

# The Future of Cognitive Strategy-enhanced Persuasive Dialogue Agents: New Perspectives and Trends

Mengqi Chen<sup>1</sup>, Bin Guo(✉)<sup>1</sup>, Hao Wang<sup>1</sup>, Haoyu Li<sup>1</sup>, Qian Zhao<sup>1</sup>, Jingqi Liu<sup>1</sup>,  
Yasan Ding<sup>1</sup>, Yan Pan<sup>2</sup>, Zhiwen Yu<sup>1</sup>

1 Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, China

2 National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China

© Higher Education Press 2024

**Abstract** Persuasion, as one of the crucial abilities in human communication, has garnered extensive attention from researchers within the field of intelligent dialogue systems. Developing dialogue agents that can persuade others to accept certain standpoints is essential to achieving truly intelligent and anthropomorphic dialogue systems. Benefiting from the substantial progress of Large Language Models (LLMs), dialogue agents have acquired an exceptional capability in context understanding and response generation. However, as a typical and complicated cognitive psychological system, persuasive dialogue agents also require knowledge from the domain of cognitive psychology to attain a level of human-like persuasion. Consequently, the cognitive strategy-enhanced persuasive dialogue agent (defined as *CogAgent*), which incorporates cognitive strategies to achieve persuasive targets through conversation, has become a predominant research paradigm. To depict the research trends of CogAgent, in this paper, we first present

several fundamental cognitive psychology theories and give the formalized definition of three typical cognitive strategies, including the persuasion strategy, the topic path planning strategy, and the argument structure prediction strategy. Then we propose a new system architecture by incorporating the formalized definition to lay the foundation of CogAgent. Representative works are detailed and investigated according to the combined cognitive strategy, followed by the summary of authoritative benchmarks and evaluation metrics. Finally, we summarize our insights on open issues and future directions of CogAgent for upcoming researchers.

**Keywords** Persuasive dialogue, cognitive strategy, cognitive psychology, persuasion strategy

---

Received month dd, yyyy; accepted month dd, yyyy

E-mail: guob@nwpu.edu.cn

## 1 Introduction

Dialog agents can engage in chitchat with humans to establish certain emotional connections or help us complete tasks through long-form conversations (e.g., restaurant reservation, travel time arrangement). Building intelligent human-machine dialogue agents that can conduct natural and engaging conversations with humans is the long-standing goal of artificial intelligence (AI) [1, 2]. Moreover, the persuasive ability of dialogue agents has garnered extensive attention from researchers. Persuasion is one of the crucial abilities in human communication. The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) theory [3] suggests that people tend to engage with persuasive messages when communicating with others. It is a prevalent phenomenon for individuals to hold diverse perspectives on a given topic and endeavor to influence others in altering their viewpoints, attitudes, or behaviors through conversational interactions [4, 5]. There are massive persuasive scenarios in the real world, such as bargaining prices of goods, debating on specific topics, and arguing in online comment sections [6, 7], and active online communities, such as Debate<sup>1)</sup> and ChangeMyView<sup>2)</sup>, for people to communicate and influence other people's opinions by posting their views [8]. A persuasive conversion includes two distinct parties, corresponding to persuader and persuadee, respectively [9]. The goal of the persuader is to change the persuadee's viewpoint on a specific topic by combining cognitive strategies, the personality of the persuadee, and other context features [10, 11]. The development of intelligent persuasive dialogue agents that can persuade users to accept certain standpoints is emerging as a promis-

ing research field [12, 13].

Modern dialogue agents have arrived at the era characterized by large language models (LLMs) [14, 15]. Driven by an immense scale of parameters and an abundance of training data, dialogue agents (e.g., ChatGPT<sup>3)</sup>, LLaMA [16], Claude [17], ChatGLM<sup>4)</sup>) have acquired an exceptional capability of context understanding and response generation [18, 19], reaching a satisfactory level of fluency, logic, emotional expression and personalization when conversing with humans [20, 21]. In addition to engaging in casual conversations with humans, existing dialogue agents, represented by ChatGPT, can assist humans in accomplishing intricate tasks, such as writing codes [22, 23], writing long and coherent academic papers [24, 25] and aiding in office works (e.g., Microsoft Copilot<sup>5)</sup>), thereby substantially augmenting productivity and the quality of life.

However, the persuasion process is an activity that involves human psychological cognition [10, 26, 27]. The design of persuasive dialogue agents needs to incorporate cognitive strategies to organize content, logic, and presentation of dialogue response reasonably from the cognitive psychology perspective. There have been considerable works of persuasive dialogue systems, which mainly enhance persuasiveness from three aspects, namely, integrating persuasion strategies, planning topic paths, and extracting argument structures. For example, Wang *et al.* [11] provide an in-depth analysis of the impact of persuasion strategies on the persuasive power of dialogue systems in the context of persuasion for donation scenarios. To enable persuasion efficiently, Qin *et al.* [28] drive a


<sup>3)</sup><https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>

<sup>4)</sup><https://github.com/THUDM/ChatGLM3>

<sup>5)</sup><https://adoption.microsoft.com/en-us/copilot/>

<sup>1)</sup><https://www.debate.org/>

<sup>2)</sup><https://www.reddit.com/r/changemyview/>



**Fig. 1** The example of persuasive dialogue, where the dialogue agent persuades the user to relieve for job crisis using various persuasion strategies.

conversation towards a specified persuasive target with explicit topics/keywords planning over knowledge graphs. Arguments are also an important source of effective persuasive content. Prakken *et al.* [29] develop a dialogue system wherein an argument graph serves as the persuasive knowledge for persuasive response generation. Different from existing works that focus on the persuasiveness of dialogue systems, in this paper, we argue that persuasion is a cognitive psychology activity and that the persuasion strategy, the topic path planning strategy, and the argument structure prediction strategy can all be categorized as cognitive strategies. We define cognitive strategy-enhanced persuasive dialogue agent as *CogAgent*.

*CogAgent* aims to integrate a variety of cognitive strategies to ensure that the generated dialogue contents can effectively influence the persuadee in terms of their perceptions, opinions, or attitudes [11, 30]. *CogAgent* has great potential in many scenarios, such as counseling depressed children [31], persuasion for social good [11], winning debates [32], and recommending items to users [33, 34]. Fig. 1 depicts a persuasive dialogue example. The dialogue agent persuades the user to reduce anxiety from job crises using various persuasion

strategies. The social and communicative dynamics behind persuasive dialogue contexts are complex. Effective and successful persuasive dialogue does not mechanically convey target viewpoints to persuadees but rather empathetically addresses persuadees through social and emotional communications [35]. Thus, persuasive dialogues are not strictly task-oriented but are carried around tasks with additional cognitive strategies to build trust and empathy with persuadees, leading to a smooth persuasive process.

As an emerging research area, an in-depth survey of the existing academic efforts is necessary. Duerr *et al.* [36] broadly reviews the works that use natural language generation to automatically detect and generate persuasive texts. Zhan *et al.* [37] concentrates on the negotiation dialogue system, a typical type of persuasive dialogue system, and comprehensively summarizes benchmarks, evaluations, and methodologies of negotiation dialogue systems. Deng *et al.* [38] provide an overview of the prominent problems and advanced designs in proactive dialogue systems, which treats persuasive dialogue as the subset of the proactive dialogue. Compared with these surveys, we provide a comprehensive review of concepts, challenges, methodologies, and applications in the field of cognitive strategy-enhanced persuasive dialogue. We formalize the definition of cognitive strategies extended from cognitive psychology theory. Based on the formalized concept model and generic system architecture, we summarize representative research in the field of *CogAgent* from a systematic perspective. Furthermore, benchmarks, evaluation metrics, and thoughts on promising research trends are analyzed to promote the research progress. To sum up, our contributions are summarized as follows.

- Drawing from cognitive psychology theories, we formalize the definition of cognitive strategies, and present the concept model and generic system architecture of CogAgent, to provide an overall picture for the summary of research works.
- We make a profound investigation of the development in CogAgent by presenting the core contributions of each work, according to the addressed challenges. Besides, we also comprehensively summarize available datasets and evaluation metrics.
- We further discuss some open issues and promising research trends in CogAgent, including model adaptivity/generality of CogAgent, multi-party CogAgent, multimodal CogAgent, etc., to promote the development of the research community.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first summarize the typical cognitive psychology theories and present the definition of cognitive strategies. Then we formalize the concept model of CogAgent and design a generic system architecture, followed by typical application scenarios of CogAgent. In Section 3, we first introduce the challenges faced by CogAgent and then summarize the key techniques to achieve CogAgent based on the user cognitive strategies. In Section 4, we summarize the available datasets and evaluation metrics, followed by open issues and promising research trends in Section 5.

## 2 Formalized Concept Model and System Architecture for CogAgent

In this section, we first summarise the typical cognitive psychology theories involved in human conversations, as the theoretical foundation for the design of CogAgent. Then we formalize the concept

model for CogAgent and present the generic system architecture to visualize the overall picture in CogAgent.

### 2.1 The Cognitive Psychology Theory

As a typical cognitive-psychological activity, the persuasion process requires the support of cognitive psychology theories to effectively model the mental changes that people experience during conversations, thus promoting the design of CogAgent. This section summarises typical cognitive psychology theories to inspire subsequent CogAgent researchers.

#### 2.1.1 Pre-suasion

The concept of Pre-suasion [39], proposed by the renowned authority on persuasion, Robert Cialdini, is a prominent theory in the persuasion field. Pre-suasion means that the success rate of persuasion can be significantly enhanced by attracting the attention of the persuadee through appropriate choices of words and actions before communication or requests are conducted. Pre-suasion emphasizes that the timing of persuasion is as important as persuasive content. When we intend to persuade others to accept our points, we need to consider others' perspectives and organize our conversational arguments at the appropriate time to effectively complete the persuasion process.

#### 2.1.2 Principle of Consistency

The principle of consistency suggests that people usually try to maintain consistency based on what they have expressed and the commitments they have made in the past [40]. By planning topic paths, one can think about and define one's opinions and arguments in advance to maintain consistency and

increase persuasiveness when communicating with others. The principle of consistency plays an important role in persuading others. Through consistency of statements, the persuadees will recognize that the points raised are consistent with their beliefs or opinions and will effectively increase the effectiveness of persuasion.

### 2.1.3 Theory of Mind

The theory of mind (ToM) [41] suggests that effective questions and answers in communications are based on a shared world of experiences and referents between interlocutors. To communicate effectively, people model both the mental states of their listeners and the effects of their behavior on the world, and then react to and predict the behavior of others. This ability to understand and infer human intentions is defined as a ToM. One way to imitate ToM is to observe others' perspectives in various situations and to derive a set of rules that affect their perspectives and emotions. When the same or highly similar scenarios reoccur, we can make reasonable behavioral or emotional predictions accordingly. Many researchers explicitly model ToM as a concrete cognitive process to ensure that dialogue agents can access potential human psychological states and cognitive processes [42–44].

### 2.1.4 Rhetoric

Aristotle, one of the earliest masters of the art of persuasion, proposes three basic elements of persuasion: ethos (credibility), pathos (emotions), and logos (logic) in his work, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* [45]. These principles serve as a guide to effective persuasive communication. By establishing credibility, appealing to emotions, and applying logical reasoning, one can effectively persuade others to accept his propositions. Aristotle's insights

in Rhetoric remain highly influential not only in the field of persuasive dialogue but also in shaping our understanding of aesthetics and related concepts.

Credibility represents the identification of persuaders, including their identity and moral character, which influences the persuasiveness of the speaker. Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* explains in detail the three elements that affect credibility, namely wisdom, virtue, and goodwill. Wisdom includes elements such as breadth of knowledge, expertise, and authority. Virtue includes elements such as fairness, honesty, and dignity. By demonstrating wisdom, virtue, and goodwill, persuaders can enhance their persuasiveness and foster the trust and reliability of persuadees. Combining essential elements of credibility can greatly enhance the effectiveness of CogAgent. Emotion refers to the expression of sentiments during the persuasion process, thus lowering people's psychological defenses in accepting persuasive content. Aristotle stated that we cannot persuade others through rationality, but can achieve it with emotion. Emotional expressions play an important role in changing the cognitive decisions of others. The use of emotionally charged content and expressions can be more effective in eliciting agreement and empathy from the persuadee. Logic refers to the use of inherent factual logic, causality, or other rational factors in expressions to gain persons' trust and persuade them to change their perceptions. By presenting coherent logical arguments, supported by factual data and authoritative sources, persuaders can establish credibility, gain persuadees' perceptions, and change their opinions.

