

# Social-RAG: Retrieving from Group Interactions to Socially Ground Proactive AI Generation to Group Preferences

**RUOTONG WANG**, University of Washington, United States

**XINYI ZHOU**, University of Washington, United States

**LIN QIU**, University of Washington, United States

**JOSEPH CHEE CHANG**, Allen Institute of AI, United States

**JONATHAN BRAGG**, Allen Institute of AI, United States

**AMY X. ZHANG**, University of Washington, United States

AI agents are increasingly tasked with making proactive suggestions in online spaces where groups collaborate, but can be unhelpful or even annoying, due to not fitting the group's preferences or behaving in socially inappropriate ways. Fortunately, group spaces have a rich history of prior social interactions and affordances for social feedback to support creating agents that align to a group's interests and norms. We present Social-RAG, a workflow for grounding agents to social information about a group, which retrieves from prior group interactions, selects relevant social signals, and then feeds the context into a large language model to generate messages to the group. We implement this into PAPERPING, our system that posts academic paper recommendations in group chat, leveraging social signals determined from formative studies with 39 researchers. From a three-month deployment in 18 channels, we observed PaperPing posted relevant messages in groups without disrupting their existing social practices, fostering group common ground.

**CCS Concepts:** • Human-centered computing → Human computer interaction (HCI); Interactive systems and tools; Collaborative and social computing; • Computing methodologies → Artificial intelligence.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: AI agent, group communication, generation

## ACM Reference Format:

Ruotong Wang, Xinyi Zhou, Lin Qiu, Joseph Chee Chang, Jonathan Bragg, and Amy X. Zhang. 2018. Social-RAG: Retrieving from Group Interactions to Socially Ground Proactive AI Generation to Group Preferences. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 38 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

AI-enabled agents are increasingly deployed into online social environments such as group conversational and collaborative spaces as assistants, facilitators, or collaborators to support varied tasks such as conversation summarization [65], brainstorming [47], and conflict resolution [17, 58]. Integrated into part of the group context, these agents insert automated messages into group spaces where human-human conversation and interaction naturally occur. While many are reactive agents, which only act upon explicit human instructions, recent research and commercial tools have also started exploring proactive agents that can act without explicit requests. Compared to reactive interactions, proactive agents open up the unique opportunities of providing useful information beyond those explicitly requested by users [5]

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

and encouraging more active and balanced user participation [12, 13]. For instance, CoExplorer, which preemptively adjusts the window layout of online meetings based on predicted meeting phases and goals, shows potential to help groups stay on track and reduce workload [41]. Another study found evidence that an AI agent that proactively posts text-based cues in brainstorming meetings could inspire new directions of the group discussions [47].

Despite their promises, proactive AI interjections could easily veer into being unhelpful or even annoying to the group members who are using the same space to communicate with each other [5, 8]. Indeed, the lack of explicit user instruction to proactive agents could also lead to ambiguity in users' preferences, resulting in irrelevant interjections [68]. Proactive agent interjection at inappropriate times during group communication could also cause distraction [45]. Rayan et al. observed that even when human facilitators play the role of AI in a wizard-of-oz study, almost half of the AI interjections were dismissed or ignored by group members since they were irrelevant or not timely [47]. As a result, without thoughtful integration into a group's social environment, AI-generated messages may be intrusive or ignored and eventually lead to system abandonment [5].

While posing challenges for agents' appropriate integration, the rich human-human interactions that already exist and the subsequent human-agent interactions within social spaces could also be a unique asset for AI agents, providing exciting opportunities for systems to learn and adapt themselves to users' preferences. Success in leveraging these opportunities can enable us to build *socially-grounded AI agents* that are able to proactively initiate relevant interaction in groups without disrupting existing group dynamics. For example, the past and ongoing interactions in the social space could inform agents to post messages with relevant information to both individual members and the group as a whole, to interact with members in the style and tone that adhere to the social norm of the group, and to time the interaction in appropriate time and cadence. The emerging capabilities for AI models (e.g., Large Language Models) to understand and generate human-like text also afford agents to post messages with flexible styles beyond scripted responses [63], though it's still unclear how to scaffold the AI models to generate messages that are aligned with the preferences and norms of a group without frequent explicit instruction (e.g., users' prompting in each session).

In this work, we consider how AI agents that proactively post messages into a group's social space can take advantage of the existing social contexts (e.g., previous Slack conversations between group members) to better align with the group's interests and social norms. We propose **Social-RAG**, a workflow for AI agents using Large Language Models (LLMs) that takes social signals gleaned from prior interactions between group members and between members and the AI agent as context for aligning the agent's generation to better match the group. Instead of requiring groups to painstakingly input their explicit preferences at the onset of their experience or before each suggestion, we can bootstrap the agent by taking advantage of the fact that the spaces in which groups interact typically store a rich history of social interactions between group members and also contain a multitude of affordances for members to give each other social feedback. This allows for repurposing the existing social affordances for group interaction (e.g., reactions and replies) to enable group members to give additional and ongoing feedback to the agent. Much like how knowledge bases in traditional retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) pipelines must curate their database of facts to be useful as context, we describe strategies for parsing and retrieving from messy social interaction data to glean "social facts" about a group. Unlike RAG, which retrieves from knowledge bases as context to improve an LLM's *factual* grounding [6], Social-RAG retrieves from data sources containing social information about a group (e.g., the group's chat history) to improve an LLM's *social* grounding.

To test our Social-RAG workflow in a real-world online social environment, we built **PAPERPING**, an AI agent that proactively posts messages containing scholarly paper recommendations and LLM-generated explanations into group chat spaces dedicated to research labs or projects. We chose this setting as a test bed due to the collaborative nature of

scientific research [23, 26], where exchanging and discussing scholarly articles is both common and a prerequisite of conducting high-quality research [23]. The rapidly growing volumes of academic research publications also lead to researchers' increasing need to identify relevant research papers. Indeed, in two formative studies with 39 researchers, we found that researchers frequently recommend papers in group chats by targeting a specific member or relating them to prior conversations. They also leverage affordances such as emoji reactions and threaded replies to provide feedback on each other's recommendations. Besides creating a rich repository from which to learn people's interests, this existing social behavior also informed the design of PAPERPING. Instantiating steps described in the Social-RAG workflow, PAPERPING collects and analyzes prior communication history (both between group members and between members and the agent) to learn group preferences, enabling the selection of relevant papers and the tailoring of its LLM-generated explanations to emphasize aspects of recommended papers that are relevant to the group.

PAPERPING was deployed for three months in 18 pre-existing Slack channels with various types of prior dynamics (e.g., types and frequency of messages) and exposure to over 500 users in total, allowing us to evaluate its performance in a real-world setting over time. We find that PAPERPING effectively learns researchers individual and group preferences with their minimum upfront effort, leveraging existing feedback signals in groups such as link sharing and emoji reactions. PaperPing's LLM-synthesized messages were considered to be contextually relevant, outperforming paper content summaries in helping participants understand the relevance of the paper recommendation with their groups. Moreover, PaperPing fits into existing practices within groups without disruption to group dynamics and fosters common ground within groups. However, the real-world deployment also surfaced PaperPing's limitations, such as in balancing group and individual preferences and reflecting the shift of group interests in a timely manner, which point to ways to further augment Social-RAG.

We conclude by discussing the broader implications of Social-RAG for designing more adaptive and socially aware AI systems in diverse collaborative settings. We also present future work on applying our strategies for social grounding in additional contexts and discuss the limitations of our approach and workflow. In summary, our work provides the following contributions:

- A novel workflow Social-RAG to design AI agents that are grounded in social information within a group space, enabling the alignment of the agent's generation to groups' interests and norms.
- An AI agent PaperPing, which instantiates the Social-RAG workflow to proactively post relevant scholarly paper recommendations with LLM-generated explanations into group chat spaces.
- Empirical observation showing how researchers interact and perceive proactive paper recommendation group messages from PaperPing, based on interviews, surveys, and log data collected during a 3-month deployment of PaperPing in 18 slack channels with exposure to over 500 researchers.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Agents in Social Spaces

While many interactive agents such as chatbots and virtual assistants are designed to support individual users, researchers increasingly noticed the opportunity for agents to interact with multiple users in established groups where humans converse or work with each other [50]. Agents have shown promise to support group tasks such as idea generation [47], information seeking [4], and decision-making [42, 49]. They can also intervene in team interpersonal dynamics to, for instance, support conflict resolution [17] or encourage balanced human participation [13]. These agents function in a diverse range of group contexts, including video conferencing [2, 41, 47] and collaborative canvas [21]; and most

commonly, agent interjects into human-human conversations by posting text messages such as facilitation messages to encourage participation [13] or relevant information to help decision-making [72].

**2.1.1 Proactive agents.** One important design dimension of an agent is whether it takes actions only based on specific user requests or proactively suggests relevant information. While reactive agents that only respond to users' requests are perceived as less disruptive, proactive systems can offer additional benefits, such as providing useful information beyond those explicitly requested [5] or initiating interactions to encourage user engagement [48]. To automatically determine when to interject into a group conversation, existing agents are often activated upon satisfaction of certain pre-defined rules or triggers (e.g., after each turn [9, 69], every 5 minutes [72] or when observing a certain pattern in ongoing conversation [8, 14]). Agents' interjections are often publicly visible [24, 57, 66], either addressing specific members [18, 24, 61] or to the general group [57]. While earlier research often pre-define a set of template messages (e.g., facilitation messages) that agents can follow [28], the recent development of Large Language Models (LLMs) has prompted exploration of agents to automatically determine the content and generate unique messages based on group contexts [8]. In this project, we build on prior work and focus on the design of AI agents that automatically determine message content, generate contextualized messages, and proactively post the messages (i.e., post information that is not limited to those explicitly requested) that are visible to the whole group in group chats, specifically addressing certain group members when relevant.

**2.1.2 Challenges with Social Awareness.** While proactive agents offer unique advantages, they also present the risk of disrupting group dynamics if their interjections are irrelevant or poorly timed. This challenge highlights the importance of designing AI agents that are socially aware and capable of adapting to the context in which they operate [1, 13, 21, 47, 50]. Researchers have explored ways to enable agents to be sensitive to key group dynamics, such as member participation (e.g., speech frequency [14], gaze [46]) and individual or collective preferences (e.g., opinions expressed [8, 9]). Indeed, recent research shows evidence that agents that demonstrate their awareness of human behavior and can learn from human behavior are perceived as more natural and trustworthy [69], thus more likely to affect team dynamics positively [72]. Similarly, Avula et al. suggested that proactive agents must provide clear justifications for their actions that can demonstrate their social awareness, as unprompted suggestions may not be immediately understood or valued by group members [5]. However, developing socially aware agents remains challenging. Even in studies where real humans act as agents via the Wizard of Oz approach, the timing and relevance of interventions can be perceived as unsatisfying by group members [5, 47].

## 2.2 Strategies for Aligning AI Agents to a Group

In this section, we review prior work on collaborative systems and group recommendation systems to understand existing strategies to elicit group preferences and leverage the preferences to inform interactive systems.

**2.2.1 Direct Elicitation of Group Preferences for AI Agent Settings.** A straightforward approach to customize AI agents to team context is to allow users to indicate their preferences to agents explicitly. For example, McQuillin et al. collected a crowd-sourced dataset with explicit user intentions and preferences and trained a robot waiter to adapt dynamically to meet individual customer preferences using the dataset [33]. Agarwal et al. developed an agent that polls group members' opinions before sending facilitation messages to the group [1]. Conversational group recommendation systems also widely use multi-turn dialog to elicit explicit user goals and preferences [5, 36–38, 59]. Moreover, continuous and interactive feedback mechanisms were shown to be able to lead to better alignment with user expectations [11, 19],

While these examples demonstrate the effectiveness of explicit user feedback in aligning agents' behavior with users' preferences in social groups, they commonly require prohibitively high effort for individual users to specify their preferences in great enough detail to steer AI models, which could potentially be disruptive to group dynamics (e.g., too frequent poll prompt) [1]. A significant limitation of relying on explicit user feedback is that it requires users to invest upfront effort to tune the agent, exclusively for the purpose of informing systems about their preferences. As a result, users only see the benefits of the system after substantial effort, making the systems suffer from a cold start problem and hindering their adoption [38].

**2.2.2 Learning Group Preferences from Activity Traces.** A unique asset of real-world groups is its rich group communication history, which captures the process of individual and team activities and thus has been leveraged to make inferences about individual and group preferences [27, 51, 62]. Indeed, researchers have explored leveraging these traces, such as engagement level and click pattern, to inform interactive systems to facilitate team processes, such as information seeking [55], peer evaluation [53], information summarization [66]. Krishna et al. showed that the collective activity traces of whether users respond to agents' questions can effectively teach an AI agent to ask socially appropriate questions, reaching a 33% response rate after learning from 236,000 interactions [27]. Others have also explored providing agents with contextual information about the team gathered from documents and ongoing conversations to equip the agent with equipping agents with social awareness [8, 9, 41]. Despite their potential, many current strategies and techniques for contextualizing agents were only validated in controlled lab environments [3, 5, 13] or using the Wizard of Oz approach [47, 48]. For example, researchers have explored extracting individual and group preferences via conversations (i.e., conversational recommender). However, most conversations that have been studied are conversations that have the explicit and dedicated goal of figuring out group preferences (e.g., a conversation to propose, critique and reach consensus on destination for group trips) [37, 38]. In those cases, conversation happens mainly for the purpose of group decision-making. Proactive agents in the wild must continuously monitor group interactions and preferences to determine the timing, content, and presentation of the message to fit the unique preferences and dynamics of diverse teams in the wild.

