

# A Graph-Based Approach for Conversational AI-Driven Personal Memory Capture and Retrieval in a Real-world Application

**Savini Kashmira**  
Jaseci Labs  
savini.kashmira@jaseci.org

**Jayanaka L. Dantanarayana**  
University of Michigan  
jayanaka@umich.edu

**Joshua Brodsky**  
University of Michigan  
joshbrod@umich.edu

**Ashish Mahendra**  
Jaseci Labs  
ashish.mahendra@jaseci.org

**Yiping Kang**  
University of Michigan  
ypkang@umich.edu

**Krisztián Flautner**  
University of Michigan  
manowar@umich.edu

**Lingjia Tang**  
University of Michigan  
lingjia@umich.edu

**Jason Mars**  
University of Michigan  
profmars@umich.edu

## Abstract

TOBU is a novel mobile application that captures and retrieves ‘personal memories’ (pictures/videos together with stories and context around those moments) in a user-engaging AI-guided conversational approach. Our initial prototype showed that existing retrieval techniques such as retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems fall short due to their limitations in understanding memory relationships, causing low recall, hallucination, and unsatisfactory user experience. We design TOBU-Graph, a novel graph-based retrieval approach. During capturing, TOBU-Graph leverages large language models (LLMs) to automatically create a dynamic knowledge graph of memories, establishing context and relationships of those memories. During retrieval, TOBU-Graph combines LLMs with the memory graph to achieve comprehensive recall through graph traversal. Our evaluation using real user data demonstrates that TOBU-Graph outperforms multiple RAG implementations in both precision and recall, significantly improving user experience through improved retrieval accuracy and reduced hallucination.

## 1 Introduction

In today’s digital age, people increasingly use mobile applications to capture meaningful life moments, storing images, videos, and audio to preserve their digital ‘personal memories’. In 2024, an estimated 1.94 trillion photos will be taken globally, averaging 5.3 billion photos daily, with the average American capturing 20 photos per day (Broz, 2024). However, the current software offerings such as Apple photo and Facebook only provide very basic multimedia storage and organization, falling short in capturing true ‘memories’, missing



Figure 1: TOBU app lets users capture, store and recall digital memories, powered by conversational AI.

the rich contextual details and narratives around the pictures such as events and sentiments. In addition, they provide very limited retrieval capabilities. For example, users need to manually add details through tagging people and providing captions and comments. When retrieving a memory, users are confined to basic search and filter functionalities, making it difficult to perform natural searches like “family trips with both David and John in the mountains”. Instead, memory retrieval often involves inefficient scrolling through chronological feeds manually or relying on simple keyword searches.

TOBU’s mission is to address these limitations, and help users capture and preserve context-rich memories, organize them based on their relationships, just as the human brain organizes memories. In addition, TOBU aims to enable effortless and accurate memory retrieval as how humans recall relevant memories. We designed and launched a mobile application shown in Figure 1, currently commercially available with a wide user base. Unlike current software solutions, TOBU presents novel capabilities to capture and retrieve memories through conversations with an AI assistant in a user-engaging manner, extracting rich context

around pictures and enabling much more accurate and satisfactory memory retrieval.

Designing such a system involves addressing key challenges such as extracting the context and relationships about memories and enabling accurate memory retrievals. In conversational AI applications, retrieval is often implemented through Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) (Asai et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2024) or structured knowledge graph retrieval (Su et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). Both approaches have significant limitations for our use case. RAG stores unstructured data in a vector database and retrieves it using embeddings. While RAG is effective for document-based retrieval, experiments with our initial prototype implemented using RAG show that it faces several limitations when applied to memory retrieval:

- RAG’s performance heavily depends on chunking configuration, often leading to low recall.
- Across our experiments of various embedding strategies, the low embedding quality for ‘memories’ often leads to low precision or low recall.
- When related memories do not exist, Large Language Models (LLMs) may hallucinate non-existent data.
- Chunks from unrelated memories can combine into incorrect or mixed results.
- Vector embeddings do not adequately capture complex relationships between memories.

An alternative approach for information organization and retrieval is through knowledge graphs, which structure data through explicit relationships (Su et al., 2024). Knowledge Graphs address some of these RAG challenges by enabling fine-grained retrieval through graph traversal. However, their construction and management are labor-intensive and lack adaptability to dynamic, user-generated data.

