial 2.0 dataset. We conducted compara-

Table 4. Experimental results of three different methods and baseline methods on DuRecDial 2.0 Chinese dataset.

Method Type	Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
baseline	ConvBERT	0.9754	0.9582	0.8885	0.9195
	ConvDeBERTa	0.9806	0.9554	0.9252	0.9379
	ConvRoBERTa	0.9800	0.9585	0.9176	0.9356
Zero-shot Prompt Evaluation	BERT-base	0.2444	0.1583	0.8641	0.2676
	RoBERTa-base	0.6537	0.1586	0.2713	0.2002
	RoBERTa-large	0.1597	0.1597	1.0000	0.2754
	ChatGLM-6B	0.6982	0.1538	0.1976	0.1730
	ChatGLM2-6B	0.1898	0.1618	0.9743	0.2775
Hard Prompt Learning	BERT-base	0.9775	0.9684	0.8893	0.9267
	RoBERTa-base	0.9787	0.9732	0.8920	0.9304
	RoBERTa-large	0.9769	0.9795	0.8739	0.9237
Soft Prompt Tuning	BERT-base	0.9767	0.9663	0.8862	0.9240
	RoBERTa-base	0.9783	0.9782	0.8838	0.9285
	RoBERTa-large	0.9776	0.9899	0.8686	0.9253

Table 5. Experimental results of hard prompt learning with BERT-base using the different samples on DuRecDial 2.0 dataset.

Samples	English				Chinese			
	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
0	0.7244	0.0444	0.0353	0.0393	0.2444	0.1583	0.8641	0.2676
30	0.8673	0.7635	0.2455	0.3715	0.8635	0.7900	0.1982	0.3169
300	0.9307	0.8054	0.7461	0.7746	0.9217	0.7761	0.7162	0.7449
3000	0.9638	0.9306	0.8353	0.8804	0.9673	0.9403	0.8491	0.8924
33079 (Full samples)	0.9811	0.9225	0.9623	0.9420	0.9780	0.9353	0.9263	0.9308
30 (balanced)	0.7677	0.3902	0.8078	0.5262	0.7235	0.3323	0.7246	0.4557
300 (balanced)	0.9276	0.7422	0.8377	0.7871	0.8996	0.6532	0.7916	0.7158

tive experiments on the zero-shot prompt evaluation and hard prompt learning methods, utilizing BERT-base as the backbone.

As illustrated in Table 6, there are specific differences in performance between Template 1 (the manual template used in the main experiment) and Template 2 under the zero-shot evaluation setting. However, under the hard prompt learning setting, the metrics of the two manual templates are very close.

Overall, Template 1, used in the main experiment, performed better. However, it is essential to acknowledge that the construction of manual templates can influence experimental results. Furthermore, there is still plenty of room for optimizing the performance of manual template construction in the recommendation identification task.




Fig. 3. Changes of 4 metrics under different sample numbers.

Table 6. Experimental results of hard prompt learning with BERT-base using different manual templates on DuRecDial 2.0 dataset.

Method Type	Template ID	English				Chinese			
		Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
Zero-shot Prompt Evaluation	1	0.7244	0.0444	0.0353	0.0393	0.2444	0.1583	0.8641	0.2676
	2	0.7658	0.0233	0.0114	0.0153	0.4090	0.1516	0.5874	0.2410
Hard Prompt Learning	1	0.9811	0.9225	0.9623	0.9420	0.9780	0.9353	0.9263	0.9308
	2	0.9809	0.9148	0.9707	0.9419	0.9745	0.9705	0.8665	0.9155

Influence of Soft Prompt Length To show the effects of different soft prompt lengths on the P-tuning method, we have conducted a comparative experiment on the DuRecDial 2.0 English dataset with BERT-base as the backbone.

