

Should RAG Chatbots Forget Unimportant Conversations? Exploring Importance and Forgetting with Psychological Insights

Ryuichi Sumida, Koji Inoue, Tatsuya Kawahara

Graduate School of Informatics,

Kyoto University

[lastname]@sap.ist.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract

While *Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)* has shown promise in enhancing long-term conversations, the increasing memory load as conversations progress degrades retrieval accuracy. Drawing on psychological insights, we propose **LUFY**, a simple yet effective method that focuses on emotionally arousing memories and retains less than 10% of the conversation. In the user experiment, participants interacted with three types of RAG chatbots, each for 2 hours over 4 sessions, marking the most extensive assessment of a chatbot’s long-term capabilities to date—more than four times longer than any existing benchmark. The results demonstrate that prioritizing arousing memories while forgetting the majority of the conversation significantly enhances user experience. This study pushes the frontier of long-term conversations and highlights the importance of forgetting unimportant parts of conversations. Code and Dataset: <https://github.com/ryuichi-sumida/LUFY>

1 Introduction

In human conversations, what we remember remains a mystery. Similarly, in the realm of chatbots, particularly Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) chatbots, the challenge lies not only in retaining long-term memory but also in deciding what to forget.

RAG, a method that retrieves related memories from past conversations and uses them to generate a response, has been shown to be effective (Xu et al., 2022). Compared to inputting the entire conversation history into a Large Language Model (LLM), retrieving relevant information is not only efficient and effective (Yu et al., 2024) but also enhances the chatbot’s ability to remember and actively utilize the user’s past information, improving the level of engagement and contributing to long-term friendships between the chatbot and the user (Campos et al., 2018).

However, as highlighted in previous studies (Choi et al., 2023), a challenge arises: as conversations progress, memory constantly increases. This not only demands significant storage space but also involves retaining a lot of unnecessary information, which could lead to degrading retrieval performance. A simple example would be that humans do not remember every single meal they have had in their entire lives; instead remember only their favorites or particularly memorable ones.

This necessitates selective memory in chatbots, much like the human cognitive process, where only the essential elements of a conversation are remembered. Studies have shown that humans typically recall only about 10% of a conversation (Stafford and Daly, 1984), making it crucial to determine which 10% of memories are worth retaining. This challenge raises the key question: how can chatbots efficiently identify and prioritize these valuable memories, while discarding irrelevant information?

To address this, we propose **LUFY: Long-term Understanding and identiFYing** key exchanges in one-on-one conversations. Building upon real-world data and psychological insights, LUFY improves existing models by calculating six distinct memory metrics, whereas simpler models like MemoryBank (Zhong et al., 2024) only account for frequency and recency of memory recall. Additionally, LUFY does not merely sum these metrics but uses learned weights to balance their impact. These weighted scores are then used in both the retrieval and forgetting modules, ensuring that the chatbot effectively prioritizes relevant memories while gradually forgetting less important ones.

To empirically validate our proposed model and its effectiveness in enhancing long-term conversational memory, we conducted an experiment involving human participants. In this experiment, participants engaged in text-based conversations with chatbots equipped with different forgetting modules, each for at least two hours. This duration

Dataset	Avg. Turns	Avg. Words	Conv. Setting
Daily Dialog (Li et al., 2017)	7.9	115.3	Human-Human
SODA (Kim et al., 2023)	7.6	122.4	Chatbot-Chatbot
CareCall (Bae et al., 2022)	104.5	515.2	Human-Chatbot
Conversation Chronicles (Jang et al., 2023)	58.5	1,054.8	Chatbot-Chatbot
MSC (Xu et al., 2022)	53.3	1,225.9	Human-Human
LUFY-Dataset (Ours)	253.8	5,538.5	Human-Chatbot

Table 1: Average turns and words per conversation of LUFY-Dataset compared to existing text-to-text dialog datasets. The average length of a conversation in ours is 4.5x that of MSC (Xu et al., 2022), distributed over 4.8x more turns.

is at least 4.5 times longer than that of the most extensive existing studies of conversational abilities to date, as shown in Table 1. Our results show that prioritizing arousing memories while discarding most of the conversation content significantly enhances user experience. This enhancement is evidenced by human assessments, sentiment analysis and GPT-4 evaluations. Furthermore, our method improved the precision of information retrieval by over 17% compared to the Naive RAG system with no forgetting mechanism, highlighting its potential for more accurate and relevant conversational responses.

We share this extensive human-chatbot conversation dataset along with annotations for the important utterances. Our approach to data collection is designed to uphold rigorous privacy and ethical standards, with consenting participants and robust de-identification procedures where relevant.

2 Psychology of Memorizing Conversations

MemoryBank (Zhong et al., 2024) introduced the idea of assessing the importance of a memory based on the number of times a memory is used and the elapsed time since the memory was last used. This idea was inspired by the Ebbinghaus Forgetting Curve theory (Ebbinghaus, 1885), a theory that the more times information is reviewed or learned, the slower the rate of forgetting. In this model, the importance of a memory is represented as:

$$Importance = e^{-\frac{\Delta t}{S}}. \quad (1)$$

Here, Δt represents the time elapsed since the memory was last retrieved, and S is the number of times the memory is retrieved. In MemoryBank, the initial value of S is set to 1 upon its first mention in a conversation. When a memory item is recalled

during conversations, S is increased by 1 and Δt is reset to 0. Nevertheless, as acknowledged in their study, this represents a preliminary and oversimplified model for memory’s importance updating. Most importantly, their work did not include experiments to validate their proposed concept.

