

Personalized LLM for Generating Customized Responses to the Same Query from Different Users

Hang Zeng¹, Chaoyue Niu^{1*}, Fan Wu¹,
Chengfei Lv², Guihai Chen¹


¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University, ²Alibaba Group
{nidhogg, rvince}@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract


Existing work on large language model (LLM) personalization assigned different responding roles to LLM, but overlooked the diversity of questioners. In this work, we propose a new form of questioner-aware LLM personalization, generating different responses even for the same query from different questioners. We design a dual-tower model architecture with a cross-questioner general encoder and a questioner-specific encoder. We further apply contrastive learning with multi-view augmentation, pulling close the dialogue representations of the same questioner, while pulling apart those of different questioners. To mitigate the impact of question diversity on questioner-contrastive learning, we cluster the dialogues based on question similarity and restrict the scope of contrastive learning within each cluster. We also build a multi-questioner dataset from English and Chinese scripts and WeChat records, called MQDialog, containing 173 questioners and 12 responders. Extensive evaluation with different metrics shows a significant improvement in the quality of personalized response generation.¹

1 Introduction

Generative LLM has revolutionized and streamlined how users interact with artificial intelligence. When users pose questions, LLM understands, interprets, and generates responses with unprecedented depth and contextual nuance. To offer diverse interaction styles, existing work assigned roles with domain-specific knowledge to LLM (Zhang et al., 2018; Shao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). As shown in Figure 1a, when a user greets with “Hello”, LLM in the role of a helpful assistant might reply “What can I help you?”, while LLM



(a) Responder in Different Roles



(b) Questioner-Aware Responder

Figure 1: LLM personalization from responder-side diversity in existing work and from questioner-side diversity in this work.

with a different role of a good friend could respond more casually with “Hey! How’s it going?”.

Parallel to existing work on responder-side diversity, we study a new form of questioner-aware personalization, where LLM adapts to a diverse range of users who pose questions. The desired effect is that even for the same query from different users, LLM will generate customized responses that are tailored to each questioner’s unique personality, the mutual relationship between the questioner and responder, and the conversational context. In the intricate tapestry of human communication, our conversational stance, linguistic choices, and emotional inflections are profoundly shaped by the specific person with whom we are engaging. The concept of questioner-awareness responding can also be traced back to the sentiment expressed by Baojia Li in the novel *The Appearance of Officialdom* (Qing Dynasty), which states: “When you meet a person, speak to them as a person; when you meet a ghost, speak to it as a ghost; when you’re among officials, speak the language of officialdom; and when you’re among businessmen, speak the language of the business world”.

*C. Niu is the corresponding author (rvince@sjtu.edu.cn).

¹Code are public at <https://github.com/Nidryen-zh/QuestionerAwareResponder>.

Questioner-aware LLM personalization is important in practical applications. Consider an intelligent assistant for answering the question about genetic sequencing, as shown in Figure 1b. To a bioinformatician, the response requires sophisticated technical vocabulary, advanced methodological details, and domain-specific references. In contrast, when a high school student poses the same query, it requires a carefully crafted narrative that simplifies complex concepts, employs accessible analogies, and progressively builds foundational understanding. By adapting to the knowledge levels of questioners, LLM can enhance information comprehension and absorption. Also, consider the reporting of an issue in LLM-based automatic operations and maintenance. To engineers, the response should emphasize technical details and necessary actions, using a solution-oriented and jargon-rich tone. To external customers, the response should prioritize reassurance and transparency regarding service quality, adopting an empathetic and customer-centric tone. By fostering questioner-awareness, LLM can more effectively address specific information needs.

To achieve questioner-aware responses, trivially prompting LLM with the questioner’s profile or a few historical dialogues does not fully leverage the potential of interaction history and cannot deeply represent users into LLM for personalization. Additionally, tuning a questioner-specific LLM for each user over their conversation history is costly, unsustainable for large user bases, and fails to exploit all the users’ interactions for learning.

In this work, we consider questioner-aware LLM personalization that incorporates each questioner’s personality and their relationships with a responder by exploiting all the dialogues between questioners and the responder. The proposed model architecture comprises a cross-questioner general encoder initialized by a pretrained LLM and a questioner-specific encoder characterized by a low-rank intrinsic property. To differentiate between the representations of various questioners, we introduce a questioner-contrastive loss to guide model training. In particular, we group dialogues containing similar questions from different questioners into clusters, and then construct positive and negative pairs within each cluster for contrastive learning. We further propose a multi-view augmentation strategy to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of contrastive learning. Considering existing datasets cannot meet questioner-aware evaluation requirements,

we build a multi-questioner dialogue dataset (MQ-Dialog) by extracting and cleaning the dialogues between different questioners and a certain responder. The source data include English and Chinese scripts as well as real-world WeChat records.

We summarize the key contributions as follows:

- We study a new form of LLM personalization with questioner-aware response generation and construct a MQDialog dataset for benchmark testing purpose.
- We design a dual-tower model architecture, a questioner-contrastive loss function with multi-view augmentation, and a question similarity-based dialogue clustering strategy for restricting contrastive learning scope.
- Evaluation results reveal that our design achieves at least a 5.2% relative improvement in BLEU and ROUGE metrics, as well as GPT-4 judgment winning rate, compared with zero-shot generation, finetuning, role profile prompting, and few-shot prompting.

2 Related Work

Role-playing LLM simulates assigned roles to generate personalized content (Chen et al., 2024). One line of work focused on maintaining role consistency in generated responses (Fu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2023), by finetuning LLM on carefully crafted role profiles and instructions (Shao et al., 2023; Song et al., 2019), or by using retrieval augmentation methods (Huang et al., 2023; Sadeq et al., 2024). Another line emphasized personalized tone and linguistic features of roles, using finetuning or reinforcement learning on dialogue datasets (Zhou et al., 2023), integrating role profiles (Chen et al., 2023), or incorporating background stories into the input (Li et al., 2023). From a broader perspective, personalized text generation (Wu et al., 2021) can also be viewed as a specific instance of role-play. Existing work on personalized review generation (Gao et al., 2023; Mazaré et al., 2018) enabled LLM to emulate as reviewers through embedding responder-specific personality, producing various comments. However, these works studied the personality of the role assigned, without modeling personalized responses to the diversity of questioners.

The concept related to questioner-awareness is user behaviors-based generation, typically, in chatbots (Ma et al., 2021) and recommendation engines

(Wu et al., 2024). These work treated users independently (Salemi et al., 2024), providing tailored responses either by prompting (Li et al., 2024) or tuning separate models for each user (Tan et al., 2024). Consequently, they failed to integrate diverse personalities of multiple users into one unified model and did not leverage the rich interactions between different users and the responder.