The cognitive psychology theories, which can be used to model the dynamics of human cognitive psychological status, provide a solid foundation for CogAgent. Under the guidance of cogni-

**Table 1** Part of definitions and examples of persuasion strategies.

Strategy	Definition	Example
<b>Present of Facts</b>	Using factual evidence (e.g., official news reports, statistics) and a credible reasoning process to persuade others	In recent months, the demand for residential properties has become extremely high. The price of residential property has risen almost twenty percent.
<b>Challenges and Inquiries</b>	Expressing disbelief or opposition to the other side's viewpoints and providing strong rebuttal evidence to enhance persuasiveness	Really? I don't agree. This Star Wars episode was incredible!
<b>Emotional Resonance</b>	Eliciting specific emotions to influence others' attitudes	State-of-the-art special effects are the main reason for the success of previous episodes, so audiences have high expectations for this one, and I don't think they will be disappointed
<b>Eliciting Anger</b>		If that's the case, there's not much point in further discussion. We might as well call the whole deal off.
<b>Eliciting Guilt</b>		Come on, you can at least try a little, besides your cigarette.
<b>Self-modeling</b>	Indicating one's intention to act and choosing to act as a role model for the persuadee to follow	That still leaves a gap of 20 dollars to be covered. Let's meet each other halfway once more, then the gap will be closed and our business completed.
<b>Building Trust</b>	Building rapport and psychological trust through a harmonious conversation	I'm glad we've agreed on price. We'll go on to the other terms and conditions at our next meeting.
<b>Courtesy Tips</b>	Expressing gratitude, approval, praise, etc. to lower the other party's psychological defenses	I know exactly what you mean. Hearing that song gives me a nostalgic feeling.
<b>Compromise</b>	Expressing concessions on time to avoid being too intense in the guidance process and causing the other party to end the conversation	I think it unwise for either of us to insist on his price. How about meeting each other halfway so that business can be concluded?
<b>Attachment of Views</b>	Expressing kindness and concern through active listening and to some extent seconding the other person's point of view	Better late than never.

tive psychology, we can comprehensively investigate and model explicit cognitive factors and strategies that can change users' cognitive psychological states, such as logical expressions and emotional appeals. These cognitive strategies can facilitate CogAgent to understand the psychological state of the persuadee and enhance the persuasiveness of responses from multiple perspectives to achieve more efficient persuasion processes.

## 2.2 Cognitive Strategy

To achieve efficient persuasion, it is necessary to integrate various cognitive strategies for precisely responding to the psychological changes of the persuadee. Evolved from cognitive psychological theories, we categorize cognitive strategies into three aspects, **persuasion strategy**, **topic path planning strategy**, and **argument structure prediction strategy**, detailed as follows.

### 2.2.1 Persuasion Strategy

The persuasion strategy aims to influence or change the perceptions, opinions, attitudes, or behaviors of persuadees from a psychological standpoint, through the use of linguistic techniques of expression, such as logical appeal, foot-in-the-door, and self-disclosure [4, 11, 46]. Based on existing research, we construct a comprehensive and effective set of persuasion strategies that can achieve persuasive goals, inspired by the theory of mind, the rhetoric, and other psychology theories. We formalize the definitions and examples of expressions of persuasion strategies, as shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

Numerous studies [11, 47–49] have demonstrated that persuasion strategies can effectively enhance the persuasiveness of the dialogue content. How to reasonably select the appropriate strategies according to the dialogue context and the persuadee's psychological state to generate a persuasive dialogue response is crucial to achieving high-quality Co-

**Table 2** Part of definitions and examples of persuasion strategies.

Strategy	Definition	Example
<b>Problem Decomposition</b>	Decomposing the ultimate persuasion goal into sub-issues and stepping through the persuasion process	Let me get down some information about your apartment first. what is your property's address?
<b>Social Identity</b>	Gaining psychological support from the other person by emphasizing group and identity belonging	I know. I have been a subscriber for the past two years.
<b>Herd Mentality</b>	Presenting a viewpoint that is recognized or accepted by the majority of people and persuading the other side to accept it	There was always a good round of applause every time she sang.
<b>Expression of Disgust</b>		Oh, my god! I look so old. I look as if I were 40. I think it's time for some plastic surgeries.
<b>Expression of Empathy</b>	Expressing a particular point of view or emotion to emphasize the persuasive content	I know, dear. I am too. But we've just been too busy to look for a house.
<b>Expression of Views</b>		That means the apartment has furniture in it.
<b>Logical Appeal</b>	Enhancing the credibility of persuasive content through the logical and reasoning process	It certainly is. But to tell you the truth, the room is so large that I can share it with someone else, and that will decrease the total amount of the rent.
<b>Task Inquiry</b>	Asking questions related to persuasive goals	That might be going overboard a bit. How about just that scarf with a bracelet?
<b>Personal Story</b>	Using narrative examples to illustrate the positive outcomes of your actions to inspire others to follow suit	Yes, I'm sure I've done a lot of house painting in my life. If I got even a tiny drop of paint on her furniture, she would get furious. So I learned to be very picky.
<b>Refutation of Objections</b>	Directly refuting the other side's point of view	Not necessary. If we use a realtor to find a house, it will be more expensive.
<b>Greeting</b>	Greeting at the beginning of a dialogue	Hi there! How are you doing today?

gAgent.

be explored.

### 2.2.2 Topic Path Planning Strategy

The topic path planning strategy aims to plan the topic transition sequence during the persuasive dialogue process, to ensure the dialogue coherence and the progress of the dialogue towards the persuasive target. The persuasive dialogue agent should smoothly navigate between topics to reduce irrelevant associations of the persuadee and the difficulty of the persuasion process [50,51]. The topic path planning strategy is widely employed in target-guided persuasive dialogue systems [52,53]. Starting from the topic of interest to the persuadee, the persuasive dialogue agent needs to gradually and smoothly transfer the conversation topic to the persuasive target to improve the persuadee's psychological acceptability and ensure the persuasive effect. How to plan the reasonable topic path and generate an in-depth multi-turn persuasive conversation according to the corresponding topics is to

### 2.2.3 Argument Structure Prediction Strategy

Argument structure prediction strategy is designed to predict persuasive and authoritative argument surrounding the discussed topic, thereby enhancing the credibility of persuasive dialogue contents and convincing the persuadee of the plausibility of the proposed claims [54–56]. Persuasive dialogue agents need to be equipped with a large-scale library of arguments and counter-arguments. By predicting reasonable argument structures based on specific persuasive topics, dialogue agents can incorporate coherent argumentation skills, such as citing authorities and providing convincing arguments and evidence, to effectively enhance the plausibility of dialogue contents and the credibility of the persuasion process. The argument structure prediction strategy has been extensively explored in the field of debate dialogue, where debaters often consider argument structures to express viewpoints with clar-

ity, logical coherence, and compelling evidence [32, 57, 58]. With the argumentative structure, the whole persuasive process can be progressed incrementally, and the overall organization, logical coherence, and credibility of the persuasive process can be significantly increased. How to mine the supporting argument structures based on the dialogue context and reasonably integrate the argument structures into dialogue contents to enhance the credibility of persuasive dialogue is to be investigated.

### 2.3 Formalized Concept Model for CogAgent

Based on the definitions of cognitive strategies, we define the dialogue system that is incorporated with cognitive strategies to accomplish persuasive tasks through smooth and accessible conversations as Cognitive Strategy-enhanced Persuasive Dialogue (-**CogAgent**). We introduce the formalized concept model of CogAgent as follows.

Typically, given the dialogue context sequence  $H = \{(Q_1, A_1), \dots, (Q_{S-1}, A_{S-1})\}$  with  $S-1$  turns, where  $Q_i$  and  $A_i$  are the dialogue query and response at the  $i$ -th dialogue turn, and the current dialogue query  $Q_S = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$  with  $m$  words, the objective of general dialogue system is to generate the dialogue response  $A_S = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  with  $n$  words. The modern dialogue systems usually follow the encoder-decoder architecture [2, 59] or decoder-only architecture [16, 60]. For the encoder-decoder architecture, the encoder aims to transform input text sequence into vector representations using LSTM [61], Transformer [62] or other advanced neural models, as shown in Eq. 1.

$$\mathbf{Q}_S, \mathbf{H} = \text{Encoder}(Q_S, H) \quad (1)$$

Based on the semantic vectors of dialogue context and input query, the decoder generates the dia-

logue response word by word in an auto-regressive manner, as shown in Eq. 2, where  $a_t$  is the  $t$ -th words in the response.

$$P(A|\mathbf{Q}_S, \mathbf{H}) = \prod_{t=1}^n p(a_t|\mathbf{Q}_S, \mathbf{H}, a_{<t}) \quad (2)$$

For the decoder-only architecture, all input text sequences will concatenated into a uniform sequence with special tokens, and then the decoder also generates the response in a word-by-word manner. The general dialogue system can generate smooth and fluent responses based on the dialogue context. To generate persuasive dialogue content, it is essential to combine three kinds of cognitive strategies.

Based on the definitions of three cognitive strategies, we give the formalized definition of CogAgent. Given the dialogue context and the current query, CogAgent needs to first predict the persuasion strategy  $Per$ , conversation topic  $Top$ , and the argument content  $Arg$  based on the current dialogue content, as follows.

$$Per, Top, Arg = Str\_Pre(\mathbf{Q}_S, \mathbf{H}) \quad (3)$$

where  $Str\_Pre$  refers to the cognitive strategy predictor. Then the dialogue decoder generates the dialogue response word by word conditioned on additional cognitive strategies, as shown in Eq. 4.

$$P(A|\mathbf{Q}_S, \mathbf{H}, Per, Top, Arg) = \prod_{t=1}^n p(a_t|\mathbf{Q}_S, \mathbf{H}, Per, Top, Arg, a_{<t}) \quad (4)$$

### 2.4 Generic System Architecture

After the concept model of CogAgent, we present the generic system architecture of CogAgent, as




Fig. 2 The generic system architecture of CogAgent.

shown in Fig 2. The overall process of CogAgent starts from the semantic understanding of dialogue context and the persuasive target, powered by LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT, LLaMa, Claude, ChatGLM). The input text will be encoded into semantic embeddings for subsequent processes. The *Cognitive Strategy Mining* part is responsible for mining cognitive strategies, including persuasion strategies, topic paths over knowledge graph, and argument structure of topics. The *Cognitive Strategy Prediction for Dialogue Modelling* part predicts appropriate cognitive strategies based on dialogue context and enhances the linguistic expression, logical structure, and other persuasive aspects of responses.

The persuasion strategy mining process first mines various kinds of persuasion strategies through crowd strategy emergence based on cognitive psy-

chology theories. According to the dialogue context, the persuasion strategies to be used in subsequent rounds of dialogue will be predicted. The topic graph construction process constructs topic graphs or topic paths and then plans the wandering paths of topics for persuasion according to the dialogue context and persuasion strategies. The argument mining process first constructs a complete argument structure from credible data sources and then predicts the arguments needed for persuasion based on the above cognitive strategies. Finally, the cognitive strategies-enhanced dialogue context will be fed into LLMs to generate persuasive dialogue responses, for numerous applications, such as psychological counseling, bargaining, and persuasion for social good.

## 2.5 Application Scenarios

Persuasive dialogue system has widespread applications in daily life. It is an ongoing effort of the academic/industry researchers to conduct persuasive dialogue with users to achieve persuasive targets, summarized as follows.

**Persuasion for social good.** Persuasion for social good is a typical persuasive dialogue scenario where people are persuaded to donate money or goods to charities for social good purposes, such as children's aid and natural disaster relief. Many researchers have explored how to combine persuasion strategies to promote users' donation behavior. For example, Wang *et al.* [11] provide an insightful analysis of what persuasion strategies are effective for what types of personal characteristics of users. Mishra *et al.* [63] propose a Reinforcement Learning (RL) based persuasive dialogue system with an efficient reward function consisting of five different sub rewards, Persuasion, Emotion, Politeness-Strategy Consistency, Dialogue-Coherence, and Non-repetitiveness. Chen *et al.* [35] produce a modular persuasive dialogue system that seamlessly integrates factual information and persuasive content into generated dialogue response using the conditional language model.

**Persuasion for psychological counseling.** The frequent occurrence of mental diseases, such as depression, makes mental health gradually receive extensive attention from society [64–66]. Psychological counseling aims at reducing people's emotional distress and helping them understand and work through the challenges that they face. Relieving the psychological pressure of the persuaded through conversation holds profound significance for the persuasive dialogue system. Extensive studies have explored the possibility of using persuasive dialogue

systems to provide psychological counseling. For example, Liu *et al.* [46] collect the Emotion Support Conversation dataset (ESConv) with well-designed persuasion strategy annotation to train dialogue system to provide emotional support through dialogue interactions. Zhou *et al.* [67] build a commonsense cognition graph and an emotional concept graph based on commonsense knowledge from COMET [68] and concept knowledge from ConceptNet [69]. The two kinds of knowledge are aligned to generate dialogue responses for emotional support.