With these considerations combined, to effectively align agents to the group context, agents need to monitor the ongoing conversations and allow users to continuously give feedback so that it can adapt to the group's preferences. It is also important for the AI agent to demonstrate its benefit and relevance to the group in visible and quick ways. In this work, we contribute a workflow Social-RAG: by automatically determining the content and presentation of the interjection based on the unique team contexts, the workflow allows agents to be a step closer to being socially aware in the wild.

### 2.3 Designing LLM Agents for Group Interactions

The emergence of large language models (LLMs), which have been shown to be good at understanding natural language and generating flexible human-understandable interactions [43], opens up new potential for agents to integrate more naturally into multi-user shared spaces. Notably, researchers have explored using LLM to enable personalized interactions that cater to the unique needs of groups. For example, Ha et al. [20] created personalized agent personas with distinct expertise to increase the relevance of the information shared to users. Lian et al. [30] also suggested potentials for LLM to act as personalized recommenders. Moreover, Chiang et al. [9] built an LLM agent to improve teams' decision-making outcomes by having the agent play devil's advocate.

**2.3.1 LLMs for Explanations.** Among all, LLMs have been used to generate explanations for agents' actions to increase transparency. For example, chatbots can explain the rationale behind suggesting specific items to improve user trust and satisfaction [34], or explain agents' actions in healthcare or financial services [67]. Lian et al. [30] also points to the potential of using LLM to tailor explanations to individual user needs. Prior HCI works have explored the different types of explanations: mechanism explanations, content-based explanations, counter-factual explanations [52], and social explanations [15]. The heuristics of our social signals are inspired by these existing explanation mechanisms. The explanations are also tailored to be relevant to the specific team context. Explanations of agent actions are helpful, but not all agent actions require explanations.

Despite these promises, integrating LLM agents into practical multi-user systems remains a challenge. Traditional LLM agents are trained or fine-tuned on datasets representing general world knowledge, which are not necessarily tailored to align with the specific preferences and backgrounds of teams. Indeed, current LLMs predominantly focus on considering information content instead of social factors [22] and thus show limited capabilities in reasoning social knowledge (e.g., speaker intention, social proximity of speaker and receiver, etc.) [10, 29]. Moreover, NLP research has shown that LLMs often lack social intelligence (i.e., cognitive intelligence, situational intelligence, and behavioral intelligence) [63]. This means that LLM often fail to interpret the social proximity, speaker intention and team norms. These factors limits LLM's capability to understand and interpret the unique dynamic in team conversation and subsequently generate responses that are natural to the team context.

**2.3.2 Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG).** LLMs often lack access to constantly growing and changing knowledge and tend to generate false content (“hallucination”). To address the issues, retrieval-augmented LLMs have been proposed, especially for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks such as question answering [32, 44, 54, 60] and fact-checking [64, 70]. Such LLMs aim to retrieve up-to-date knowledge—often from the Web [16, 60, 70], Wikipedia [54], or a domain-specific corpus like LitCovid [64]—and incorporate this external knowledge into their prompts to enable more accurate generation. In recent years, a growing body of literature has improved this framework by, e.g., building a more accurate [44, 54, 64, 70], efficient [54, 64, 70], and credible [70] information retriever.

LLMs also struggle to produce content aligned with various individual and group preferences. Addressing this problem, especially without the need of individuals' or groups' direct inputs, requires LLMs to access group interactions that update over time. Given LLMs' lack of such access, there is a strong need—addressed by our proposed Social-RAG but overlooked in previous studies—for LLMs to retrieve “social facts” from up-to-date group interactions to enable more aligned generation.

### 3 SOCIAL-RAG: SOCIALLY GROUNDING AI GENERATION BY RETRIEVING FROM GROUP INTERACTIONS

In this work, we seek to design AI agents that can proactively post automated messages in online group spaces in ways that are helpful and that fit in to the social dynamics of the group. While LLMs can support the generation of automated messages that are more human-like, they have no knowledge of a group's social context to best align their generation. In order to enable AI agent generations that fit a group's preferences and social norms, we take inspiration from traditional retrieval augmented generation (RAG) workflows that leverage knowledge bases as additional context for grounding LLM agents to factual information [16, 60, 70]. We introduce **Social-RAG**, a workflow for grounding LLM agent generations to social information about a group.

In the following, we begin with design goals for our workflow drawn from prior work and through building, iterating, and playtesting a prototype AI agent that implements Social-RAG over the course of 18 months (described in more detail in Section 4). We then describe the steps of our workflow, including both the curation of a database storing a group’s social information gleaned from raw group interactions, as well as the retrieval pipeline for real-time zero-shot learning for message generation.

### 3.1 Design Goals

Our design goals are informed by prior literature as well as a research-through-design (RtD) approach [71] where we iteratively designed and built a prototype LLM-based AI agent over the course of 18 months along with deployment and feedback within a set of our own social spaces. In Section 4, we provide details of our eventual system and evaluation. While that system is built for a specific task and social context, the process of iteratively working through design requirements enabled us to reflect on and gain insights into the broader question of how to best leverage existing group information and infrastructure towards aligning an AI agent to a group.

- **DG1: Contextualize suggestions in the group’s social context.** Research has shown that the relevance of suggestion and the agent’s ability to demonstrate and articulate the relevance impact the adoption of proactive agent [5, 47]. A promising approach is explicitly explaining the suggestion’s relevance to the group context. Indeed, tailored explanations have been shown to be able to help improve users’ trust in AI suggestions from personal AI agent [5, 15, 31]. Many RAG approaches also include in their generation citations to references retrieved from a knowledge base as a way to improve trust [70]. With information about a group’s social context, we can use the same approach to contextualize AI suggestions in the group.
- **DG2: Integrate into the group without disturbing existing group social practices.** While the AI agent will be interacting with the group in their shared social space, it should not crowd out existing productive human-human interactions that occur or degrade usability, e.g., by posting messages so long that group members have trouble reading them or locating each other’s posts. Poor integration could result in users moving to a different channel or otherwise reducing discussion, which would partly defeat the purpose of having the agent in the group’s social space in the first place.
- **DG3: Minimize upfront user effort in preference elicitation and allow for continued improvement.** Many existing AI agents require explicit elicitation from users regarding preferences [1, 33], which can be tedious and creates barrier for groups to adopt the AI agent. Given the potential of activity traces to indicate users’ preferences [27], we can potentially learn from prior group interaction data to learn group preferences, reducing the user effort needed to bootstrap the agent. We can also lower barriers to user feedback for additional adaptation by leveraging the existing affordances of the space and existing common behaviors of users.
- **DG4: Establish common ground among the group.** Maintaining common ground is essential for productive asynchronous collaboration [39]. Thus, agent communication to the group, even when targeted to specific members, should happen in the shared group space. User feedback back to the agent should also be visible to others, particularly as this steering has group-wide implications. This way, group members can know what suggestions other members have received and also learn more about each other’s preferences.

### 3.2 Social-RAG Workflow

We now detail the steps of the Social-RAG workflow and how they instantiate our four design goals.




Fig. 1. The Social-RAG workflow involves four steps, as illustrated in the figure. After collecting and indexing content group interactions to create a social knowledge base (Step 1), Social-RAG retrieves from prior group interactions (Step 2), selects and ranks relevant social signals which are fed as context into a large language model to generate a succinct message (Step 3). The message is then posted to social channels, where the agent can continue to collect and index group reactions (Step 4). The workflow grounds LLM agent generations to social information about a group.

**3.2.1 Step 1: Collect and index content from group interactions to create a social knowledge base.** Our first step is to create a knowledge base that stores information about group members for making more targeted AI suggestions. In order to minimize upfront user effort in eliciting preferences (DG3), we can leverage the group’s interaction history to learn information about group members’ preferences.

Depending on the specific goal of the AI agent’s interjection and technical feasibility, the scope of relevant items in the history could vary. For instance, given a bot that recommends the latest news items to a group that likes to discuss the news, prior messages discussing news-related topics and news articles posted by group members could be collected as an indication of group members’ interests. In addition, group members’ reactions and engagement around these messages could also be useful context that provides more nuance or captures preferences of more group members. For example, if a group chat had active discussion around an article, then it’s possible that another article on a similar topic could inspire future conversations.

After collection, posts must be parsed to extract items that are then indexed to be able to be retrieved via an algorithm. Items to be extracted include anything that could be surfaced in a suggestion, e.g., an article URL for a bot that recommends articles. How to index an item depends on what aspects of the item should be used to determine relevance. For instance, news articles could be indexed according to the semantic similarity of the article title.

Each item is then associated with additional information. First, each item should be associated with the **posts** that mention it. Additional context such as the sentiment of the message or reactions to the message containing the item could be stored to better understand the **direction of preference**, as opposed to simply interest. Additional **metadata** about each of the items could be gathered from external data sources or through additional analysis (e.g., the publisher of an article or its main topics). Indexed items can also be associated with the **group members** that mention or interact with the entity so that the agent knows who in the group would be most interested.

One way this index can already be used is to improve the underlying suggestions the AI agent provides to be targeted to the group. For instance, when recommending a new article to the group, the news recommendation bot could query the index to determine whether the article might be interesting to the group (i.e., if the group has discussed similar articles) and only recommend the articles that return the most results.

**3.2.2 Step 2: Retrieve social signals from knowledge base to contextualize AI explanations.** After deciding on a relevant suggestion to post to the group, we then use the social knowledge base again for determining how to explain the relevance of the suggestion to the group (DG1). We present three types of social signals we can retrieve from our social knowledge base and how we can use those signals to contextualize AI suggestions to the group in different ways:

- **Cite relevant prior posts in group history.** Given an index of items previously mentioned and the posts they came from, we can retrieve prior posts discussing similar items as the item currently being suggested. This prior message and its associated thread of discussion could be cited by the AI agent when suggesting a new item as an explanation of relevance. The citation could then link to the prior post, enabling members to investigate for themselves the connection and establish trust in the agent’s suggestions. This is similar to how traditional RAG systems for factual information often cite the sources from which they retrieved contextual information in their generation. The ability to see older relevant discussions also reminds group members of what was already discussed to help establish common ground (DG4) for continuing discussion. For instance, an AI agent that makes automated pull requests (PRs) in a code repository with suggested code edits could link to prior PRs that recently edited the same piece of code or is attempting to fix the same problem.
- **Highlight relevant metadata in an explanation.** Each item in our index can be associated with one or more pieces of metadata gathered from external data sources. From this information, we can determine what metadata is potentially interesting to the group by storing and retrieving counts of how often an item with that metadata was mentioned. For instance, if group members in the past have shared many news articles from a particular writer or publisher, they might be more interested in a new article if they know that it is also from that writer or publisher. Thus, when a new item is set to be suggested to the group, we can also determine whether any particular metadata about it should be highlighted in the explanation of the suggestion.
- **Mention relevant group members.** Finally, each item in our index can be associated with one or more group members who posted about the item or reacted or responded to a post about that item. When a new item is set to be suggested, we can determine which items it is most similar to and which group members interacted with those items as a signal of interest. Additionally, external data sources with other information about group members could be used to determine connections to specific group members. Then the AI agent can @-mention specific group members as another explanation of relevance. This has the added benefit of alerting members of the group and potentially encouraging them to interact with the agent’s message in the channel, as well as teaching group members about each other’s interests (DG4).

**3.2.3 Step 3: Rank social signals and generate a succinct message to be posted by the AI agent.** In this step, we gather all the relevant social signals associated with a suggestion in order to combine them into a message that will be posted by the AI agent. Our goal is to craft a message that fits in naturally with the existing human-human conversation happening in the social space (DG2). To achieve this goal, we leverage large language models (LLMs) to flexibly generate a message in natural language mimicking existing group dialogue and also to summarize the social signals in a succinct way so as to not overwhelm group members. We take the social signals gathered in the last step and the original

suggested item and provide them as context to an LLM, along with instructions and examples of how the AI agent should provide their suggestion and explanation. For instance, the prompt could ask for a specific format, length, or tone. If the prior step resulted in many social signals retrieved, we can use heuristics to select one or a few most relevant signals to provide as context or simply provide everything to the LLM and allow it to determine what to keep in an short explanation.

*3.2.4 Step 4: Post generated message to social channel and collect and index group reactions.* Finally, with an LLM generation in hand, we have the AI agent post the message in the group channel for all members to see (DG4). At this point, just like with any other post made by a human, members can interact with the post such as by reacting or replying to it. These interactions can also be collected and indexed much like how posts made by group members are collected and indexed in Step 1. Not only does enabling group reactions to the post serve as a way to further learn about other group members' preferences (DG4), by leveraging the existing social affordances of the social space, we provide an easy and more natural way to given feedback to the AI agent for additional adaptation (DG3).