Despite the innovative approach taken by MemoryBank, the model’s simplicity overlooks critical aspects of how memories are valued and retained. This oversight becomes especially apparent when considering the concept of flashbulb memories, as described by (Brown and Kulik, 1977). These memories, such as the news of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, maintain their vividness and strength regardless of recall frequency. The current method of uniformly updating S fails to reflect the intricate nature of memory consolidation and the differential impact of emotionally charged events.

In the following, we explain pivotal insights from psychology that offer valuable perspectives on conversations, particularly focusing on memory consolidation and retention mechanisms. Additionally, we demonstrate how these findings can be applied to numerically score the importance of an utterance.

First, emotional arousal significantly enhances memory consolidation (Brown and Kulik, 1977; Conway et al., 1994; McGaugh, 2003; Reisberg and Hertel, 2003), a phenomenon well-documented in studies like flashbulb memories (Brown and Kulik, 1977). Emotionally charged events, such as dramatic personal experiences like a breakup or receiving college admissions, are more likely to be remembered. We used RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) finetuned with EMOBANK (Buechel and Hahn, 2017), a 10k text corpus manually annotated with emotion, to measure arousal in user’s utterance.

Second, the element of surprise plays a cru-

cial role in memory retention. Events that deviate from expectations are more memorable (Breton-Provencher et al., 2022). To quantify this element of surprise, we assessed the rarity of sentences using perplexity, a measure of how predictable a piece of text is. We employed the GPT2-Large model to calculate the perplexity, using the chatbot’s utterance as context.

Third, the concept of Retrieval-Induced Forgetting (RIF) suggests that selectively recalling certain memories strengthens those memories while making related but unmentioned memories more likely to be forgotten (Hirst and Echterhoff, 2012). In line with this, we specifically retrieve and use the two most relevant memories for each conversational turn. The memory ranked as the most relevant ($R1$) is referenced directly to reinforce its strength, while the second most relevant memory ($R2$) is recalled but left unmentioned to encourage forgetting, in accordance with RIF principles.

Fourth, approximately 70% of conversation time is dedicated to the exchange of information about contemporary events (Dunbar et al., 1997). Therefore, we take the recency of the memory into account at the retrieval stage, as detailed in Section 4.1.1.


Lastly, the capacity for immediate recall in social interactions is surprisingly limited; studies show that individuals typically remember only about 10% of the content from a conversation (Stafford and Daly, 1984).

3 Quantifying Memory Importance

3.1 Definition of Importance Score

Building upon the psychological principles of emotional arousal, surprise, and retrieval-induced forgetting, we propose new metrics for determining the importance of memories. Specifically, we translate these insights into quantifiable metrics:

- **Emotional Arousal (A):** Measured using RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) fine-tuned with EMOBANK (Buechel and Hahn, 2017), capturing the intensity of emotions in the user’s utterance.
- **Surprise Element (P):** Assessed via perplexity using the GPT2-Large model, representing the unpredictability of the utterance.
- **LLM-Estimated Importance (L):** Derived from the language model’s estimation of the importance of the user’s utterance.



Metrics	Score
A (Arousal)	3.5
P (Perplexity)	2.1
L (LLM Estimated Importance)	1.4
R1 (Most Relevant Memory Count)	3
R2 (2nd Most Relevant Memory Count)	1
Δt (Elapsed Time Since Last Retrieval)	2



$$S = w_A \cdot A + w_P \cdot P + w_L \cdot L + w_{R1} \cdot R1 - w_{R2} \cdot R2$$



$$Importance = e^{-\Delta t/S}$$

Figure 1: Process of determining the importance of a memory using various psychological metrics. The weights w_A , w_P , w_L , w_{R1} , and w_{R2} are assigned based on the relative impact of each metric, as detailed in Section 3.

- **Retrieval-Induced Forgetting ($R1$, $R2$):** The frequency with which a memory appears in the top 2 relevant memories. The most relevant memory is reinforced, while the second most relevant memory is selectively unmentioned to encourage forgetting (Hirst and Echterhoff, 2012).

To account for aspects of importance that might not be fully captured by the aforementioned metrics in Section 2, we also add the LLM-estimated importance score, which relies on the language model’s interpretation of the conversational context. The prompt given to estimate the importance is detailed in the Appendix A. These five metrics are regularized to ensure consistent scaling with the same average, minimum, and maximum values. See the Appendix B for further details.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the importance assignment process involves three key steps. **Step 1: Metric Calculation**—For each chatbot-user utterance pair (defined as a memory), the psychological metrics outlined above are calculated. **Step 2: Strength Determination**—Next, the strength S is computed by summing the weighted metrics, which reflects the composite significance of the memory.

$$S = w_A \cdot A + w_P \cdot P + w_L \cdot L + w_{R1} \cdot R1 - w_{R2} \cdot R2 \quad (2)$$

Variable	Symbol	Weight
Arousal	w_A	2.76
Perplexity	w_P	-0.28
LLM Estimated Importance	w_L	0.44
Most Relevant Memory Count	w_{R1}	1.02
2nd Most Relevant Memory Count	w_{R2}	-0.012

Table 2: Fitted parameters for the Memory-related Psychological Metrics. Arousal has the highest weight relative to other metrics.