**Persuasion for negotiation.** Negotiation is a common real-life persuasion scenario in which two parties negotiate through ongoing conversations to persuade the other party to accept the terms or demands they make to maximize their interests. Negotiation is a necessary means of facilitating agreements among people and improving the efficiency of society. There have been several studies using persuasive dialogue systems to achieve negotiation. For instance, Joshi *et al.* propose DIALOGraph [13], a negotiation dialogue system that explicitly incorporates dependencies between sequences of strategies into graph neural networks. Nortio *et al.* [70] embark on an exploration of persuasive techniques in international negotiations, emphasizing the significance of persuasive strategies during the negotiation process.

**Persuasion for debate.** Debate is a professional persuasive scenario in which debaters persuade the opponent and the audience to accept their viewpoints by planning their arguments wisely and arguing their points from multiple perspectives. Many researchers have explored the automatic generation of persuasive arguments from online discussions or debate competitions [57, 71, 72]. Slonim *et al.* [32] introduce Project Debater, an autonomous debat-

ing system that can engage in a competitive debate with humans.

**Persuasion for recommendation.** Engaging in dialogue-based recommendations for movies, products, and other such aspects proves to be a highly practical application of a persuasive dialogue system. To achieve successful recommendations, it is crucial to employ a persuasion strategy to facilitate rapid user comprehension and acceptance of the recommendations. For example, Gupta *et al.* [73] propose to decompose the recommendation response generation process into first generating explicit commonsense paths between the source and persuasive target followed by generating responses conditioned on the generated paths.

### 3 Research Challenges and Key Techniques

Due to the complexity of modeling the psychological changes in the persuasive conversation, many critical challenges in CogAgent need to be addressed. In this section, we first detail these challenges faced by CogAgent, and then conduct a comprehensive investigation of representative works of CogAgent according to the adopted cognitive strategies, i.e., the persuasion strategy, the topic path planning strategy, and the argument structure prediction strategy.

#### 3.1 Research Challenges in CogAgent

**Exhaustive mining of cognitive strategies.** Psychology defines human cognition as the process by which a person encounters, perceives, and understands things [74, 75]. The formation and evolution of human cognition is an extremely complex process involving knowledge, personality, emotion, and many other aspects. Effective persuasive dialogue changes people’s feelings and perceptions

about things through persuasive strategies that convince people to change their opinions and behaviors [11, 76]. Therefore, it is a great challenge to build a complete set of cognitive strategies from the perspective of cognitive psychology by mining cognitive strategies that can effectively change the way human beings perceive and understand things. Several researchers have defined some persuasion strategies based on cognitive psychology theories (e.g., *logical appeal* and *emotion appeal* from [11], *self-disclosure* from [46]). However, most of these strategies are task-specific and not exhaustive enough to cope with generalized persuasion scenarios. How to construct well-defined cognitive strategies from multiple perspectives needs to be explored in depth.

#### Modeling and selecting of cognitive strategies.

In persuasive dialogues, people usually dynamically choose different persuasive strategies depending on different persuasive goals and the evolving conversational contexts. Persuasive strategies contain complex semantic patterns, rather than mere names or descriptions [77, 78]. How to model the implicit associations between strategy definitions and linguistic expressions, and precisely select cognitive strategies according to the dialog context to facilitate the smooth flow of the persuasive dialog process is a serious challenge. Some researches have explored how to select appropriate cognitive strategies based on the dialogue context [13, 49]. The appropriate selection of cognitive strategies is a critical step for CogAgent to simulate humans in persuasive conversations and is essential for achieving high-quality persuasive conversations.

#### Integrating cognitive strategies into models.

As defined at the cognitive psychology level, cognitive strategies are more abstract semantic concepts. Data-driven neural network models (DNNs), even LLMs, remain superficial in the understand-

ing of cognitive strategies. How to facilitate DNNs to learn the profound semantics of cognitive strategies, to rationally integrate cognitive strategies into the generation of persuasive dialogues, and to improve the persuasiveness of CogAgent, is quite challenging. Graph-based, [13], reinforcement learning-based [79] and other advanced methods are investigated to integrate cognitive strategies into persuasive dialog generation. It is promising to integrate cognitive strategies with the outstanding language comprehension ability of LLMs.

**Absence of evaluation metrics.** To improve the quality of persuasive dialogue, the performance of CogAgent needs to be evaluated accurately and comprehensively. However, existing evaluation metrics for dialog systems (e.g., BLEU [80], METEOR [81], ROUGE-L [82]) are usually evaluated at the level of word similarity or semantic similarity between generated responses and ground truth, without taking into account the effectiveness of persuasive strategies, the rationality of persuasive path planning, and the richness of argument structure. It is a challenge to develop comprehensive and reasonable evaluation metrics to accurately evaluate the quality of CogAgent, incorporating the characteristics of persuasive dialog systems.

### 3.2 Persuasion Strategy-based CogAgent

Incorporating persuasion strategies to enhance the persuasiveness of dialog responses is an important research direction in CogAgent. By using specific persuasive strategies, CogAgent can express the persuasive content in a way that is more acceptable to the persuadees, thus accomplishing the persuasive goals more smoothly. As abstract psychological concepts, how to select appropriate persuasion strategies according to the dialogue context and guide the generation of responses is an important re-

search question. In this section, we make an investigation of the employment of persuasion strategies in CogAgent, summarized in Table 3.

#### 3.2.1 Strategy Classification based on Dialogue Context

A straightforward approach to fusing persuasion strategies in persuasive conversations is to predict a strategy label (e.g., Present of Facts) based on the dialogue context and feed the strategy into the decoder with the dialogue context to generate the dialogue response.

For example, Wang *et al.* [11] propose a persuasion strategy classifier to predict 10 persuasion strategies based on the dialogue context information and sentence-level features. The authors also analyze the impact that different people's backgrounds on strategy prediction, laying the groundwork for research on personalized persuasive dialogue agents. He *et al.* [47] decouple strategy selection and response generation in CogAgent. The dialogue manager predicts a persuasion strategy based on the persuasion strategies in dialogue history by a sequence-to-sequence model and the response generator produces a response conditioned on the strategy and dialogue history.

#### 3.2.2 Persuasion Strategy Planning

Persuasive dialogue is usually a process that lasts multiple turns, supported by successive strategies [87, 88]. Consequently, strategy planning within a long planning horizon in CogAgent is quite important, rather than predicting a specific strategy based on the dialogue history. Several studies focus on long-term planning of persuasion strategies, making CogAgent more efficient in reaching persuasion goals.

**Table 3** Representative works of persuasion strategy-based CogAgent.

Solution	Work	Description
Strategy classifying based on dialogue context	Wang et al. [11]	Proposing a classifier to predict persuasion strategies in dialogue using context and sentence features.
	He et al. [47]	Decoupling strategy selection and response generation in CogAgent for predicting strategy and generating responses based on dialogue history.
Persuasion strategy planning	Cheng et al. [49]	Proposing lookahead heuristics to estimate future user feedback after using the specific strategy.
	Yu et al. [83]	Using Monte Carlo Tree Search for persuasion strategy planning without model training.
Graph-based strategy incorporation	Joshi et al. [48]	Using GNNs to model strategies, dialogue acts, and dependencies in graph structures for response generation.
	Zhou et al. [84]	Modeling both dialogue context semantic and persuasion strategy history with finite state transducers.
Knowledge-enhanced strategy modeling	Jia et al. [85]	Introducing a knowledge-enriched encoder and memory-enhanced strategy module for dynamic emotion and semantic pattern modeling.
	Chen et al. [35]	Designing RAP for dynamic factual and persuasive responses based on knowledge and individual persuasion strategies.
Novel integration mechanism	Mishra et al. [63]	Creating an RL reward function to enhance consistency in politeness strategy, persuasiveness, and emotion acknowledgment in persuasive dialogue.
	Tu et al. [86]	Proposing a novel model MISC, which firstly infers the user’s fine-grained emotional status, and then responds skillfully using a mixture of strategies.


For instance, Cheng *et al.* [49] firstly adopt an A\* search algorithm for persuasion strategy planning. When predicting the appropriate strategy in each dialogue turn, look-ahead heuristics are proposed to estimate future user feedback after using the specific strategy, thus considering the long-term effect of persuasion strategies. The proposed lookahead method requires abundant annotated data, affecting the application to broader persuasive dialogue scenarios. To overcome this bottleneck, Yu *et al.* [83] prompts LLMs to perform persuasion strategy planning by simulating future dialogue interactions using the Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) algorithm. This method requires no model training and can therefore be adapted to any persuasion scenario.

### 3.2.3 Graph-based Strategy Incorporation

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) [89–91] can combine the benefits of interpretability and expressivity, benefiting from encoding graph-structured data through message propagation. Due to the human brain’s reasoning process to capture semantic as-

sociations, graph-based methods have been widely used in various tasks [92,93]. Numerous researchers have embarked on exploring the potential of graph-based methods for incorporating persuasion strategies in CogAgent.

For example, Joshi *et al.* [48] introduce DIALOGraph, as shown in Fig 3, a persuasive dialogue system that incorporates persuasion strategies and dialogue acts using GNNs. DIALOGraph models persuasion strategies in multi-turn dialogue context and their dependencies as graph structures and incorporating strategies into response generation using hierarchical graph pooling-based approaches. Zhou *et al.* [84] propose to model both dialogue context semantic and persuasion strategy history finite state transducers (FSTs). To model the persuasion factors affecting the persuasive content of dialogues, Liu *et al.* [94] present persuasion-factor graph convolutional layers to encode and learn representations of the persuasion-aware interaction data.



**Fig. 3** Overview architecture of DIALOGraph which models persuasion strategies as graph structure.

### 3.2.4 Knowledge-enhanced Strategy Modeling

As concepts in cognitive psychology, persuasion strategies encompass complex semantic information and various intricate linguistic features [88, 95]. To comprehensively represent the complex semantics embedded within persuasion strategies, researchers investigate combining external knowledge to model and mimic the intricate patterns in strategies.

For example, Jia *et al.* [85] propose a knowledge-enriched dialogue context encoder to model the dynamic emotion state and a memory-enhanced strategy modeling module to model the semantic patterns of persuasion strategies. The same-strategy responses are stored in the memory bank to provide more specific guidance for the strategy-constrained response generation. Chen *et al.* [35] design the Response-Agenda Pushing Framework (RAP) to dynamically produce factual responses based on knowledge facts and persuasive responses conditioned on individual persuasion strategies.

### 3.2.5 Novel Integration Mechanisms

In addition to the above studies to model and integrate persuasion strategies, researchers propose some novel integration mechanisms to improve the performance of CogAgent, summarized as follows.

Combined with RL, Yang *et al.* [96] propose two variants of ToM-based persuasive dialog agent, where the explicit version that outputs the opponent type as an intermediate prediction, and an implicit version that models the opponent type as a latent variable. Both models are optimized using reinforcement learning. Similarly, Mishra *et al.* [63] design an efficient reward function in RL to improve the politeness-strategy consistency, persuasiveness, and emotional acknowledgement in persuasive dialogue.

To increase the expressed empathy and learn the gradual transition in the long response, Tu [86] introduce a Mixed Strategy-aware model (MISC) integrating COMET, a pre-trained generative commonsense reasoning model, for emotional persuasive dialogue. The COMET knowledge tuples are adopted to enhance the fine-grained emotional understanding of users. Then MISC formulates per-

**Table 4** Representative works of topic path planning strategy-based CogAgent.

Solution	Work	Description
Reinforcement learning based planning	Xu et al. [98]	Presenting KnowHRL, a three-layer Knowledge-aware hierarchical RL-based model for coherent topic path planning and multi-turn persuasive dialogue responses.
	Liu et al. [99]	Hierarchical RL for conversation topic path planning, using high-level strategies and low-level responses.
	Lei et al. [100]	Introducing four persuasion-related factors in the reward function to achieve persuasive goals efficiently.
Graph-based planning	Zhong et al. [101]	Using commonsense knowledge graphs and GNN to enhance semantic relations between topic keywords, improving keyword-augmented response retrieval.
	Zou et al. [102]	Employing a concept graph for topic planning, utilizing an Insertion Transformer for persuasive response generation based on multi-concept paths.
	Wang et al. [103]	Introducing a Transformer-based network for target-driven topic path planning with knowledge-target mutual attention and set-search decoding.
Novel planning mechanism	Tang et al. [53]	Combining various planning algorithms for robust and smooth topic path planning, incorporating a sampling strategy, flow generator, and global planner.
	Wang et al. [104]	Introducing a consistency-driven dialogue planning approach that utilizes stochastic processes to model the temporal evolution of the conversation path dynamically.

suasion strategy as a probability distribution over a strategy codebook to use a mixture of strategies for persuasive response generation.

To investigate the potential of LLMs in persuasive conversations, Zheng *et al.* [97] first construct a large-scale persuasive dialogue dataset in the emotional support domain, leveraging the generative capabilities of LLMs. Then several advanced tuning techniques (fine-tuning, adapter-tuning, LoRA-tuning) are employed to showcase the superiority of LLMs in persuasive dialogue generation.