In the field of representation learning, representation alignment ensures consistency across different perspectives of the data, while representation differentiation focuses on extracting the unique traits of each sample. One prominent method for achieving representation alignment is multi-view learning (Li et al., 2019). Existing work leveraged the correlation between different views (Hotelling, 1992; Andrew et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015) and the distance (Frome et al., 2013) between samples to integrate information across diverse views. View reconstruction (Zhang et al., 2020) and view augmentation (Federici et al., 2020) are also helpful in enhancing alignment. On the other hand, contrastive learning is a key method for representation differentiation, focusing on maximizing the similarity between positive pairs and minimizing it for negative pairs (Weinberger et al., 2005; van den Oord et al., 2018; Hjelm et al., 2019). Some work extended contrastive learning to multiple views (Bachman et al., 2019; Tian et al., 2020), pulling features of views from the same sample closer while pushing apart features from different samples.

3 Problem Formulation

3.1 Questioner-Aware Response Generation

We let $\mathbb{Q} = \{Q^1, Q^2, \dots, Q^m\}$ denote m different questioners and refer to LLM as the responder R . For each questioner Q^i , we let $\mathcal{D}^i = \{d_1^i, d_2^i, \dots, d_{n_i}^i\}$ denote a collection of n_i dialogues with R . Each dialogue $d_k^i = (x_k^i, y_k^i)$ consists of x_k^i , the historical context, typically including multiple rounds of previous interactions and the latest query, and y_k^i , the corresponding ground-truth response. Questioner-aware response generation desires that for any two different questioners $Q^i \neq Q^j$, given the same historical context $x_k^i = x_l^j$, the distributions of generated responses differ, formalized as

$$P(y_k^i | x_k^i; Q^i; \Theta) \neq P(y_l^j | x_l^j; Q^j; \Theta), \quad (1)$$

where Θ denotes the parameters of LLM. The optimization objective of personalized LLM is still to

maximize the overall likelihood across all questioners and dialogues, formalized as

$$\Theta = \arg \max_{\Theta} \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{k=1}^{n_i} P(y_k^i | x_k^i; Q^i; \Theta). \quad (2)$$

3.2 Trivial Methods and Our Consideration

One straightforward way to enable LLM to distinguish between different questioners \mathbb{Q} is to add questioner-specific information, such as user profile, into the prompt. Providing a few historical dialogues associated with a specific questioner can further serve as examples for few-shot prompting or in-context learning. However, the key problem is not fully exploiting all the dialogues to deeply and comprehensively encode each individual questioner’s features into LLM. Moreover, it is costly to build fine-grained profiles for a large number of users in practice. Meanwhile, static user profiles and fixed prompting examples cannot adapt effectively to varying conversational contexts.

To integrate questioner-specific response capability into LLM, a trivial method is to train a personalized LLM for each individual questioner Q^i , based on the historical dialogues between Q^i and R . When serving Q^i , the corresponding personalized LLM is invoked to generate responses. The key problem is that the rich dialogues with other questioners $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{Q^i\}$ are not exploited to capture the general personality of R that is inherently embedded in the dialogues with all questioners \mathbb{Q} , and the potential benefit of contrastive learning against other questioners is also neglected. Furthermore, for a large user base, training personalized models and maintaining them for real-time serving incurs unaffordable offline and online overhead.

For the above concerns, we consider the new problem of how to effectively and efficiently exploit the dialogues with all the questioners to integrate the personalized ability of questioner-aware response generation in a single, unified model, intuitively, personalized one-for-all LLM.

4 Design

The overall insight of our key design is to divide the personality in dialogue into two components: a general personality that represents the responder’s cross-questioner characteristics, and a questioner-specific personality that captures the unique characteristics of individual questioners and their relationships with the responder. We introduce the design

from sample construction, model architecture, and loss function. In particular, we first propose to cluster dialogues based on the semantic similarity of questions, mitigating the impact of question diversity on contrastive learning across different questioners. We then design a dual-tower architecture with a general encoder and a low-rank specific encoder. We finally perform contrastive learning with multi-view augmentation in each cluster, aligning representations for the same questioner while differentiating those of different questioners.

4.1 Question Similarity Based Dialogue Clustering

An ideal way for sample construction is to let different users ask the same question and collect corresponding responses for better questioner-contrastive learning while minimizing the impact of question diversity. However, the real-world dataset with such samples does not exist in practice. To deal with this problem, we relax the strict requirement of the same question $x_k^i = x_l^j$ from Q^i and Q^j in equation 1, allowing instead for similar questions $x_k^i \approx x_l^j$. Thus, given an existing dialogue dataset, we cluster similar questions rather than requiring exact matches and then perform personalized LLM learning within these clusters. In particular, for each dialogue d_k^i between Q^i and R , the historical context x_k^i contains tokens not only from Q^i but also from R . We filter out the tokens from R and keep only the tokens from Q^i , thus forming a questioner-oriented context q_k^i . By inputting q_k^i into a text embedding model (e.g., OpenAI’s text-embedding-ada-002 in this work), we can obtain its semantic vector. We further apply k-means clustering to group similar dialogues using the cosine distance between semantic vectors as the similarity measure. By clustering dialogues based on question similarity, we can distinguish between dialogues from different questioners to facilitate questioner-specific representation. This approach also prevents the issue of naively forcing all dialogues even with different questions from one questioner to have similar representations, which is essential for effectively learning distinct response patterns for different questioners.

4.2 Dual-Tower Model Architecture

To disentangle cross-questioner general representation from questioner-specific representation, we propose a dual-tower model architecture, as illustrated in Figure 2. The first “tower” is the general




Figure 2: Dual-tower model architecture.

encoder with multiple transformer blocks, denoted as G_g , which can be initialized using a pretrained LLM. The second “tower” is the specific encoder with multiple adapted transformer blocks, denoted as G_s . A key adaptation lies in the dense feed-forward layer after multi-head attention, which is decomposed into two low-rank matrices. The design insight is that questioner-specific representations are intrinsically sparser compared to cross-questioner general representations, making low-rank matrices sufficient. In addition to effectiveness, the low-rank design also makes the learning process parameter-efficient. Two representations after the general encoder and the specific encoder are further fused using element-wise addition and then passed through the language model header to predict the next token.

The training of G_g is guided by the language modeling loss (Peters et al., 2018), while the training of G_s is guided by both the language modeling loss and the questioner-contrastive loss with multi-view augmentation defined in equation 6. Additionally, contrastive learning is conducted among each cluster of dialogues containing similar questions from different questioners.