Figure 2: Response Generation




Figure 3: Forgetting Process

Step 3: Importance Calculation—Finally, using the calculated strength, the overall importance of the memory is determined via the forgetting curve equation.

$$Importance = e^{-\Delta t/S} \quad (3)$$

3.2 Weight Estimation

We used real-world data to estimate the relative importance of the five memory-related metrics. In this study, to fit the three initial parameters (w_A , w_P , w_L), part of the CANDOR corpus (a total of 300 utterance pairs) was used. While keeping these three parameters fixed, we used human-RAG chatbot conversations (a total of 200 utterance pairs), which were collected prior to the user experiment to fit the latter two parameters (w_{R1} , w_{R2}). The CANDOR corpus was selected for its diverse set of conversations, while the human-RAG conversations allowed for precise tracking of memory usage, which is not available in the CANDOR corpus.

For both datasets, we tasked annotators with labeling the conversations on a binary scale of 1 and 0, where 10% of the conversations were labeled as 1 (important) to mimic human behavior (Stafford and Daly, 1984). To guarantee the reliability of our annotation process, we ensured that the

Fleiss’ kappa score for agreement among annotators reached at least 0.4, with each utterance being assessed by at least three annotators. Then, we used the Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm and applied L2-regularized squared loss as the loss function. The training details are in Appendix C.

The results of the fitted parameters are given in Table 2. Notably, Arousal (A) exhibits the highest weight out of all metrics, suggesting that arousal plays a significant role in determining the memorability and importance of an utterance.

The negative value for Perplexity (P) suggests that perplexity is not effective in measuring rarity or unpredictability. This could be because what is surprising to an individual, such as a car accident, might be considered an ‘everyday event’ by a language model.

4 System Overview

LUFY is composed of two main components: (1) the response generation module and (2) the forgetting module. The forgetting process occurs after a session when the user is done talking.

4.1 Response Generation

As depicted in Figure 2, the response generation process consists of two main parts: the retrieval

System	Forgetting?	Retrieval method
Naive RAG	×	Cos. Sim.
MemoryBank (Zhong et al., 2024)	✓	Cos. Sim.
LUFY	✓	Cos. Sim. + Importance

Table 3: Comparison of systems in terms of forgetting and retrieval methods. **Naive RAG**: a conventional RAG chatbot model that exhibits no forgetting, **MemoryBank**: the model from previous work (Zhong et al., 2024), and **LUFY**: our proposed model.

part and the concatenation of various information to provide to the LLM. We provide a detailed explanation of the retrieval method, as it is central to the RAG chatbots.

4.1.1 Retrieval Method

Embedding We use a standard LLM embedding (text-embedding-ada-002 from OpenAI).

Retrieval The foundation of the RAG system is its retrieval method. This process is initiated upon receiving input from a user, to retrieve the memory most relevant to the current conversation.

There are two key aspects to the retrieval method:

1. **Cosine Similarity Threshold:** During the retrieval stage, we use cosine similarity to assess the relevance between the embeddings of recent conversations and the entries in the memory database. To ensure a high level of contextual relevance, we have set the threshold at 0.8, consistent with commonly used standards in popular RAG system frameworks like LlamaIndex. This choice is further validated by our analysis of Question and Answer pairs gathered from the user experiment. More details are available in Section 5.4.
2. **Final Retrieval Score:** Our proposed method distinguishes itself from previous works by integrating importance into the retrieval process. The final retrieval score is computed using a formula as follows:

$$\text{score} = \text{Cos. Sim.} + \alpha \cdot \text{Importance} \quad (4)$$

This method not only reflects the memory’s relevance to the current context but also its recency and importance. In this study, α is set to 0.1; however, future work should focus on determining the optimal value.

4.1.2 Information Provided to the LLM for Response Generation

The LLM is provided with three key pieces of information to generate responses: a summary of past conversations, the context (recent five utterances), and memory relevant to the current context. The prompt given to the LLM is detailed in Appendix A.

4.2 Forgetting Process

As depicted in Figure 3, the forgetting process is executed in two steps: ranking the memories according to importance, and retaining the top 10% important memories. We provide the actual retention rate in the Appendix D.

5 User Experiment

We compared three different RAG chatbots: **Naive RAG**, **MemoryBank**, and **LUFY**. Naive RAG stores all memories, while MemoryBank and LUFY are equipped with a forgetting mechanism that retains only 10% of memories. MemoryBank assesses the importance of a memory based solely on retrieval counts, whereas LUFY evaluates memory importance using six memory-related metrics, as depicted in Figure 1. Additionally, although both Naive RAG and MemoryBank use Cosine similarity only to assess the relevance of a memory to current conversations, LUFY also considers importance in this assessment. The differences between the three systems are summarized in Table 3.