## 4 PAPERPING SYSTEM

We implement the Social-RAG workflow into a system called PAPERPING, which provides automated academic paper recommendations in a group chat context to academic groups. We chose this setting to test our approach due to the highly collaborative nature of scientific research, oftentimes involving regular and information-dense communication among collaborators [23, 25, 26, 40], much of which today takes place using digital tools. We also chose to focus on paper recommendation as academic papers play an important role in facilitating knowledge sharing, fostering collaboration and informing decision making in the communication of scientific teams. The process of discovering and searching papers is often open-ended, with no clear decision point to stop, and opportunistic [35]. Paper recommendations often come from social networks [56], and researchers commonly form groups for the purpose of sharing and exchanging relevant research literature.

### 4.1 Formative Studies

We first describe two formative studies we conducted with scholars to understand if and how they use social channels to discuss and recommend papers to each other and their preferences for an automated paper recommendation bot. Findings from these studies motivate and inform the system design of PAPERPING, including the specific social signals (e.g., paper metadata) we choose to capture about each paper and the design of automated messages (e.g., format, tone). Our study is approved by the Institution Review Board.

*4.1.1 Procedure & Participants.* In our first study, we interviewed 13 researchers who regularly discuss research in group chat channels. The groups that our participants are part of include research project groups as well as interest groups such as a lab discussion channel. The interviews lasted 19 minutes to 1 hour. During the interviews, we asked participants about their motivations and considerations in sharing scientific literature and their experiences getting literature recommendations. Our interview participants are mainly in the areas of HCI and NLP. We analyzed the interview transcripts using inductive coding and clustered the codes into common themes.

Second, we conducted a survey with 26 participants from two active research discussion channels on Slack, consisting of a mix of research scientists, professors, PhD students, and undergraduate students. In the survey, we asked participants to compare different styles of Slack messages that recommend academic papers in order to understand people's preferred message presentation in an academic Slack setting. These styles varied across several dimensions, including tone (neutral

vs. enthusiastic, promotional language, humor), use of emojis, and formatting (single block of text vs. bulleted format, use of text decoration such as bold). Participants were asked to indicate their preferences for pairs of messages showcasing different styles.

**4.1.2 Results. Researchers regularly share papers with each other in chat.** In project-specific channels, our interviewees share papers that directly support specific goals, such as answering research method questions or illustrating ideas to other team members. These shared papers play a crucial role in shaping the research project by providing potential citations, serving as model papers, and enhancing collaboration by ensuring everyone is on the same page. In interest-based channels, papers are shared for their general relevancy to the group's common interests. Although not shared in response to specific questions, these papers spark new conversations and facilitate relationship-building among like-minded researchers.

**Researchers posting papers recommendations attempt to connect the papers they share with the group.** Our interviewees who post paper recommendations mentioned that they like to contextualize the recommendation in the discussion. For example, they would highlight specific quotes or explain their reasons for sharing the paper. Researchers also use @-mentions to draw the attention of relevant individuals to specific papers. Interviewees looked to prior papers shared and group engagement to determine what kinds of papers to share, how to share, and the frequency of sharing. However, some interviewees also said it currently takes too much effort to craft a message explaining a paper recommendation, calling it "*free labor*". They are also sometimes hesitant to write their own summaries of the paper since they often recommend papers without having fully read them and worry about providing an inaccurate summary. Some junior scholars also worry about interrupting group dynamics or taking too much space with papers that are perceived to be low quality or irrelevant to groups.

**Researchers reading papers recommendations prefer short and neutral explanations.** Participants in our survey overwhelmingly preferred straightforward and neutral Slack messages when introducing academic papers in their channels. Messages with minimal formatting, without text decoration or humor, were favored, as seen in the strong preference for neutral tone (92.3%) and simple formatting (96.2%). Promotional language and humor were particularly unpopular, with only 15.4% and 7.7% of participants supporting those styles, respectively. While there was some division on emoji usage—undergraduates were more receptive (60%) compared to PhD-level participants (43%)—the overall trend leaned toward simplicity and clarity.

**Researchers prefer quick ways to engage with paper recommendations.** When responding to papers that others shared in chat, our interviewees commonly use emojis and quick comments to indicate their interest, as a way to show appreciation and encourage others to continue to share. Emojis are liked because they are "*unobtrusive and don't take space*".

**4.1.3 Summary.** Our findings motivate the utility of a paper recommendation bot that posts in group chat, as researchers already perform this activity but sometimes find it difficult to do well. In terms of how to best design the bot, our interviewees provide examples of ways they connect their recommendation to the group; these inform the social signals we implement into PAPERPING from the Social-RAG workflow. In addition, our findings guide our effort to design bot interjections that are unobtrusive, as well as ways to give feedback to the bot that are quick and easy.

## 4.2 PAPERPING Example User Scenario

Kara leads a research group, consisting of PhD students, postdocs, and undergraduate researchers. The group is interdisciplinary across several fields but also shares common interests. To help the group stay on top of the latest




Fig. 2. An example scenario demonstrates how users can interact with PaperPing. Channel members share paper links, react to papers shared by other members or PaperPing, and comment on shared papers. After gathering and processing this information, PaperPing sends new contextually grounded paper recommendations, including explanations of how the recommended papers are relevant to the channel. It also provides links to previous related discussions and includes meta-information about the recommended papers in the recommendation message.

research, Kara encourages everyone to share and discuss relevant papers in their group chat on Slack (Figure 2, a & b). Upon learning about PAPERPING, Kara introduces it to her group to help them keep up with the latest literature without extra workload. Kara set the recommendation frequency to be once every other day.

One day, PAPERPING notifies the group with a new paper recommendation. The message includes metadata about the paper (Figure 2, h) and a brief explanation that highlights the connection between the recommended paper and their recent chat (Figure 2, f), citing a previous discussion thread for reference (Figure 2, g). The message is also personalized with an @-mention to her postdoc Ryan, since he has previously reacted positively to similar papers (Figure 2, d). Ryan views the linked previous discussion to gain more context and has some new thoughts regarding one of the questions that they were confused about in the previous discussion. He shared his thoughts under the latest paper recommendation while @-mentioning other relevant students and reacting to the bot's post with an emoji to show interest (Figure 2, d & e). Kara saw the discussion and contributed another paper that she recently come across that's relevant. The team continues to interact with PAPERPING as recommendations arrive and with each other. Over time, the positive feedback and ongoing interactions from the group help PAPERPING refine its understanding of the team's preferences, recommending more relevant papers and providing more targeted explanations.




Fig. 3. The implementation of PaperPing, leveraging Social RAG workflow. PaperPing leverages two data sources: the Semantic Scholar knowledge base, providing paper contents, paper-author connections, and citation graphs; and Slack chat history, which includes previously mentioned papers, emoji reactions, comments, and user interactions. Indexes include Paper Metadata API, Mentioned Paper Index, and Member Preference Index. For prompt construction process, given a paper, PaperPing retrieves relevant metadata, the most similar and discussed prior paper in the chat, and identifies the member most likely to be interested. Then, these signals are ranked according to importance heuristics, and finally, an explanation is generated.

#### 4.3 PAPERPING Features

PAPERPING is an implementation of our Social-RAG workflow for socially grounded AI text generation. Building on the findings from the formative interviews, we describe in more detail PAPERPING’s features specific to the context of an AI agent that proactively posts academic paper recommendations in a research lab’s group chat (Figure 3).

**4.3.1 Step 1.** To create a social knowledge base from prior chat history, PAPERPING parses prior messages to extract links to academic papers shared by others. We convert these links into an embedding for each paper to store in a vector database, along with the messages that mention that paper, the authors of those messages, and when messages were posted. In addition, we collect users’ emoji reactions to the message, noting which emojis have a positive versus negative sentiment (e.g., thumbs up as a positive reaction), and any comments in the thread under the message.

We also link this paper database with external data sources that provide additional relevant metadata. In particular, we collect the authors of the paper, their affiliations, the papers they cite and that cite them, and the venue in which the paper is published. Finally, we optionally allow users of PAPERPING to link their group chat account to their academic publication record, enabling PAPERPING to know the user’s affiliation and publication history.

When PAPERPING is due to make a recommendation, it chooses as positive examples to an off-the-shelf recommender algorithm recent items from this paper database that have received positive emoji reactions or one more comments in response from a group member.




Fig. 4. PaperPing prompts pipeline (Condition 4). It starts with social signals leading to three prompts: Prompt 1 highlights paper content, Prompt 2 highlights relevance to a previous paper, and Prompt 3 highlights relevance to a channel member. Finally, outputs from these prompts feed into Prompt 4, which synthesizes the information and adjusts the style, resulting in a final output.

**4.3.2 Step 2.** With a paper in hand, PAPERPING next retrieves social signals related to the paper. PAPERPING focuses on three groups of social signals: (1) PAPERPING assesses connections from the new paper to previously shared papers in the chat channel, looking for potential topic overlaps, citation relationships, or common authorships. (2) PAPERPING checks to see if any metadata items about the paper, such as authors or publisher, have some connection to prior interactions in the chat channel. For example, if an author of the new paper was previously mentioned in the group chat history, PAPERPING will identify the author's name as a social signal. (3) PAPERPING identifies team members who might be interested in the paper based on their previous interactions in the chat channel. These align with the three types of social signals mentioned in Section 3.2.2. We offer a detailed list of retrievable social signals that we implemented in PAPERPING in the Appendix. If many social signals are retrieved from this step, we use heuristics developed over several months of piloting to rank and select only a few that are the most important. For example, we prioritize social signals that involve papers that have received high numbers of comments and emoji reactions. We also prioritize papers that are more recently posted.

**4.3.3 Step 3.** As shown in Figure 4, PAPERPING uses chains of LLM prompts to turn the retrieved information into a natural language explanation. The chains of prompts are dynamically constructed based on the availability of social signals from Step 2. PAPERPING has one prompt for each group of social signals before using one final prompt to succinctly summarize the information and change the tone to be more friendly and informative. This approach allows the output to be able to address meaningful connections between the recommended paper and the channel context while reducing hallucination. We iteratively developed these prompts through piloting our prototype in two channels we belong to that are not part of the deployment study. The specific LLM prompts are provided in the Appendix.

In our LLM prompts, we instruct the generation to take the following format. It first introduces the paper using a contextualized explanation based on the above social signals. Whenever the explanation mentions a user, it will also

@-mention the user, unless it has already done so recently. When there is a relevant previously mentioned paper, the explanation also cites the previous thread that mentions the paper. This citation is linked, allowing group members to go back to view the previous thread. Finally, PAPERPING also provides the paper's meta information, such as title, author name, venue, etc. in a structured format separate from the contextualized explanation.

We asked users for feedback on the initial mockups and iterated on the design of the text. For example, users indicate that they prefer to see keywords bolded in the explanation to help them skim through the text.

**4.3.4 Step 4.** The message gets posted in the group channel after which group members can provide an emoji reaction or reply to the message to give feedback. The frequency of recommendation can be adjusted by group members based on their own preference to daily, once every other day, or weekly.

#### 4.4 System Implementation

PAPERPING is implemented as a Slack application, with recommendations arriving in the group conversation as chat messages from the PAPERPING bot account. It is built with the Slack Web API. The backend server is built in Node.js and interfaces with a PostgreSQL database. PaperPing leverages the Semantic Scholar Recommendation API to select paper recommendations based on groups' interests and prior interactions. To retrieve the paper's metadata, SPECTER embeddings for each paper and citations from the citation graph, PaperPing uses the public Semantic Scholar Academic Graph API. PaperPing uses GPT4-turbo-preview through the OpenAI API for all text generation with an LLM.

### 5 FIELD DEPLOYMENT

To collect empirical evidence on the effectiveness of Social-RAG in designing AI agents that can be grounded in group settings, we conducted a three-month field study where PAPERPING was deployed in 18 channels, collectively reaching over 500 people who are members in these channels. From these channels, we collected in-depth feedback from 28 members via interviews and an offline evaluation task. Three participants (P8, P23, P24) were in multiple channels that installed PaperPing. The others were only in one participating channel. All groups installed PaperPing for at least 3 months, except for one group, which decided to discontinue the study after one week. We still invited them to debrief about their experience, so their feedback was also reported in the following section. The study was approved by a university IRB.