The results of all metrics as soft prompt length varies are presented in Fig. 4. The results of this figure show that the model’s accuracy and F1 scores do not change significantly as the length of the soft prompt changes. This suggests the soft prompt tuning method performs consistently well in the recommendability identification task. It also confirms the beneficial role of fewer training parameters in ensuring experimental stability.

5.5 Discussion and Limitation

This work primarily introduces the recommendability identification task and reveals the potential of leveraging PLMs through experiments. While we have achieved some encouraging results, there are still limitations:

First, constrained by computation resources, our experiments could only cover a limited number of LLMs and conduct prompt evaluation under the zero-shot condition. In the future, further experiments can be conducted with a broader range of LLMs.




Fig. 4. Performance comparison across different soft prompt lengths.

Second, due to the limitations on the encoding length of various PLMs, we did not leverage rich user profiles and context information to design our manual templates. This area is also worth exploring in future research.

Third, JDDCRec, consisting of 17k utterances and 1k conversations obtained through manual annotation, represents our first step in studying recommendability. We hope that JDDCRec can be further explored and expanded, encouraging more researchers to construct larger-scale datasets. Additionally, automated data collection from real-life scenarios is an exciting and meaningful research direction as well.

6 Conclusion

Our work took the first step in recommendability identification in conversations, integrating the fields of conversation and recommender systems. We have achieved encouraging results and showed the potential of incorporating recommendation capabilities into conversation systems. The findings emphasize the importance of minimizing user disruption, particularly regarding recommendation behavior, to enhance the overall user experience.

Further improvements can be made in refining the recommendability identification models and exploring novel techniques. Additionally, it will be crucial to develop real-time dynamic identification mechanisms that adapt to users' changing needs and preferences. By trade-off between providing relevant recommendations and respecting user needs, we can apply conversational search and recommendation systems in more scenarios.

In summary, our work highlights the significance of giving recommendations at the right time in conversations and paves the way for future research in this domain. By considering user needs and minimizing disruptions, we can improve user satisfaction and the overall performance of conversation systems.

Acknowledgement. This work is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. U21B2026, 62372260) and Quan Cheng Laboratory (Grant No. QCLZD202301).

References

1. Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al.: Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020)
2. Castellucci, G., Bellomaria, V., Favalli, A., Romagnoli, R.: Multi-lingual intent detection and slot filling in a joint bert-based model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02884* (2019)
3. Cui, Z., Ma, J., Zhou, C., Zhou, J., Yang, H.: M6-rec: Generative pre-trained language models are open-ended recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08084* (2022)
4. Culpepper, J.S., Diaz, F., Smucker, M.D.: Research frontiers in information retrieval: Report from the third strategic workshop on information retrieval in lorne (swirl 2018). In: *ACM SIGIR Forum*. vol. 52, pp. 34–90. ACM New York, NY, USA (2018)
5. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018)
6. Ding, N., Hu, S., Zhao, W., Chen, Y., Liu, Z., Zheng, H.T., Sun, M.: Openprompt: An open-source framework for prompt-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.01998* (2021)
7. Friedman, L., Ahuja, S., Allen, D., Tan, T., Sidahmed, H., Long, C., Xie, J., Schubiner, G., Patel, A., Lara, H., et al.: Leveraging large language models in conversational recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07961* (2023)
8. Geng, S., Liu, S., Fu, Z., Ge, Y., Zhang, Y.: Recommendation as language processing (rlp): A unified pretrain, personalized prompt & predict paradigm (p5). In: *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. pp. 299–315 (2022)
9. Haffner, P., Tur, G., Wright, J.H.: Optimizing svms for complex call classification. In: *2003 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2003. Proceedings.(ICASSP'03)*. vol. 1, pp. I–I. IEEE (2003)
10. Hashemi, H.B., Asiaee, A., Kraft, R.: Query intent detection using convolutional neural networks. In: *International conference on web search and data mining, workshop on query understanding* (2016)
11. Jia, Q., Li, J., Zhang, Q., He, X., Zhu, J.: Rmbert: News recommendation via recurrent reasoning memory network over bert. In: *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. pp. 1773–1777 (2021)
12. Kim, J.K., Tur, G., Celikyilmaz, A., Cao, B., Wang, Y.Y.: Intent detection using semantically enriched word embeddings. In: *2016 IEEE spoken language technology workshop (SLT)*. pp. 414–419. IEEE (2016)
13. Li, L., Zhang, Y., Chen, L.: Personalized prompt learning for explainable recommendation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* **41**(4), 1–26 (2023)
14. Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H., Neubig, G.: Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(9), 1–35 (2023)