4.3 Questioner-Contrastive Loss

The goal of a questioner-contrastive loss function is to pull close the representations of dialogues from the same questioner, while pushing apart the representations of dialogues from different questioners. For a dialogue d_k^i from Q^i input into G_s , the output representation vector $G_s(x_k^i)$ is projected by a learnable matrix W to a low-dimensional space (Li et al., 2021) for contrastive learning, denoted as

$$z_k^i = W \cdot G_s(x_k^i). \quad (3)$$

For each questioner $Q^i \in \mathbb{Q}$, a global low-dimensional representation e^i is maintained by av-




Figure 3: Questioner-contrastive loss in each cluster of dialogues with similar questions.

eraging the representations of all Q^i 's previous dialogues during the training process. Then, (z_k^i, e^i) both from Q^i constitute a positive pair, and (z_k^i, e^j) from Q^i and Q^j constitute a negative pair, where e^j denotes global representation of Q^j . We further introduce a metric $f(\cdot)$ to measure the distance between representations in each pair with a temperature hyperparameter τ , formalized as

$$f(z_k^i, e^i) = \exp\left(\frac{z_k^i \cdot e^i}{\|z_k^i\| \cdot \|e^i\|} \cdot \frac{1}{\tau}\right), \quad (4)$$

which is proportional to the cosine distance between normalized z_k^i and e^i . We finally define the questioner-contrastive loss as

$$L_{QC} = -\log \frac{f(z_k^i, e^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^m f(z_k^i, e^j)}, \quad (5)$$

where all m questioners are introduced for contrast. In fact, the questioner-contrastive loss can also be interpreted as a categorical loss that differentiates the dialogue features corresponding to different questioners. Minimizing this loss is to maximize the mutual information between the current dialogue representation and the corresponding questioner's global representation. Please refer to Appendix A for detailed reasoning.

4.4 Multi-View Loss Augmentation

We adopt the manual view augmentation technique (Chen et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021; Federici et al., 2020) to enhance questioner-contrastive learning. In particular, we generate multiple views for each dialogue by applying different projection matrices. We let W_{v_1} and W_{v_2} denote the projection matrices for generating two views. Then, each dialogue d_k^i has two-view representation vectors, denoted as z_{k,v_1}^i and z_{k,v_2}^i . Similarly, each questioner Q_i also

maintains two-view global representations, denoted as $e_{v_1}^i$ and $e_{v_2}^i$. The questioner-contrastive loss with two-view augmentation becomes

$$L_{QC}^+ = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\log \frac{f(z_{k,v_1}^i, e_{v_2}^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^m f(z_{k,v_1}^i, e_{v_2}^j)} + \log \frac{f(z_{k,v_2}^i, e_{v_1}^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^m f(z_{k,v_2}^i, e_{v_1}^j)} \right), \quad (6)$$

which contrasts the current dialogue representation with the global representation of the same questioner across different views.

5 Multi-Questioner Dialogue (MQDialog) Dataset and Evaluation Metric

5.1 Existing Datasets

For questioner-aware response evaluation, the desired dataset should include the dialogues between multiple questioners and one responder, where the responses should reflect the unique personality of each questioner. Real-life private conversations from messaging and social media applications, such as WhatsApp, Messenger, WeChat, Snapchat, and Line, naturally exhibit these characteristics. However, due to privacy concerns, no public real-life conversation dataset is available. Other datasets either lack clear differentiation between questioners (e.g., role-play datasets (Shao et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023) that feature one user player interacting with independent characters and ShareGPT dataset with anonymous, non-identifiable questioners (ShareGPT, 2023)) or contain too few dialogues between each pair of questioner and responder (e.g., (Tu et al., 2024)).

We build a new multi-questioner dialogue dataset, called MQDialog, sourced from English and Chinese scripts as well as real-world WeChat conversations. In what follows, we introduce data sources, data processing method, dataset statistics, and evaluation metrics.²

5.2 Data Sources

We take a diverse set of source corpora, including 3 English scripts, 2 Chinese scripts, and 1 person's WeChat records. We select 12 leading actors as responders based on the volume of dialogue they contribute, including Sheldon Cooper and Leonard Hofstadter from *The Big Bang Theory*,

²MQDialog dataset are publicly accessible at https://huggingface.co/datasets/Nidhogg-zh/Multi-Questioner_Dialogue.

Language	Data Source	# Questioners	Responder	# train	# test
English	The Big Bang Theory	14	Sheldon	4805	1101
		12	Leonard	4607	1014
	Friends	12	Rachel	3768	870
		20	Ross	3839	960
	Modern Family	9	Claire	1161	281
		8	Phil	881	246
Chinese	My Own Swordsman	16	Tong Xiangyu	3200	831
		16	Bai Zhantang	2995	857
		8	Lv Xiucui	1635	409
	Empresses in the Palace	17	Zhen Huan	1229	350
		11	Emperor	704	200
	WeChat Records	30	Author	16302	3887

Table 1: MQDialog dataset statistics.

Rachel Green and Ross Geller from *Friends*, Claire and Phil Dunphy from *Modern Family*, Tong Xiangyu, Bai Zhantang, and Lv Xiucui from *My Own Swordsman*, Zhen Huan and the Emperor from *Empresses in the Palace*, and one *WeChat* user who is the author of the work. For each leading actor or the *WeChat* user as the responder, the other supporting actors or the *WeChat* user’s contacts interacting with them are treated as distinct questioners. We filter out the questioners who have fewer than 20 dialogues with the responder.

5.3 Dialogue Extraction and Cleaning

For scripts, raw data consists of multi-person conversations, and we extract the dialogues between each questioner-responder pair of a supporting actor and a leading actor. We retain the interactions within an episode as a multi-turn conversation. For each multi-turn conversation, we remove any content preceding the supporting actor’s first line, ensuring that the supporting actor strictly functions as the questioner, while the leading actor serves as the responder. Additionally, to improve data quality, we eliminate errors commonly found in the original scripts sourced from the internet, such as repeated conversations or blank entries. For *WeChat* records, we focus on two-person dialogues and exclude group chats. A new dialogue begins when the current message is sent after a predefined interval (e.g., empirically set to 3 hours in this work) following the previous message, signifying the start of a multi-turn conversation.

5.4 Dataset Statistics and Splitting

The MQDialog dataset has 173 questioners and 12 responders in total. We randomly split the dialogues into training sets and test sets. On average, each responder has 3761 dialogues for training and 917 dialogues for testing. More detailed statistics are shown in Table 1 and Table 5.