#### 5.1 Research Questions

To evaluate how well Social-RAG enables AI agents to generate messages that are socially appropriate, we focus on understanding how group members perceive and engage with PaperPing's suggestions, as well as how PaperPing affects the group's dynamics. Our research questions include:

- RQ1: How effective and effortful are PaperPing's feedback mechanisms in eliciting individual & group interests?  
How relevant are PaperPing's suggestions? (Design Goal 3)
- RQ2: How effective are the social explanations in contextualizing PaperPing's suggestions? (Design Goal 1)
- RQ3: How does PaperPing affect existing social practices in the groups? (Design Goal 2)
- RQ4: What impact do PaperPing's suggestions have on groups' common ground? (Design Goal 4)

Condition	Signals	Presentation
C1: TLDR	Paper Summary	Template
C2: Template	Social Grounding	Template
C3: TLDR w/ Template	Paper Summary + Social Grounding	Template
C4: PaperPing w/ LLM synthesis	Paper Summary + Social Grounding	Natural Description

**C1**  
Abstract: Online mental health spaces require effective content moderation for safety. Whilst policies acknowledge the need for proactive practices and moderator support, expectations and experiences of internet users engaging with self-harm...  
*Experiences of moderation, moderators, and moderating by online users who engage with self-harm and suicide content.*  
Z. Haime, L. Kennedy, L. Grace, L. Biddle  
medRxiv | 2024 | Save to library

**C2**  
Possibly of interest to [@Tom](#) because you've reacted positively to a similar paper in the channel: [Towards Intersectional Moderation: An Alternative Model of Moderation...](#) ( in prev thread)  
*Experiences of moderation, moderators, and moderating by online users who engage with self-harm and suicide content.*  
Z. Haime, L. Kennedy, L. Grace, L. Biddle  
medRxiv | 2024 | Save to library

**C3**  
Abstract: Online mental health spaces require effective content moderation for safety. Whilst policies acknowledge the need for proactive practices and moderator support, expectations and experiences of internet users engaging with self-harm...  
Possibly of interest to [@Tom](#) because you've reacted positively to a similar paper in the channel: [Towards Intersectional Moderation: An Alternative Model of Moderation...](#) ( in prev thread)  
*Experiences of moderation, moderators, and moderating by online users who engage with self-harm and suicide content.*  
Z. Haime, L. Kennedy, L. Grace, L. Biddle  
medRxiv | 2024 | Save to library

**C4**  
Study reveals challenges in SH/S content moderation, highlighting the need for proactive strategies. Interesting for @Tom, who liked [Towards Intersectional Moderation: An Alternative Model of Moderation...](#) ( in prev thread); this paper focuses on self-harm/suicide, while the latter examines power dynamics and care in moderation.  
*Experiences of moderation, moderators, and moderating by online users who engage with self-harm and suicide content.*  
Z. Haime, L. Kennedy, L. Grace, L. Biddle  
medRxiv | 2024 | Save to library

Fig. 5. Four conditions of PaperPing shown in the offline evaluation and example explanations. The names are anonymized.

## 5.2 Study Procedure & Participants

**5.2.1 Participants.** Via social media advertisement and word-of-mouth, a total of 28 participants from 18 channels (Table 1) participated in interviews for our deployment study, ranging from junior PhD students to professors across various domains (e.g., AI, HCI, NLP, Programming Languages). The groups included research labs, reading groups, project teams, and course channels, with sizes ranging from 2 to over 200 members. These channels had varied levels of paper-sharing activities prior to installing the bot, ranging from 0 to over 5 papers per week.

**5.2.2 Installing PaperPing in channels.** We invited participants who volunteered as their channel's contact person to an onboarding session, where we explained PaperPing's key features and guided them through installation and setup. To set up, participants selected a recommendation frequency suited to their channel's norms. We also invited participants to share several papers in the channels to seed PaperPing if the channel was inactive. Upon installation, PaperPing introduced itself to the group with a brief message, highlighting core features such as link sharing and emoji reactions. During the study, we sent check-in surveys every few weeks to participants. These surveys captured memorable positive and negative experiences in time, which were used in post-study interviews to help participants recall their experiences.

**5.2.3 Offline evaluation.** To more comprehensively understand participants' perceptions of the generated message, we designed an offline evaluation task to understand the effect of different variations of messages on participants' experiences.

In the task, we presented four variations of explanations for papers (see Fig. 5). Specifically, condition 4 (LLM synthesis of social grounding information and paper summary) shows PaperPing's messages that were posted in the Slack channel.

Index	Channel Type	Channel Size	Frequency of Recommendation	Duration (weeks)	Participants
1	Lab channel	31-100	every-other-day	25	P1, P2, P4
2	Common interest	2-10	every-other-day	25	P3, P5
3	Lab channel	100+	weekly	25	P12, P17
4	Lab channel	31-100	weekly	18	P10, P15
5	Project	2-10	every-other-day	24	P8, P23
6	Project	2-10	every-other-day	24	P8, P23
7	Lab channel	10-30	every-other-day	24	P8, P23
8	Project	2-10	every-other-day	24	P8, P23
9	Lab channel	2-10	every-other-day	24	P14, P20
10	Project	2-10	daily	23	P11
11	Seminar	31-100	weekly	16	P16, P9
12	Seminar	31-100	every-other-day	23	P13, P18, P19
13	Common interest	10-30	weekly	10	P24
14	Lab channel	10-30	weekly	15	P24
15	Lab channel	10-30	daily	2	P6, P7
16	Common interest	10-30	weekly	24	P21, P25*
17	Common interest	10-30	weekly	24	P26*, P27*
18	Common interest	10-30	every-other-day->weekly	22	P22, P28*

Table 1. Field deployment participants Information by Channel Type and Recommendation Frequency. Participants marked with an asterisk (\*) indicate those who participated asynchronously without joining the exit interview.

Conditions 1 (TLDR), Condition 2 (social grounding information presented in template), Condition 3 (social grounding information and paper summary information presented in template), each aim to explore a different component of a generated message (i.e., Signal or Presentation) and their effects on users' perception. Each participant was asked to evaluate five papers that were randomly selected from the recommendations that they had received in the channel. Each paper was shown in four variations (Fig. 5), presented in random order. For each variation, participants rated Likert scale questions such as whether the explanation was concise, interesting or help them understand the relevance to the group. After seeing all four variations, they selected the variations that fit their own and group preferences, respectively.

**5.2.4 Exit Interview & questionnaire.** After using PaperPing for at least 3 months, participants were invited to reflect on their experience in an exit interview lasting 30–75 minutes. During the session, they first completed the offline evaluation task, after which they discussed their experience in a semi-structured interview focusing on their perceptions of PaperPing's alignment with their individual and group preferences, as well as its impact on group dynamics. Lastly, they completed a questionnaire containing Likert scale questions about their overall satisfaction, gains, and effort in using PaperPing. The questions were iteratively developed with inspirations from prior work on the evaluation of conversational AI tools [3]. Participants were compensated with \$50 gift cards upon completion. Four participants (P25–28) were unable to join the interviews due to schedule conflicts, thus completed the offline evaluation and questionnaire asynchronously and received \$25 gift cards.




Fig. 6. Results of our post-study questionnaire. The responses are grouped based on the four design goals. The original questions of the questionnaire are presented in the Appendix.

### 5.3 Data Collection & Analysis

**5.3.1 Statistical analysis for offline evaluation ratings.** PaperPing made 832 recommendations in 18 channels during the deployment study (See Appendix for a detailed count of interactions for each channel). We randomly selected 136 papers and collected 540 observations from 28 participants in the offline evaluation task. Participants' ratings in the offline evaluation task were treated as ordinal variables and analyzed using a mixed ordinal logistic regression, where variations were fixed effects, and participants were treated as random effects. We calculated the pairwise differences between the four variations and applied Tukey correction. We also applied a Holm correction for testing multiple hypotheses.

**5.3.2 Qualitative coding for exit Interviews.** We took detailed memos during the interview process and discussed emerging themes in regular project meetings. Interviews were automatically transcribed. We analyzed the data following the guidance of reflective thematic analysis [7]. We first developed codes based on the research questions and emerging themes in the memos, and add new codes as they emerged in the analysis process. The final codebook contained 35 codes focusing on alignment of recommendations with participants' preferences, the effectiveness of the social signals, as well as PaperPing's impact on social dynamics. Examples include: *relevance to individual preference, conciseness of explanations, individual willing to engage with PaperPing*.

## 5.4 Results

### 5.4.1 PaperPing effectively learns individual and group preferences with minimal user effort (DG3).

*PaperPing recommends papers that fit individual and group preferences.* PaperPing's messages were considered relevant and aligned well with researchers' personal and group preferences. In the offline evaluation, 59.6% of the 136 reviewed




Fig. 7. Results of our offline evaluation. Error bars show standard errors. The “template” messages (C2) are consistently rated lower than other conditions across six questions ( $p<0.001$ ). Additionally, explanations with social signals (PaperPing’s LLM synthesis (C4) and Template+TLDR (C3)) were rated significantly more helpful on “explanation helps assess paper relevance to group.” compared to the TLDRs that only summarize paper content ( $p<0.001$  for both comparisons). We did not observe statistical significance in other comparisons.

recommendations were marked as relevant to participants’ individual preferences, and 75.7% were relevant to groups’ preferences. Moreover, 82% of participants agreed that PaperPing helped them discover papers they wouldn’t have found otherwise. Over half (54%) of the participants thought PaperPing’s suggestions aligned with their interests, which is comparable to those that consider recommendations from other channel members to be relevant. In fact, PaperPing’s suggestions were able to directly benefit researchers’ ongoing research. Participants have considered benchmark papers suggested by PaperPing in their research (P8, P11): “*we definitely use the papers that are suggested*.” Several participants (P5, P15, P16) appreciated PaperPing’s ability to surface relevant papers in fast-moving fields. Compared to general-purpose literature discovery tools, PaperPing was considered more helpful, as it is “*seeded*” and “*have a good sense of the topics and research communities that I want to read papers from*.” (P3) P11 echoed: “*With PaperPing we can focus our time and energy on our own paper*.”

*Indicating preference to PaperPing involves minimum effort.* While PaperPing suggests relevant content that brings practical benefits, researchers agreed that indicating their interests to PaperPing was a natural process without being effortful. In the post-study questionnaire, 88% of participants agreed that using PaperPing required little effort. Sharing paper links in the channel was the most frequently used method to communicate interests to PaperPing. Participants appreciated that these feedback mechanisms fit into their existing workflows. P3 described reading and sharing papers in channels to be a “*natural part of my day-to-day interaction of being on Slack*.” P4 also thought that reacting to papers in group chat is a natural interaction: “*it feels social...other people also are interested in this, and they also react to this*.” P20 echoed and described group members’ emoji reactions and comments as a form of “*collective annotation*.”

*Limitations of existing feedback mechanisms.* Despite promising, we observed several limitations of PaperPing's existing feedback mechanisms. In less active groups, PaperPing struggled to gather sufficient signals, leading to less accurate recommendations. P10 mentioned: "*there are definitely more interests that we have, but we just didn't put in the channel so PaperPing wasn't able to pick up the signal.*" P5 and P13 both wished their group members had reacted to papers more frequently to better inform PaperPing about their groups' interests. Moreover, the diverse group norms around using emojis could introduce ambiguity in the interpretation of the feedback. For example, P8 noted that in their channel, "*the reaction was more for acknowledgment as opposed to indicating that the paper is very useful.*" PaperPing considers all the papers shared in the past. While this strategy enriches groups' interests profile, it struggled to reflect groups' interests shift in a timely manner: "*It's hard to branch out into super new papers...it feels like the types of papers that recommend don't change too much over time.*" (P1)

For groups with diverse interests, the tension between individual and group interests also poses challenges. P4 observed: "*even paper shared by my lab mates, I don't relate to most of the time.*" As a result, PaperPing sometimes "overfit" to certain channel members' interests (P5). The misalignment could further turn into barriers for users with unique interests to share papers. P17 felt uncomfortable sharing papers that diverged from the group's primary focus, which only represented the interests of active members in the channel: "*I feel like talking to Siri about my research preference on the street.*"

In sum, despite recognizing PaperPing's usefulness, Participants did not see it as a replacement for paper recommendations from other human channel members. As P3 describes: "*PaperPing is not a replacement. It's an addition to the practice of people sharing with other people.*" Participants noted that PaperPing did complement human recommendations in its timeliness, broad coverage, and ability to tie back to previous discussions. P8 shared: "*there are some papers that it[PaperPing] suggested that I think people just missed or they didn't suggest it in the group. It[PaperPing] helps to have a better picture of the ongoing work related to the project.*" P4 observed that PaperPing offered more diverse and more timely recommendations than they would typically receive from human group members. However, Participants still place more trust in human recommendations and find them still want to additionally verify recommendations from PaperPing. For example, P8 explicitly compared of papers from PaperPing, Arxiv, and other human members further illustrated this sentiment: "*PaperPing is more helpful than browsing ArXiv since the topics are more focused, but I still feel like I have to briefly judge whether I wanna actually read it or not. Whereas if a person who is familiar with our project suggested it, I would definitely read it without having to consider it again.*"

#### 5.4.2 Social explanations contextualize suggestions in group context (DG1).

*Social signals in explanations help contextualize the recommendation in social context.* To contextualize AI suggestions within groups' social contexts, PaperPing explained each paper recommendation with a summary of the paper content and its relevance to the group. These explanations help participants assess paper relevance (75% agree) and were perceived as sufficient by most participants (75%). In contrast, only 29% of participants' explanations provided by other channel members were sufficient. In the offline evaluation, explanations with social signals (PaperPing's LLM synthesis and Template+TLDR) were rated significantly more helpful for conveying relevance to the group compared to the TLDRs that only summarize paper content ( $p < 0.001$  for both comparisons).