To address the limitations of both RAG and knowledge graph-based approaches, we propose TOBUGraph, a novel dynamic conversational graph-based memory retrieval technique that we ultimately adopted in the TOBU app. Our approach transforms pictures and conversations about a memory into a structured memory graph using LLMs. The graph consists of semantic nodes representing key features of each memory, and interest nodes as common themes between various memories. These nodes are dynamically created and interlinked, en-

abling the system to capture nuanced relationships between memories. Unlike traditional knowledge graphs, TOBUGraph leverages LLMs for intelligent graph formation and traversal, eliminating the manual effort and facilitating comprehensive and efficient memory retrieval. This method also addresses the limitations of RAG through structured graph nodes, improving recall and precision while minimizing hallucinations.

Using real-world data from the existing user base of the TOBU app, we evaluated the memory retrieval technique of the TOBUGraph approach against multiple RAG baseline implementations. TOBUGraph outperforms the baseline approaches in retrieval accuracy, efficiency, and user satisfaction, achieving 92.86% *precision* (vs. 78.58% best baseline), 93.33% *recall* (vs. 80% best baseline), and 93.09% *F1* (vs 81.48% best baseline). It also demonstrated around 20% improvement in user experience and satisfaction over the next-best baseline in human study, with consistently higher preference ratings in human evaluations across diverse memory recall scenarios.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows.

1. A novel memory capturing approach using dynamic graph structures.
2. An LLM-powered extractor for dynamic, complex relationships across memories.
3. A novel graph-based memory retrieval system for enhanced user interaction.
4. A Comprehensive evaluation against RAG systems using real-world user data.

## 2 TOBUGraph

In this section, we present TOBUGraph, a novel graph-based retrieval approach we integrated into the TOBU app. TOBUGraph addresses two main limitations of RAG and knowledge graph approaches.

During capturing (Figure 2), TOBUGraph leverages a LLM and automatically extracts semantics from user-provided pictures to create context rich memories. In addition, it also extracts and establishes relationships among those memories and creates a dynamic, contextually relevant memory graph. This graph generation process is fully automatic, reducing the manual effort of creating knowledge graphs in prior work.

During retrieval (Figure 3), user can interact with TOBU through a conversational AI assistant. TO-




Figure 2: Memory capturing workflow in TOBUGraph framework.

BUGraph combines LLMs with the memory graph, efficiently navigating the graph to achieve comprehensive recall through graph traversal, providing superior retrieval performance over RAG approaches. The following sections outline each step of the TOBUGraph process.

### 2.1 Memory Input Data Collection

TOBU app uses both automatic image analysis and conversational AI assistant to help users create memory entries. When users provide multimedia inputs, such as images, videos, or audio, TOBU app first applies object recognition, emotion detection, scene recognition and geolocation estimation to automatically extract semantic and context around the media. TOBU AI assistant then initiates a conversation with the user, gathering further details. This interactive process is designed to be user-engaging, fun and not labor-intensive.

### 2.2 Memory Graph Construction

Memory Graph Construction Engine processes the extracted semantics and conversational data to create a graph-based structure as illustrated in Figure 2.

**Semantic Extraction Module:** In addition to the image analysis described earlier, the extraction module leverages an LLM to process the user-AI conversation, augmenting and updating with future details such as participants, activities, stories, and sentiment. Each of semantic details the system extracted is stored in a dedicated *semantic node* linked to the memory node. A summary of the memory is also generated and stored as a distinct semantic node.

**Basic Memory Graph Structure:** The initial memory graph can be represented as  $G = (V, E)$  where  $V = M \cup S$  represents memory nodes  $M = \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n\}$  and semantic nodes  $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}$ . The edge set  $E \subseteq M \times S$  connects




Figure 3: Memory retrieving workflow in TOBUGraph framework.

memory nodes to their semantic nodes. For each memory node  $m_i \in M$  while connected semantic nodes are defined as  $S_i = \{s_j | (m_i, s_j) \in E\}$ .