5.5 Evaluation Methods and Metrics

To evaluate the quality of response generation, we adopt two kinds of automatic evaluation methods. (1) The first method is comparing generated responses with ground-truth references by quantitatively measuring their lexical and semantic similarity. We take widely used metrics, including BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE variants (Lin, 2004) (i.e., ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L). (2) The second method is to compare the responses generated by the proposed design and the baseline using a powerful LLM (e.g., GPT-4-turbo-2024-04-09³ in this work), which is popular in recent work (Gilardi et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023). We record the winning rate as the evaluation metric. In particular, we prompt LLM to judge which of the two responses is more like the words the responder would speak to a specific questioner, ensuring a closer alignment with the responder’s personality. During testing, we randomly sample 5 dialogues between the pair of the questioner and the responder from the training set as few-shot examples for prompting the LLM evaluator. We reserve the detailed prompts in Appendix D.

6 Evaluation

6.1 Experimental Setups

Pretrained Models. We take the chat version of different pretrained LLMs. We use Llama3-8B-Instruction for datasets in English and Qwen1.5-7B-Chat for datasets in Chinese. All the pretrained checkpoints are loaded from huggingface⁴.

Baselines. We introduce the following baselines for comparison: (1) **Zero-shot generation**, which directly answers the query with the pretrained LLM; (2) **Finetuning (FT)**, which tunes the pretrained LLM over the whole training set with the mixed dialogues between the responder and different questioners; (3) **Role profile-based generation (RPG)** (Chen et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024), which concatenates the manually constructed role profile of the responder and the query together as LLM input; and (4) **Few-shot prompting generation** (Brown et al., 2020), which retrieves five dialogues from the training set as examples and concatenates them with the current query based on a template as LLM input.

³<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4/>

⁴<https://huggingface.co>

Responder	BLEU			ROUGE-1			ROUGE-2			ROUGE-L		
	Zero-shot	FT	Ours	Zero-shot	FT	Ours	Zero-shot	FT	Ours	Zero-shot	FT	Ours
Sheldon	3.9797	6.5735	7.1614	6.1781	6.6702	7.5167	0.4702	0.9782	0.9963	7.2071	6.6744	7.4033
Leonard	2.5615	5.9819	6.1396	4.3820	7.7222	8.2565	0.3729	1.4968	1.7124	5.4891	7.6489	8.2118
Rachel	2.9235	6.5236	6.6896	4.6938	6.4507	7.1204	0.3519	1.0676	1.1620	5.5534	6.4801	7.1785
Ross	3.1068	5.8860	6.3427	4.8847	6.2950	7.0198	0.4064	1.0698	1.0753	5.8019	6.3311	7.0631
Claire	2.5573	5.5085	5.7579	4.3031	5.0970	6.0438	0.2846	0.7619	0.8282	5.2116	5.6657	6.1565
Phil	2.7447	4.8807	5.7088	4.9144	5.6815	5.7513	0.4406	0.8520	0.9852	6.1379	6.2191	7.2409
Avg.	2.9789	5.8924	6.3000	4.8927	6.3194	6.9514	0.3878	1.0377	1.1266	5.9002	6.5032	7.2090
Tong Xiangyu	3.3461	8.8936	9.4152	10.8013	14.8161	16.0344	1.3985	3.0028	3.2017	10.2609	14.5403	15.5033
Bai Zhantang	3.4277	9.0297	9.8695	10.9927	16.0032	17.2560	1.7875	3.6810	4.1399	10.5688	14.7769	15.8390
Lv Xiucui	3.2751	7.8505	9.1866	10.1551	13.8980	14.6503	1.2331	3.3971	3.9831	10.2536	13.9918	14.8151
Zhen Huan	4.3413	9.0201	10.0170	14.5787	21.4767	22.5703	3.0340	6.3267	6.7392	12.8749	18.9461	20.1831
Emperor	4.1695	10.7383	10.7792	13.1406	18.1443	18.7504	1.6471	3.9739	4.4008	11.5753	16.4289	17.4351
Real Person	5.8995	8.1937	9.9579	11.5782	17.7877	18.1972	4.2777	10.8688	11.0217	11.8683	18.6527	19.1615
Avg.	4.0765	8.9543	9.8709	11.8744	17.0210	17.9098	2.2297	5.2084	5.5811	11.2336	16.2228	17.1562

Table 2: Our design vs. Baselines of zero-shot generation and finetuning from BLEU and ROUGE (%) metrics.

To validate the effectiveness of questioner-contrastive loss and clustering strategy, we further introduce the following variants of our design: (5) **Questioner-aware responder without questioner-contrastive loss (w/o QCL)**, which uses additional parameters for encoding specific personality without the supervision of questioner-contrastive loss; and (6) **Questioner-aware responder without cluster-based contrastive learning (w/o CCL)**, which performs contrastive learning over all the dialogues without clustering strategy rather than each cluster with similar questions.

Implementation Details. We implement our design and all the baselines in PyTorch. The workstation has 8 NVIDIA V100 32G GPUs. To improve training efficiency, we integrate LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) into our process. Additionally, we also share parameters between the attention layers of the transformer blocks in the general encoder and the corresponding layers in the specific encoder. The parameters of Qwen and Llama are quantized to FP16 during training. More training settings are listed in Appendix C.

6.2 Main Results

6.2.1 From BLEU and ROUGE Metrics

We first report the comparison results of our design with zero-shot generation and FT in Table 2. We can observe that, on average across all the responders, the relative improvements over zero-shot generation are 111%, 42%, 190%, and 22% for BLEU, ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L, respectively, on the English dataset; and 142%, 50%, 150%, and 52% on the Chinese dataset. We can also see that the average relative improvements over FT are 6.9%, 10.0%, 8.6%, and 10.9% for

Responder	Method		
	RPG	Few-shot	Ours
Sheldon	6.8179	7.0864	7.4033
Leonard	4.7510	5.3372	8.2118
Rachel	5.0773	5.1813	7.1785
Ross	5.3017	5.3287	7.0631
Claire	4.8250	5.2077	6.1565
Phil	4.6629	5.0749	7.2409
Avg.	5.2393	5.5360	7.2090
Tong Xiangyu	9.8987	9.5217	15.5033
Bai Zhantang	9.7413	8.8194	15.8390
Lv Xiucui	9.5392	6.3736	14.8151
Zhen Huan	13.0081	16.8380	20.1831
Emperor	11.5380	14.6267	17.4351
Real Person	-	13.3141	19.1615
Avg.	10.7451	11.5823	17.1562


Table 3: Our design vs. Baselines of role profile-based generation and few-shot prompting generation from ROUGE-L (%). Results from all metrics are in Table 7.

BLEU, ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L, respectively, on the English dataset; and 10.2%, 5.2%, 7.2%, and 5.8% on the Chinese dataset. The significant improvements highlight the importance of considering the questioner’s perspective to enhance the quality of generated responses.