### 3.3 Topic Path Planning Strategy-based CogAgent


In persuasive dialogues, generating engaging responses through effective topic path planning is critical to achieving persuasive targets. Topic path planning strategy is a navigation tool that enhances the coherence of the persuasion process by continuously leading users to discuss different points and topics until reaching persuasive targets. This section deepens into the intricate details of the topic path planning strategy, summarized in Table 4.

#### 3.3.1 Reinforcement Learning-based Planning

In the context of topic paths planning strategy, Reinforcement Learning serves as a dynamic framework for guiding persuasive dialogue systems in a goal-oriented manner. The core of RL is to learn the optimal sequence of actions according to the reward function and is therefore ideally suited for planning coherent topic paths in CogAgent.

For example, to achieve coherent topic path planning, Xu *et al.* [98] introduce a three-layer Knowledge aware hierarchical RL-based model (KnowHRL). The upper layer of KnowHRL plans a high-level topic sequence to track user interests toward persuasive targets. The lower layers are responsible for generating multi-turn persuasive dialogue responses. similarly, Liu *et al.* [99] propose a hierarchical RL method, GoChat, for topic path planning, as shown in Fig 4. The high-level strategies in GoChat determine sub-goals that guide the conversation towards the ultimate target and the low-level strategy generates the corresponding responses to achieve those sub-goals.

To plan topic paths from a global perspective, Yang *et al.* [105] introduce the global planning method integrated with a commonsense knowledge gr-



**Fig. 4** The overall framework of GoChat with hierarchical reinforcement learning.

aph (KG). The key advancement is the introduction of a global RL framework that utilizes topic path planning on KG to guide the local response generation model toward persuasive targets, resulting in more coherent conversations. To achieve persuasive goals more effectively, Lei *et al.* [100] consider four factors (dialogue turn, goal completion difficulty, user satisfaction estimation, and cooperative degree) in the reward function. The targets of achieving persuasive targets quickly and maintaining the engagingness of users.

### 3.3.2 Graph-based Planning

Knowledge is essential to the cognitive reasoning processes of human beings. We humans usually perform common reason during persuasive conversation to enhance the logic and persuasiveness of dialog contents. Therefore, relying on common-sense knowledge graphs for topic path planning can produce more persuasive target-related topic paths for CogAgent, thus reaching persuasive targets more efficiently.

Initially, the semantic knowledge relations among topic keywords are captured to perform next-turn topic prediction during conversation [28, 106]. Then the predicted topic keywords are used to retrieve appropriate candidate responses for persua-


sive targets. Furthermore, Zhong *et al.* [101] introduce commonsense knowledge graphs and Graph Neural Networks (GNN) to model the semantic relations between topic keywords and enhance the keyword-augmented response retrieval,

To plan topic paths more reasonably, Zou *et al.* [102] introduces a concept graph based on the dialogue data, where the vertices represent concepts and edges are concept transitions between utterances. The topic sequence containing multiple concepts is obtained by the multi-concept planning module and an Insertion Transformer generates a persuasive response according to the planned topic paths. Wang *et al.* [107] propose a target-driven planning network (TPNet), which models the topic path planning as a sequence generation task using Transformer, as shown in Fig 5. A knowledge-target mutual attention mechanism and a set-search decoding (SSD) strategy are developed to generate topic paths based on the dialogue context.

### 3.3.3 Novel Planning Mechanism

In addition to the above research to plan topic paths in CogAgent, there are some novel planning mechanisms to be explored, summarized as follows.

Combining the strengths of multiple topic planning algorithms, the Tang *et al.* [53] propose an



**Fig. 5** The overview framework of TPNet.

EAGLE model for topic path planning. Comprising a topic path sampling strategy, topic flow generator, and global planner, EAGLE achieves robustness to unseen target topics and smooth transitions. The model demonstrates enhanced global planning ability through its integrated approach, addressing limitations in existing topic-planning conversation models.

To ensure the smooth and coherent progression toward persuasive goals across different turns, Wang *et al.* [108] introduce a consistency-driven dialogue planning approach that utilizes stochastic processes to model the temporal evolution of the conversation path dynamically. Firstly, a latent space is defined, and Brownian bridge processes are employed to capture the continuity of goal-oriented behavior, allowing for more flexible integration of user feedback into dialogue planning, and explicitly generating conversation paths. Ultimately, these paths are employed as natural language prompts to guide the generation of persuasive dialogue.

### 3.4 Argument Structure Prediction Strategy-based CogAgent

CogAgent entails an ongoing conversation between a dialogue agent and a user at the cognitive level, where the dialogue agent proactively steers the conversation. As the conversation progresses, the contents presented by the dialogue agent to support its perspectives undergo dynamic transformations. Consequently, the reasonable selection and application of arguments and evidence play a pivotal role in the persuasiveness of the dialogue. The utilization of arguments and evidence is imperative in the process of persuasion. Firstly, employing arguments and evidence allows for the gradual decomposition and progressive reasoning of persuasive targets, thereby facilitating a logical and sequential flow of the conversation that enhances the users' acceptance of viewpoints [109]. Secondly, the provision of factual support elevates the credibility of persuasive discourse, thereby augmenting the persuasiveness of the conversation. In this section, we provide an investigation of the crucial techniques for argument mining and argument structure prediction in CogAgent, as summarized in Table 5.

**Table 5** Representative works of argument structure prediction strategy-based cogAgent.

Solution	Work	Description
Argument mining	Khatib et al. [110]	Classifying and structurally modeling arguments from online debate portals based on diverse vocabulary, grammar, and metric features.
	Hua et al. [111]	Proposing an argument generation framework with retrieval modules and a sentence-level LSTM for generating viewpoints.
	Srivastava et al. [112]	Using attention-based link prediction and Transformer encoder to model hierarchical causal relationships and discover associations in online argument structures.
	Niculae et al. [113]	Introducing factor graph model for argument mining, concurrently learning fundamental unit types classification and argument relationship prediction.
Argument structure prediction	Rach et al. [57]	Proposing argument search technique using supervised learning-based relation classification to retrieve arguments for debate dialogue system
	Sakai et al. [71]	Introducing an approach to consider the human agreement and disagreement, resulting in a persuasive argument with a hierarchical argumentation structure.
	Prakken et al. [29]	Enhancing argument modeling with a five-layer graph, serving as a knowledge base for a chatbot to identify user focal points and select rebuttal points.
	Li et al. [114]	Using factor graphs to extract online debate features, incorporating them into an LSTM model to predict persuasive arguments.


### 3.4.1 Argument Mining

To integrate the argument structure into CogAgent, it is first necessary to perform argument mining according to conversation topics. Researchers embark on mining argumentative text from dialogues for CogAgent.

Debate involves the explicit use of argumentative content for dialogue expression, making it an important source of argument mining. For example, Khatib *et al.* [110] utilize online debate portals to acquire both controversial and non-controversial text snippets related to several contentious topics. These snippets are organized in a semi-structured format. Eventually, by employing a diverse set of vocabulary, grammar, and metric feature types, the arguments are classified and structurally modeled. Hua *et al.* [111] propose a framework for generating arguments to opposing viewpoints. The retrieval module of this framework comprises Query Formulation, Keyphrase Extraction, and Passage Ranking and Filtering. Subsequently, a sentence-level LSTM is trained to generate a sequence of sentences.

In online discussion platforms, people also use argumentative texts to enhance their expressions.

For instance, Tran *et al.* [115] and others [104, 116, 117] employ multi-task learning to unearth arguments and evidence at both the micro and macro levels, enhancing persuasive power in online discussions. Srivastava *et al.* [112] employs an attention-based link prediction embedding model to model the hierarchical causal relationships within common argument structures in online discussions. They then utilize Transformer encoder layers to discover the associations and boundaries between arguments. Furthermore, they employ AMPERSAND *et al.* [56] and SMOTE *et al.* [118] to address data imbalance issues, thereby improving model accuracy. Furthermore, Niculae *et al.* [113] introduce a factor graph model for argument mining, wherein the model concurrently learns the classification of fundamental unit types and prediction of argument relationships. Furthermore, the parameter structures of structured SVM and RNN can enforce structural constraints (e.g., transitivity), while also representing dependencies between adjacent relationships and propositions.



**Fig. 6** The overall framework of the model for predicting which side makes more convincing arguments [114].

### 3.4.2 Argument Structure Prediction

Dialogue systems of persuasive tasks commonly rely on structured knowledge concerning arguments and their relationships. Numerous researchers have demonstrated that predicting argument structures and integrating them into CogAgent can significantly enhance topic consistency, content coherence, and persuasiveness of persuasive dialogue contents [32, 71, 72].

For example, Rach *et al.* [57] propose an argument search technique for a debate dialogue system, which utilizes supervised learning-based relation classification to retrieve arguments mapped to a generic tree structure for the dialogue model. Sakai *et al.* [71] introduce an approach to consider human agreement and disagreement, resulting in a persuasive argument with a hierarchical argumentation structure. The dialogue agent selects the next action based on the user's agreement or disagreement and sends the chosen action to the response generation module to generate logically consistent and persuasive dialogue.

For more intensive argument modeling, Prakken *et al.* [29] equip dialogue agents with a five-layer argument graph, consisting of 1288 nodes, with an

average of three counterarguments per node. This graph serves as the knowledge base for the proposed chatbot, allowing it to dynamically identify and annotate the user's focal points on the parameters, enabling the selection of appropriate rebuttal points. Li *et al.* [114] utilized factor graph models to extract features of argument structures from online debate platforms. These features were then incorporated into an LSTM model to predict the most persuasive arguments, as shown in Fig 6. This study proves that the consideration of argument structure plays a vital role in producing persuasive dialogue content.

## 4 Datasets and Evaluation Metrics for CogAgent

### 4.1 Datasets for CogAgent

Massive data is undeniably indispensable for training high-quality CogAgent. To foster advancement in this field, numerous large-scale and high-quality datasets have been released. In this section, we categorize existing datasets by application scenarios, including psychological counseling, debate, price negotiation, persuasion for donation, and product recommendation, summarized as Table 6.

**Table 6** A review of available datasets for CogAgent.

Scenario	Dataset	Description
Psychological counseling	ESConv [46]	The first dataset for psychological counseling, annotated with persuasive strategies.
	AUGESC [119]	The enhanced dataset from ESConv using LLMs with a broader range of topics.
	PsyQA [120]	A Chinese mental health support dataset featuring annotated persuasive strategies.
	IAC [121]	Argumentative dialog dataset with curated threads, posts, and annotations.
Debate	Winning Arguments [7]	A metadata-rich subset of r/ChangeMyView subreddit conversations includes data on the success of user utterances in persuading the poster.
	DebateSum [122]	A dataset for the competitive formal debate with corresponding argument and extractive summaries.
Price negotiation	Craigslist-Bargain [47]	A human-human dialogue dataset for price negotiation where the buyer and seller are encouraged to reach an agreement to get a better deal.
	Negotiation-Coach [123]	An additional negotiation coach based on CraigslistBargain, which monitors the exchange between two annotators and provides real-time negotiation strategy.
Persuasion for donation	Persuasion For Good [11]	A collection of online conversations where one participant (the persuader) tries to convince the other (the persuadee) to donate to a charity.
	EPP4G and ETP4G [63]	Datasets extending Persuasion For Good by annotating it with the emotion and politeness-strategy labels.
	FaceAct [124]	A dataset extending Persuasion For Good by adding the utterance-level annotations that change the positive and/or the negative face of the participants in a conversation
Product recommendation	TG-ReDial [33]	A dataset consisting of dialogues between a seeker and a recommender.
	DuRecDial [125]	A human-to-human Chinese dialog dataset, which contains multiple sequential dialogues for every pair of a recommendation seeker and a recommender.
	INSPIRED [126]	A movie recommendation dataset, consisting of human-human dialogues with an annotation scheme for persuasive strategies.

#### 4.1.1 Datasets for Psychological Counseling

Psychological counseling is a typical field of persuasive dialogue, where CogAgent reduces users' psychological anxiety and encourages positive emotions through the persuasive dialogue process. Researchers have released several datasets for psychological counseling.

**ESConv.** ESConv<sup>6)</sup> [46] is a well-designed and rich, effective corpora for psychological counseling, consisting of 1,053 dialogue pairs and a total of 31,410 sentences. Each dialogue pair includes information about the initial emotional state of the seeker, the persuasive strategies employed by the supporter during each interaction, and the content of the conversation. The dataset encompasses seven distinct emotional states and eight supportive strategies, with the labeling of these strategies being inspired by Hill's Helping Skills Theory [88].