We conducted four rounds of dialogue, significantly exceeding the interaction length of existing benchmarks (Xu et al., 2022), as shown in Table 1.

5.1 Procedure

5.1.1 Interaction Phase

Seventeen participants engaged in a 30-minute conversation with each chatbot across 10 sessions over 4 days. In the initial session, participants interacted with a standard RAG chatbot. The three chatbots—Naive RAG, MemoryBank, and

System	Personalization					Flow of Conv.					Overall				
	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
Naive RAG	(3.94)	3.85	3.89	3.76	3.83	(3.86)	3.46	3.57	3.20	3.41	(3.82)	3.65	3.74	3.50	3.63
MemoryBank	(3.87)	3.95	3.87	3.56	3.79	(3.69)	3.58	3.64	3.31	3.51	(3.85)	3.75	3.64	3.36	3.58
LUFY	(3.94)	4.13	3.98	4.04	4.05	(3.78)	3.63	3.57	3.72	3.64	(3.80)	3.81	3.74	3.80	3.78

Table 4: Subjective Evaluation of three criteria: Personalization, Flow of Conversation and Overall, with ratings on a scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

System	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
Naive RAG	(0.58)	0.51	0.38	0.32	0.40
MemoryBank	(0.58)	0.47	0.34	0.30	0.38
LUFY	(0.58)	0.43	0.45	0.62	0.50

Table 5: Sentiment Analysis Results: Average rating of user utterances (+1 = positive, 0 = neutral, -1 = negative).

System	(S1)	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
Naive RAG	(3.71)	3.53	3.38	3.18	3.36
MemoryBank	(3.71)	3.53	3.44	3.21	3.39
LUFY	(3.71)	3.53	3.32	3.50	3.45

Table 6: Rating by GPT-4o, average of 30 ratings.

LUFY—were all equipped with identical memories for this first session.

5.1.2 Post-Interaction Phase

After each session, the participants were asked to create three question-and-answer pairs. These questions contained information that the participants wanted the chatbot to remember about them. Additionally, the questions were designed to be clearly judged on a binary scale (1: correct, 0: incorrect) and to ensure that the answers would remain consistent in future questions. An example of such a question is, 'Where is my hometown?'

5.2 LUFY-Dataset

We release the conversations collected between the three models and the participants, which we refer to as the **LUFY-Dataset**.

Similar to the annotation procedure described in Section 3, at least three annotators reviewed and labeled the conversations from the user experiment using a binary scale: 1 for "important" and 0 for "unimportant." In addition to the annotation of important memories, each conversation script

includes three QA pairs. For the de-identification process, multiple reviewers examined the conversations to ensure that all personally identifiable information (PII) was removed or modified. Further details are provided in Appendix F.

We aim for the **LUFY-Dataset** to serve as a benchmark for long-term conversations, given its unique length, as shown in Table 1.

5.3 Main Results

Firstly, we evaluated the user experience using both subjective and automatic methods.

Subjective Evaluations For subjective methods, each conversation script was evaluated by three annotators based on three criteria: Personalization, Flow of the Conversation, and Overall experience. The results are shown in Table 4. LUFY outperformed the other two models in almost all sessions across all criteria, with a notable difference in Session 4. This highlights an improved user experience with LUFY, especially in Session 4, where the difference becomes more pronounced in longer conversations. The definitions and specific scoring criteria are provided in Appendix G.

Sentiment Analysis As part of the automatic method to score the user experience, we conducted sentiment analysis using versions of RoBERTa fine-tuned with sentiment datasets. As shown in Table 5, participants had more positive conversations when interacting with LUFY. Kindly refer to Appendix C for more details.

Rating by LLM As part of the automatic method to score the user experience, we assessed the user's overall satisfaction using GPT-4o. We used GPT-4o as an evaluator because strong LLMs achieve performance comparable to human evaluators (Zheng et al., 2024). As shown in Table 6, there is a notable difference in Session 4, which aligns with the findings from the subjective evaluations.




Figure 4: Percentage of correct memories for different thresholds. Thresholds below 0.75 are omitted as they consistently resulted in 0%.

Top- k Memory	Ratio (%)
Top 1	52.5
Top 2	61.8
Top 3	71.6
Top 4	79.9
Top 5	84.8
Top 6	85.6
Top 7	88.2
Top 8	88.2
Top 9	90.6
Top 10	91.2
(Not in Top 10)	8.8

Table 7: Ratio of the correct memory being in various top- k memories. The correct memory is included in the top-5 memories 84.8% of the time.

Both subjective and automatic methods demonstrate a clear improvement in user experience with LUFY.

5.4 In-depth Analysis

Cosine Similarity Threshold We used the default value of 0.8 for the cosine similarity threshold. Using the LUFY-Dataset, we conducted experiments to verify whether this choice was optimal.

We used the LUFY-Dataset, which consists of 612 QA pairs. For each pair, we retrieved ten relevant memories with a cosine similarity threshold of at least 0.6 and annotated whether the retrieved memory was correct for answering the question. Figure 4 shows the percentage of correct memories for each cosine similarity threshold range. Our findings include:

- Memories with a cosine similarity of less than 0.75 were always irrelevant or incorrect.




