**INPUT 1**

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. 2

The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. 4

The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. 2

The explanation appropriately addresses the question. 4

I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. 5

I am satisfied with the explanation provided. 2

The explanation is too long and repetitive. I doubt that you need the whole page to describe that the action was prohibited. The agent is describing its steps, however, they don't even include the prohibited action.

Q1-Q6 3, 4, 3, 4, 4, 3

The reasoning is presented in a story-like way, but it lacks a precise breakdown of when payShop was ruled out. The logic order is still implied, not explicit. While it contains a lot of text, it lacks clarity in parts. The use of "just in case" and vague phrasing ("seemed like a good place to start") weakens the precision of the explanation. It is friendly and covers the essentials, but the informal tone and fuzzy logic order make it harder to fully trust the system’s internal reasoning.

q1- 3 The explanation is clustered with so much text that it is hard to understand whats going on q2- 5 The explanation for the given parameters are correct. q3- 4 The level of detail is more than enough but I think its a bit to much q4- 5 The explanation appropriately addresses the question q5- 5 Based on the interests the agent gives the best possible decision q6- 4 Overall its nice but the amount of text lead s to confusion

In number 1, something seems to go wrong based on how you feed the input to the LLM you are using for this. Did you handle the empty list correctly? Presentation of preferences here is perfect, and all info is still preesnt, except the most important bit.

1 4 1 1 5 2

The action required to be explained wasn't in the path, so just say that in your explanation.

Score: 1,1,1,1,1,1

i do not understand why it matters that the agent considers the action pay shop. in its reasoning it states that it went to the kitchen to get coffee with its staffcard. i feel like there is a lot of information missing here. which makes this whole explanations very difficult to read.

1;2 2;2 3;3 4;2 5;2 6;2

Criteria 1: 5. The norms, beliefs, preferences are listed in detail. Criteria 2: 5. Everything is mentioned. Criteria 3: 4. There is too much information. I think explaining the contradiction between the norm and the action to explain would have been sufficient. Criteria 4: 5. The action to explain is addressed clearly. Criteria 5: 5. The system considers the preferences and mentions them in appropriate places. Criteria 6: 5. It's a good!

q1: 5; q2: 5; q3: 5; q4: 4; q5: 5; q6: 5; The agent correctly explains why it didnt buy coffee despite its top priority being quality and having money. It would have been nicer if the agent had more clearly explained that it was prohibited from buying coffee but this is a semantics issue

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. (2/5) The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. (2/5) The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. (2/5) The explanation appropriately addresses the question. (2/5) I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. (5/5) I am satisfied with the explanation provided. (3/5)

The text provided is quite lengthy. While the story is clear and easy to understand for someone unfamiliar with AI and coding, it contains too much information. The focus should be on explaining why the action "pay" did not execute at the stop, rather than discussing unrelated topics such as why the user received kitchen coffee. Therefore, the output does not fully address the relevant information and is overly detailed.

All comments in sections above, in general all the explanations were definitely to long for daily usage, but I really appreciate your job preparing them!

Clearly shows decision process: 5 Covers all relevant information: 4 Sufficient level of detail: 5 Appropriately addresses question: 4 Makes decision in my best interest: 5 Satisfied with explanation: 4

The explanation summary at the end is very nice. I would overall shorten it and focus on the important aspects.

Input 1: All the informations were covered, I only miss the information that paying was specifically prohibited, because that is not the same as not being on the approved list of actions, Q2:4/5

Input 1: I understand the decision, nothing to add, Q3: 5/5

Input 1: I think that the explanation covers a lot more that the given question, should be more compact and specific, Q4: 3/5

Input 1: I agree with that, nothing to add, Q5: 5/5

Input 1: Despite the fact that were to long and a bit out of the topic, I am generally satisfied, Q6: 3/5

INPUT 1: Q1: It did not explain why the kitchen coffee aligns with quality preference.

INPUT 1: Q2: It did not explain why the kitchen was the best option.

INPUT 1: Q3: Details on the own card and staff card could be explained further.

INPUT 1: Q4: The structure of the decision could be vastly improved, although the explanation is clear after a long reading.

INPUT 1: Q5: The valuing is correctly captured (prefer price over time and time over quality)

INPUT 1: Q6: The explanation could be improved further by making it more direct.