15. Liu, X., Ji, K., Fu, Y., Tam, W.L., Du, Z., Yang, Z., Tang, J.: P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602 (2021)
16. Liu, X., Zheng, Y., Du, Z., Ding, M., Qian, Y., Yang, Z., Tang, J.: Gpt understands, too. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10385 (2021)
17. Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., Levy, O., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V.: Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692 (2019)
18. Liu, Z., Wang, H., Niu, Z.Y., Wu, H., Che, W.: Durecdial 2.0: A bilingual parallel corpus for conversational recommendation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08877 (2021)
19. Mao, K., Dou, Z., Chen, H., Mo, F., Qian, H.: Large language models know your contextual search intent: A prompting framework for conversational search. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06573 (2023)
20. McCallum, A., Nigam, K., et al.: A comparison of event models for naive bayes text classification. In: AAAI-98 workshop on learning for text categorization. vol. 752, pp. 41–48. Madison, WI (1998)
21. Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., Sutskever, I., et al.: Improving language understanding by generative pre-training (2018)
22. Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al.: Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. OpenAI blog **1**(8), 9 (2019)
23. Tran, D.H., Sheng, Q.Z., Zhang, W.E., Hamad, S.A., Zaib, M., Tran, N.H., Yao, L., Khoa, N.L.D.: Deep conversational recommender systems: A new frontier for goal-oriented dialogue systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13245 (2020)
24. Vakulenko, S.: Knowledge-based conversational search. arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06859 (2019)
25. Wang, J., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., Yang, P., Gao, X., Wu, Z., Dong, X., He, J., Zhuo, J., Yang, Q., Huang, Y., Li, X., Wu, Y., Lu, J., Zhu, X., Chen, W., Han, T., Pan, K., Wang, R., Wang, H., Wu, X., Zeng, Z., Chen, C., Gan, R., Zhang, J.: Fengshenbang 1.0: Being the foundation of chinese cognitive intelligence. CoRR **abs/2209.02970** (2022)
26. Wei, J., Bosma, M., Zhao, V.Y., Guu, K., Yu, A.W., Lester, B., Du, N., Dai, A.M., Le, Q.V.: Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652 (2021)
27. Wu, C., Wu, F., Qi, T., Huang, Y.: Empowering news recommendation with pre-trained language models. In: Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. pp. 1652–1656 (2021)
28. Zhang, Q., Li, J., Jia, Q., Wang, C., Zhu, J., Wang, Z., He, X.: Unbert: User-news matching bert for news recommendation. In: IJCAI. pp. 3356–3362 (2021)
29. Zhang, Y., Ding, H., Shui, Z., Ma, Y., Zou, J., Deoras, A., Wang, H.: Language models as recommender systems: Evaluations and limitations (2021)
30. Zhao, N., Li, H., Wu, Y., He, X.: Jddc 2.1: A multimodal chinese dialogue dataset with joint tasks of query rewriting, response generation, discourse parsing, and summarization. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 12037–12051 (2022)
31. Zhou, K., Wang, X., Zhou, Y., Shang, C., Cheng, Y., Zhao, W.X., Li, Y., Wen, J.R.: Crslab: An open-source toolkit for building conversational recommender system. arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00939 (2021)
32. Zhou, K., Zhou, Y., Zhao, W.X., Wang, X., Wen, J.R.: Towards topic-guided conversational recommender system. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04125 (2020)