**AUGESC.** The limitations imposed by crowdsourcing platforms on data themes and collection methods, along with the substantial regulatory costs, have hindered the extension of downstream dialogue models to open-domain topics. In response, Zheng et al. augment ESConv to AUGESC<sup>7)</sup> [119] using LLMs, which comprises 65,000 dialogue sessions and a total of 1,738,000 utterances. It substantially expands the scale of ESConv and encompasses a broader range of topics.

**PsyQA.** PsyQA<sup>8)</sup> [120] is a Chinese mental health support dataset collected from a Chinese mental health service platform, including 22,000 questions and 56,000 lengthy, well-structured answers. In line with psychological counseling theory, PsyQA annotates some of the answer texts with persuasive strategies and further conducts in-depth analyses of the lexical features and strategic patterns within

<sup>6)</sup><https://github.com/thu-coai/Emotional-Support-Conversation>

<sup>7)</sup><https://github.com/thu-coai/AugESC>

<sup>8)</sup><https://github.com/thu-coai/PsyQA>

counseling responses.

#### 4.1.2 Datasets for Debate

Debates are typically persuasive scenarios in which each party of the debate organizes arguments to persuade the other party to accept his or her side’s viewpoints. Existing datasets for debate are listed as follows.

**Internet Argument Corpus (IAC).** IAC<sup>9)</sup> [121] is a scriptless argumentative dialog dataset, comprising 390,704 posts extracted from 11,800 discussions on the online debate platform [4forums.com](https://4forums.com). Within this corpus, a manually curated subset of 2,866 threads and 130,206 posts is formed, categorized based on discussion topics. Extended from IAC, IAC 2<sup>10)</sup> [127] is a corpus for research in political debate on Internet forums, consists of three data sets: 4forums (414K posts), ConvinceMe (65K posts), and a sample from CreateDebate (3K posts).

**Winning Arguments.** To delve deeper into the mechanisms of changing others’ viewpoints in social interactions, Tan et al. [7] introduce the Winning Arguments (ChangeMyView) Corpus. Wining ArgumentsCorpus is a metadata-rich subset of conversations made in the *r/ChangeMyview* subreddit between 1 Jan 2013 - 7 May 2015, with information on the delta (success) of a user’s utterance in convincing the poster. There are 34911 Speakers, 293297 Utterances, and 3051 Conversations.

**DebateSum.** DebateSum<sup>11)</sup> [122] is a dataset for the competitive formal debate, including 187,386 unique pieces of evidence with corresponding argument and extractive summaries. The argument data is collected from the National Speech and Debate Association over 7 years.

<sup>9)</sup><https://nlds.soe.ucsc.edu/iac>

<sup>10)</sup><https://nlds.soe.ucsc.edu/iac2>

<sup>11)</sup><https://debate.cards/>

#### 4.1.3 Datasets for Price Negotiation

Price negotiation is an everyday persuasive scenario where buyers and sellers reach their desired price through the persuasive dialog process. Datasets for price negotiation are summarized as follows.

**CraigslistBargain.** CraigslistBargain<sup>12)</sup> [47] is a human-human dialogue dataset for price negotiation, which consists of 6682 dialogues, collected using Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) in a negotiation setting where two workers were assigned the roles of buyer and seller, respectively. The buyer is additionally given a target price and both parties are encouraged to reach an agreement while each of the workers tries to get a better deal.

**Negotiation-Coach.** Negotiation-Coach<sup>13)</sup> [123] introduce an additional negotiation coach based on CraigslistBargain, which monitors the exchange between two annotators and provides real-time negotiation strategy recommendations to the seller for achieving better deals.

#### 4.1.4 Datasets for Persuasion for Donation

Persuasion for donation is very common in life, where the persuader persuades others to donate property or labor to charities for a public good purpose. Datasets for persuasion for donation are listed as follows.

**Persuasion for Social Good.** Persuasion for Social Good<sup>14)</sup> [11] is a collection of online conversations generated by AMT workers, where one participant (the persuader) tries to convince the other (the persuadee) to donate to a charity. This dataset

---

<sup>12)</sup><https://worksheets.codalab.org/worksheets/0x453913e76b65495d8b9730d41c7e0a0c/>

<sup>13)</sup><https://github.com/zhouyiheng11/Negotiation-Coach>

<sup>14)</sup><https://gitlab.com/ucdavisnlp/persuasionforgood>

contains 1017 conversations, along with demographic data and responses to psychological surveys from users. 300 conversations also have per-sentence human annotations of dialogue acts that pertain to the persuasion setting, and sentiment.

**EPP4G and ETP4G.** EPP4G and ETP4G<sup>15)</sup> [63] extend Persuasion For Good by annotating it with the emotion and politeness-strategy labels.

**FaceAct.** FaceAct<sup>16)</sup> [124] further extend Persuasion For Good by adding the utterance-level annotations that change the positive and/or the negative face of the participants in a conversation. A face act can either raise or attack the positive face or negative face of either the speaker or the listener in the conversation.

#### 4.1.5 Datasets for Product Recommendation

Product recommendation intends to induce the recommended person to accept or buy a particular product through persuasive dialogues. Datasets for product recommendation are listed as follows.

**TG-ReDial.** TG-ReDial<sup>17)</sup> [33] consists of 10,000 two-party dialogues between a seeker and a recommender in the movie domain.

**DuRecDial.** DuRecDial<sup>18)</sup> [125] is a human-to-human Chinese dialog dataset (about 10k dialogs, 156k utterances), which contains multiple sequential dialogues for every pair of a recommendation seeker (user) and a recommender (bot). In each dialogue, the recommender proactively leads a multi-type dialogue to approach recommendation targets and then makes multiple recommendations with rich interaction behavior.

**INSPIRED.** INSPIRED<sup>19)</sup> [126] is a movie recommendation dataset, consisting of 1,001 human-human dialogues with an annotation scheme for persuasive strategies based on social science theories.

### 4.2 Evaluation metrics Toward CogAgent

The reasonable evaluation of the quality of CogAgent is a challenging dilemma. Different from the open-domain dialog system, the evaluation of CogAgent needs to be performed under different persuasion scenarios and multifaceted persuasive goals. This requires judging the quality of dialogue response while emphasizing the persuasive effects in specific persuasive contexts and assessing the adaptability and persuasiveness of the system's cognitive strategies in different domains. Up to now, there is no unified theory on how to effectively evaluate CogAgent, and researchers predominantly employ two kinds of evaluation methods: automatic evaluation metrics and human evaluation. We summarized commonly used automatic evaluation and human evaluation metrics in table 7. Notably, evaluating CogAgent based on LLMs has also recently received significant attention.

#### 4.2.1 Automatic Evaluation Metrics

Automatic evaluation metrics evaluate the performance of CogAgent by calculating the similarity between the responses generated by CogAgent and ground truths. There are typical categories of automatic evaluation metrics: overlap-based methods, embedding-based methods, and learning-based techniques.

**Overlap-based metrics.** Overlap-based methods measure the degree of text overlap between

<sup>15)</sup><https://github.com/Mishrakshitij/PEPDS>

<sup>16)</sup><https://github.com/ShoRit/face-acts>

<sup>17)</sup><https://github.com/RUCAIBox/TG-ReDial>

<sup>18)</sup><https://github.com/PaddlePaddle/Research/tree/master/NLP/ACL2020-DuRecDial>

<sup>19)</sup><https://github.com/sweetpeach/Inspired>

**Table 7** Evaluation metrics for CogAgent.

Evaluation Method	Category	Description	Metrics
Automatic evaluation	Overlap-based	Measuring the degree of text overlap between generated responses and golden responses	BLEU [80], ROUGE [82], METEOR [128], CIDEr [129]
	Embedding-based	Evaluating the semantic similarity of embedding vectors between generated responses and reference ones	Greedy Matching [130], Embedding averaging [131], Vector Extreme [132]
	Learning-based	Employing machine learning models to predict the quality scores of generated responses, relying not only on given references	ADEM [133]
Human evaluation		Scoring by human annotators to evaluate the quality of the generated responses with subjective judgment	Fluency, Coherence, Contextualization, Emotional expression, Diversity, Persuasiveness

generated responses and golden responses, with particular emphasis on the number of the same n-grams. These methods quantify the similarity of the text, especially the local structural similarity, to measure the quality of generated responses. Classical Overlap-based methods include **BLEU** [80], **ROUGE** [82], **METEOR** [128] and **CIDEr** [129]. Among these, BLEU evaluates response quality by comparing the harmonic mean of n-gram overlaps between generated responses and the golden ones. BLEU is a straightforward and intuitive metric, yet it is constrained by surface features and may exhibit a weak capture of semantic relevance. ROUGE calculates the length of the longest common subsequences between generated and golden responses and considers the precision and recall to evaluate the quality. METEOR integrates multiple aspects of information, including precision, recall, and syntactic structure, providing a more comprehensive evaluation. CIDEr evaluates the semantic similarity between generated responses and ground truths using n-gram level cosine similarity. These metrics have been widely applied in the evaluation of open-domain dialog systems, but they focus mainly on surface features of the response and may not capture semantic relevance. In addition, relying solely on n-gram overlap to measure similarity may not always accurately evaluate the quality of long texts.

#### Embedding-based metrics.

Embedding-based metrics evaluate the semantic similarity of embedding vectors between generated responses and reference ones. These methods utilize pre-trained word embedding models (e.g., BERT [134]) to map textual responses into embedding vectors, thus capturing the semantic relationships between the texts more accurately. Specifically, **Greedy Matching** [130] computes the cosine similarity of word embeddings between each word in generated response and golden ones. **Embedding averaging** [131] averages all words in the sentence to calculate the sentence-level similarity. **Vector Extrema** [132] takes the most extreme value in the embedding vector to represent the response to be evaluated. In essence, embedding-based metrics emphasize the semantic quality of CogAgent more than overlap-based metrics and better capture the semantic correlations between generated responses and references.

**Learning-based metrics.** Learning-based metrics employ machine learning models to predict the quality scores of generated responses, relying not only on given references but aiming to better correlate with human judgment. ADEM [133] is a deep model-based evaluation metric for dialogue systems. A hierarchical RNN model is trained in a semi-supervised manner to capture semantic information and contextual associations and align with the human preferences for dialogue responses.

In summary, automatic evaluation metrics offer advantages in terms of efficiency and consistency. However, they face challenges in terms of semantic understanding, manual annotation costs, and model complexity. When selecting and applying automated evaluation metrics, it is important to balance their advantages and disadvantages according to specific persuasive tasks and scenarios.

#### 4.2.2 Human Evaluation

Human evaluation involves subjective judgment and scoring by human annotators to evaluate the quality of the generated responses. The annotators are usually domain experts and crowd workers who subjectively evaluate the generated responses based on specified criteria and task requirements. Compared to automatic evaluation metrics, human evaluation captures the subjectivity, emotion, and use of persuasive strategies expressed by CogAgent. Therefore, the flexibility and highly customizable nature of human evaluation becomes a reliable means to ensure that the quality of CogAgent is robustly evaluated.

The human evaluation mainly evaluates CogAgent in the following main aspects: fluency, coherence, contextualization, emotional expression, diversity, and persuasiveness. In summary, human evaluation has advantages in terms of insightful and accurate evaluation of the quality of CogAgent. However, it also has limitations in terms of cost and efficiency, due to the requirement of human labor and time resources. Therefore, in practical applications, researchers need to strike a balance between human and automatic evaluation and choose the evaluation metrics that best suit the task requirements.

## 5 Open Issues and Future Trends

Though researchers have made considerable efforts to address the above challenges in CogAgent, there are still open issues to be resolved. In this section, we present some open issues and future development trends for CogAgent to promote the advancement of the research community.

### 5.1 Comprehensive Modeling of Cognitive Psychology Theory for CogAgent

Although we have summarized some of the cognitive psychology theories, a comprehensive investigation of the cognitive mechanisms of persuasive dialogues from a cognitive psychology perspective is essential for understanding users' cognitive weaknesses and generating engaging persuasive dialogues. Many researchers have demonstrated the indispensability of employing specific strategies to achieve persuasive effects based on different cognitive psychology theories. Utilizing cognitive strategies, CogAgent can avoid cognitive dissonance in users and efficiently persuade them to accept specific viewpoints [11, 96, 135]. Prakken *et al.* [136] argue that psychological dissonance occurs when individuals are confronted with multiple conflicting cognitions. To alleviate this dissonance, three approaches can be used: changing cognitively relevant factors in the environment, introducing new cognitive elements, and changing cognitive elements in behavior. CogAgent should be aware of cognitive dissonance to mitigate the obstacles it creates in the persuasion process. In addition, researchers utilize the dual process theory of persuasion and guide the persuasive process with the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) [27], a theory that focuses on cognitive and affective appeals in persuasion. Another noteworthy aspect is modeling the

user’s cognition. Proposing agreements or making concessions promptly facilitates the perception of the user’s cognitive state, enabling CogAgent to adapt to changes in the user’s cognition on time and avoiding the failure of the persuasive process [137].