### 2.3 Relational Memory Graph: Augmenting with Relationship Information

After the basic memory graph is constructed, TOBUGraph will interconnect multiple memory graphs of each user into one unified structure called the Relational Memory Graph (RMG) as in Figure 2. This structure captures the relationships across memories using interest nodes that serve as central points, enabling the system to access all memories linked to a specific interest.

**Relation Extraction Module** Using LLMs, we analyze each memory graph independently to extract users’ various ‘interests’ from the memories. These interests are common themes capturing key topics and aspects that the memories are often centered around, such as hobbies, locations, activities, preferences, important dates, or people mentioned. For each identified interest, a dedicated unique interest node is created and connected to all the relevant memory nodes. Therefore, those memories with each common theme are connected through the shared interest node, creating a graph with interconnected memories.

**Augmented Graph Formulation:** The RMG extends the basic graph  $G$  to  $G' = (V', E')$  where  $V' = M \cup S \cup I$  includes interest nodes  $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_p\}$ . The extended edge set  $E' \subseteq (M \times S) \cup (M \times I)$  connects memory and interest nodes. For each memory node  $m_i$ , connected semantic nodes are  $S_i = \{s_j | (m_i, s_j) \in E'\}$ , and connected interest nodes are  $I_i = \{i_j | (m_i, i_j) \in E'\}$ .

### 2.4 Memory Retrieval

TOBUGraph enables users to recall memories through an integrated conversational AI assistant

Table 1: Comparison of Baseline RAG Implementation Variants.

<b>Notations:</b> $M$ : set of memories, $m_i$ : individual memory, $n$ : total memories, $C$ : set of chunks, $c_i$ : individual chunk, $l$ : fixed chunk length		
<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Input Processing</b>	<b>Chunking Strategy</b>
RAGv1	Memory summaries generated during TOBUGraph approach in section 2.2.	<b>Fixed-size chunks with specified overlap</b> $c_i = split(summary(M)),  c_i  = l$ and $ C  >  M $
RAGv2	Memory summaries as in RAGv1.	<b>Memory-boundary aligned chunks</b> $c_i = summary(m_i),  C  =  M  = n$
RAGv3	Raw user-assistant conversations captured during memory input in TOBUGraph approach in section 2.1.	<b>Memory-boundary aligned chunks</b> $c_i = conversation(m_i),  C  =  M  = n$

that interacts with the user’s RMG as shown in Figure 3. When a user initiates a memory retrieval request, the system first identifies all interest nodes connected to the RMG and generates a prompt combining the user request with the content of these nodes. This prompt is processed by an LLM to filter and identify the most relevant interests related to the user’s request. The system then traverses the RMG through the identified interest nodes to retrieve associated memory nodes and their semantic content.

The conversational AI analyzes semantic nodes of retrieved memories, to generate targeted responses. If the user’s request contains sufficient details, the response is direct, avoiding unnecessary follow-up questions. Otherwise, the AI assistant requests clarification. As this conversation progresses, the system continuously refines its traversal of the RMG, ensuring increasingly accurate memory retrieval that enhances the user’s experience.

**Retrieval Process Formalization:** The memory retrieval process can be formalized as:

- Interest relevance:**  $f(q, I) \rightarrow I' \subseteq I$ , where  $f$  identifies relevant interest nodes  $I'$  for a given query  $q$ .
- Memory retrieval:**  $g(I', G') \rightarrow M' \subseteq M$ , where  $g$  retrieves memory nodes  $M'$  connected to  $I'$  in the RMG  $G$ .
- Response generation:**  $h(q, M', S') \rightarrow r$ , where  $S' = \cup S_i | m_i \in M'$ , and  $h$  generates the response  $r$  based on  $q, M'$  and  $S'$ .

### 3 Evaluation

#### 3.1 Baselines

To evaluate our proposed TOBUGraph approach, we implement three versions of naive RAG systems using LangChain and ChromaDB as baseline approaches. The basic RAG pipelines consists of four sequential steps: (1) memory storage document chunking, (2) vector embedding of chunks and vector database storage, (3) retrieval of  $k$  most

relevant chunks based on user request, and (4) response generation by combining user request and retrieved chunks using LLM (Wu et al., 2024).