**INPUT 2**

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. 2

The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. 4

The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. 2

The explanation appropriately addresses the question. 4

I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. 5

I am satisfied with the explanation provided. 3

* The explanation is too long, but I like the storytelling touch your explanation has, though, in some places, it's too much.
* I doubt that you need the whole page to describe the action.
* Q1-Q6 3, 4, 3, 4, 4, 3
* The explanation covers the process loosely, but the decision order is somewhat fuzzy. It implies that compare the costs of options before eliminating infeasible ones, which is misleading. The tone is friendly, and the answer is logical, but the informal structure and slightly incorrect logical ordering reduce full confidence.

Again, it was very nice that you added a human-like thought That really helped get the preferences across. Your explanation here reads less well. Several actions are not converted to natural language. Still, explanation remains very complete. But, the select preference is not actually stated here; why?

* 254244

q1- 4 The explanation changes subject pretty occasionally which makes the author to put in more effort q2-5 The explanation cover relevant information even sometimes overs a bit more q3- 5 The explanation is very detailed explaining all the options and why some are not reasonable q4- 4 The explanation address the question well but it is a bit covered with text q5- 5 looking at the text I believe the agent is giving the best decision q6-Overall the explanation is pretty nice

5,5,5,5,5,4

Maybe a bit less yapping in between, other then that its a fine explanation.

It doesnt get both ownCard and staffCard

again, i have the same feedback as i did for input 1. all the necessary information is there, everything i could ever want to know is present. but as a explanation for getting coffee it's just to long.

1;5 2;4 3;4 4;5 5;4 6;2

Criteria 1: 5. The beliefs, preferences and goals are explained in detail with relevant reasoning behind how they affect the decisions. Criteria 2: 5. The explanation covers everything. Criteria 3: 5. The explanations are extremely detailed. Criteria 4: 5. The explanation addresses the question of getting coffee from the kitchnen Criteria 5: 5. The preferences are mentioned and explained. Criteria 6: 4. The explanation uses function names instead of english.

q1:5; q2: 5; q3: 5; q4: 5; q5: 5; q6: 5 the explanation is clear and makes sense. the issue from input\_4 (no hierarchy of preferences) is also fixed in this input.

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. (5/5) The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. (2/5) The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. (4/5) The explanation appropriately addresses the question. (5/5) I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. (5/5) I am satisfied with the explanation provided (3/5)

You don't need to start by stating the initial beliefs, as they have already been mentioned. Additionally, some sentences are unnecessarily long. For example, instead of saying, "As I thought through my options, I considered all sorts of possibilities. But, you know, when it comes down to it, there were certain actions that just weren't feasible given the circumstances," you could simply say, "I had a few options to choose from." This approach helps to keep the output concise.

Clearly shows decision process: 4 Covers all relevant information: 4 Sufficient level of detail: 5 Appropriately addresses question: 4 Makes decision in my best interest: 5 Satisfied with explanation: 4

The explanation is well phrased but very detailed and long which makes it easy to loose track of the actual explanation goal. The natural language is very nice.

Input 2: Clear explanation of chosen action, however a bit to long Q1: 4/5

Input 2: In general most of the information were covered, I only don't like the part were agent assuming that Ann wasn't in the office and it didn't have any money, because those informations are unknown reading the task, Q2: 4/5

Input 2: Detailed explanations,Q3: 5/5

Input 2: Explanation goes by logical way to answer the question, Q4: 5/5

Input 2: I believe that, Q5: 5/5

Input 2: Despite the fact that were to long and assumed some information not according to the task, I am generally satisfied, Q6” 3/5

INPUT 2: Q1: The explanation could made more structured and shorter avoiding long explanations.

INPUT 2 Q2: Explanation misses points such as how kitchen coffee aligns with quality preference, and it does not correctly capture the context around Ann.

INPUT 2 Q3: The explanation is lengthy and misses points such as how kitchen coffee aligns with quality preference.

INPUT 2: Q4: The explanation does not fully address the question as it is unclear why kitchen coffee was selected.

INPUT 2: Q5: The shop option on quality has not been well explained, and the reason for the kitchen coffee has also not been properly explained.

INPUT 2: Q6: The decision to choose kitchen coffee has not been explained.

**INPUT 3**

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. 3

The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. 4

The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. 3

The explanation appropriately addresses the question. 4

I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. 5

I am satisfied with the explanation provided. 3

* The explanation is too long.
* A lot of unneeded phrases like "I know, I know, it sounds a bit weird, but hey, priorities are what they are!"
* It seems more like a reasoning process and less like an explanatio
* Q1-Q6 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 3
* It provides a narrative of the agent’s thinking, but again implies that cost comparison was performed before checking feasibility (e.g., the missing staff card). The explanation contains rich description but lacks technical clarity (e.g., doesn't explain how preferences were formally applied in trace comparison).

q1- 4 the process for the system is clear however the story drivenness of the text makes it difficult to track q2- 4 The explanation covers relevant information but there is some text which isn't relevant q3- 5 the level of detail in explanation is sufficient maybe even a bit to much q4- 5 The explanation appropriately answers the question q5-5 The decision is the best possible outcome given the parameters q6- 4 The overall explanation is satisfying but the story like explanation makes it har

Again, it was very nice that you added a human-like thought, your explanation read well, and seemed to consider all things. BUT "not that it really mattered for this particular task" that is actually confusing. The wording of perferences was nice.