In the interviews, participants shared how social signals helped determine a paper's relevance. For example, P10 and P11 mentioned using the importance of the linked paper (i.e., similar or cited by the recommended paper) and the presence of shared authors highlighted in the explanation to infer the relevance of the recommended paper. Others also mentioned using the channel engagement of the linked paper highlighted in the explanation to determine the

importance of the recommended paper: “*three thumbs up versus one neutral reaction makes a difference.*” (P4) P17 noted that social signals could be more helpful than paper content summaries in determining the relevance of the paper: “*I only need to glance at the people who are mentioned; I don't even need to go through the summary of the paper to know how relevant this paper is to me.*” This can be especially helpful for junior scholars like P21, who have less expertise on the topic compared to other channel members: “*I don't have as much background on the main topic of the channel, so social signals were helpful for me in understanding why it'd be relevant for me to read.*” As P21 summarized: “*social signals provided a more contextual way of understanding how the recommended paper related to a past paper.*”

Social signals also foster group members’ trust in PaperPing’s suggestions. P8 thought that the social signals provided transparency into PaperPing’s action: “*the fact that there are correct links to who reacted to or who suggested what helps you to trust that the way that the information is being considered in an accurate or relevant way.*” The association with specific group members highlighted in the explanations made P17 more receptive to PaperPing’s suggestions that are not immediately relevant to themselves: “*if PaperPing mentioned a person who's not in my small group or who I don't work with, I know this paper is not relevant to me but are relevant to the larger group.*”

*PaperPing’s LLM synthesis is informative and natural but could lead to unreliable interpretation.* Participants thought PaperPing’s LLM-synthesized explanations could introduce paper content in personalized and contextualized ways and surface connections that might otherwise be missed. P3 appreciated the LLM explanations highlighting the novelty of the recommended paper beyond its findings. P5 and P13 valued the explanations and also highlighted connections with their interests that they hadn’t considered: “*That made me decide that I could take a look at the recommended paper.*” (P13) However, some participants found LLM explanations too speculative or ambiguous. P10 noted that LLM synthesis could overly compress information, making the explanations unclear P12 also found the LLM explanations to be too generic: “*It highlighted the similarities between two papers, but can be too broad, like boosting computer visual models. That's what every single paper is about.*” Indeed, the usefulness of social signals relies on the prerequisite of having a clear summary of the paper’s content. This is evident in offline evaluation, where the template variation is consistently rated lower than other variations that contain a summary of paper content across all seven evaluation dimensions ( $p<0.001$  for all comparisons). For many researchers, a clear summary of the paper is considered as a “*more reliable source of information*” (P7) compared to the inferred social signals (P1, P2, P7, P15).

Participants also noted that PaperPing’s awareness of individual and group context could still be insufficient. For example, P10 found explanations sometimes highlight connections that are misaligned with their interests. “*it has its own understanding of why and sometimes that leads to inaccuracy or irrelevance.*” P17 noted that PaperPing could miss group context and offer redundant information: “*Everyone in the group already knows YOLO and has been following the different versions. It's just like announcing a new iphone, you don't really need to introduce the iphone 14 iphone 13 before that. You can just say here's new iphone 15.*” Participants such as P6 and P18 also noted that LLM’s interpretation of emoji reactions in explanations could be awkward and inaccurate: “*it feels like it's trying to derive the conclusions when not having enough data points.*” (P1) They prefer to see the exact emoji to better understand the nuances of the reactions, especially given the diverse norms of emoji usage across groups. Due to these uncertainties in LLM interpretations, participants like P10 preferred the TLDR+template explanations (condition 3) because “*it felt a little bit more objective.*” P14 also preferred forming their own interpretations after reading a paper, instead of relying on PaperPing’s interpretation.

*Challenges in translating social explanations to personal relevance.* While social signals help contextualize a paper’s relevance to the group, participants noted the challenge of translating them to their personal interests (P1, P19). P19 explained: “*if I decided to open up that paper, those reasons are all related to myself.*” Seeing PaperPing’s social explanations

that are associated with other group members helps them infer the paper's relevance to themselves. P1, however, thinks it's challenging to do the translation: "*we have very diverse interests and people have different standards for liking. I don't know how they relate to my own standards.*" Indeed, the usefulness of social signals in explanation varies across individual members in groups. P17 and P22 found references to past papers confusing if they had joined the channel later or forgotten the shared context: "*to me that shared context was lost*" (P22) P22 highlighted that "*shared context from working in the same team towards the same goal*" was essential for them to find the explanations naming relevance to specific members to be helpful: "*if I had not been there in person or if I didn't know these people, then I don't know how much it would help.*"

**5.4.3 PaparPing does not disturb existing social practices (DG2).** PaperPing generally fits well with the group's dynamics, as agreed by over half of the participants (54% strongly agree or agree). 86% of participants indicated they would recommend PaperPing to others, and 75% expressed a desire to continue using PaperPing in their channels. As P4 described: "*PaperPing feels natural to me. It doesn't disrupt the natural flow of the conversation in the channel.*" P1 described PaperPing as "*an invited robot guest in the group's space, adopting to groups' norms rather than trying to make the group adapt to it.*" They elaborated: "*it doesn't really feel out of place. It recommends things in a message and links back to previous threads just like any other member.*" P23 also echoed the sentiment: "*PaperPing's behavior didn't interfere with anything. It didn't disrupt the natural conversation.*" P4 appreciated the pace of posting: "*the frequency is nice. I didn't feel like I was annoyed by the bot or anything.*" P8 and P11 noted that PaperPing's contextualized, natural language explanations made it feel more human, instead of reports. Participants like P16 and P21 also liked the concise and stylized summary with key information bolded: "*I like bolded text in the explanations. They are especially helpful for Slack messages, allowing me to skim it first and then like decide if you want to read it.*" (P21) However, other participants found PaperPing's explanations could be verbose: "*If there's like a huge chunk of text in Slack, I tend to glance at the first sentence or maybe word. If it's not important then I just dismiss it.*" (P15). The chunk of text could potentially bury human conversations if not posted at an ideal time (P23).

#### **5.4.4 PaperPing foster common ground within groups (DG4).**

*Social signals help establish common ground.* PaperPing not only suggests useful and relevant information without disrupting channels but also plays a social role by exposing group members to each other's interests and fostering common ground within groups. Participants noted that social signals, such as tagging relevant members and referencing prior discussions and engagements, could lead to potential follow-up interactions and foster group cohesion. As P14 reflected, "*the social signal is the strongest aspect because it shows relevance to me or to my group, which helps me understand my group pattern to some extent.*" Participants appreciated how PaperPing's social signals facilitated group members to learn more about each others' interests. As P3 shared, "*the recommendations and the social signals helped me realize my group member was interested in this type of research.*" Integrated into existing social spaces and practices, PaperPing enables researchers to naturally build on top of its nudges to develop further interactions among each other. As P14 illustrated, "*PaperPing is a part of a chat group with other members. I get to understand the interests of other people. It's a part of a practice that I already have in real life, and it has a lot of potential to assist and support in connecting better with other.*" P10, who is in a large research lab channel, also sees PaperPing's explanations as opportunities to develop long-term collaborations: "*just having it in the group is helpful for me to know what other people's interest is. Even if the interest is slightly different, seeing some new things from related fields is helpful for me to learn what other people are maybe working on, common things that we work on, and things that we could be chatting about.*"

*PaperPing revives activity in inactive channels, but limited in establishing norm.* Several participating channels were lab groups that wanted to encourage paper-sharing but haven't been successful. In these inactive channels, PaperPing helped revive activity by posting recommendations and tagging members to prompt engagement. Participants felt that PaperPing “keep the channel alive” (P3, P14). As P14 described: “*Whenever there was a new message, I would look at it.*” P10 observed that PaperPing prompted more contributions from channel members: “*the channel hasn't been active at all for half a year or more. PaperPing definitely prompts some other people to post. At least I'm seeing two or three other people who have posted on this channel.*” Indeed, P8 thought that PaperPing served as a reminder for other human members to engage: “*It reminded people to send paper recommendations. We have always been encouraged to do that, but people tend to forget previously. Seeing PaperPing's recommendation every two days in the channel reminded people.*” P13 added that PaperPing incentivized them to contribute more: “*it made me feel my reactions or activities in the channel are being seen and are going somewhere, which gets me excited to contribute. It will be captured by PaperPing, and sometime later it gonna give me a reward.*” Participants also noted that tagging specific channel members is an effective way to keep people engaged P5 usually skims through PaperPing’s posts, but “*If my name is tagged, I would read a little more into it.*”

However, participants also noted that PaperPing struggled to establish new norms, such as having discussions around papers within groups that didn’t already have such practices. Only 25% of the participants self-reported often engaging with PaperPing’s recommendations, as compared to 50% of the participants who self-reported often engaging with other human recommendations. P15 observed that although PaperPing was helpful in suggesting relevant papers, it didn’t lead to more paper discussions in the channel. Similarly, P5 hoped that PaperPing could spark more conversations around papers, but the goal was not fully realized. The lack of extrinsic incentives could be one reason for less engagement with PaperPing’s recommendation. Although we disclosed PaperPing’s feedback mechanism to the whole group upon installation, P8 pointed out that some group members could be unaware that their engagement could inform future recommendations and thus weren’t incentivized to engage. Even when aware of the mechanism, participants could still be hesitant to engage with PaperPing because of the lack of potential follow-up interactions with PaperPing: “*I know PaperPing won't respond.*” Participants agreed that respected human members were more effective at encouraging engagement than PaperPing alone. P4 observed that their channel became more receptive to PaperPing’s recommendations and had more engagement after their advisor reacted to one of the posts.

## 6 DISCUSSION

In this paper, we present Social-RAG, a socially-grounded retrieval augmented generation (RAG) LLM workflow. We instantiate this workflow in a user-facing system called PaperPing that can generate text that is grounded in the social context of group interactions on Slack. Based on our findings, below, we discuss the implications for future systems that wish to support socially-grounded text generation.

### 6.1 Bootstrapping Social Ground with Past Conversations

The use of past interactions as a basis for social grounding is a core advantage of Social-RAG—When introducing a Social-RAG system into an existing group, the historical group interactions, can bootstrap such systems to not only be contextually relevant, but also socially appropriate. Our work show that this approach can enhance engagement and foster a more inclusive group dynamic based on our deployment study of PaperPing. However, there are limitations to relying solely on past interactions for social grounding. For example, as group dynamics evolve, the relevance of past interactions may diminish. This suggests that, when bootstrapping, the system might need to additionally consider the

recency of past interactions, and continue to update its understanding of the group as users continue to interact with the system.

Common to any systems designed to embed in social spaces, learning from interactions introduces privacy concerns. One way to mitigate is to limit the scope of what the system is allowed to learn from. For example, we made the conscious decision to only allow PaperPing to access user interactions on messages where a research paper was shared. This is a trade-off between privacy concerns and how well our system can learn from interactions between members. Future work could provide greater users control over which aspects of their interactions are used to inform AI-generated content, potentially through customizable privacy settings or explicit consent mechanisms.

## 6.2 Costs and Benefits of Different Levels of Group Social Grounding

In developing PaperPing, we noticed and reflected on the different levels of social-grounding when generating text in a group setting. Different levels may require different amount of resources and consideration, and can potentially lead to different benefits:

**No social grounding:** At lowest level, a one-size-fits-all system could employ simple heuristics across all groups. Regardless of the group context, the system would generate text that is likely acceptable across all settings (e.g., using a generic template). The main benefit is resources as it does not requiring understanding nor adhering to social contexts and that the system behavior is more static and predictable.

**Category-level social grounding:** A system could pre-define categories of group based on broad characteristics and design corresponding appropriate behaviors (e.g., with socially-informed rules). For example, in our deployment study we observed groups that focus on a progressing specific research project that might care more about exhaustively exploring closely related papers and understanding their relations more deeply. Contrastly, reading groups might care more about exploring diverse sets of papers. While supporting this allows systems to behavior more socially appropriate, they would not be able to support nuanced differences within groups of the same broad categories.

**Group-level social grounding:** A system could tailor its output for each specific group, for example, by observing and learning from previous and on-going conversation in a channel. For example, adhering to the sharing messaging cadence and tones of the group so the generated text are not intrusive, overwhelming, or seemed out-of-place.

**Individual-level grounding:** Finally, a system could target and tailor its messages to specific group members (e.g., via mentions). Challenges here include deeper understanding of individual members and balancing individual preferences with group preferences. Benefits of supporting this could include better understanding of the power dynamics for social appropriateness and helping group members better understand each others' preferences via the generated texts.

To more concretely illustrate the above, we can position PaperPing (i.e., Condition 4) within this framework: Selecting which paper to recommend is grounded at the group-level by pooling all previously shared papers as the input to a recommender system. This allow group members to papers both of common and individual interests. The generated explanations were tailored at the individual-level, with relevant members being mentioned. This promoted engagement with PaperPing, as well as awareness of member's interests to other group members. While in this work we focused on leveraging social signals to tailor the right information with the most relevant social context, future work could also consider additionally tailoring the tone of explanations, how much details to include, posting cadence of the group , etc. In sum, the flexibility to ground different aspects of a system at varying levels offers significant opportunities for creating more socially aware and contextually relevant AI agents. However, it also requires thoughtful design choices and a deep understanding of the social dynamics at play within the target groups.

### 6.3 The Tension of Group vs. Individual Preferences

As mentioned in the previous section, a key design consideration for a socially grounded system is to balance between group-level and individual-level personalization. Empirical observations from our 3 months deployment showed that within the same group, individuals might have different preferences between each other, or even for different messages. For example, members who are more familiar with a recommended paper might prefer explanations that are more in-depth compare to other members. One way to address the tension is by aligning the generation with an “average group” preference. Future systems could consider experimenting with different ways to aggregate individual preferences that optimize various goals. Another way to address this is to scaffold the explanation. For example, start with a more generic and explanation that is tailored to all member, followed by in-depth explanations tailored to individual members. However, the potential risk of diminishing common grounds amongst members also need to be carefully considered (DG4).