We then compare our design with RPG and few-shot generation and show the results in Table 3. We can observe that, compared with RPG, the average ROUGE-L improvements are 38% and 60% on the English and Chinese datasets, respectively; and compared with few-shot generation, the average ROUGE-L improvements are 30% and 48%. These results highlight the importance of incorporating comprehensive interactions between multiple questioners and the responder into LLM.

6.2.2 From Winning Rate Judged by GPT-4

The winning rates for our design in comparison to zero-shot generation and FT are shown in Fig-



(a) Ours vs. Zero-Shot Generation



(b) Ours vs. Finetuning

Figure 4: The winning rate judged by GPT-4.

Responder	w/o QCL	w/o CCL	Ours
Sheldon	7.0385	7.1397	7.4033
Leonard	7.3811	7.7838	8.2118
Rachel	6.8740	6.9600	7.1785
Ross	6.5765	6.6159	7.0631
Claire	5.5315	6.0754	6.1565
Phil	5.9688	6.8943	7.2409
Avg.	6.5617	6.9115	7.2090
Tong Xiangyu	15.1094	14.8118	15.5033
Bai Zhantang	15.1317	15.2266	15.8390
Lv Xiucui	14.4334	14.2958	14.8151
Zhen Huan	19.7887	19.6287	20.1831
Emperor	17.0687	17.2169	17.4351
Real Person	18.8708	19.0264	19.1615
Avg.	16.7338	16.7010	17.1562

Table 4: Ablation of questioner-contrastive loss or question similarity-based clustering from ROUGE-L (%).

ure 4. The results are consistent with the findings from the BLEU and ROUGE metrics. In particular, compared with zero-shot generation, our design achieves winning rates ranging from 54% to 67% on the English dataset, and from 66% to 82% on the Chinese dataset. Against FT, the winning rates range from 59% to 72% on the English dataset, and from 62% to 73% on the Chinese dataset.

6.3 Ablation Study

From Table 4, we can see that, introducing questioner-contrastive loss results in average improvements of 9.9% on the English dataset and 2.5% on the Chinese dataset, demonstrating its role in helping the specific encoder extract personalized representations for different questioners. Additionally, introducing the question similarity-based clustering strategy yields average improvements of 4.3% on the English datasets and 2.7% on




Figure 5: English dialogue representations of different questioners interacting with Sheldon.




Figure 6: Chinese dialogue representations of different questioners interacting with Tong Xiangyu.


the Chinese datasets, revealing its effectiveness in maintaining semantic understanding by focusing contrastive learning within clusters.

6.4 Visualization


To visualize how our design distinguishes between different questioners, we extract the output of the final layer of our specific encoder for samples from one cluster and plot them using t-SNE (Van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008). We introduce FT for comparison. Figure 5 shows the representation distribution of Sheldon-oriented dialogues from *The Big Bang Theory*; and Figure 6 shows the representation distribution of Tong Xiangyu-oriented dialogues dataset from *My Own Swordsman*. We can find that, with FT, the representations of dialogues from different questioners are intermixed together. In contrast, our design effectively groups the representations of dialogues from the same questioner together, distinguishing them from those of different questioners. For our design, a small portion of representations from different questioners cluster together, which may be caused by dimension reduction of original high-dimensional features.

6.5 Case Study

To take a closer look at the difference between FT and our design, we present several cases in Figure 7. We ask the same question with different questioners and compare the responses. In par-



(a) Case 1: Same query asked by Leonard and Amy and answered by Sheldon.



(b) Case 2: Same query asked by Bai Zhantang and Bai Sanniang and answered by Tong Xiangyu

Figure 7: Case study with Sheldon from *The Big Bang Theory* and Tong Xiangyu from *My Own Swordsman*.

ticular, in case from *The Big Bang Theory*, our design demonstrates an understanding of the relationship between the questioner and the responder. For Leonard, who is a friend, our design asks him to wait for a moment, while for Amy, who is a romantic partner, our design expresses a sense of missing her. In case from *My Own Swordsman*, our design accurately identifies of Bai Zhantang in its response and offers to invite another questioner home. These cases demonstrate that FT tends to produce similar responses for the same query regardless of the questioner. In contrast, our design generates distinct responses by recognizing the questioner’s identity and the relationship between the questioner and the responder. Additional cases, including multi-round interactions, are presented in Figures 8 and 9.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we have studied the new problem of questioner-aware LLM personalization. We have designed a dual-tower model architecture that decouples responder’s general personality from questioner-specific personality. We also have introduced a questioner-contrastive loss with multi-view augmentation, along with a question similarity-based dialogue clustering strategy for effectively and efficiently differentiating questioner-specific representation. We finally have built the MQDialog dataset and extensively evaluated our design, demonstrating the superiority over several baselines and the necessity of key design modules.

Limitations

We construct the dataset and train questioner-aware LLM using dialogues between the responder and different questioners. However, non-dialogue contents from the original scripts, such as scene descriptions and character actions, have been filtered out. Incorporating additional contextual information is an interesting direction for future research.

Ethical Statement

This work explores a new form of question-aware LLM personalization. The design, implementation, and application of the Questioner-Aware Responder, along with the proposed MQDialog dataset are guided by ethical principles for responsible AI deployment. (1) Dataset Construction: All data used in this study are either publicly available or anonymized, ensuring that no personally identifiable information (PII) is collected. Source scripts are legally obtained from the Internet. Additionally, chat records are sourced from an author’s personal chat history and undergo thorough desensitization and privacy protection processes to safeguard sensitive information. (2) Fair Usage: The primary objective of questioner-aware personalized LLMs is to deliver a more realistic and engaging user experience while prompting the harmonious development of AI system. We believe that applying our design and our dataset responsibly aligns with established ethical guidelines.