The three implementations differ primarily in their chunking strategies and input data sources as represented in Table 1. RAGv1 processes memory summaries by splitting them into fixed-size chunks with specified overlap. RAGv2 also uses memory summaries but creates chunks aligned with memory boundaries, where each chunk corresponds to one memory summary. RAGv3 diverges by using raw user-assistant conversations instead of summaries, splitting the input at memory boundaries so each chunk contains one complete conversation.

#### 3.2 Dataset Construction

Using real memory data from five highly active TOBU app users, we selected four unique memory retrieval conversations per user, utilizing the TOBUGraph memory retrieval technique. For comparison, we applied the same memory retrieval requests to generate conversations using baseline RAG approaches where the only difference between TOBUGraph and baseline approaches being the retrieval technique.


#### 3.3 Quantitative Analysis

##### 3.3.1 Retrieval Metrics Evaluation


Table 2: *Precision, Recall* and *F1 – Score* for TOBUGraph approach and baseline approaches.

	<b>TOBU</b>	<b>RAGv1</b>	<b>RAGv2</b>	<b>RAGv3</b>
<i>Precision</i>	92.86%	71.42%	78.57%	78.57%
<i>Recall</i>	93.33%	76.92%	84.61%	80%
<i>F1 – Score</i>	93.09%	74.07%	81.48%	79.28%

To evaluate TOBUGraph against the baseline approaches discussed in Section 3.1, we use standard information retrieval metrics: *Precision* (percentage of retrieved memories that were actually relevant), *Recall* (percentage of relevant memories that were successfully retrieved), and *F1 – score* calculated using the dataset described in Section



(a) Human evaluator preferences for four competing approaches, evaluated across 20 user requests.



(b) The distribution of preference probabilities for each approach. Majority of the evaluators prefer TOBU 75% of the time on average, among all conversations

Figure 4: Human evaluation results analysis.

3.2. The results are presented in Table 2. As shown in the table, TOBUGraph demonstrates significant performance improvement across all metrics, achieving the highest *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-score*. This indicates that TOBUGraph significantly outperforms RAGv1, RAGv2, and RAGv3 both in accurately retrieving relevant memories and avoiding irrelevant retrievals, with an average improvement of approximately 14% in overall effectiveness in *F1-score* compared to RAGv2, the next-best performing approach.

### 3.3.2 User Experience Evaluation

We then conducted a human-based study to quantitatively analyze user experiences across different approaches. Using the dataset outlined in Section 3.2, we applied a double-blind pairwise comparison method via crowd-sourcing, leveraging the SLAM tool. This tool facilitates pairwise matchups of responses to a single query (Irugalbandara et al., 2024). A total of 240 evaluators participated, each evaluating exactly 10 pairwise comparisons. To ensure unbiased results, no evaluator reviewed pairs involving the same request, and all pairs were evaluated equally.

An analysis of the evaluator preferences across the 20 user requests in Figure 4a reveals that preferences for the best approach vary depending on the type of memory recall request. TOBUGraph consistently leads, with preference rates often exceeding 40% in most cases. In contrast, RAGv1 consistently performs poorly, reflecting limited user satisfaction. RAGv2 and RAGv3 show more variability, with RAGv3 occasionally matching TOBUGraph’s performance and RAGv2 gaining moderate success in specific instances. This indicates TOBUGraph’s

adaptability and effectiveness in delivering an enhanced user experience across diverse scenarios.

By examining the results of the evaluator preference probability for each approach, a clear trend emerges favoring the TOBUGraph approach, as illustrated in the Figure 4b. TOBUGraph consistently achieves higher preference probabilities, with a median around 0.75, indicating that the majority of users found it effective. On the other hand, RAGv1 demonstrates the lowest median 0.25, highlighting its lower favorability. RAGv2 and RAGv3 show more balanced distributions, with peaks in the mid-range probabilities, suggesting moderate preferences. These findings highlight the TOBUGraph’s effectiveness in delivering a more satisfying user experience compared to the baseline RAG approaches.

### 3.4 Qualitative Analysis

To evaluate TOBUGraph approach against baseline RAG models using the dataset created in Section 3.2, we also conducted a qualitative analysis. Key observations are summarized in Table 3, with detailed discussion below.

Table 3: Qualitative comparison between memory retrieval techniques.