### 6.4 Social-RAG in Other Example Scenarios

Finally, in this paper, we explored the idea of Social-RAG in a specific context of research paper recommendation in Slack group chats with a system called PaperPing. However, we believe Social-RAG can be generalized to many different social spaces and for a wide range of goals. Below we list a few example online social scenarios and how the Social-RAG strategy may be employed.

**6.4.1 A Social Bot that Corrects Misinformation in a Subreddit.** In a subreddit where people discuss current issues (e.g., r/inthenews), an AI bot could automatically identify and correct misinformation. Existing systems that tries to achieve this provides an one-size-fits-all explanations based on external sources (e.g., MUSE [70]). However, if the explanations do not adhere to the social norm of the subreddit, group members might not develop enough trust in the system. A Social-RAG workflow here could instead generate explanations that are best suited for the groups’ norm to convey trust. For example, the system could learn about the specific types of sources (e.g., governmental vs journalistic) that are often shared and trusted by the community and successful debunking strategies they were used in the past by members.

**6.4.2 A Collaborative Writing Assistant.** In a real-time collaborative writing environment, such as Google Docs, a writing assistant could learn from past edits and comments from different authors to provide edit suggestions to the group. When added to a new document, the system could leverage past edit histories to better understand the tones and stance of each author to provided socially appropriate edit suggestions. In contrary to previous discussion around balancing group vs individual preferences, in this scenario, the goal of surfacing multiple edit suggestions (e.g., with different tones) tailored to different individual would not only allow authors to better understand each others’ preferences, but can also be a first step to helping authors align on a coherent style for the final article.

**6.4.3 Live AI Meeting Summarization.** An AI meeting assistant could generates group meeting summaries for recurring meetings that updates a running meeting log document with meeting minutes. The tool could analyze the document understand team members’ expertise, as well as the relevant projects to each members. This way AI can generate summaries that highlight the information relevant to the group’s common goals and tag the most relevant team members for awareness. Beyond understanding the preferences and interests of individual team members, learning the power structure and social dynamics *between* individual members from past interactions may also be especially important in for team forming and task delegation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dhruv Agarwal, Farhana Shahid, and Aditya Vashistha. 2024. Conversational Agents to Facilitate Deliberation on Harmful Content in WhatsApp Groups. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3687030>
- [2] Mark Armstrong, Chi-Lan Yang, Kinga Skiers, Mengzhen Lim, Tamil Selvan Gunasekaran, Ziyue Wang, Takuji Narumi, Kouta Minamizawa, and Yun Suen Pai. 2024. SealMates: Supporting Communication in Video Conferencing using a Collective Behavior-Driven Avatar. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637395>
- [3] Sandeep Avula, Jaime Arguello, Robert Capra, Jordan Dodson, Yuhui Huang, and Filip Radlinski. 2019. Embedding Search into a Conversational Platform to Support Collaborative Search. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval (CHIIR '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295750.3298928>
- [4] Sandeep Avula, Gordon Chadwick, Jaime Arguello, and Robert Capra. 2018. SearchBots: User Engagement with ChatBots during Collaborative Search. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Human Information Interaction & Retrieval (CHIIR '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3176349.3176380>
- [5] Sandeep Avula, Bogeum Choi, and Jaime Arguello. 2022. The Effects of System Initiative during Conversational Collaborative Search. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 6, CSCW1 (April 2022), 66:1–66:30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3512913>
- [6] Parishad BehnamGhader, Santiago Miret, and Siva Reddy. 2022. Can Retriever-Augmented Language Models Reason? The Blame Game Between the Retriever and the Language Model. *ArXiv* abs/2212.09146 (2022). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:254854344>
- [7] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 11, 4 (Aug. 2019), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806> Publisher: Routledge \_eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>.
- [8] Zhenyao Cai, Seehee Park, Nia Nixon, and Shayan Doroudi. 2024. Advancing Knowledge Together: Integrating Large Language Model-based Conversational AI in Small Group Collaborative Learning. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.3650868>
- [9] Chun-Wei Chiang, Zhuoran Lu, Zhuoyan Li, and Ming Yin. 2024. Enhancing AI-Assisted Group Decision Making through LLM-Powered Devil's Advocate. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3640543.3645199>
- [10] Minje Choi, Jiaxin Pei, Sagar Kumar, Chang Shu, and David Jurgens. 2023. Do LLMs Understand Social Knowledge? Evaluating the Sociability of Large Language Models with SocKET Benchmark, author=Minje Choi and Jiaxin Pei and Sagar Kumar and Chang Shu and David Jurgens, booktitle=Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, year=2023, url=<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258865939> nd Social Knowledge? Evaluating the Sociability of Large Language Models with SocKET Benchmark. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258865939>
- [11] David Contreras, Maria Salamó, and Ludovico Boratto. 2021. Integrating Collaboration and Leadership in Conversational Group Recommender Systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 39, 4 (Aug. 2021), 41:1–41:32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3462759>
- [12] Alan R. Dennis, Akshat Lakhiwal, and Agrim Sachdeva. 2023. AI Agents as Team Members: Effects on Satisfaction, Conflict, Trustworthiness, and Willingness to Work With. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 40, 2 (April 2023), 307–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2023.2196773> Publisher: Routledge \_eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2023.2196773>.
- [13] Hyo Jin Do, Ha-Kyung Kong, Jaewook Lee, and Brian P. Bailey. 2022. How Should the Agent Communicate to the Group? Communication Strategies of a Conversational Agent in Group Chat Discussions. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 6, CSCW2 (Nov. 2022), 387:1–387:23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3555112>
- [14] Hyo Jin Do, Ha-Kyung Kong, Pooja Tetali, Jaewook Lee, and Brian P. Bailey. 2023. To Err is AI: Imperfect Interventions and Repair in a Conversational Agent Facilitating Group Chat Discussions. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 7, CSCW1 (April 2023), 99:1–99:23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579532>
- [15] Upol Ehsan, Q Vera Liao, Michael Muller, Mark O Riedl, and Justin D Weisz. 2021. Expanding explainability: Towards social transparency in ai systems. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–19.
- [16] Luyu Gao, Zhuyun Dai, Panupong Pasupat, Anthony Chen, Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Yicheng Fan, Vincent Zhao, Ni Lao, Hongrae Lee, Da-Cheng Juan, et al. 2023. RARR: Researching and revising what language models say, using language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 16477–16508.
- [17] Jarod Govers, Eduardo Velloso, Vassilis Kostakos, and Jorge Goncalves. 2024. AI-Driven Mediation Strategies for Audience Depolarisation in Online Debates. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [18] Zixuan Guo and Tomoo Inoue. 2019. Using a conversational agent to facilitate non-native speaker's active participation in conversation. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–6.
- [19] Francesca Guzzi, Francesco Ricci, and Robin Burke. 2011. Interactive multi-party critiquing for group recommendation. In *Proceedings of the fifth ACM conference on Recommender systems (RecSys '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 265–268. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2043932.2043980>
- [20] Juhye Ha, Hyeon Jeon, Daeun Han, Jinwook Seo, and Changhoon Oh. 2024. CloChat: Understanding How People Customize, Interact, and Experience Personas in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642472>

- [21] Jessica He, Stephanie Houde, Gabriel E. Gonzalez, Dario Andrés Silva Moran, Steven I. Ross, Michael Muller, and Justin D. Weisz. 2024. AI and the Future of Collaborative Work: Group Ideation with an LLM in a Virtual Canvas. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work (CHIWORK '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3663384.3663398>
- [22] Dirk Hovy and Diyi Yang. 2021. The Importance of Modeling Social Factors of Language: Theory and Practice. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235097460>
- [23] Marina Jirotka, Charlotte P Lee, and Gary M Olson. 2013. Supporting scientific collaboration: Methods, tools and concepts. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* 22, 4 (2013), 667–715.
- [24] Soomin Kim, Jinsu Eun, Changhoon Oh, Bongwon Suh, and Joonhwan Lee. 2020. Bot in the bunch: Facilitating group chat discussion by improving efficiency and participation with a chatbot. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–13.
- [25] Robert Kraut, Carmen Egido, and Jolene Galegher. 1988. Patterns of contact and communication in scientific research collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 1988 ACM conference on Computer-supported cooperative work (CSCW '88)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/62266.62267>
- [26] Robert Kraut, Jolene Galegher, and Carmen Egido. 1986. Relationships and tasks in scientific research collaborations. In *Proceedings of the 1986 ACM conference on Computer-supported cooperative work*. 229–245.
- [27] Ranjay Krishna, Donsuk Lee, Li Fei-Fei, and Michael S. Bernstein. 2022. Socially situated artificial intelligence enables learning from human interaction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119, 39 (Sept. 2022), e2115730119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2115730119> Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
- [28] Sung-Chul Lee, Jaeyoon Song, Eun-Young Ko, Seongho Park, Jihee Kim, and Juho Kim. 2020. SolutionChat: Real-time Moderator Support for Chat-based Structured Discussion. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. <http://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376609>
- [29] Minzhi Li, Weiyan Shi, Caleb Ziems, and Diyi Yang. 2024. Social Intelligence Data Infrastructure: Structuring the Present and Navigating the Future. *ArXiv abs/2403.14659* (2024). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268667546>
- [30] Jianxun Lian, Yuxuan Lei, Xu Huang, Jing Yao, Wei Xu, and Xing Xie. 2024. RecAI: Leveraging Large Language Models for Next-Generation Recommender Systems. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024 (WWW '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1031–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3589335.3651242>
- [31] Q. Vera Liao, Matthew Davis, Werner Geyer, Michael Muller, and N. Sadat Shami. 2016. What Can You Do? Studying Social-Agent Orientation and Agent Proactive Interactions with an Agent for Employees. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems (DIS '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 264–275. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2901790.2901842>
- [32] Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 9802–9822.
- [33] Emily McQuillin, Nikhil Churamani, and Hatice Gunes. 2022. Learning Socially Appropriate Robo-waiter Behaviours through Real-time User Feedback. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI '22)*. IEEE Press, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan, 541–550.
- [34] Geoff Musick, Allyson I. Hauptman, Christopher Flathmann, Nathan J. McNeese, and Bart P. Knijnenburg. 2023. Recommendations with Benefits: Exploring Explanations in Information Sharing Recommender Systems for Temporary Teams. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 0, 0 (2023), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2278933> Publisher: Taylor & Francis \_eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2278933>
- [35] Y. R. Nedumov and S. D. Kuznetsov. 2019. Exploratory Search for Scientific Articles. *Programming and Computer Software* 45, 7 (Dec. 2019), 405–416. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S0361768819070089>
- [36] Thuy Ngoc Nguyen. 2017. Conversational Group Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization (UMAP '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 331–334. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3079628.3079704>
- [37] Thuy Ngoc Nguyen and Francesco Ricci. 2017. A Chat-Based Group Recommender System for Tourism. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2017*, Roland Schegg and Brigitte Stangl (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 17–30. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51168-9\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51168-9_2)
- [38] Thuy Ngoc Nguyen and Francesco Ricci. 2017. Dynamic elicitation of user preferences in a chat-based group recommender system. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1685–1692. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3019612.3019764>
- [39] Gary M Olson and Judith S Olson. 2000. Distance matters. *Human-computer interaction* 15, 2–3 (2000), 139–178.
- [40] Drew Paine and Charlotte P Lee. 2017. "Who Has Plots?" Contextualizing Scientific Software, Practice, and Visualizations. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction* 1, CSCW (2017), 1–21.
- [41] Gun Woo (Warren) Park, Payod Panda, Lev Tankelevitch, and Sean Rintel. 2024. The CoExplorer Technology Probe: A Generative AI-Powered Adaptive Interface to Support Intentionality in Planning and Running Video Meetings. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1638–1657. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643834.3661507>
- [42] Jeongeon Park, Bryan Min, Xiaojuan Ma, and Juho Kim. 2023. Choicemates: Supporting unfamiliar online decision-making with multi-agent conversational interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01331* (2023).