References

- Galen Andrew, Raman Arora, Jeff A. Bilmes, and Karen Livescu. 2013. [Deep canonical correlation analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2013, Atlanta, GA, USA, 16-21 June 2013*, volume 28 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 1247–1255. JMLR.org.
- Philip Bachman, R. Devon Hjelm, and William Buchwalter. 2019. [Learning representations by maximizing mutual information across views](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 15509–15519.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Jiangjie Chen, Xintao Wang, Rui Xu, Siyu Yuan, Yikai Zhang, Wei Shi, Jian Xie, Shuang Li, Ruihan Yang, Tinghui Zhu, Aili Chen, Nianqi Li, Lida Chen, Caiyu Hu, Siye Wu, Scott Ren, Ziquan Fu, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. [From persona to personalization: A survey on role-playing language agents](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.18231.
- Nuo Chen, Yan Wang, Haiyun Jiang, Deng Cai, Yuhan Li, Ziyang Chen, Longyue Wang, and Jia Li. 2023. [Large language models meet harry potter: A dataset for aligning dialogue agents with characters](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8506–8520, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2020. [A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR.
- Marco Federici, Anjan Dutta, Patrick Forré, Nate Kushman, and Zeynep Akata. 2020. [Learning robust representations via multi-view information bottleneck](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- Andrea Frome, Gregory S. Corrado, Jonathon Shlens, Samy Bengio, Jeffrey Dean, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Tomas Mikolov. 2013. [Devise: A deep visual-semantic embedding model](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26: 27th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2013. Proceedings of a meeting held December 5-8, 2013, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States*, pages 2121–2129.
- Tingchen Fu, Xueliang Zhao, Chongyang Tao, Ji-Rong Wen, and Rui Yan. 2022. [There are a thousand hamlets in a thousand people’s eyes: Enhancing knowledge-grounded dialogue with personal memory](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pages 3901–3913. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jingsheng Gao, Yixin Lian, Ziyi Zhou, Yuzhuo Fu, and Baoyuan Wang. 2023. [Livechat: A large-scale personalized dialogue dataset automatically constructed from live streaming](#). 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 15387–15405. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fabrizio Gilardi, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. 2023. [Chatgpt outperforms crowd-workers for text-annotation tasks](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.15056.
- R. Devon Hjelm, Alex Fedorov, Samuel Lavoie-Marchildon, Karan Grewal, Philip Bachman, Adam Trischler, and Yoshua Bengio. 2019. [Learning deep representations by mutual information estimation and maximization](#). In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Harold Hotelling. 1992. Relations between two sets of variates. In *Breakthroughs in statistics: methodology and distribution*, pages 162–190. Springer.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Qiushi Huang, Shuai Fu, Xubo Liu, Wenwu Wang, Tom Ko, Yu Zhang, and Lilian Tang. 2023. [Learning retrieval augmentation for personalized dialogue generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 2523–2540. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cheng Li, Ziang Leng, Chenxi Yan, Junyi Shen, Hao Wang, Weishi Mi, Yaying Fei, Xiaoyang Feng, Song Yan, HaoSheng Wang, Linkang Zhan, Yaokai Jia, Pingyu Wu, and Haozhen Sun. 2023. [Chatharuhi:](#)

- Reviving anime character in reality via large language model. *CoRR*, abs/2308.09597.
- Hao Li, Chenghao Yang, An Zhang, Yang Deng, Xiang Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024. **Hello again! IIm-powered personalized agent for long-term dialogue.** *CoRR*, abs/2406.05925.
- Junnan Li, Ramprasaath R. Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq R. Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu-Hong Hoi. 2021. **Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation.** In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 9694–9705.
- Yingming Li, Ming Yang, and Zhongfei Zhang. 2019. **A survey of multi-view representation learning.** *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 31(10):1863–1883.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. **ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries.** In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. **G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment.** In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 2511–2522. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhengyi Ma, Zhicheng Dou, Yutao Zhu, Hanxun Zhong, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. **One chatbot per person: Creating personalized chatbots based on implicit user profiles.** In *SIGIR '21: The 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Virtual Event, Canada, July 11-15, 2021*, pages 555–564. ACM.
- Pierre-Emmanuel Mazaré, Samuel Humeau, Martin Raision, and Antoine Bordes. 2018. **Training millions of personalized dialogue agents.** In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 2775–2779. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. **Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation.** In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, July 6-12, 2002, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 311–318. ACL.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. **Deep contextualized word representations.** In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 2227–2237. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nafis Sadeq, Zhouhang Xie, Byungkyu Kang, Prarit Lamba, Xiang Gao, and Julian J. McAuley. 2024. **Mitigating hallucination in fictional character role-play.** *CoRR*, abs/2406.17260.
- Alireza Salemi, Sheshera Mysore, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. **Lamp: When large language models meet personalization.** In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 7370–7392. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yunfan Shao, Linyang Li, Junqi Dai, and Xipeng Qiu. 2023. **Character-IIm: A trainable agent for role-playing.** In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 13153–13187. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- ShareGPT. 2023. Sharegpt dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/shareAI/ShareGPT-Chinese-English-90k>.
- Tianhao Shen, Sun Li, and Deyi Xiong. 2023. **Roleeval: A bilingual role evaluation benchmark for large language models.** *CoRR*, abs/2312.16132.
- Haoyu Song, Weinan Zhang, Yiming Cui, Dong Wang, and Ting Liu. 2019. **Exploiting persona information for diverse generation of conversational responses.** In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 5190–5196. ijcai.org.
- Zhaoxuan Tan, Qingkai Zeng, Yijun Tian, Zheyuan Liu, Bing Yin, and Meng Jiang. 2024. **Democratizing large language models via personalized parameter-efficient fine-tuning.** In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2024, Miami, FL, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 6476–6491. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yonglong Tian, Dilip Krishnan, and Phillip Isola. 2020. **Contrastive multiview coding.** In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2020 - 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XI*, volume 12356 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 776–794. Springer.
- Quan Tu, Shilong Fan, Zihang Tian, Tianhao Shen, Shuo Shang, Xin Gao, and Rui Yan. 2024. **Charactereval: A chinese benchmark for role-playing conversational agent evaluation.** In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 11836–11850. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Aäron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2018. [Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding](#). *CoRR*, abs/1807.03748.
- Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11).
- Hongru Wang, Minda Hu, Yang Deng, Rui Wang, Fei Mi, Weichao Wang, Yasheng Wang, Wai-Chung Kwan, Irwin King, and Kam-Fai Wong. 2023. [Large language models as source planner for personalized knowledge-grounded dialogues](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 9556–9569. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Noah Wang, Z. y. Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhan Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Jian Yang, Man Zhang, Zhaoxiang Zhang, Wanli Ouyang, Ke Xu, Wenhao Huang, Jie Fu, and Junran Peng. 2024. [Rolellm: Benchmarking, eliciting, and enhancing role-playing abilities of large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 14743–14777. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weiran Wang, Raman Arora, Karen Livescu, and Jeff A. Bilmes. 2015. [On deep multi-view representation learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2015, Lille, France, 6-11 July 2015*, volume 37 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 1083–1092. JMLR.org.
- Zijian Wang, Yadan Luo, Ruihong Qiu, Zi Huang, and Mahsa Baktashmotlagh. 2021. [Learning to diversify for single domain generalization](#). In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2021, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 10-17, 2021*, pages 814–823. IEEE.
- Kilian Q. Weinberger, John Blitzer, and Lawrence K. Saul. 2005. [Distance metric learning for large margin nearest neighbor classification](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 18 [Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS 2005, December 5-8, 2005, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada]*, pages 1473–1480.
- Likang Wu, Zhi Zheng, Zhaopeng Qiu, Hao Wang, Hongchao Gu, Tingjia Shen, Chuan Qin, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Qi Liu, Hui Xiong, and Enhong Chen. 2024. [A survey on large language models for recommendation](#). *World Wide Web (WWW)*, 27(5):60.
- Yuwei Wu, Xuezhe Ma, and Diyi Yang. 2021. [Personalized response generation via generative split memory network](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 1956–1970. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Changqing Zhang, Yajie Cui, Zongbo Han, Joey Tianyi Zhou, Huazhu Fu, and Qinghua Hu. 2020. [Deep partial multi-view learning](#). *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(5):2402–2415.
- Saizheng Zhang, Emily Dinan, Jack Urbanek, Arthur Szlam, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2018. [Personalizing dialogue agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too?](#) In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2018, Melbourne, Australia, July 15-20, 2018, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 2204–2213. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jinfeng Zhou, Zhuang Chen, Dazhen Wan, Bosi Wen, Yi Song, Jifan Yu, Yongkang Huang, Libiao Peng, Jiaming Yang, Xiyao Xiao, Sahand Sabour, Xiaohan Zhang, Wenjing Hou, Yijia Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Minlie Huang. 2023. [Characterglm: Customizing chinese conversational AI characters with large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.16832.