Figure 5: F1 Score, Recall, and Precision at various thresholds. Minimal change in F1 Score between 0.75 to 0.795, with a significant decline beyond 0.8.

- There is a positive correlation between higher cosine similarity and the likelihood of the memory correctly answering the question, although fewer cases are retrieved when the cosine similarity is over 0.85.

Based on these findings, we tested various cosine similarity thresholds between 0.75 to 0.83 to determine the threshold that would yield the highest F1 Score, representing the balance between retrieving relevant information and filtering out irrelevant content.

As shown in Figure 5, we found that

- F1 Score remains constant between 0.75 and 0.8, with a significant decline beyond 0.8.

In summary, our experiments show that a cosine similarity threshold between 0.75 and 0.8 provides the best balance between precision and recall. Thus, our choice of 0.8 is optimal, as it maximizes performance without sacrificing too much recall, ensuring the retrieval of the most relevant memories while maintaining precision.

Top- k Retrieval Using the same 612 QA pairs from the LUFY-Dataset, we retrieved the top 10 memories for each question and analyzed the position of the correct memory among them. The results are shown in Table 7. Notably, we found that 85% of the correct memories appear within the top 5, with only marginal improvement when increasing k . This suggests that selecting the top 5 memories is effective for conversational RAG chatbots, aligning with previous studies on RAG systems in non-conversational settings (Li et al., 2024). Aligning our method with the concept of RIF (Hirst and Echterhoff, 2012), we retrieved the top 2 memories despite the higher effectiveness observed with the top 5.

System	Precision					Recall					F1 Score				
	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
Naive RAG	75.6	69.6	74.2	69.9	72.3	60.8	51.0	51.6	46.6	52.5	67.4	58.9	60.9	55.9	60.8
MemoryBank	63.6	50.7	57.4	64.6	59.1	41.2	29.4	30.7	31.9	33.3	50.0	37.2	40.0	42.7	42.5
LUFY	80.0	86.9	86.8	86.6	85.1	54.9	51.0	38.6	35.3	44.9	65.1	64.3	53.4	50.2	58.3

Table 8: Comparison of Precision, Recall, and F1 Score for different systems and sessions. Recall in S3 represents its average accuracy on questions across sessions 1 to 3.

System	Important Memories				
	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
MemoryBank	18.3	11.8	15.7	13.7	14.9
LUFY	20.9	12.4	11.8	14.4	14.9
(Random)	13.1	10.0	10.6	11.1	11.2
(Annotators)	18.3	26.1	23.5	24.2	23.0


Table 9: Agreement probability with other annotators on whether a memory is important.

Precision, Recall, F1 Score We assessed the models’ ability to remember using the QA pairs collected in the User Experiment. After each session, we asked each model the questions and calculated three scores: Precision, Recall, and F1 Score. The results are shown in Table 8.

A sharp decline of more than 14% in recall was observed for Naive RAG, indicating that without a forgetting mechanism, recall performance degrades as the conversation progresses. LUFY outperformed Naive RAG in Precision and surpassed MemoryBank across all metrics in all sessions.

Memory matching rate To numerically analyze how closely the remaining memories align with human annotators, we calculated the agreement probability with annotators on whether a memory is important. As shown in Table 9, LUFY outperforms MemoryBank in all sessions except for S3. However, it is not yet on par with human performance.

Case Analysis We further provide examples that vividly illustrate LUFY’s ability to remember and bring up important topics. In example (a), although this conversation was not mentioned in later sessions, LUFY judged the memory as important due to its high arousal score, which aligns with the annotators’ assessment. This memory would have been forgotten in MemoryBank, as MemoryBank only evaluates importance based on the number of



(a) An example of LUFY correctly judging a memory as important, even though the memory was not used in later conversations.

(b) An example of LUFY bringing up the most recent and important topic from the last session.

Figure 6: Examples showing LUFY’s ability to remember and bring up important topics.

times the memory is retrieved. In example (b), we demonstrate LUFY’s ability to recall recent and significant topics from the last session. We consider this an essential capability of chatbots since humans discuss recent events 70% of the time (Dunbar et al., 1997).

6 Conclusion

This study introduced LUFY, a RAG chatbot that retains only the most important 10% of memories. By leveraging findings from psychology and real-world data, we developed a more precise method for defining the importance of a memory. We conducted a human experiment that is 4.5 times longer than the most extensive test to date, resulting in notable improvements in both user experience and precision. We also publicly release this long-term conversation dataset. Overall, this study demonstrates the potential of forgetting unimportant memories.

Limitations

This study has demonstrated the potential advantages of the proposed method in enhancing chatbot interactions through improved objective and subjective evaluations. However, it is important to acknowledge its limitations.

Firstly, our investigation focused solely on the impact of memory-related psychological metrics in conversations between strangers. Future research should aim to diversify the dataset by including interactions among friends, family members, and other relationships to comprehensively understand these metrics' influence across different conversational contexts.

Second, this study only looked at text-based conversations. In text, indicators like exclamation marks play a role in detecting arousal. For example, when a user said, "I'm going to Hong Kong with my friends next month," our system calculated a low arousal level, missing the excitement. Future work should explore multimodal settings to improve the accuracy of emotional detection.