- [43] Joon Sung Park, Joseph O'Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S Bernstein. 2023. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 1–22.
- [44] Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, Qiuyuan Huang, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2023. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12813* (2023).
- [45] Nia Peters, Griffin Romigh, George Bradley, and Bhiksha Raj. 2017. When to interrupt: A comparative analysis of interruption timings within collaborative communication tasks. In *Advances in Human Factors and System Interactions: Proceedings of the AHFE 2016 International Conference on Human Factors and System Interactions, July 27-31, 2016, Walt Disney World®, Florida, USA*. Springer, 177–187.
- [46] Tuan Vu Pham, Thomas H. Weisswange, and Marc Hassenzahl. 2024. Embodied Mediation in Group Ideation – A Gestural Robot Can Facilitate Consensus-Building. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2611–2632. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643834.3660696>
- [47] Jude Rayan, Dhruv Kanetkar, Yifan Gong, Yuewen Yang, Srishti Palani, Haijun Xia, and Steven P Dow. 2024. Exploring the potential for generative ai-based conversational cues for real-time collaborative ideation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Creativity & Cognition*. 117–131.
- [48] Lazlo Ring, Barbara Barry, Kathleen Totzke, and Timothy Bickmore. 2013. Addressing Loneliness and Isolation in Older Adults: Proactive Affective Agents Provide Better Support. In *2013 Humaine Association Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction*. 61–66. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACII.2013.17> ISSN: 2156-8111.
- [49] Sara Salimzadeh and Ujwal Gadiraju. 2024. When in Doubt! Understanding the Role of Task Characteristics on Peer Decision-Making with AI Assistance. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization (UMAP '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3627043.3659567>
- [50] Joseph Seering, Michal Luria, Geoff Kaufman, and Jessica Hammer. 2019. Beyond Dyadic Interactions: Considering Chatbots as Community Members. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300680>
- [51] N. Sadat Shami, Kate Ehrlich, Geri Gay, and Jeffrey T. Hancock. 2009. Making Sense of Strangers' Expertise from Signals in Digital Artifacts. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 69–78. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1518713>
- [52] Ruoxi Shang, KJ Kevin Feng, and Chirag Shah. 2022. Why am I not seeing it? Understanding users' needs for counterfactual explanations in everyday recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1330–1340.
- [53] Wenxuan Wendy Shi, Sneha R. Krishna Kumaran, Hari Sundaram, and Brian P. Bailey. 2023. The Value of Activity Traces in Peer Evaluations: An Experimental Study. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 7, CSCW1 (April 2023), 151:1–151:39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579627>
- [54] Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2021. Retrieval Augmentation Reduces Hallucination in Conversation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*. 3784–3803.
- [55] A. V. Smirnov, N. G. Shilov, A. V. Ponomarev, A. M. Kashevnik, and V. G. Parfenov. 2014. Group context-aware recommendation systems. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing* 41, 5 (Dec. 2014), 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S0147688214050050>
- [56] Nouran Soliman, Hyeyoung Kang, Matthew Latzke, Jonathan Bragg, Joseph Chee Chang, Amy Xian Zhang, and David R Karger. 2024. Mitigating Barriers to Public Social Interaction with Meronymous Communication. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–26.
- [57] Stergios Tegos, Stavros Demetriadis, and Thrasivoulos Tsatsos. 2014. A configurable conversational agent to trigger students' productive dialogue: a pilot study in the CALL domain. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 24 (2014), 62–91.
- [58] Michael Henry Tessler, Michiel A Bakker, Daniel Jarrett, Hannah Sheahan, Martin J Chadwick, Raphael Koster, Georgina Evans, Lucy Campbell-Gillingham, Tantum Collins, David C Parkes, et al. 2024. AI can help humans find common ground in democratic deliberation. *Science* 386, 6719 (2024), eadq2852.
- [59] João G. Bracaioli Vitório and Carlos N. Silla. 2023. Music Recommendation System for Shared Environments. In *2023 30th International Conference on Systems, Signals and Image Processing (IWSSIP)*. 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IWSSIP58668.2023.10180270>
- [60] Tu Vu, Mohit Iyyer, Xuezhi Wang, Noah Constant, Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Chris Tar, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Denny Zhou, Quoc Le, et al. 2023. FreshLLMs: Refreshing Large Language Models with Search Engine Augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03214* (2023).
- [61] Xu Wang, MiaoMiao Wen, and Carolyn Rosé. 2017. Contrasting explicit and implicit support for transactive exchange in team oriented project based learning. Philadelphia, PA: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- [62] Samuel Westby and Christoph Riedl. 2023. Collective Intelligence in Human-AI Teams: A Bayesian Theory of Mind Approach. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2208.11660> arXiv:2208.11660 [cs].
- [63] Diyi Yang, Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Michael S Bernstein, and John Mitchell. 2024. Social Skill Training with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04204* (2024).
- [64] Zhenrui Yue, Huimin Zeng, Yimeng Lu, Lanyu Shang, Yang Zhang, and Dong Wang. 2024. Evidence-Driven Retrieval Augmented Response Generation for Online Misinformation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 5628–5643.
- [65] Amy X. Zhang and Justin Cranshaw. 2018. Making Sense of Group Chat through Collaborative Tagging and Summarization. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 2, CSCW (Nov. 2018), 196:1–196:27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274465>

- [66] Amy X. Zhang and Justin Cranshaw. 2018. Making Sense of Group Chat through Collaborative Tagging and Summarization. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 2, CSCW (Nov. 2018), 196:1–196:27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274465>
- [67] Rui Zhang, Christopher Flathmann, Geoff Musick, Beau Schelble, Nathan J. McNeese, Bart Knijnenburg, and Wen Duan. 2024. I Know This Looks Bad, But I Can Explain Understanding When AI Should Explain Actions In Human-AI Teams. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.* 14, 1 (Feb. 2024), 6:1–6:23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3635474>
- [68] Xuan Zhang, Yang Deng, Zifeng Ren, See-Kiong Ng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024. Ask-before-Plan: Proactive Language Agents for Real-World Planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12639* (2024).
- [69] Jijie Zhou and Yuhan Hu. 2024. Beyond Words: Infusing Conversational Agents with Human-like Typing Behaviors. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Conversational User Interfaces (CUI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3640794.3665560>
- [70] Xinyi Zhou, Ashish Sharma, Amy X Zhang, and Tim Althoff. 2024. Correcting misinformation on social media with a large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11169* (2024).
- [71] John Zimmerman, Jodi Forlizzi, and Shelley Evenson. 2007. Research through design as a method for interaction design research in HCI. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. 493–502.
- [72] Josie Zvelebilova, Saiph Savage, and Christoph Riedl. 2024. Collective Attention in Human-AI Teams. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.17489v1>

## A SOCIAL SIGNALS USED IN PAPERPING

See Table 2.

## B PROMPTS DESIGNED FOR PAPERPING

To anonymize, social context information in the following examples is hypothetical.

Prompt 1 in Fig. 4 (*before adaption*):

```

1 You are a helpful assistant for paper summarization.
2 The paper has the following details:
3 * Abstract: [ABSTRACT_OF_RECOMMENDED_PAPER]
4 * Authors: [AUTHORS_OF_RECOMMENDED_PAPER]
5 In your summarization, you must
6 * Congratulate the following authors: [AUTHOR_NAME_TO_CONGRATULATE].
7 * Mention the following authors: [AUTHOR_NAME_TO_HIGHLIGHT].
8 * Mention [AUTHOR_AFFILIATION_TO_HIGHLIGHT].
9 * Mention the paper's conference or journal: [VENUE_TO_HIGHLIGHT].
10 * Keep your output less than [CHARACTER_LIMIT] characters.
11 * Be informative.
12 * If applicable, be specific about the numbers in the abstract that may refer to the
→ proposed method's performance.

```

Example Prompt 1 (*after adaption*):

```

1 You are a helpful assistant for paper summarization.
2 The paper has the following details:

```

```

3   * Abstract: {By simply composing prompts, developers can prototype novel generative
   ↳ applications with Large Language Models (LLMs). To refine prototypes into products,
   ↳ however, developers must iteratively revise prompts by evaluating outputs to diagnose
   ↳ weaknesses. Formative interviews (N=8) revealed that developers invest significant
   ↳ effort in manually evaluating outputs as they assess context-specific and subjective
   ↳ criteria. We present EvalLM, an interactive system for iteratively refining prompts by
   ↳ evaluating multiple outputs on user-defined criteria. By describing criteria in natural
   ↳ language, users can employ the system's LLM-based evaluator to get an overview of where
   ↳ prompts excel or fail, and improve these based on the evaluator's feedback. A
   ↳ comparative study (N=12) showed that EvalLM, when compared to manual evaluation, helped
   ↳ participants compose more diverse criteria, examine twice as many outputs, and reach
   ↳ satisfactory prompts with 59% fewer revisions. Beyond prompts, our work can be extended
   ↳ to augment model evaluation and alignment in specific application contexts.}
4   * Authors: Tae Soo Kim, Yoonjoo Lee, Jamin Shin, Young-Ho Kim, Juho Kim
5   In your summarization, you must
6   * Congratulate the following authors: Tae Soo Kim.
7   * Mention the following authors: Juho Kim.
8   * Keep your output less than 350 characters.
9   * Be informative.
10  * If applicable, be specific about the numbers in the abstract that may refer to the
    ↳ proposed method's performance.

```

Output of example Prompt 1: Congratulations to @tsk and team, including Juho Kim, on developing EvalLM! This system aids in refining LLM prompts by evaluating outputs against user-defined criteria, showing a 59% reduction in needed revisions. It enables examining twice as many outputs, enhancing prompt development efficiency.

Prompt 2 in Fig. 4 (before adaption):

```

1 You are a helpful assistant.
2 Title: [TITLE_OF_RECOMMENDED_PAPER]
3 Abstract: [ABSTRACT_OF_RECOMMENDED_PAPER]
4 Title: [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER]
5 Abstract: [ABSTRACT_OF_PREVIOUS_PAPER]
6 The first paragraph of your answer should explain and specify the relationship between
   ↳ [TITLE_OF_RECOMMENDED_PAPER] and [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER]. Be informative.
7 * In this first paragraph of your answer, you must explain and specify how
   ↳ [TITLE_OF_RECOMMENDED_PAPER] is related to [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER] in one short
   ↳ sentence.
8 * In this first paragraph of your answer, you must start with "This paper might be related
   ↳ to [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER] because".

```

9     \* In this first paragraph of your answer, you must specify how [TITLE\_OF\_RECOMMENDED\_PAPER]  
    → cites [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER] in one short sentence. The content from  
    → [TITLE\_OF\_RECOMMENDED\_PAPER] that cites [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER]: [CITATION\_CONTEXT].  
10    \* In this first paragraph of your answer, you must mention the following shared authors of  
    → the two papers: [SHARED\_AUTHOR\_NAMES].  
11    \* The first paragraph should have no more than [CHARACTER\_LIMIT\_P1] characters.  
12    The message from [USERNAME] who shared [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER]: [MESSAGE]  
13    People's comments about [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER]: [COMMENTS]  
14    People's reactions about [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER]: [EMOJIS]  
15    The second paragraph of your answer should specify what people think about  
    → [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER] and who these people are. Be informative.  
16    \* In this second paragraph of your answer, you must start with "thoughts about  
    → [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER]". Note that user A 'cc' user B means that A thought  
    → [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER] is related to B's research, projects, or interests. Thoughts  
    → would not be negative.  
17    \* In this second paragraph of your answer, you must appreciate that [USERNAME] shared  
    → [TITLE\_OF\_RELEVANT\_PAPER].  
18    \* In this second paragraph of your answer, you must NOT add in-line citations and citation  
    → numbers.  
19    \* The second paragraph should have no more than [CHARACTER\_LIMIT\_P2] characters.  
20    Your answer should replace [TITLE\_OF\_RECOMMENDED\_PAPER] with "this paper".

Example Prompt 2 (*after* adaption):

1    You are a helpful assistant.  
2    Title: EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts on User-Defined  
    → Criteria

- 3     Abstract: {By simply composing prompts, developers can prototype novel generative  
 ↳ applications with Large Language Models (LLMs). To refine prototypes into products,  
 ↳ however, developers must iteratively revise prompts by evaluating outputs to diagnose  
 ↳ weaknesses. Formative interviews (N=8) revealed that developers invest significant  
 ↳ effort in manually evaluating outputs as they assess context-specific and subjective  
 ↳ criteria. We present EvalLM, an interactive system for iteratively refining prompts by  
 ↳ evaluating multiple outputs on user-defined criteria. By describing criteria in natural  
 ↳ language, users can employ the system's LLM-based evaluator to get an overview of where  
 ↳ prompts excel or fail, and improve these based on the evaluator's feedback. A  
 ↳ comparative study (N=12) showed that EvalLM, when compared to manual evaluation, helped  
 ↳ participants compose more diverse criteria, examine twice as many outputs, and reach  
 ↳ satisfactory prompts with 59% fewer revisions. Beyond prompts, our work can be extended  
 ↳ to augment model evaluation and alignment in specific application contexts.}\n\n Title:  
 ↳ Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3\n Abstract:  
 ↳ {Prompting Large Language Models (LLMs) is an exciting new approach to designing  
 ↳ chatbots. But can it improve LLM's user experience (UX) reliably enough to power  
 ↳ chatbot products? Our attempt to design a robust chatbot by prompting GPT-3/4 alone  
 ↳ suggests: not yet. Prompts made achieving "80%" UX goals easy, but not the remaining  
 ↳ 20%. Fixing the few remaining interaction breakdowns resembled herding cats: We could  
 ↳ not address one UX issue or test one design solution at a time; instead, we had to  
 ↳ handle everything everywhere all at once. Moreover, because no prompt could make GPT  
 ↳ reliably say "I don't know" when it should, the user-GPT conversations had no  
 ↳ guardrails after a breakdown occurred, often leading to UX downward spirals. These  
 ↳ risks incentivized us to design highly prescriptive prompts and scripted bots, counter  
 ↳ to the promises of LLM-powered chatbots. This paper describes this case study, unpacks  
 ↳ prompting's fickleness and its impact on UX design processes, and discusses  
 ↳ implications for LLM-based design methods and tools.}
- 4     The first paragraph of your answer should explain and specify the relationship between  
 ↳ EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts on User-Defined Criteria  
 ↳ and Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3. Be  
 ↳ informative.
- 5     \* In this first paragraph of your answer, you must explain and specify how EvalLM:  
 ↳ Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts on User-Defined Criteria is  
 ↳ related to Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3 in one  
 ↳ short sentence.
- 6     \* In this first paragraph of your answer, you must start with "This paper might be related  
 ↳ to Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3 because".

