

An Integrated Framework for Adaptive Reasoning About Conversation Patterns

Michael Rovatsos (University of Edinburgh)

Felix Fischer, Gerhard Weiß (Technical University of Munich)

- ▶ ACL/protocol semantics usually provided in the form of dialogue sequence patterns + logical constraints
- ▶ We describe an integrated social reasoning architecture that is capable of
 1. processing such patterns,
 2. making boundedly rational communication decisions,
 3. learning communication patterns and their strategic application from observation
- ▶ Combination of decision-theoretic utility maximisation, case-based reasoning methods, hierarchical reinforcement learning and cluster validation techniques
- ▶ Adequacy of the approach illustrated through experimental results in complex negotiation scenarios

Interaction Frames

- ▶ How can we build agents that can learn to use a given communication mechanism optimally in an open multiagent system?
- ▶ Communication mechanism usually defined through surface structure of dialogues and logical constraints that limit their applicability
- ▶ **Interaction frames** are suitable for capturing this information *and* combining it with experience about past usage

$$F = \left\langle \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \xrightarrow{5} \text{request}(A, B, X) \xrightarrow{3} \text{do}(B, X) \\ \langle \{ \text{can}(B, X) \}, \{ \text{can}(B, \text{pay}(S)) \} \rangle \\ \langle \xrightarrow{2} \langle [A/a], [B/b], [X/\text{pay}(\$100)] \rangle \rangle \\ \xrightarrow{1} \langle [A/b], [B/a], [X/\text{pay}(S)] \rangle \end{array} \right\rangle \right\rangle$$

- ▶ Hierarchical decision-making and (reinforcement) learning process allows for complexity reduction in communicative decision making

Experimental Results

- ▶ Empirical evaluation in
 1. simple proposal-based negotiation (where agents simply exchange proposals and counter-proposals)
 2. complex interest-based negotiation (which involves discussing the underlying reasons and assumptions for statements)
- ▶ Example for interest-based negotiation frame:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \langle \overset{0}{\rightarrow} \text{request}(A, B, X) \overset{0}{\rightarrow} \text{ask-reason}(B, A, \text{request}(X)) \\ & \quad \overset{0}{\rightarrow} \text{inf-goal}(A, B, G) \overset{0}{\rightarrow} \text{att-goal}(B, A, \text{threat}(X, T)) \\ & \quad \overset{0}{\rightarrow} \text{concede}(B, A, \text{threat}(X, T)) \rangle, \\ & \langle \{ \text{can}(B, X), \text{goal}(A, G), \text{achieves}(X, G), \text{goal}(A, T), \\ & \quad \neg \text{achieves}(Y, T) \} \rangle, \langle \overset{0}{\rightarrow} \langle \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Results show that effective social reasoning and learning is possible even under such complex communication regimes