Qualitative Observations	RAGv1	RAGv2	RAGv3	TOBU Graph
(I1) Low recall due to top $k$ chunk limitation	Red	Yellow	Red	Green
(I2) Low recall due to embedding quality	Yellow	Orange	Red	Green
(I3) Memory fragmentation due to chunking	Red	Green	Yellow	Green
(I4) Hallucinations during memory retrieval failures	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green

■ Worst      ■ Medium      ■ Best

**(I1) Low recall due to top  $k$  chunk limitation:** In baseline RAG approaches, only the top  $k$  most relevant chunks are retrieved. Because of this all




Figure 5: Example conversations from the dataset discussed in section 3.2 where (a) having issues **I1** and **I2**, (b) representing hallucination as in **I4** while (c) demonstrating issues **I2** and **I3** from Table 3.

relevant memories will not get retrieved if there are more memories exceeding  $k$  value. This issue is highlighted as **I1** in Table 3. In Figure 5a, five memories relevant to the user request are successfully retrieved using TOBU. However, as labeled in **I1**, RAGv1, RAGv2, and RAGv3 fail to retrieve all five memories. Although RAGv1 retrieves five memories, two of them are redundant due to memory fragmentation, which is discussed further in **I3**. Moreover, RAGv2 and RAGv3 retrieve only four relevant memories missing the memory numbered as '2' in TOBU. As TOBUGraph approach utilizes graph traversal to eliminate this limitation, retrieving all related memories.

**(I2) Low recall due to embedding quality:** RAG approaches rely on the embedding quality of the chunks for precise retrieval. However, in our use case, the quality of a chunk's embedding depends on its length when using a constant embedding model. Hence, the embedding quality sequentially diminishes from RAGv1 to RAGv3. This degradation impacts retrieval performance, causing baseline RAG approaches to occasionally fail in

retrieving all relevant memories. This limitation is illustrated in Table 3, with the color gradient for **I2**. As shown in **I2** in Figure 5c, TOBU successfully retrieves both relevant memories, whereas RAGv2 and RAGv3 retrieve only one memory, even after a follow-up query, omitting the "Disney World" memory included in TOBU's response. While RAGv1 manages to retrieve both memories, this occurs only after a follow-up question. Hence, TOBU outperforms all the baseline approaches in this regard due to its graph-based retrieval mechanism which captures complex relationships between memories.

**(I3) Memory fragmentation due to chunking:** RAGv1 faces two notable challenges: missing key details of memories and misinterpreting a single memory as multiple distinct ones due to fragmentation of memories during memory chunking. This is not present in other baseline RAG approaches as they perform chunking at memory boundaries, as depicted under **I3** in Table 3. TOBU also avoids such a behavior due to its graph implementation. In Figure 5a, memories numbered '3' and '4' in

RAGv1 are actually the same memory in the memory database. However, due to fragmentation into two chunks, they are incorrectly treated as separate memories. A similar issue is seen with memories numbered ‘1’ and ‘5’ annotated with with **I3** annotation. Additionally, in Figure 5c, the first memory retrieved by RAGv1 lacks the correct name of the water show, as the strike-through content is absent in the response.

**(I4) Hallucinations during memory retrieval failures:** When no specific memory relevant to user request is available, an LLM may sometimes fabricate responses, leading to harmful hallucinated digital memories. RAG implementations are supposed to mitigate this effect (Béchar and Ayala, 2024). However, in our use case, baseline RAG approaches still hallucinate in certain cases performing worse than TOBUGraph approach as shown in Table 3. An example of this can be shown in Figure 5b at **I4**, where a nonexistent memory in the database was fabricated without retrieving the relevant memory.