7    \* In this first paragraph of your answer, you must specify how EvalLM: Interactive  
     → Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts on User-Defined Criteria cites Herding AI  
     → Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3 in one short sentence. The  
     → content from EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts on  
     → User-Defined Criteria that cites Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by  
     → Prompting GPT-3: {However, most designers (P1-7) mentioned how they were unsure about  
     → how they should revise their prompts' wellknown challenge with LLM prompts [72].,  
     → However, as the space of possible natural language instructions is near infinite,  
     → designers need to test as many possibilities as possible to identify high-performing  
     → prompts [38, 72].}, "As LLMs are non-deterministic and even partial changes in a prompt  
     → can significantly influence generated outputs [37, 41], designers need to iterate on  
     → their prompts multiple times to achieve satisfactory results [27, 39, 57, 69, 72, 73].,  
     → to automatically generate, evaluate, and revise outputs that satisfy the  
     → criteria--without the designer needing to "herd" the LLM themselves [72].}.

8    \* The first paragraph should have no more than 425 characters.

9    Your answer should replace EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts  
     → on User-Defined Criteria with "this paper".

Output of example Prompt 2: This paper might be related to Herding AI Cats: Lessons from Designing a Chatbot by Prompting GPT-3 because it cites the challenges in revising prompts, the need for extensive testing, and the iterative nature of achieving satisfactory results, referencing the concept of "herding" LLMs as discussed in the cited work.

Prompt 3 in Fig. 4 (*before adaption*):

1    You are a helpful assistant in finding the relationships between two papers.  
 2    Title: [TITLE\_OF\_RECOMMENDED\_PAPER]  
 3    Abstract: [ABSTRACT\_OF\_RECOMMENDED\_PAPER]  
 4    Title: [TITLE\_OF\_PAPER\_SHARED\_BY\_RELEVANT\_USER]  
 5    Abstract: [ABSTRACT\_OF\_RELEVANT\_USER\_SHARED\_PAPER]  
 6    Your answer should explain and specify how [TITLE\_OF\_RECOMMENDED\_PAPER] is related to and  
     → different from [TITLE\_OF\_PAPER\_SHARED\_BY\_RELEVANT\_USER] with no more than 300  
     → characters. If two papers are irrelevant, you should answer "NONE". Your answer must  
     → start with "This paper is related to '[TITLE\_OF\_PAPER\_SHARED\_BY\_RELEVANT\_USER]'  
     → because both papers". Be informative.

Example Prompt 3 (*after adaption*):

1    You are a helpful assistant in finding the relationships between two papers.  
 2    Title: EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts on User-Defined  
     → Criteria

3     Abstract: {By simply composing prompts, developers can prototype novel generative  
     ↳ applications with Large Language Models (LLMs). To refine prototypes into products,  
     ↳ however, developers must iteratively revise prompts by evaluating outputs to diagnose  
     ↳ weaknesses. Formative interviews (N=8) revealed that developers invest significant  
     ↳ effort in manually evaluating outputs as they assess context-specific and subjective  
     ↳ criteria. We present EvalLM, an interactive system for iteratively refining prompts by  
     ↳ evaluating multiple outputs on user-defined criteria. By describing criteria in natural  
     ↳ language, users can employ the system's LLM-based evaluator to get an overview of where  
     ↳ prompts excel or fail, and improve these based on the evaluator's feedback. A  
     ↳ comparative study (N=12) showed that EvalLM, when compared to manual evaluation, helped  
     ↳ participants compose more diverse criteria, examine twice as many outputs, and reach  
     ↳ satisfactory prompts with 59% fewer revisions. Beyond prompts, our work can be extended  
     ↳ to augment model evaluation and alignment in specific application contexts.}

4     Title: Safer-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with Automated Preference Data

5     Abstract: {Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) is a vital strategy for  
     ↳ enhancing model safety in language models. However, annotating preference data for RLHF  
     ↳ is a resource-intensive and creativity-demanding process, while automatic generation  
     ↳ methods face limitations in data diversity and quality. In response, we present  
     ↳ Safer-Instruct, a novel pipeline for semi-automatically constructing large-scale  
     ↳ preference datasets. Our approach leverages reversed instruction tuning, instruction  
     ↳ induction, and expert model evaluation to efficiently generate high-quality preference  
     ↳ data without human annotators. We evaluate Safer-Instruct using LLaMA for instruction  
     ↳ induction and GPT-4 as an expert model, generating approximately 10K preference samples.  
     ↳ Finetuning an Alpaca model on this dataset demonstrates improved harmlessness while  
     ↳ maintaining competitive performance on conversation and downstream tasks.  
     ↳ Safer-Instruct addresses the challenges in preference data acquisition, advancing the  
     ↳ development of safer and more responsible AI systems. Our code and data are available  
     ↳ at <https://github.com/uscnlp-lime/safer-instruct>"}

6     Your answer should explain and specify how EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language  
     ↳ Model Prompts on User-Defined Criteria is related to and different from Safer-Instruct:  
     ↳ Aligning Language Models with Automated Preference Data with no more than 300  
     ↳ characters. If two papers are irrelevant, you should answer "NONE". Your answer must  
     ↳ start with "This paper is related to Safer-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with  
     ↳ Automated Preference Data because both". Be informative.

Output of example Prompt 3: This paper is related to Safer-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with Automated Preference Data because both focus on improving LLMs' outputs. EvalLM refines prompts via user feedback, while Safer-Instruct automates preference data generation for safer AI.

Prompt 4 in Fig. 4 (before adaption):

```

1 You are a helpful assistant for paper summarization.
2 [PROMPT_123_OUTPUTS]
3 First, you are required to shorten the above content with no more than [CHARACTER_LIMIT]
4 ↳ characters. Note that:
5 - The shortened content must contain the following strings: [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER]
6 - The shortened content must contain the following strings:
7   ↳ [TITLE_OF_PAPER_SHARED_BY_RELEVANT_USER]
8 - The shortened content must contain the following strings: [RELEVANT_USER_SLACK_ID]
9 - Two papers are mentioned in [PROMPT_2_OUTPUT]. When you specify people's reactions or
10   ↳ comments about [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER], you should focus more on who reacted or
11   ↳ commented and how these reactions or comments infer the potential reactions or comments
12   ↳ about another paper based on the two papers' similarities than people's reactions or
13   ↳ comments about [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER].
14 - Do not remove any person's name (with or without '@'), institution's name, number, and
15   ↳ conference/journal's name.
16 - Do not change the content's tone when it is low-confidence.
17 Second, you are required to bold at most three key phrases of the shortened content by
18   ↳ adding ONE '*' to the left of the bolded text and ONE '*' to the right of the bolded
19   ↳ text.
20 You should only bold the following text:
21 - The text tells what a paper is about.
22 - The text explains why a paper might be related to another paper or why a user might be
23   ↳ interested in a paper, which is often after (does not include) the keywords such as
24   ↳ "because" and "due to".
25 You should not bold the following text:
26 - [TITLE_OF_RELEVANT_PAPER]
27 - [TITLE_OF_PAPER_SHARED_BY_RELEVANT_USER]
28 - [RELEVANT_USER_SLACK_ID]
```

Example Prompt 4 (*after adaption*):

```

1 You are a helpful assistant for paper summarization.
2 {Congratulations to @tsk and team, including Juho Kim, on developing EvalLM! This system
3   ↳ aids in refining LLM prompts by evaluating outputs against user-defined criteria,
4   ↳ showing a 59% reduction in needed revisions. It enables examining twice as many outputs,
5   ↳ enhancing prompt development efficiency. This paper might be interesting to @xinyiz
6   ↳ because @xinyiz've liked Safer-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with Automated
7   ↳ Preference Data; improving LLMs' outputs. EvalLM refines prompts via user feedback,
8   ↳ while Safer-Instruct automates preference data generation for safer AI.}
```

```

3 First, you are required to shorten the above content with no more than 386 characters. Note
4   ↳ that:
5 - The shortened content must contain the following strings: Safer-Instruct: Aligning
6   ↳ Language Models with Automated Preference Data
7 - The shortened content must contain the following strings: @anonymity
8 - Do not remove any person's name (with or without '@'), institution's name, number, and
9   ↳ conference/journal's name.
10 - Do not change the content's tone when it is low-confidence.
11 Second, you are required to bold at most three key phrases of the shortened content by
12   ↳ adding ONE '*' to the left of the bolded text and ONE '*' to the right of the bolded
13   ↳ text.
14 You should only bold the following text:
  - The text tells what a paper is about.
  - The text explains why a paper might be related to another paper or why a user might be
    ↳ interested in a paper, which is often after (does not include) the keywords such as
    ↳ "because" and "due to".
15 You should not bold the following text:
  - Safer-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with Automated Preference Data
  - @anonymity

```

Output of example Prompt 4, where the title in blue is clickable and links to the article's Semantic Scholar page in our deployment: Congrats to @tsk, Juho Kim on [EvalLM](#), reducing prompt revisions by 59% and doubling output examination. It refines LLM prompts with user feedback. This might interest @anonymity, who liked [EvalLM: Interactive Evaluation of Large Language Model Prompts...](#), for its focus on **improving LLM outputs** through automated preference data for safer AI.

## C NUMBERS OF INTERACTIONS IN EACH CHANNEL

See Table 3.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009

Table 2. Social signals used in PaperPing

Category	Heuristic	Example message
<b>Recommended Paper Information</b> <i>(I) This paper is about...</i>	<b>h1</b> - Is the paper's author a channel member? I.e., Does the author show up at least once in the past 3 months among papers posted, reacted to, or replied to by at least one human user?	Congrats @{UserSlackID}
	<b>h2</b> - Was the paper's author mentioned recently in the channel?	{AuthorName} also authored [K] papers that you've discussed in the past three months in the channel
	<b>h3</b> - Does the author's affiliation overlap with a channel member's affiliation	A paper from {AuthorAffiliation}
	<b>h4</b> - Was the paper's venue mentioned recently in the channel? I.e., Does the venue show up at least once in the past 3 months among papers posted, reacted to, or replied to by at least one human user?	You've reacted positively to other papers from CHI
<b>Paper Connections</b> <i>(II) This paper might be related to another paper in the channel, because...</i>	<b>h5</b> - What is the relationship b/w two papers? I.e., Does one cite the other? Do they have shared authors? Are two papers semantically relevant?	<i>Cites: The Participatory Turn in AI Design: Theoretical Foundations and the Current State of Practice (@anonymity shared in a thread), for its methodology: This shift in design strategy transformed the participatory design's user-centered goal from "consulting" to "ownership," aligning with the principles outlined in [10, 25]</i>
	<b>h6</b> - How did channel members react and reply to another paper? If two papers are relevant, such reactions and replies could be used to infer how channel members would react and reply to the recommended paper.	<i>Shared authors: 3 paper authors, Tae Soo Kim, Juho Kim, and Yoonjoo Lee, also contributed to Cells, Generators, and Lenses: Design Framework for Object Oriented Interaction with Large Language Models that @anonymity1 shared in a thread, with 1 reply from @anonymity2 ("I like that the paper...")</i>
	<b>h7</b> - Was another paper authored by a channel member?	<i>Related paper: Redefining Qualitative Analysis in the AI Era: Utilizing ChatGPT for Efficient Thematic Analysis that @scholar shared in a thread which received 2 replies and 3 reactions</i>
<b>User Connections</b> <i>(III) This paper might be interesting to someone in the channel, because...</i>	<b>h8</b> - Is the paper relevant to a channel member? I.e., Is the paper's semantic embedding similar to that of papers already interested by a channel member?	Possibly of interest to @anonymity
	<b>h9</b> - What is the relationship between user's interests and the recommended paper I.e., Has the user liked a previous paper that's similar? cites or cited by this paper? or shares the same authors?	Possibly of interest to @anonymity, because <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- you've liked several similar papers in the channel, such as title1 (in thread1) and others in thread2 and thread3</li><li>- you've liked several of James's papers in the channel, such as title1 (in thread1) and others in thread2 and thread3</li><li>- you've liked several CHI papers in the channel, such as title1 (in thread1) and others in thread2 and thread3</li><li>- several of your publications (1, 2, 3) are similar</li><li>- you've cited similar papers before, such as title1 and others (2, 3).</li></ul>

Table 3. Numbers of Interactions in Each Channel

Channel index	# human recs before PaperPing	# human recs after PaperPing	# emojis before PaperPing	# emojis after PaperPing	# comments before PaperPing	# comments after PaperPing	# PaperPing recs
1	31	6	27	21	12	4	51
2	18	4	0	8	0	2	65
3	2	7	4	27	5	4	20
4	3	2	0	1	0	0	12
5	4	2	3	5	0	0	69
6	26	25	22	20	2	0	67
7	20	89	23	127	2	14	64
8	19	10	18	14	6	4	54
9	3	1	0	3	0	0	102
10	2	8	0	21	0	7	106
11	2	0	0	0	0	1	15
12	7	18	5	12	4	2	62
14	6	13	2	13	0	0	71
15	233	41	249	40	183	41	6
16	7	0	4	10	0	0	22
17	19	0	34	3	3	0	21
18	12	0	22	0	11	3	25