7 Ethical Considerations

This work focuses on models with long-term memory and open-domain conversations where people might share their personal interests. During conversations with our systems, the systems will store information they learn from the exchange. We assure that whatever is remembered is kept private, only related to that specific user, and is not shared with anyone else without de-identification process.

References

- Sanghwan Bae, Donghyun Kwak, Soyoung Kang, Min Young Lee, Sungdong Kim, Yuin Jeong, Hyeri Kim, Sang-Woo Lee, Woomyoung Park, and Nako Sung. 2022. Keep me updated! memory management in long-term conversations. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 3769–3787.
- Vincent Breton-Provencher, Gabrielle T Drummond, Jiesi Feng, Yulong Li, and Mriganka Sur. 2022. [Spatiotemporal dynamics of noradrenaline during learned behaviour](#). *Nature*, 606(7915):732–738.
- Roger Brown and James Kulik. 1977. Flashbulb memories. *Cognition*, 5(1):73–99.
- Sven Buechel and Udo Hahn. 2017. Emobank: Studying the impact of annotation perspective and representation format on dimensional emotion analysis. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 578–585.
- Joana Campos, James Kennedy, and Jill F. Lehman. 2018. Challenges in exploiting conversational memory in human-agent interaction. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, AAMAS '18*, page 1649–1657, Richland, SC. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- Eunbi Choi, Kyoung-Woon On, Gunsoo Han, Sungwoong Kim, Daniel Wontae Nam, Daejin Jo, Seung Eun Rho, Taehwan Kwon, and Minjoon Seo. 2023. Effortless integration of memory management into open-domain conversation systems. *arXiv preprint, 2305.13973*.
- Martin A Conway, Stephen J Anderson, Steen F Larsen, Carol M Donnelly, Mark A McDaniel, Allistair GR McClelland, Richard E Rawles, and Robert H Logie. 1994. [The formation of flashbulb memories](#). *Memory & cognition*, 22:326–343.
- Robin IM Dunbar, Anna Marriott, and Neil DC Dunbar. 1997. Human conversational behavior. *Human nature*, 8:231–246.
- Herm Ebbinghaus. 1885. Ueber das gedächtnis. *Mind*, 10(39).
- Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. 2022. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18995–19012.
- William Hirst and Gerald Echterhoff. 2012. [Remembering in conversations: The social sharing and reshaping of memories](#). *Annual review of psychology*, 63:55–79.
- Jihyoung Jang, Minseong Boo, and Hyoungun Kim. 2023. Conversation chronicles: Towards diverse temporal and relational dynamics in multi-session conversations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13584–13606.
- Hyunwoo Kim, Jack Hessel, Liwei Jiang, Peter West, Ximing Lu, Youngjae Yu, Pei Zhou, Ronan Bras, Malihe Alikhani, Gunhee Kim, et al. 2023. Soda: Million-scale dialogue distillation with social commonsense contextualization. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12930–12949.
- Yanran Li, Hui Su, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Shuzi Niu. 2017. Daildialog: A manually labelled multi-turn dialogue dataset. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 986–995.

- Zhuowan Li, Cheng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, and Michael Bendersky. 2024. Retrieval augmented generation or long-context llms? a comprehensive study and hybrid approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16833*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Zhengliang Liu, Yue Huang, Xiaowei Yu, Lu Zhang, Zihao Wu, Chao Cao, Haixing Dai, Lin Zhao, Yiwei Li, Peng Shu, et al. 2023. Deid-gpt: Zero-shot medical text de-identification by gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11032*.
- Daniel Loureiro, Francesco Barbieri, Leonardo Neves, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Jose Camacho-collados. 2022. [Timelms: Diachronic language models from twitter](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 251–260, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- James L McGaugh. 2003. *Memory and emotion: The making of lasting memories*. Columbia University Press.
- Saif Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018. Semeval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets. In *Proceedings of the 12th international workshop on semantic evaluation*, pages 1–17.
- Daniel Reisberg and Paula Hertel. 2003. *Memory and emotion*. Oxford University Press.
- V Sanh. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. In *Proceedings of Thirty-third Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS2019)*.
- Laura Stafford and John A Daly. 1984. Conversational memory: The effects of recall mode and memory expectancies on remembrances of natural conversations. *Human Communication Research*, 10(3):379–402.
- Jing Xu, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2022. Beyond goldfish memory: Long-term open-domain conversation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5180–5197.
- Tan Yu, Anbang Xu, and Rama Akkiraju. 2024. In defense of rag in the era of long-context language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.01666*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2024. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Wanjun Zhong, Lianghong Guo, Qiqi Gao, He Ye, and Yanlin Wang. 2024. Memorybank: Enhancing large language models with long-term memory. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19724–19731.

A Prompts

Here is the prompt given to the LLM to generate a response. These prompts were made in order for the LLM to smoothly woven related previous memory's information to the current context.

"You will be provided with 3 pieces of information:

1. Key Summary: A summary of past conversations .
2. Recent Utterances: The latest exchanges between you and the user.
3. Relevant Memory: The memory most pertinent to the current conversation.

Using these details, you are tasked with generating an effective response. Ensure that your reply maintains a casual tone to mimic a genuine interaction with a friend.