Language	Data Source	Questioner Examples	Responder
English	The Big Bang Theory	Priya, Barry, Howard, Leonard, etc. Bernadette, Penny, Raj, Stuart, etc.	Sheldon Leonard
	Friends	Amy, Chandler, Charlie, Joey, etc. Ben, Mike, Gary, Paul, etc.	Rachel Ross
	Modern Family	Alex, Cameron, Dylan, Gloria, etc. Haley, Jay, Luke, Mitchell, etc.	Claire Phil
Chinese	My Own Swordsman	Bai Sanniang, Guo Furong, Mo Xiaobei, etc. Bao Daren, Ji Wuming, Zhu Wushuang, etc. Li Dazui, Xing Butou, Yan Xiaoliu, etc.	Tong Xiangyu Bai Zhanfang Lv Xiucui
	Empresses in the Palace	Cao Guiren, Mei Zhuang, Liu Zhu, etc. Consort Hua, Empress, Huan Bi, etc.	Zhen Huan Emperor
	WeChat Records	Author’s contacts	Author

Table 5: Questioners in the MQDialog dataset.

A Proof

Referring to the main theorem in (van den Oord et al., 2018), we establish Lemma 1 as follow.

Lemma 1 *Given a feature vector y and a set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of n features of random samples, where one sample x_i is drawn from $p(x_i|y)$ and the rest from the corresponding marginal distribution $p(x)$, an arbitrary score function f , and loss $L = -\mathbb{E}_X \left[\log \frac{f(x_i, y)}{\sum_{x_j \in X} f(x_j, y)} \right]$, we have*

$$I(x_i, y) \geq \log n - L, \quad (7)$$

where $I(x_i, y)$ denotes the mutual information between x_i and y .

Theorem 1 *Given the representation z_k^i of d_k^i and the global feature set of questioners $E = \{e^1, \dots, e^m\}$, minimizing the loss function L_{QC} maximizes the mutual information between d_k^i and e^i .*

Proof The loss L in Lemma 1 corresponds to a categorical cross-entropy loss of classifying which x_i is sampled from the conditional probability. Substituting y with z_k^i , X with E and defining the score function $f_{QC}(z_k^i, e^i) = \exp(\frac{z_k^i \cdot e^i}{\tau \|z_k^i\| \|e^i\|})$ in Lemma 1, we can find that L_{QC} equals to L in Lemma 1. Then, we have

$$I(e^i, d_k^i) \geq \log m - L_{QC}. \quad (8)$$

Thus, minimizing L_{QC} maximizes a lower bound on mutual information between d_k^i and e^i . \square

B Questioners of MQDialog Dataset

MQDialog dataset comprises a total of 173 questioners and 12 responders. Table 5 provides some questioners for each dataset.

C Additional Training Details

We employ the AdamW optimization scheme with PyTorch for all methods. The maximum learning rate is set to $2e-4$, the minimum learning rate is set to $1e-4$, the batch size is set to 4, the epoch number is set to 20, and the maximum length of tokens is set to 592. For LoRA, we set the rank to 16, the dropout rate to 0.05, and apply weight decomposition for the query, key, value matrices, and the dense MLP in a transformer block.

D Prompt for Evaluation

Table 6 shows detailed prompts used for evaluating the winning rate. First, we prompt the LLM to determine which of the two responses better aligns with the responder’s personality and resembles how the responder would naturally speak to the specific questioner. We request the LLM to provide its reasoning process. Next, we prompt the LLM to format its output based on the reasoning process.

E Full Results

Table 7 presents detailed comparison results between extra information-based generation and our method. Across all metrics and datasets of different responders, our method consistently outperforms both role profile-based generation and few-shot generation. Table 8 provides the complete results of the ablation experiments. The results demonstrate that incorporating the clustering strategy and the questioner-contrastive loss enhances the model’s ability to learn questioner-specific personalities and capture semantic information effectively.

F Case Study

We present additional cases of Sheldon from *The Big Bang Theory* and Tong Xiangyu from *My Own Swordsman* in Figure 8 and Figure 9. These cases demonstrate that FT tends to provide similar responses to same query, regardless of the questioner, while our design generates distinct responses by recognizing the questioner’s identity and the relationship between the questioner and the responder.

Prompts for English datasets.

Step 1: Judge which answer better meets our requirements.

System:

You need act as the {RESPONDER} in the {DATASET SOURCE} and determine which of the two responses to {QUESTIONER} is better.

Message:

As a {RESPONDER}, please judge which of the following two responses is more authentic, aligns better with your personality, resembles what you would say to {QUESTIONER}, and fits your relationship with {QUESTIONER}.

The better response should be a semantically complete sentence and should especially not include any unrelated information. Here are some examples from your previous conversations with {QUESTIONER}:

{FEW-SHOT EXAMPLES}

The current dialogue between you and {QUESTIONER} is as follows:

Current dialogue: {DIALOGUE}

A: {RESULT 1}

B: {RESULT 2}

Step 2: Format the output to indicate which answer wins based on the reasoning process.

System:

You are a teacher who grades multiple-choice questions.

Message:

Please determine whether the answer derived from the reasoning is "A" or "B" based on the reasoning information.

The following is the reasoning process and result:

{REASONING}

Your answer should be only "A" or "B".

Prompts for Chinese datasets.