## 4 Related Works

Digital memory capture and organization is an extensively researched topic (Hodges et al., 2006; Sellen and Whittaker, 2010). Traditional methods rely on recording life events using audio and image devices, while recent advancements incorporate LLMs and machine learning models (Min et al., 2021; Zulfikar et al., 2024). Our approach captures memories as conversations, storing them in graph-based formats. Leveraging the structured storage capabilities of graph structures (Chen et al., 2024; Su et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2024), we utilize pre-trained LLMs to generate and manage memory graphs. Memory retrieval techniques often use RAG, a state-of-the-art method (Asai et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024; Guu et al., 2020; Karpukhin et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2024). However, RAG systems face limitations such as difficulty in capturing relationships, incomplete retrieval, and hallucination risks. Graph-based retrieval methods utilizing knowledge graphs offer solutions to these issues (Su et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2022; Peng et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2024). By integrating graph-based retrieval, we improve accuracy and contextuality while automating memory graph generation and management.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced TOBUGraph, a novel framework for digital memory capture and retrieval that combines dynamic graph structures with LLM-powered extraction to establish intelligent relationships between memories. TOBUGraph outperformed three RAG baseline implementations in both quantitative and qualitative evaluations. By addressing key limitations of traditional RAG systems, such as fragmentation and hallucinations, TOBUGraph delivers a more reliable and cohesive memory experience. Its successful deployment in a production mobile application underscores its practical viability and paves the way for future advancements in digital memory systems.

## References

- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection](#).
- Matic Broz. 2024. [Photography and photo statistics 2024](#). Accessed: 2024-11-29.
- Patrice Béchar and Orlando Marquez Ayala. 2024. [Reducing hallucination in structured outputs via retrieval-augmented generation](#).
- Kai Chen, Ye Wang, Yitong Li, Aiping Li, Han Yu, and Xin Song. 2024. [A unified temporal knowledge graph reasoning model towards interpolation and extrapolation](#).
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. 2024. [Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey](#).
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2020. Realm: retrieval-augmented language model pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’20*. JMLR.org.
- Steve Hodges, Lyndsay Williams, Emma Berry, Shahram Izadi, James Srinivasan, Alex Butler, Gavin Smyth, Narinder Kapur, and Ken Wood. 2006. Sensecam: A retrospective memory aid. In *UbiComp 2006: Ubiquitous Computing*, pages 177–193, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Chandra Irugalbandara, Ashish Mahendra, Roland Daynauth, Tharuka Kasthuri Arachchige, Jayanaka Dantanarayana, Krisztian Flautner, Lingjia Tang, Yiping Kang, and Jason Mars. 2024. [Scaling down to scale up: A cost-benefit analysis of replacing openai’s llm with open source slms in production](#). In *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, pages 280–291.

- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taewoon Kim, Vincent François-Lavet, and Michael Cochez. 2024. Leveraging knowledge graph-based human-like memory systems to solve partially observable markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05861*.
- Bonan Min, Hayley Ross, Elior Sulem, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Thien Huu Nguyen, Oscar Sainz, Eneko Agirre, Ilana Heinz, and Dan Roth. 2021. [Recent advances in natural language processing via large pre-trained language models: A survey](#).
- Boci Peng, Yun Zhu, Yongchao Liu, Xiaohe Bo, Haizhou Shi, Chuntao Hong, Yan Zhang, and Siliang Tang. 2024. [Graph retrieval-augmented generation: A survey](#).
- Abigail J Sellen and Steve Whittaker. 2010. Beyond total capture: a constructive critique of lifelogging. *Communications of the ACM*, 53(5):70–77.
- Xiaorui Su, Yibo Wang, Shanghua Gao, Xiaolong Liu, Valentina Giunchiglia, Djork-Arné Clevert, and Marinka Zitnik. 2024. [Knowledge graph based agent for complex, knowledge-intensive qa in medicine](#).
- Xi Wang, Procheta Sen, Ruizhe Li, and Emine Yilmaz. 2024. [Adaptive retrieval-augmented generation for conversational systems](#).
- Shangyu Wu, Ying Xiong, Yufei Cui, Haolun Wu, Can Chen, Ye Yuan, Lianming Huang, Xue Liu, Tei-Wei Kuo, Nan Guan, et al. 2024. Retrieval-augmented generation for natural language processing: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.13193*.
- Fuwei Zhang, Zhao Zhang, Fuzhen Zhuang, Yu Zhao, Deqing Wang, and Hongwei Zheng. 2024. [Temporal knowledge graph reasoning with dynamic memory enhancement](#). *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36(11):7115–7128.
- Xinliang Frederick Zhang, Nick Beauchamp, and Lu Wang. 2022. Generative entity-to-entity stance detection with knowledge graph augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01467*.
- Wazeer Deen Zulfikar, Samantha Chan, and Pattie Maes. 2024. Memoro: Using large language models to realize a concise interface for real-time memory augmentation. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–18.