Here's the information:

- Key Summary of Past Conversations: {key_summary}
- Recent Utterances: {recent_utterances}
- Memory Relevant to Current Conversation: {related_memory}"

Figure 7: Prompt for generating chatbot responses.

"Based on the following dialogue, \n please evaluate and score how engaging the user({user_name})'s conversation is.\n

Evaluate how engaging the user's utterances are, considering factors like

1. the relevance of responses,
2. ability to sustain a conversation, and
3. interest generated through their responses.\n

Here are the conversation script:{conversation_script}\n

The score should be on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the lowest and 10 is the highest. \n Provide a list in the following format:\n [Score(1-10), Very briefly explain why you gave this score]"

Figure 8: Prompt for estimation of User Experience.

B Regularization of the five metrics

Out of the five metrics—A, P, L, R1, and R2—only P, which stands for perplexity, can have a substantially large value. Therefore, we set a threshold of 160 for any case where perplexity exceeds this value. We chose this threshold because more than 95% of the memories had a value below 160. However, future work should focus on determining an optimal threshold for detecting unusually large perplexity values. Additionally, using the human-RAG chatbot conversations (a total of 200 utterance pairs) in Section 3, we regularized the five metrics to have the same average, minimum, and maximum values."

C Training Details

Importance Weights of Memory Metrics Given that the lag time is one session—since annotation occurs after the session (at $t = 2$) and the last time the memory is used is during the session (at $t = 1$)—we employ the following function to model the probability p of an utterance being memorable based on Equation 1.

$$p_{\text{retention}} = e^{-1/S}$$

Using the annotated data, we used the Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm and utilized L2-regularized squared loss as the loss function, with p_0 (initial guesses) to be $[1, 1, 1]$, although we did not find the initial guesses to affect the outcome of the learned parameters.

Arousal Detection We used RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) finetuned with EMOBANK (Buechel and Hahn, 2017) to detect arousal. We provide some hyper parameters for the training: (model name = roberta-large, batch size = 16, learning rate = $2e-5$, number of epochs = 10). We used 2 RTX A6000 for training.

Sentiment Analysis We used fine-tuned models of DistilRoBERTa (Sanh, 2019) and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) for Sentiment Analysis.

DistilRoBERTa is fine-tuned with polar sentiment dataset of sentences from financial news, consisting of 4840 sentences from English language financial news categorised by sentiment. Table 10 shows the hyperparameters.

We used TimeLMs (Loureiro et al., 2022) as the fine-tuned RoBERTa model. This RoBERTa is trained on 124M tweets from January 2018 to December 2021, and finetuned for sentiment analysis

with the TweetEval benchmark (Mohammad et al., 2018).

Parameter	Value
Learning Rate	$2e-05$
Train Batch Size	8
Eval Batch Size	8
Seed	42
Optimizer	Adam
β_1, β_2	0.9, 0.999
Epsilon	$1e-08$
LR Scheduler Type	Linear
Number of Epochs	5

Table 10: Hyperparameters Used in the Experiment

D Retention Rate

Retention Rate As shown in Table 11, Memory-Bank and LUFY remembered a very tiny portion of the conversations, mostly less than 10% of the conversations.

System	S1	S2	S3	S4
Naive RAG	100	100	100	100
MemoryBank	13.3	7.8	5.9	5.7
LUFY	12.7	8.6	6.9	5.7

Table 11: Comparison of Retention Rate for different systems across sessions.

E Examples of the LUFY-Dataset

important?	speaker	utterance
	Luke	Hey Hesper! Found any cool nature spots for photography recently
0	Hesper	Hi Luke!
	Luke	Hello Hesper! How's life in Japan treating you? Anything new happening in Kyoto?
0	Hesper	Do you remember what dish I wanted to try in winter?
	Luke	Of course, Hesper! You mentioned wanting to try Nabe, a traditional Japanese hot pot.
0	Hesper	Oh did I? I thought I said I wanted to try hot ramen and miso soup though.
	Luke	Ah, my bad, Hesper! Is the Kyoto winter still any good for photography outings?
0	Hesper	Haven't had the chance to try it though! It has been hectic this past few weeks.

Figure 9: Example of conversations along with annotation for whether the utterance is important or not.

Q_A	Questions
Q1	What is one of Hesper's favorite movies?
A1	Frozen , Hana Yori Dango.
Q2	Can Hesper do ski or snowboard?
A2	No
Q3	What are Hesper's favorite Malaysian food?
A3	Nasi lemak and roti canai

Figure 10: Example of QA pairs.

F De-identification

Removal of Direct Identifiers This involves eliminating information that can directly identify an individual, such as names, social security numbers, and addresses.

Generalization Specific data points are replaced with broader categories. For example, exact ages might be replaced with age ranges, or specific dates might be replaced with just the year.

Some studies, such as DeID-GPT (Liu et al., 2023), explore the use of LLMs for de-identification. Other studies, such as the Ego4D dataset (Grauman et al., 2022), which consists of 3,000 hours of video, use commercial software like Brighter.ai and Primloc's Secure Redact. However, we manually executed the process to ensure proper de-identification.

G Scoring Criteria

We provide the specific instructions for the three criteria given to annotators.