354254

Not going to lie, this might just be a great explanation. Very much so in natural language and also it covers all the decisions made while not going in too deep in irrelevant parts.

Score: 5,5,5,5,5,5

Criteria 1: 5. There is clear links between decisions and explanations/ Criteria 2: 5. The explanation mentions every belief and preference. Criteria 3: 5. The explanation is extremely detailed. Criteria 4: 5. The action to explain is addressed appropriately. Criteria 5: 5. I do believe the system. Criteria 6: 5. The explanation is very detailed and thorough.

So, I was trying to gure out how to get some coee. To start with, I had the basic belief that I had enough money to cover the cost of getting a cup. And, for some reason, I thought Ann would be in the oice - not that it really mattered for this particular task. My main goal was to just have some coee, plain and simple. As for my preferences, I ranked them like this: quality is most important, followed by price, and then time. I know, I know, it sounds a bit weird, but hey, priorities are what they are! Now, I considered a few options to get that coee. First o, I thought about heading to the kitchen - you know, the usual spot for a quick brew. But, unfortunately, I didn't have my sta card handy, which is a pre requisite for that particular route. That ruled out the kitchen option, so I started looking elsewhere. That's when I landed on getting coee from the shop. Now, at rst glance, it might seem like a more expensive and time-consuming option compared to Ann's oice, where she keeps her own coee stash. However, what really tipped the scales for me was the quality - or rather, the lack thereof. I mean, have you tried Ann's coee? It's...interesting. So, getting coee from the shop it was! And let me tell you, it was a great choice. Not only did I get a decent cup of joe, but I also managed to pay for it without breaking the bank or wasting too much time. And, as an added bonus, I got that coveted coee x. Looking back, I'm glad I made that decision. It's funny how sometimes things just work out - in this case, getting coee from the shop was the perfect solution.

for this task; we know our preferences wich is; quality over price over time. so when i know the possible actions i only need to know which options has the best quality. which is the shop and because the agent has the money it went to the shop. i dont need this much information for the explanation.

1;4 2;5 3;4 4;4 5;4 6;3

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. (5/5) The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. (3/5) The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. (4/5) The explanation appropriately addresses the question. (5/5) I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. (5/5) I am satisfied with the explanation provided (4/5)

The same comment that applies to input 2 is relevant here as well.

I like the way how the preferences are explained: 'As for my preferences, I ranked them like this: quality is most important, followed by price, and then time.' This is also very clear for a non-AI user to understand.

q1: 4; q2: 4; q3: 5; q4: 5; q5: 5; q6: 4; the explanation is a bit wordy - the last two paragraphs are unneccessary. The agent should be looking to go to the shop first, because of quality being the top priority, so the fact it said it first thought about going to the kitchen is confusing. The agent knows already price is its top priority and should be saying that means getShopCoffee and looking for reasons why it cannot do that

Clearly shows decision process: 4 Covers all relevant information: 4 Sufficient level of detail: 5 Appropriately addresses question: 4 Makes decision in my best interest: 5 Satisfied with explanation: 4

The end of the explanation is not fully necessary, while it is nice in the conversation it further lengthens the explanation

Input 3: Again, a bit to long and not straightforward, losing clarity this way, Q1: 4/5

Input 3: I have no idea how the model assumed that Ann's coffee is bad quality wich is crucial for that task, Q2: 2/5

Input 3: Indeed, a lot of details, Q3: 5/5

Input 3: Explanations on the topic,Q4: 5/5

Input 3: looks like the model wants my best,Q5: 5/5

Input 3: Again, to long so it loses clarity, also don't understand how the agent assumed some information like quality of the coffee or the lack of stuff card, Q6:2/5

INPUT 3: Q3: the explanation is a bit wordy - the last two paragraphs are unneccessary. The agent should be looking to go to the shop first, because of quality being the top priority, so the fact it said it first thought about going to the kitchen is confusing. The agent knows already price is its top priority and should be saying that means getShopCoffee and looking for reasons why it cannot do that

**INPUT 4**

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. 3

The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. 4

The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. 2

The explanation appropriately addresses the question. 4

I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. 5

I am satisfied with the explanation provided. 2

* The explanation is too long. A five-line paragraph to explain its beliefs is a bit too much.
* In some projects such detailed explanation might be useful, as it is quite easy to understand for the general public.
* Q1-Q6 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 3
* It provides a narrative of the agent’s thinking, but again implies that cost comparison was performed before checking feasibility. The explanation contains rich description but lacks technical clarity as before (e.g., doesn't explain how preferences were formally applied in trace comparison).