Step 1: 判断哪个回答更符合我们的要求

System:

你将扮演{DATASET SOURCE}中的{RESPONDER}，判断你对{QUESTIONER}的两个回复哪个更好。

Message:

作为{RESPONDER}，请判断以下两个回答中，哪个更真实，更贴近你的性格，更像是你会对{QUESTIONER}说的话，更符合你跟{QUESTIONER}之间的关系。

更好的回答是语义完整的一句话，特别是不应有其他不相关的信息出现。

参考你跟{QUESTIONER}之前对话的一些例子：

{FEW-SHOT EXAMPLES}

以下是你跟{QUESTIONER}当前对话的两个回答

当前对话: {DIALOGUE}

A: {RESULT 1}

B: {RESULT 2}

Step 2: 根据推理过程，格式化输出结果

System:

你是一位选择题的批改老师。

Message:

请根据推理信息，判断出推理所得到的答案是"A"还是"B"。

以下为推理过程与结果：

{REASONING}

你的回答应仅为"A"或"B"。


Table 6: Prompt template for evaluating the winning rate, a relative score between the baseline and our design.

Responder	BLEU			ROUGE-1			ROUGE-2			ROUGE-L		
	RPG	Few-shot	Ours	RPG	Few-shot	Ours	RPG	Few-shot	Ours	RPG	Few-shot	Ours
Sheldon	3.7808	4.1268	7.1614	6.1112	6.1251	7.5167	0.4651	0.4297	0.9963	6.8179	7.0864	7.4033
Leonard	2.4064	2.5615	6.1396	4.2146	4.4335	8.2565	0.2793	0.3860	1.7124	4.7510	5.3372	8.2118
Rachel	2.7659	2.8733	6.6896	4.6200	4.5079	7.1204	0.3401	0.2522	1.1620	5.0773	5.1813	7.1785
Ross	2.8685	3.0778	6.3427	4.7497	4.7984	7.0198	0.4039	0.3177	1.0753	5.3017	5.3287	7.0631
Claire	2.3126	2.5895	5.7579	4.1380	4.2564	6.0438	0.3070	0.2942	0.8282	4.8250	5.2077	6.1565
Phil	2.3728	2.4176	5.7088	4.2823	4.2669	5.7513	0.3203	0.1802	0.9852	4.6629	5.0749	7.2409
Avg.	2.7512	2.9411	6.3000	4.6860	4.7314	6.9514	0.3526	0.3100	1.1266	5.2393	5.5360	7.2090
Tong Xiangyu	4.3287	6.0368	9.4152	11.4930	10.3487	16.0344	1.2544	1.3596	3.2017	9.8987	9.5217	15.5033
Bai Zhantang	4.4217	5.9340	9.8695	11.1240	9.3529	17.2560	1.3034	1.4273	4.1399	9.7413	8.8194	15.8390
Lv Xiucui	4.2062	3.0090	9.1866	10.8039	6.8027	14.6503	1.2279	1.1770	3.9831	9.5392	6.3736	14.8151
Zhen Huan	6.0633	9.9077	10.0170	16.4259	19.0553	22.5703	2.8163	4.7266	6.7392	13.0081	16.8380	20.1831
Emperor	5.8238	8.7152	10.7792	14.8267	16.6891	18.7504	1.7674	2.8404	4.4008	11.5380	14.6267	17.4351
Real Person	-	2.1163	9.9579	-	12.9303	18.1972	-	5.5303	11.0217	-	13.3141	19.1615
Avg.	4.9687	5.9532	9.8709	12.9347	12.5298	17.9098	1.6739	2.8435	5.5811	10.7451	11.5823	17.1562


Table 7: Our design vs. Baselines of role profile-based generation and few-shot prompting generation from BLEU and ROUGE (%) metrics.

Responder	BLEU			ROUGE-1			ROUGE-2			ROUGE-L		
	w/o QCL	w/o CCL	Ours	w/o QCL	w/o CCL	Ours	w/o QCL	w/o CCL	Ours	w/o QCL	w/o CCL	Ours
Sheldon	6.6912	6.9225	7.1614	7.1899	7.1622	7.5167	1.1712	1.0381	0.9963	7.0385	7.1397	7.4033
Leonard	6.1370	5.9004	6.1396	7.4007	7.7720	8.2565	1.6765	1.4882	1.7124	7.3811	7.7838	8.2118
Rachel	6.3430	5.7944	6.6896	6.6878	6.8334	7.1204	0.9772	1.0000	1.1620	6.8740	6.9600	7.1785
Ross	5.8668	5.9030	6.3427	6.5473	6.5119	7.0198	1.1516	1.1251	1.0753	6.5765	6.6159	7.0631
Claire	5.5331	5.2452	5.7579	5.5828	5.4510	6.0438	0.5777	0.7631	0.8282	5.5315	6.0754	6.1565
Phil	5.2277	5.5008	5.7088	5.5691	5.4392	5.7513	1.0981	0.9861	0.9852	5.9688	6.8943	7.2409
Avg.	5.9665	5.8777	6.3000	6.4963	6.5283	6.9514	1.1087	1.0668	1.1266	6.5617	6.9115	7.2090
Tong Xiangyu	9.0508	9.1998	9.4152	15.5027	15.2251	16.0344	2.9266	3.1766	3.2017	15.1094	14.8118	15.5033
Bai Zhantang	9.3794	9.5388	9.8695	14.9993	15.0884	17.2560	3.9836	3.7512	4.1399	15.1317	15.2266	15.8390
Lv Xiucui	8.0470	8.6549	9.1866	14.2912	14.5121	14.6503	3.5885	3.5571	3.9831	14.4334	14.2958	14.8151
Zhen Huan	9.2843	9.7096	10.0170	21.0672	20.6157	22.5703	6.0122	6.2049	6.7392	19.7887	19.6287	20.1831
Emperor	10.3512	10.4404	10.7792	18.1983	18.0917	18.7504	3.9919	4.1257	4.4008	17.0687	17.2169	17.4351
Real Person	6.9792	9.2908	9.9579	17.7889	17.8540	18.1972	10.9825	10.9505	11.0217	18.8708	19.0264	19.1615
Avg.	8.8486	9.4724	9.8709	16.9746	16.8978	17.9098	5.2476	5.2943	5.5811	16.7338	16.7010	17.1562

Table 8: Full ablation study results of questioner-contrastive loss or question similarity-based clustering from BLEU and ROUGE metrics (%).



(a) Case 3: Same query asked by Leonard and Penny and answered by Sheldon.



(b) Case 4: Same query asked by Leonard and Howard and answered by Sheldon.

Figure 8: Case study with Sheldon from The Big Bang Theory.



(a) Case 5: Same query asked by Mo Xiaobei and Li Dazui and answered by Tong Xiangyu.



(b) Case 6: Same query asked by Bai Zhantang and Mo Xiaobei and answered by Tong Xiangyu.

Figure 9: Case study with Tong Xiangyu from My Own Swordsman.