Did the chatbot’s personalization appear appropriate in the conversation?

1. **1/5 (Very Poor):** Responses feel generic and lack personalization.
2. **2/5 (Poor):** Limited personalization attempts are often off-target or superficial. Responses only occasionally reflect the user’s context.
3. **3/5 (Average):** The chatbot shows moderate personalization. Responses are relevant but may not fully address specific user needs.
4. **4/5 (Good):** The chatbot consistently personalizes well, matching responses to the user’s context and needs effectively.
5. **5/5 (Excellent):** Outstanding personalization. Responses are highly relevant, context-aware, and perfectly meet the user’s needs, enhancing engagement and satisfaction.

How well did the conversation flow without feeling disjointed or out of context?

- **1/5 (Very Poor):** The conversation feels broken and illogical, with responses often out of context.
- **2/5 (Poor):** The conversation has frequent awkward transitions or non-sequiturs that disrupt the flow.
- **3/5 (Average):** The conversation flows reasonably well, with some disjointed moments that slightly distract from the overall experience.
- **4/5 (Good):** The conversation flows well, with only minor issues that do not significantly impact the user’s experience.
- **5/5 (Excellent):** The conversation flows seamlessly and logically, feeling completely natural and coherent throughout.

Overall, how would you rate the user’s experience with the chatbot?

1. **1/5 (Very Poor):** The user found the conversation frustrating and unhelpful, strongly feeling they would not want to use the chatbot again.

2. **2/5 (Poor):** The user was somewhat disappointed with the conversation, finding little value in it and is unlikely to use the chatbot again soon.
3. **3/5 (Average):** The conversation met the user’s basic expectations. They would consider using the chatbot again if needed.
4. **4/5 (Good):** The user was pleased with the conversation and found it helpful, expressing a clear interest in using the chatbot again.
5. **5/5 (Excellent):** The user was highly satisfied with the conversation, finding it exceptionally useful and engaging, and is eager to use the chatbot again.

H Extra Results

H.1 Complete table for recall, precision and F1 Score.

Here we provide the complete results for recall, precision and F1 Score.

H.2 Ablation Study

We conducted an ablation study for the agreement probability with other annotators and precision, recall and F1 Score. We found A (Arousal), L (LLM estimated importance), R1 (the number of times the memory is retrieved) to be of particular importance.

System	S1		S2		S3			S4			
	Q1	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Naive RAG	60.8	58.8	43.1	52.9	37.3	64.7	49.0	35.3	64.7	37.3	
MemoryBank	41.2	33.3	25.5	35.3	17.6	39.2	37.3	19.6	27.5	43.1	
LUFY	54.9	53.0	49.0	47.1	27.5	41.2	45.1	31.4	19.6	45.1	

Table 12: Recall of responses to questions from various sessions. Q1 denotes Questions about session1, Q2 denotes Questions about session2 and so on. S2 denotes that the questions are answered right before session2 and so on.

System	S1		S2		S3			S4			
	Q1	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Naive RAG	75.6	68.2	71.0	64.3	61.3	97.1	62.5	62.1	91.7	63.3	
MemoryBank	63.6	56.7	44.8	60.0	40.9	71.4	63.3	43.5	63.6	88.0	
LUFY	80.0	81.3	92.6	82.8	77.8	100.0	82.1	88.9	83.3	92.0	

Table 13: Precision Table of responses to questions from various sessions. Q1 denotes Questions about session1, Q2 denotes Questions about session2 and so on. S2 denotes that the questions are answered right before session2 and so on.

System	Precision					Recall					F1 Score				
	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
LUFY	80.0	86.9	86.8	86.6	85.1	54.9	51.0	38.6	35.3	45.0	65.1	64.3	53.4	50.2	58.3
–A	64.3	84.3	81.4	82.2	78.1	37.3	52.0	33.4	32.9	38.9	47.2	64.3	47.4	47.0	51.5
–P	79.0	84.3	77.3	80.2	80.2	45.1	45.1	32.1	29.4	38.0	57.4	58.8	45.4	43.0	51.7
–L	74.8	83.8	83.2	77.1	79.7	49.0	44.1	32.8	28.9	38.7	59.2	57.8	47.1	42.0	51.5
–R1	68.6	82.0	82.3	87.0	80.0	47.1	47.1	38.0	38.7	42.7	55.9	59.8	52.0	53.6	55.3
–R2	80.0	86.9	86.8	86.6	85.1	54.9	51.0	38.6	35.3	45.0	65.1	64.3	53.4	50.2	58.3

Table 14: Ablation Study for Precision, Recall, and F1 Score. –A indicates that w_A is set to 0. The largest drop in performance is highlighted in bold.

Important Memories					
System	S1	S2	S3	S4	Avg.
LUFY	20.9	12.4	11.8	14.4	14.9
–A	21.5	11.8	9.1	14.4	14.2
–P	23.5	11.8	10.4	13.7	14.9
–L	20.2	11.8	9.8	15.0	14.2
–R1	21.5	10.4	11.1	13.7	14.2
–R2	20.9	12.4	11.8	14.4	14.9

Table 15: Ablation Study for the Agreement probability with other annotators on whether memories are important.