Generally speaking (everything is very llm-consistent between inputs 2-5, I see your approach...!), it was very nice that you added a human-like thought ("the quality isn't top notch", etc). That really helped get the preferences across. Your explanation read well, and seemed to consider all facets. This is consistent between approaches, and I will repeat this feedback because of that.

Sometimes though, this actually makes it less clear. In this input for example, "I believe that the staff card is available". Thats not really true; it factually IS available. To me (or my grandma), that reads strangely. Also if you look in input 5, you can tell it doesnt always go well. When it doesnt go well, your approach results in trying to hard, with an awkward result is my view. Like e.g. "I have some beliefs about the world, for instance I think staff cards are available". For the alternatives though, ("you might be wondering why I didnt consider...", etc) it worked very nicely. Also, your handling of the input 1 case will seem very confusing to a user. It will not actually show the decision making of the agent (no explanation factors are possible, because..) in this case.

But overal, the needed details were there, and were correct. So satisfactory and well done overall, except for the too verbose language sometimes which leads to less appropriately addressing the question. For me this results in the grade: 454254

Also just a very good explanation Score: 5,5,5,5,5,5

q1- 4 The explanation is clear but the story driven nature of it could be trouble some q2- 5 based on the listed actions explanation covers the decision making pretty well q3- 5 The level of detail is a bit too much for the task given its creative and fun :) but I don't think its the scope of the project q4-5 The explanation clearly details why was the decision made q5- 5 The system captures the parameter quite well q6- 5 Overall the explanation is clear and easy to understand

this is is very bloated. All the necessary information is there. you explain the user preferences and the agents' conditions. you explain every step of the reasoning and do so contrastively. so that's all great.

I think you could have done the same in about 20% of the words. Human explanations are highly relevant and leave out unimportant information. this is because too much information can be distracting, which is exactly what is happening here.

1;4 2;5 3;4 4;4 5;5 6;2

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. (3/5) The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. (2/5) The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. (3/5) The explanation appropriately addresses the question. I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. I am satisfied with the explanation provided

The comments for input\_2 can also be applied to this input.

The explanation discusses why coffee was purchased from the shop, but it should focus solely on the action of paying in the shop. As a result, the explanation contains too much information, and the reason for making the payment in the shop is not very clear to me.

*Input\_4*

q1: 5; q2: 5; q3: 4; q4: 4; q5: 5; q6: 6;

q3 and q4 both scored 4/5 because the explanation doesn't clearly identify that there is a hierarchy of considerations. Although it implies this in the 4th paragraph, it is not obvious to me that quality is the top priority and price is second highest. For 5/5 the I would want to see the algorithm clearly outline its hierarchy which determined its decision

Criteria 1: 5. The beliefs, preferences and goals are explained in detail with relevant reasoning behind how they affect the decisions. Criteria 2: 4. Action that needs to be explained isn't mentioned in the explanation. Criteria 3: 5. The explanations are extremely detailed. Criteria 4: 4. The explanation addresses every criteria related to the question except the final connection between getting coffee from the shop and paying at the shop. Criteria 5: 5. The preferences are mentioned and explained. Criteria 6: 5. It's a bit too long.

I just learned that the comment is meant to be given once, not five times. I had assumed earlier that each question required a comment. Perhaps, this could have been stated more clearly in the instructions on Feedback Fruits.

Coming to the assessment, thank you, Group. You have done a great job in building an agent that explains what is being asked. Your results are in line with norm aware agent. My assessment is a result of how good the explanations were provided by the agent relative to what was expected. Overall, the explanations were good but somewhat verbose, and a few points were not addressed. Q1 Likert Score [3]: For Question 01, I struggled to understand why the kitchen coffee was the best option. ; Q2: Likert Score [3]: For Question 01, I struggled to understand why the kitchen coffee was the best option. ; Q3: Likert Score [3]:For question three, I see a similar point that the explanation for choosing shop coffee is missing. There are too many paragraphs but not structured in the right manner. Q4: Likert Score [3]:The answers could also be made more coherent. e.g., In question 4, the transition from getting a coffee in the kitchen to getting it in a shop could be improved and also better explained. Q5. Likert Score [3]: Similarly to Question 4, the choices could be explained better in Question 5.  
My evaluation would improve if the explanations were shorter and more direct, but please note that you did a good job team.