Besides using data analysis to study the mechanisms of persuasive dialog, we can also explore this phenomenon from the perspective of the cognitive functions of the human brain. Advances in neuroscience have provided valuable methods for studying the cognitive mechanisms of persuasive dialogue. As Poldrack *et al.* state [138], the use of electroencephalography (EEG), magnetoencephalography (MEG), functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), and other brain-imaging tools can deepen our understanding of how the human brain produces social behavior. Arapakis *et al.* [139] use brainwave recordings to measure users’ interest in news articles, and the experimental results suggest that frontal asymmetry (FFA) can objectively assess users’ receptive preferences for content. Exploring the changes in neural signals in the brain of the persuadee during persuasive conversations to model which persuasive factors are effective in being accepted by users and convincing them to adopt persuasive targets is a promising research direction.

## 5.2 Model Adaptivity/Generality of CogAgent

Equipping CogAgent with cross-domain understanding and generation capabilities is a promising research direction. Existing CogAgent usually focuses on one specific persuasion scenario, such as persuasion for social good, bargaining, and debating. However, it is crucial to develop the ability of CogAgent to understand and transfer through multiple domains, which enables CogAgent to dynamically optimize cognitive strategies based on different persuasive targets and efficiently perform per-

suasive tasks. For example, Wolf *et al.* [140] utilize transfer learning to jointly fine-tune multiple unsupervised response prediction tasks. They demonstrate the effectiveness of language model transfer learning on the PERSONA-CHAT dataset, especially on the dialogue response generation task. Qian *et al.* [141] propose a meta-learning-based approach to domain adaptive dialogue generation that learns from multiple resource-rich tasks. They utilize multiple resource-rich single-domain dialog datasets to train the dialogue system so that it can adapt to new domains with minimal training samples. Therefore, improving the transferability of CogAgent across different domains using transfer learning and other advanced approaches is an important step towards the universal CogAgent.

## 5.3 Multi-party CogAgent

Existing research of CogAgent has demonstrated remarkable performance in two-party conversational scenarios. However, in real world, multi-party conversations (MPCs) are more prevalent and require CogAgent to persuade multiple participants simultaneously. Unlike existing persuasive dialog systems, multi-party dialogue scenarios require the collaboration of multiple CogAgent to efficiently achieve persuasion targets [142–144]. Specifically, a single CogAgent is prone to be overly purposeful when interacting with users, which can cause the users’ resentment and resistance and hinder the realization of persuasion targets. In contrast, multiple CogAgents can assume different persuasive roles, cooperate, and persuade from different perspectives, thus winning users’ trust and realizing persuasion targets more effectively. Existing studies have explored MPCs in open-domain dialogue systems. For instance, Ito *et al.* [145] construct a multi-modal and multi-party model based on GRU

to predict the persuasiveness of multiple members within a group during multi-party conversations, thereby providing a model paradigm for the study of multi-party dialogues. Gu *et al.* [146] propose a Speaker-Aware BERT (SABERT) model to select appropriate speaking targets from multiple users based on dialogue contexts. Gu *et al.* [147] explore the problem of "who says what to whom" in MPCs and propose a plug-and-play graphically-induced fine-tuning (GIFT) module for tuning a variety of PLMs for generalized multi-party conversation understanding. Inspired by multi-party dialogue research, it is promising to utilize multiple CogAgents to collaborate on persuasive tasks to enhance the credibility and efficiency of the persuasion process. Multiple CogAgents utilize persuasive roles with complementary capabilities, strategies, and trust-building to enhance persuasion and effectiveness, thereby facilitating more persuasive and successful persuasion results.

#### 5.4 Interpretability of Persuasive Process

Interpretability of models can improve their credibility. Improving the interpretability of the persuasion process is essential to ensure that persuasive dialogue contents produced by CogAgent are accepted and adopted. In recent years, the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP) has increasingly focused on improving the interpretability of deep models [148, 149]. For example, Gaur *et al.* [150] argue that domain-specific knowledge helps to understand how deep models work. They demonstrate the utility of incorporating knowledge-infused learning in knowledge graph format into complex neural networks to achieve model interpretability. Similarly, Yasunaga *et al.* [151] demonstrate model interpretability and structure inference by combining a pre-trained language model a knowledge graph-

h, and a quality assurance context into a unified graph. Currently, research on the interpretability of the persuasion process still lacks an overall framework. For the interpretability of the persuasion process, the effectiveness of the persuasion strategy can be verified from the cognitive theory, combined with the knowledge graph reasoning, and the persuasion behavior can be analyzed interactively.

#### 5.5 Multimodal CogAgent

Multimodal perception and comprehension capabilities are essential for human beings in daily conversations. By understanding the multimodal surroundings around them, including visual, textual, auditory, and other modal information, we humans can produce engaging dialogues to communicate messages, emotions, and attitudes with others [152, 153]. Despite the outstanding natural language understanding and generation capabilities, perceiving and understanding multimodal context information is essential for natural and harmonious human-machine conversation systems [154, 155]. To persuade people to change their thoughts, opinions, or attitudes, it is crucial to understand the multimodal surroundings of users. Different environments may lead users to develop different attitudes towards things. Combining multimodal contextual information, persuasive dialogue systems can comprehensively understand users' mental states to generate more specific persuasive dialogue content. There has been extensive research on multimodal dialogue systems that enable the understanding of image or video content through dialogue [156–158]. For example, Murahari *et al.* adapt ViLBERT [159] to achieve multi-turn image-based dialogue, which understands the image information through image-text pre-trained on multimodal datasets. Visual ChatGPT [158] integrates ChatGPT with visual foun-

dation models to achieve visual dialogue. Different kinds of visual information, such as images, depth images, and mask matrices, are converted into language formats based on visual foundation models and the prompt manager. Then ChatGPT takes the information from visual and textual modalities to generate dialogue responses. These efforts have laid a solid foundation for multimodal persuasive dialogue systems. The integration of multimodal information to generate more persuasive conversational content is a highly promising research direction.

## 5.6 Data and Model Co-Optimization for CogAgent

The huge impact of LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT) in the field of dialog systems has sparked the enthusiasm of researchers and has been widely used in many domains [160–162]. For example, Liang *et al.* [161] rewrite the policy code for controlling a robot using LLMs. The policy code can receive and understand commands and then outputs the execution code to the API to achieve coherent control of the robot’s actions through the classical chain logic. Similarly, Wen *et al.* [162] combine the common-sense knowledge implicit in LLMs with the domain-specific knowledge of mobile applications to realize hands-free speech-based interaction between users and smartphones. LLM can be surprisingly useful in a variety of domains. To develop a high-quality CogAgent, we can utilize LLMs to generate large-scale persuasive dialogue data to quickly validate the algorithm at an early stage. Since the capability of LLMs stems from massive amounts of data, retraining this data is hugely expensive. Therefore, the persuasion process also needs to be modeled to efficiently and accurately perform the persuasion task. The combination of data-driven

LLMs and model-driven persuasion process is the most efficient way to develop intelligent CogAgent. Future research directions for combining LLMs and model-driven persuasion processes include issues such as when to employ the generation abilities of LLMs, when model constraints are needed, and the rules and timing of collaboration between LLMs and the persuasion process.

## 5.7 Construction of standardized datasets and benchmarks

Despite the significant progress researchers have made in CogAgent, datasets, and benchmarks for the study of CogAgent are still scarce. The relatively small size of many existing datasets (e.g., Persuasion for good [11]) limits the performance of the model in a wider range of applications. The limited amount of data hinders the ability to capture the full complexity and diversity of persuasive dialogue. Moreover, the lack of detailed annotations about cognitive strategies in existing datasets creates challenges for training persuasive dialogue agents. Building large-scale, high-quality datasets of persuasive dialogues with rich cognitive strategy annotations is indispensable for the development of CogAgent. Combining the superior text generation capabilities of LLMs [163, 164] is a potential way to build large-scale and high-quality datasets for CogAgent.

---

## 6 Conclusion

Persuasion is an essential ability in human social communication, and people often skillfully persuade others to accept their standpoints, views, or perspectives for various purposes. Consequently, persuasive dialogue systems have become an engaging research direction. In this paper, we have made a systematic survey of CogAgent. We first present

some representative cognitive psychology theories to guide the design of CogAgent at the principle level and formalize the necessary cognitive strategies for generating highly persuasive dialogue contents, including the persuasion strategy, the topic path planning strategy, and the argument structure prediction strategy. Based on the formalized definition and generic architecture of CogAgent, we comprehensively investigate representative works by categorizing cognitive strategies. The available datasets and evaluation metrics for CogAgent are also summarized. Despite significant progress, the research of CogAgent is still in the early stage and massive open issues and prospective future trends to be explored, such as model adaptivity/generality of CogAgent, multi-party CogAgent, and multimodal CogAgent.

**Acknowledgements** This work was partially supported by the National Science Fund for Distinguished Young Scholars(62025205), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62032020).

## References

- Guo B, Wang H, Ding Y, Wu W, Hao S, Sun Y, Yu Z. Conditional text generation for harmonious human-machine interaction. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 2021, 12(2): 1–50
- Huang M, Zhu X, Gao J. Challenges in building intelligent open-domain dialog systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 2020, 38(3): 1–32
- Petty R E, Cacioppo J T, Petty R E, Cacioppo J T. The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. Springer, 1986
- Fogg B J. Persuasive technology: using computers to change what we think and do. *Ubiquity*, 2002, 2002(December): 2
- IJsselsteijn W, De Kort Y, Midden C, Eggen B, Van Den Hoven E. Persuasive technology for human well-being: setting the scene. In: *Persuasive Technology: First International Conference on Persuasive Technology for Human Well-Being, PERSUASIVE 2006, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, May 18–19, 2006. Proceedings* 1. 2006, 1–5
- Fogg B J. Mass interpersonal persuasion: An early view of a new phenomenon. In: *Persuasive Technology: Third International Conference, PERSUASIVE 2008, Oulu, Finland, June 4–6, 2008. Proceedings* 3. 2008, 23–34
- Tan C, Niculae V, Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil C, Lee L. Winning arguments: Interaction dynamics and persuasion strategies in good-faith online discussions. In: *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*. 2016, 613–624
- Hidey C, Musi E, Hwang A, Muresan S, McKeown K. Analyzing the semantic types of claims and premises in an online persuasive forum. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Argument Mining*. 2017, 11–21
- Torning K, Oinas-Kukkonen H. Persuasive system design: state of the art and future directions. In: *Proceedings of the 4th international conference on persuasive technology*. 2009, 1–8
- Eagly A H, Chaiken S. Cognitive theories of persuasion. In: *Advances in experimental social psychology*, volume 17, 267–359. Elsevier, 1984
- Wang X, Shi W, Kim R, Oh Y, Yang S, Zhang J, Yu Z. Persuasion for good: Towards a personalized persuasive dialogue system for social good. In: *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2019, 5635–5649
- Shi W, Wang X, Oh Y J, Zhang J, Sahay S, Yu Z. Effects of persuasive dialogues: testing bot identities and inquiry strategies. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2020, 1–13
- Joshi R, Balachandran V, Vashishth S, Black A, Tsvetkov Y. Dialograph: Incorporating interpretable strategy-graph networks into negotiation dialogues. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2021
- Min B, Ross H, Sulem E, Veyseh A P B, Nguyen T H, Sainz O, Agirre E, Heintz I, Roth D. Recent advances in natural language processing via large pre-trained language models: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2021
- Zhao W X, Zhou K, Li J, Tang T, Wang X, Hou Y, Min Y, Zhang B, Zhang J, Dong Z, others . A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023
- Touvron H, Martin L, Stone K, Albert P, Almahairi A, Babaei Y, Bashlykov N, Batra S, Bhargava P, Bhosale S, others . Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023
- Bai Y, Kadavath S, Kundu S, Askell A, Kernion J, Jones A, Chen A, Goldie A, Mirhoseini A, McKin-