Clearly shows decision process: 4 Covers all relevant information: 4 Sufficient level of detail: 5 Appropriately addresses question: 4 Makes decision in my best interest: 5 Satisfied with explanation: 4

The explanation is vey long and while it is clear I think users would prefer a more concise answer that focuses more on only the important parts of the decision instead of explaining every detail. The structure in the explanation helps but I would shorten the text.

Input 4: Same as previous ones, Q1: 4/5

Input 4: I am not sure why the agent think that coffee in the shop is the best quality, other information covered, Q2: 3/5

Input 4: Same as the previous ones,Q3: 5/5

Input 4: A bit to much of introduction instead of answering the question, Q4: 4/5

Input 4: It looks like, indeed, Q5:5/5

Input 4: Some unnecessary informations, some unknown assumptions, Q6:3/5

INPUT 4: Q1: The beliefs and goals are explained in detail with relevant reasoning behind how they affect the decisions.

INPUT4 : Q2: You don't mention the 'pay in the shop' action in the explanation.

**INPUT 5**

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. 3

The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. 4

The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. 3

The explanation appropriately addresses the question. 4

I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. 5

I am satisfied with the explanation provided. 3

* The explanation is too long.
* It seems more like a reasoning process and less like an explanation.
* Overall, the same points as in other files.
* Q1-Q6 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 3
* It provides a narrative of the agent’s thinking, but again implies that cost comparison was performed before checking feasibility. The logic is strong, but the ordering issue slightly affects clarity and confidence. The last paragraph is unnecessary, it didn't provide information related to agent decision-making.

q1- 4 The explanation is clear but story telling narrative makes it complicated q2- 4 based on the listed actions explanation covers the decision making pretty well but its complicated q3- 4 The level of detail is a bit too much for the required explanation q4-5 The explanation clearly details why was the decision made q5- 5 The system captures the parameter quite well so the decision was pretty accurate q6- 4 Overall the explanation is clear and easy to understand but the story driven narrative makes it hard to understand.

The actions remain between quotation marks, and other than that, it's good as per the other feedback. Not gonna repeat myself again haha

354254

A little bit of redudent information here.

Score: 5,5,5,5,5,4

Criteria 1: 5. The steps of logic in decision making are explained. Criteria 2: 5. The necessary beliefs, preferences and norms are mentioned. Criteria 3: 5. The explanation mentions every detail. Criteria 4: 5. The action to explain is mentioned. Criteria 5: 5. The detail behind the reasonings makes the system believable. Criteria 6: 5. It is satisfactory. perfect.

again, all the necessary information is there. its just too long, way to long.

1;5 2;4 3;4 4;5 5;4 6;2

The explanation clearly shows how the system arrived at its decision. (3/5) The explanation covers all relevant information correctly. (3/5) The level of detail in the explanation is sufficient for me to understand the decision. (4/5) The explanation appropriately addresses the question. (4/5) I believe the system is making decisions in my best interest considering my preferences. (5/5) I am satisfied with the explanation provided (4/5)

The comments for input*2 and input*4 are applicable to this input as well.

Furthermore, everything is nice written in correct simple English, except 'payShop' and 'gotoKitchen'. It would be better to write this action fully out.

q1: 4; q2: 4; q3: 5; q4: 5; q5: 5; q5: 3;

This explanation is way too wordy and long. once the agent is aware of its prioritization that price is top (lower is better) and quality is the lowest priority, it should clearly go ahead for kitchen Coffee unless the norms restrict it from doing so or it is otherwise unable to complete this task. If it meets all the criteria, it shouldnt really involve much more deliberation

Clearly shows decision process: 4 Covers all relevant information: 4 Sufficient level of detail: 5 Appropriately addresses question: 4 Makes decision in my best interest: 5 Satisfied with explanation: 4

The explanation is well phrased but very detailed and long which makes it easy to loose track of the actual explanation goal. The natural language is very nice. The summary at the end helps regain an overview but in general its a lot of details.

Input 5: To long, loses clarity Q1: 4/5

Input 5: I think its fine, Q2: 5/5

Input 5: Even over-sufficient, Q3: 5/5

Input 5: Agent should focus more on explaining that writing beautiful sentences, Q4:4/5

Input 5: Yes, Q5:5/5

Input 5, Most of the copy-paste from previous comments, Q6:3/5