- non C, others . Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073, 2022
18. Zhou C, Li Q, Li C, Yu J, Liu Y, Wang G, Zhang K, Ji C, Yan Q, He L, others . A comprehensive survey on pretrained foundation models: A history from bert to chatgpt. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09419, 2023
  19. Ray P P. Chatgpt: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*, 2023
  20. Li J, Han D, Guo Z, Qiao B, Wu G. Generating empathetic responses through emotion tracking and constraint guidance. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 2024, 18(2)
  21. Wang W, Feng S, Song K, Wang D, Li S. Informative and diverse emotional conversation generation with variational recurrent pointer-generator. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 2022, 16: 1–3
  22. Vaithilingam P, Zhang T, Glassman E L. Expectation vs. experience: Evaluating the usability of code generation tools powered by large language models. In: Chi conference on human factors in computing systems extended abstracts. 2022, 1–7
  23. Ni A, Iyer S, Radev D, Stoyanov V, Yih W t, Wang S, Lin X V. Lever: Learning to verify language-to-code generation with execution. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. 2023, 26106–26128
  24. Yuan A, Coenen A, Reif E, Ippolito D. Wordcraft: story writing with large language models. In: 27th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces. 2022, 841–852
  25. Dergaa I, Chamari K, Zmijewski P, Saad H B. From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examining the prospects and potential threats of chatgpt in academic writing. *Biology of Sport*, 2023, 40(2): 615–622
  26. Bless H, Bohner G, Schwarz N, Strack F. Mood and persuasion: A cognitive response analysis. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 1990, 16(2): 331–345
  27. Petty R E, Briñol P. Emotion and persuasion: Cognitive and meta-cognitive processes impact attitudes. *Cognition and Emotion*, 2015, 29(1): 1–26
  28. Qin J, Ye Z, Tang J, Liang X. Dynamic knowledge routing network for target-guided open-domain conversation. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2020, 8657–8664
  29. Prakken H, others . A persuasive chatbot using a crowd-sourced argument graph and concerns. *Computational Models of Argument*, 2020, 326: 9
  30. Dijkstra A. The psychology of tailoring-ingredients in computer-tailored persuasion. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 2008, 2(2): 765–784
  31. Kolenik T, Gams M. Intelligent cognitive assistants for attitude and behavior change support in mental health: state-of-the-art technical review. *Electronics*, 2021, 10(11): 1250
  32. Slonim N, Bilu Y, Alzate C, Bar-Haim R, Bogin B, Bonin F, Choshen L, Cohen-Karlik E, Dankin L, Edelstein L, others . An autonomous debating system. *Nature*, 2021, 591(7850): 379–384
  33. Zhou K, Zhou Y, Zhao W X, Wang X, Wen J R. Towards topic-guided conversational recommender system. In: Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. 2020, 4128–4139
  34. Kang D, Balakrishnan A, Shah P, Crook P, Boureau Y L, Weston J. Recommendation as a communication game: Self-supervised bot-play for goal-oriented dialogue. In: 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019. 2020, 1951–1961
  35. Chen M, Shi W, Yan F, Hou R, Zhang J, Sahay S, Yu Z. Seamlessly integrating factual information and social content with persuasive dialogue. In: Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing. 2022, 399–413
  36. Duerr S, Gloor P A. Persuasive natural language generation—a literature review. arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.05786, 2021
  37. Zhan H, Wang Y, Feng T, Hua Y, Sharma S, Li Z, Qu L, Haffari G. Let's negotiate! a survey of negotiation dialogue systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09072, 2022
  38. Deng Y, Lei W, Lam W, Chua T S. A survey on proactive dialogue systems: Problems, methods, and prospects. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02750, 2023
  39. Cialdini R. *Pre-suasion: A revolutionary way to influence and persuade*. Simon and Schuster, 2016
  40. Bilu Y, Gera A, Hershcovich D, Sznajder B, Lahav D, Moshkowich G, Malet A, Gavron A, Slonim N. Argument invention from first principles. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2019, 1013–1026
  41. Premack D, Woodruff G. Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 1978, 1(4): 515–526
  42. Wu J, Chen Z, Deng J, Sabour S, Huang M. Coke: A cognitive knowledge graph for machine theory of mind. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05390, 2023
  43. Sap M, Le Bras R, Fried D, Choi Y. Neural theory-of-

- mind? on the limits of social intelligence in large lms. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 2022, 3762–3780
- 44. Roman H R, Bisk Y, Thomason J, Celikyilmaz A, Gao J. Rmm: A recursive mental model for dialogue navigation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020. 2020, 1732–1745
  - 45. Campbell G. The philosophy of rhetoric. SIU Press, 1988
  - 46. Liu S, Zheng C, Demasi O, Sabour S, Li Y, Yu Z, Jiang Y, Huang M. Towards emotional support dialog systems. In: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). 2021, 3469–3483
  - 47. He H, Chen D, Balakrishnan A, Liang P. Decoupling strategy and generation in negotiation dialogues. In: 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2018. 2018, 2333–2343
  - 48. Joshi R, Balachandran V, Vashishth S, Black A, Tsvetkov Y. Dialograph: Incorporating interpretable strategy-graph networks into negotiation dialogues. In: International Conference on Learning Representations. 2020
  - 49. Cheng Y, Liu W, Li W, Wang J, Zhao R, Liu B, Liang X, Zheng Y. Improving multi-turn emotional support dialogue generation with lookahead strategy planning. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 2022, 3014–3026
  - 50. Cacioppo J T, Petty R E. Effects of message repetition and position on cognitive response, recall, and persuasion. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, 37(1): 97
  - 51. Cialdini R B, Cialdini R B. Influence: The psychology of persuasion. volume 55. Collins New York, 2007
  - 52. Ni J, Pandelea V, Young T, Zhou H, Cambria E. Hitkg: Towards goal-oriented conversations via multi-hierarchy learning. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. 2022, 11112–11120
  - 53. Tang Z H, Yeh M Y. Eagle: Enhance target-oriented dialogs by global planning and topic flow integration. In: Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management. 2023, 2402–2411
  - 54. Petty R E, Cacioppo J T. Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012
  - 55. Swanson R, Ecker B, Walker M. Argument mining: Extracting arguments from online dialogue. In: Proceedings of the 16th annual meeting of the special interest group on discourse and dialogue. 2015, 217–226
  - 56. Chakrabarty T, Hidey C, Muresan S, McKeown K, Hwang A. Ampersand: Argument mining for persuasive online discussions. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP). 2019, 2933–2943
  - 57. Rach N, Schindler C, Feustel I, Daxenberger J, Minker W, Ultes S. From argument search to argumentative dialogue: A topic-independent approach to argument acquisition for dialogue systems. In: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue. 2021, 368–379
  - 58. Wambsganss T, Kueng T, Soellner M, Leimeister J M. Arguetutor: An adaptive dialog-based learning system for argumentation skills. In: Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems. 2021, 1–13
  - 59. Ni J, Young T, Pandelea V, Xue F, Cambria E. Recent advances in deep learning based dialogue systems: A systematic survey. *Artificial intelligence review*, 2023, 56(4): 3055–3155
  - 60. Bubeck S, Chandrasekaran V, Eldan R, Gehrke J, Horvitz E, Kamar E, Lee P, Lee Y T, Li Y, Lundberg S, others . Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712, 2023
  - 61. Hochreiter S, Schmidhuber J. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 1997, 9(8): 1735–1780
  - 62. Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, Uszkoreit J, Jones L, Gomez A N, Kaiser Ł, Polosukhin I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2017, 30
  - 63. Mishra K, Samad A M, Totala P, Ekbal A. Pepds: A polite and empathetic persuasive dialogue system for charity donation. In: Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. 2022, 424–440
  - 64. Walker E R, McGee R E, Druss B G. Mortality in mental disorders and global disease burden implications: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA psychiatry*, 2015, 72(4): 334–341
  - 65. Xu B, Zhuang Z. Survey on psychotherapy chatbots. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 2022, 34(7): e6170
  - 66. Liang Y, Liu L, Ji Y, Huangfu L, Zeng D D. Identifying emotional causes of mental disorders from social

- media for effective intervention. *Information Processing & Management*, 2023, 60(4): 103407
67. Zhou J, Zheng C, Wang B, Zhang Z, Huang M. Case: Aligning coarse-to-fine cognition and affection for empathetic response generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08845, 2022
  68. Bosselut A, Rashkin H, Sap M, Malaviya C, Celikyilmaz A, Choi Y. Comet: Commonsense transformers for automatic knowledge graph construction. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2019
  69. Speer R, Chin J, Havasi C. Conceptnet 5.5: An open multilingual graph of general knowledge. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. 2017
  70. Nortio E, Jasinskaja-Lahti I, Hämäläinen M, Pakkasvirta J. Fear of the russian bear? negotiating finnish national identity online. *Nations and Nationalism*, 2022, 28(3): 861–876
  71. Sakai K, Higashinaka R, Yoshikawa Y, Ishiguro H, Tomita J. Hierarchical argumentation structure for persuasive argumentative dialogue generation. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 2020, 103(2): 424–434
  72. Rach N, Minker W, Ultes S. Increasing the naturalness of an argumentative dialogue system through argument chains. In: Computational Models of Argument, 331–338. IOS Press, 2020
  73. Gupta P, Jhamtani H, Bigham J P. Target-guided dialogue response generation using commonsense and data augmentation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022. 2022, 1301–1317
  74. Mondal P. A unifying perspective on perception and cognition through linguistic representations of emotion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2022, 13: 768170
  75. Shettleworth S J. Cognition, evolution, and behavior. Oxford university press, 2009
  76. Nguyen H, Masthoff J. Designing persuasive dialogue systems: Using argumentation with care. In: Persuasive Technology: Third International Conference, PERSUASIVE 2008, Oulu, Finland, June 4-6, 2008. Proceedings 3. 2008, 201–212
  77. Orji R. Why are persuasive strategies effective? exploring the strengths and weaknesses of socially-oriented persuasive strategies. In: Persuasive Technology: Development and Implementation of Personalized Technologies to Change Attitudes and Behaviors: 12th International Conference, PERSUASIVE 2017, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, April 4–6, 2017, Proceedings 12. 2017, 253–266
  78. Ham J, Bokhorst R, Cuijpers R, Van Der Pol D, Cabibihan JJ. Making robots persuasive: the influence of combining persuasive strategies (gazing and gestures) by a storytelling robot on its persuasive power. In: Social Robotics: Third International Conference, ICSR 2011, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, November 24-25, 2011. Proceedings 3. 2011, 71–83
  79. Samad A M, Mishra K, Firdaus M, Ekbal A. Empathetic persuasion: reinforcing empathy and persuasiveness in dialogue systems. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022. 2022, 844–856
  80. Papineni K, Roukos S, Ward T, Zhu W J. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In: Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2002, 311–318
  81. Banerjee S, Lavie A. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In: Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization. 2005, 65–72
  82. Lin C Y, Hovy E. Automatic evaluation of summaries using n-gram co-occurrence statistics. In: Proceedings of the 2003 human language technology conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics. 2003, 150–157
  83. Yu X, Chen M, Yu Z. Prompt-based monte-carlo tree search for goal-oriented dialogue policy planning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13660, 2023
  84. Zhou Y, Tsvetkov Y, Black A W, Yu Z. Augmenting non-collaborative dialog systems with explicit semantic and strategic dialog history. In: International Conference on Learning Representations. 2019
  85. Jia M, Chen Q, Jing L, Fu D, Li R. Knowledge-enhanced memory model for emotional support conversation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07700, 2023
  86. Tu Q, Li Y, Cui J, Wang B, Wen J R, Yan R. Misc: A mixed strategy-aware model integrating comet for emotional support conversation. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). 2022, 308–319
  87. Greene J O, Burleson B R. Handbook of communication and social interaction skills. Psychology Press, 2003
  88. Hill C E. Helping skills: Facilitating, exploration, insight, and action. American Psychological Association, 2009
  89. Kipf T N, Welling M. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In: International

- Conference on Learning Representations. 2016
90. Veličković P, Cucurull G, Casanova A, Romero A, Liò P, Bengio Y. Graph attention networks. In: International Conference on Learning Representations. 2018
  91. Wu Z, Pan S, Chen F, Long G, Zhang C, Philip S Y. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 2020, 32(1): 4–24
  92. Wu L, Chen Y, Shen K, Guo X, Gao H, Li S, Pei J, Long B, others . Graph neural networks for natural language processing: A survey. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 2023, 16(2): 119–328
  93. Wang H, Guo B, Liu J, Ding Y, Yu Z. Towards informative and diverse dialogue systems over hierarchical crowd intelligence knowledge graph. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 2023, 17(7): 1–25
  94. Liu C, Gao C, Yuan Y, Bai C, Luo L, Du X, Shi X, Luo H, Jin D, Li Y. Modeling persuasion factor of user decision for recommendation. In: Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 2022, 3366–3376
  95. Zheng C, Liu Y, Chen W, Leng Y, Huang M. Comae: A multi-factor hierarchical framework for empathetic response generation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021. 2021, 813–824
  96. Yang R, Chen J, Narasimhan K. Improving dialog systems for negotiation with personality modeling. In: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). 2021, 681–693
  97. Zheng Z, Liao L, Deng Y, Nie L. Building emotional support chatbots in the era of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11584*, 2023
  98. Xu J, Wang H, Niu Z, Wu H, Che W. Knowledge graph grounded goal planning for open-domain conversation generation. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. 2020, 9338–9345
  99. Liu J, Pan F, Luo L. Gochat: Goal-oriented chatbots with hierarchical reinforcement learning. In: Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. 2020, 1793–1796
  100. Lei W, Zhang Y, Song F, Liang H, Mao J, Lv J, Yang Z, Chua T S. Interacting with non-cooperative user: A new paradigm for proactive dialogue policy. In: Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. 2022, 212–222
  101. Zhong P, Liu Y, Wang H, Miao C. Keyword-guided neural conversational model. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2021, 14568–14576
  102. Zou Y, Liu Z, Hu X, Zhang Q. Thinking clearly, talking fast: Concept-guided non-autoregressive generation for open-domain dialogue systems. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 2021, 2215–2226
  103. Wang J, Lin D, Li W. Dialogue planning via brownian bridge stochastic process for goal-directed proactive dialogue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05290*, 2023
  104. Wang S, Yin Z, Zhang W, Zheng D, Li X. Two stage learning for argument pairs extraction. In: Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing: 10th CCF International Conference, NLPCC 2021, Qingdao, China, October 13–17, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 10. 2021, 538–547
  105. Yang Z, Wang B, Zhou J, Tan Y, Zhao D, Huang K, He R, Hou Y. Topkg: Target-oriented dialog via global planning on knowledge graph. In: Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. 2022, 745–755
  106. Tang J, Zhao T, Xiong C, Liang X, Xing E, Hu Z. Target-guided open-domain conversation. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2019, 5624–5634
  107. Wang J, Lin D, Li W. A target-driven planning approach for goal-directed dialog systems. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023
  108. Wang J, Lin D, Li W. Dialogue planning via brownian bridge stochastic process for goal-directed proactive dialogue. 2023
  109. Vecchi E M, Falk N, Jundi I, Lapesa G. Towards argument mining for social good: A survey. In: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). 2021, 1338–1352
  110. Al Khatib K, Wachsmuth H, Hagen M, Köhler J, Stein B. Cross-domain mining of argumentative text through distant supervision. In: Proceedings of the 2016 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies. 2016, 1395–1404
  111. Hua X, Hu Z, Wang L. Argument generation with retrieval, planning, and realization. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2019, 2661–2672
  112. Srivastava P, Bhatnagar P, Goel A. Argument min-

- ing using bert and self-attention based embeddings. In: 2022 4th International Conference on Advances in Computing, Communication Control and Networking (ICAC3N). 2022, 1536–1540
113. Niculae V, Park J, Cardie C. Argument mining with structured svms and rnns. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). 2017, 985–995
114. Li J, Durmus E, Cardie C. Exploring the role of argument structure in online debate persuasion. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). 2020, 8905–8912
115. Tran N, Litman D. Multi-task learning in argument mining for persuasive online discussions. In: Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Argument Mining. 2021, 148–153
116. Cheng L, Bing L, He R, Yu Q, Zhang Y, Si L. Iam: A comprehensive and large-scale dataset for integrated argument mining tasks. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). 2022, 2277–2287
117. Sun J, Zhu Q, Bao J, Wu J, Yang C, Wang R, Xu R. A hierarchical sequence labeling model for argument pair extraction. In: Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing: 10th CCF International Conference, NLPCC 2021, Qingdao, China, October 13–17, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 10. 2021, 472–483
118. Chawla N V, Bowyer K W, Hall L O, Kegelmeyer W P. Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 2002, 16: 321–357
119. Zheng C, Sabour S, Wen J, Zhang Z, Huang M. Augesc: Dialogue augmentation with large language models for emotional support conversation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023. 2023, 1552–1568
120. Sun H, Lin Z, Zheng C, Liu S, Huang M. Psyqa: A chinese dataset for generating long counseling text for mental health support. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021. 2021, 1489–1503
121. Walker M, Tree J E F, Anand P, Abbott R, King J. A corpus for research on deliberation and debate. In: Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’12). 2012, 812–817
122. Roush A, Balaji A. Debatesum: A large-scale argument mining and summarization dataset. In: Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining. 2020, 1–7
123. Zhou Y, He H, Black A W, Tsvetkov Y. A dynamic strategy coach for effective negotiation. In: 20th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue. 2019, 367
124. Dutt R, Joshi R, Rose C. Keeping up appearances: Computational modeling of face acts in persuasion oriented discussions. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). 2020, 7473–7485
125. Liu Z, Wang H, Niu Z Y, Wu H, Che W, Liu T. Towards conversational recommendation over multi-type dialogs. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2020, 1036–1049
126. Hayati S A, Kang D, Zhu Q, Shi W, Yu Z. Inspired: Toward sociable recommendation dialog systems. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). 2020, 8142–8152
127. Abbott R, Ecker B, Anand P, Walker M. Internet argument corpus 2.0: An sql schema for dialogic social media and the corpora to go with it. In: Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16). 2016, 4445–4452
128. Lavie A, Agarwal A. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with high levels of correlation with human judgments. In: Proceedings of the second workshop on statistical machine translation. 2007, 228–231
129. Vedantam R, Lawrence Zitnick C, Parikh D. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. 2015, 4566–4575
130. Rus V, Lintean M. An optimal assessment of natural language student input using word-to-word similarity metrics. In: Intelligent Tutoring Systems: 11th International Conference, ITS 2012, Chania, Crete, Greece, June 14–18, 2012. Proceedings 11. 2012, 675–676
131. Wieting J, Bansal M, Gimpel K, Livescu K. Towards universal paraphrastic sentence embeddings. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.08198, 2015
132. Forgues G, Pineau J, Larchevêque J M, Tremblay R. Bootstrapping dialog systems with word embeddings. In: Nips, modern machine learning and natural language processing workshop. 2014, 168
133. Lowe R, Noseworthy M, Serban I V, Angelard-Gontier N, Bengio Y, Pineau J. Towards an automatic turing test: Learning to evaluate dialogue responses. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long

- Papers). 2017
134. Devlin J, Chang M W, Lee K, Toutanova K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers). 2019, 4171–4186
  135. Chen Y, Deng S, Kwak D H, Elnoshokaty A, Wu J. A multi-appeal model of persuasion for online petition success: A linguistic cue-based approach. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 2019, 20(2): 105–131
  136. Jing Wen T, Kim E, Wu L, Dodoo N A. Activating persuasion knowledge in native advertising: the influence of cognitive load and disclosure language. *International Journal of Advertising*, 2020, 39(1): 74–93
  137. Thimm M. Strategic argumentation in multi-agent systems. *KI-Künstliche Intelligenz*, 2014, 28: 159–168
  138. Poldrack R A, Farah M J. Progress and challenges in probing the human brain. *Nature*, 2015, 526(7573): 371–379
  139. Arapakis I, Barreda-Angeles M, Pereda-Baños A. Interest as a proxy of engagement in news reading: Spectral and entropy analyses of eeg activity patterns. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 2017, 10(1): 100–114
  140. Wolf T, Sanh V, Chaumond J, Delangue C. Transfertransfo: A transfer learning approach for neural network based conversational agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08149*, 2019
  141. Qian K, Yu Z. Domain adaptive dialog generation via meta learning. In: Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2019, 2639–2649
  142. Shi Z, Huang M. A deep sequential model for discourse parsing on multi-party dialogues. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2019, 7007–7014
  143. Ju D, Feng S, Lv P, Wang D, Zhang Y. Learning to improve persona consistency in multi-party dialogue generation via text knowledge enhancement. In: Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. 2022, 298–309
  144. Yuan L, Chen F, Zhang Z, Yu Y. Communication-robust multi-agent learning by adaptable auxiliary multi-agent adversary generation. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 2024, 18(6): 186331
  145. Ito A, Nakano Y I, Nihei F, Sakato T, Ishii R, Fukayama A, Nakamura T. Predicting persuasiveness of participants in multiparty conversations. In: 27th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces. 2022, 85–88
  146. Gu J C, Li T, Liu Q, Ling Z H, Su Z, Wei S, Zhu X. Speaker-aware bert for multi-turn response selection in retrieval-based chatbots. In: Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management. 2020, 2041–2044
  147. Gu J C, Ling Z H, Liu Q, Liu C, Hu G. Gift: Graph-induced fine-tuning for multi-party conversation understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09360*, 2023
  148. Belinkov Y, Gehrmann S, Pavlick E. Interpretability and analysis in neural nlp. In: Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: tutorial abstracts. 2020, 1–5
  149. Jacovi A, Goldberg Y. Towards faithfully interpretable nlp systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. 2020, 4198–4205
  150. Gaur M, Faldu K, Sheth A. Semantics of the black-box: Can knowledge graphs help make deep learning systems more interpretable and explainable? *IEEE Internet Computing*, 2021, 25(1): 51–59
  151. Yasunaga M, Ren H, Bosselut A, Liang P, Leskovec J. Qa-gnn: Reasoning with language models and knowledge graphs for question answering. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. 2021, 535–546
  152. Quek F, McNeill D, Bryll R, Duncan S, Ma X F, Kirbas C, McCullough K E, Ansari R. Multimodal human discourse: gesture and speech. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 2002, 9(3): 171–193
  153. Turk M. Multimodal interaction: A review. *Pattern recognition letters*, 2014, 36: 189–195
  154. Jaimes A, Sebe N. Multimodal human-computer interaction: A survey. *Computer vision and image understanding*, 2007, 108(1-2): 116–134
  155. Baltrušaitis T, Ahuja C, Morency L P. Multimodal machine learning: A survey and taxonomy. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2018, 41(2): 423–443
  156. Qi J, Niu Y, Huang J, Zhang H. Two causal principles for improving visual dialog. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 2020, 10860–10869
  157. Alamri H, Cartillier V, Das A, Wang J, Cherian A, Essa I, Batra D, Marks T K, Hori C, Anderson P, others. Audio visual scene-aware dialog. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and

- Pattern Recognition. 2019, 7558–7567
158. Wu C, Yin S, Qi W, Wang X, Tang Z, Duan N. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671, 2023
  159. Lu J, Batra D, Parikh D, Lee S, Vilbert: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks. Advances in neural information processing systems, 2019, 32
  160. Pal S, Bhattacharya M, Lee S S, Chakraborty C. A domain-specific next-generation large language model (llm) or chatgpt is required for biomedical engineering and research. Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 2023, 1–4
  161. Liang J, Huang W, Xia F, Xu P, Hausman K, Ichter B, Florence P, Zeng A. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In: 2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA). 2023, 9493–9500
  162. Wen H, Li Y, Liu G, Zhao S, Yu T, Li T J J, Jiang S, Liu Y, Zhang Y, Liu Y. Empowering llm to use smartphone for intelligent task automation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15272, 2023
  163. Kim H, Hessel J, Jiang L, Lu X, Yu Y, Zhou P, Bras R L, Alikhani M, Kim G, Sap M, others . Soda: Million-scale dialogue distillation with social commonsense contextualization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10465, 2022
  164. Zheng C, Sabour S, Wen J, Huang M. Augesc: Large-scale data augmentation for emotional support conversation with pre-trained language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13047, 2022



Bin Guo was born in 1980. He is a Ph.D. professor and Ph.D. supervisor at Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU). He is a senior member of the China Computer Federation. His main research interests include ubiquitous computing, social and community intelligence, urban big data mining, mobile crowdsensing, and human-computer interaction.



Hao Wang was born in 1996. He received his B.E. degree in computer science and technology from Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU) in 2019. He is currently working toward a Ph.D. degree at NWPU. His current research interests include natural language processing, dialog systems, and large language models.



Mengqi Chen was born in 1997. She received her master's degree in digital textiles from Xi'an Polytechnical University (XPU) in 2022. She is currently working toward a Ph.D. degree at Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU). Her current research interests include natural language processing, dialog systems, and large language models.



Haoyu Li was born in 2002. He received his B.E. degree in computer science and technology from Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU) in 2023. He is currently working toward a master's degree at NWPU. His current research interests include natural language processing, large language models, and robot dynamic obstacle avoidance.



Qian Zhao was born in 2001. She received her B.E. degree in Internet of Things engineering from Tianjin University of Technology (TUT) in 2023. She is currently working toward a master's degree at Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU). Her current research interests include multimodal dialogue, large language models, and visual human-computer interaction.



Jingqi Liu was born in 2002. She entered Northwestern Polytechnical University(NWPU) to study for a bachelor's degree in information and computing science in 2020. Her current research interests include natural language processing, dialogue systems, and large language models.



Yasan Ding was born in 1995. He received his B.E. degree in computer science and technology from Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU) in 2018. He is currently working toward a Ph.D. degree at NWPU. His current research interests include fake news detection and natural language processing.



Yan Pan was born in 1991. He is a lecturer at the Science and Technology on Information Systems Engineering Laboratory. He respectively received the B.S. degree in 2013 and the Ph.D. degree in 2020 from Northwestern Polytechnical University (NWPU). His research interests include Big Data, Machine Learning, and Crowd Intelligence.



Zhiwen Yu was born in 1977. He is a Ph.D. professor and Ph.D. supervisor. He is a senior member of the China Computer Federation. His main research interests include mobile internet, ubiquitous computing, social and community intelligence, urban big data mining, mobile crowdsensing, and human-computer interaction.