

Beyond Borrowed Histories: Person-Aligned User Simulation for Interactive Role-Playing Evaluation

Yuhang Zhu^{1,*}, Mingxuan Du^{1,*}, Benfeng Xu^{1,2,‡}, Jie Gao², Lingyun Yu^{1,†}, Hongtao Xie¹

¹University of Science and Technology of China, ²MetaStone Technology, Beijing, China

*Equal contribution, [§]Work done during the internship at MetaStone, [†]Corresponding author, [‡]Project lead

Role-playing agents (RPAs) have become one of the most important consumer applications of large language models. Users engage in multi-turn conversations with RPAs for experiences such as emotional comfort, making reliable evaluation essential for measuring capability, comparing systems, and guiding further improvement. Existing benchmarks, however, typically require an RPA to continue a fixed dialogue history and then evaluate the continuation using a fixed rubric detached from the user. We identify and empirically demonstrate two limitations of this design. First, an RPA’s output is shaped by the preceding dialogue history, preventing a scientifically grounded assessment of its role-playing ability in real multi-turn settings. Second, user experience varies substantially across individuals, and conventional fixed rubrics need not align with user satisfaction. We therefore introduce **PALATE** (Person-**A**ligned LLM-Simulated-User **A**ssessment with **T**ailored **E**valuation), a scalable RPA benchmark built on user simulators. PALATE is accompanied by a pool of 300 character profiles. Its main evaluation trains five per-user simulators and lets them engage candidate RPAs in free-form, multi-turn conversations over a pre-frozen panel of character profiles. Alongside a general quality rubric, we construct personalized rubrics to measure user satisfaction; on held-out annotated data, the personalized rubrics show higher agreement with human judgments than the general rubric. In the main evaluation of 16 candidates, PALATE separately characterizes generic turn quality, long-horizon session capability, and per-user experience on multi-turn trajectories co-constructed by each candidate. It thereby produces interpretable evaluations of specific user–RPA pairs rather than compressing systems into a single user-independent ranking.

Resources: [PALATE repository](#).



1 Introduction

Role-playing agents (RPAs) provide interactive storytelling, companionship, and emotionally engaging conversation. Their value often unfolds over multiple turns, and deployed systems already serve millions of users (Irvine et al., 2023). As these systems enter large-scale real-world use, reliable evaluation becomes essential for measuring capability, comparing systems, and guiding further improvement.

Unlike general-purpose task assistants, the object being evaluated is not an isolated response but a dialogue jointly constructed by the RPA and its user. Such dialogues rarely have a uniquely correct answer, and conventional automatic metrics correlate poorly with human judgments in open-ended dialogue (Liu et al., 2016). Quality must instead be established through measures of character fidelity, narrative development, and user experience.

Although existing benchmarks cover different characters and capabilities, they commonly adopt a similar measurement design: the RPA under evaluation generates a continuation from a fixed dialogue history or prompt set, and an LLM judge scores it for criteria such as persona consistency and narrative coherence (Wang et al., 2024c; Tu et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2025; Xiang et al., 2025). Giving every candidate the same input may appear fair, but these histories are constructed or generated by an external process and themselves influence subsequent RPA outputs. The resulting score therefore mixes the candidate’s own capability with the influence of the external history (Figure 1).

We select five real conversations longer than 20 turns, hold all user turns and plot events fixed, retain the original character-side history, and rewrite it into high-quality and degraded versions. Four candidate RPAs then continue the histories at different depths, and all continuations are scored with the same generic rubric. Relative to the original history, high-quality character-side histories raise the candidates’ mean overall score by about 0.21 on a five-point scale, whereas degraded histories lower it by about 0.13. Appendix A.1 provides the complete setup and results. Fixed-history evaluation therefore measures quality conditioned on an external history, $Q(c | H)$, rather than an RPA’s role-playing ability independently of that history. Even when the ranking in a particular experiment happens to remain unchanged, the measurement still carries systematic conditional bias. To evaluate performance in realistic multi-turn settings, the evaluation trajectory should be co-constructed by the system under test rather than inherited from an external source.

The second problem is treating quality as independent of the user. The core of role-playing is user participation: a detailed and gradual relationship arc may be a strength for someone who prefers slow-burn interaction, yet a weakness for someone seeking high tension and rapid conflict. A static, user-independent rubric therefore need not align with a particular user’s satisfaction and cannot fully capture individual differences in experience (Kirk et al., 2024; Garbacea et al., 2026).

To address these two problems, we introduce PALATE, a person-aligned free multi-turn benchmark that redesigns both the evaluation trajectory and the scoring perspective. It trains a dedicated user simulator from each person’s real dialogue history and lets that simulator interact freely with the candidate RPA from the character’s opening, so every candidate is evaluated on a trajectory that it helps construct. In parallel, it automatically induces a personalized experience rubric from the same user’s history with turn-level satisfaction annotations. During scoring, the personalized rubric jointly considers an RPA response and the next user reaction it elicits, translating natural continuation, correction, reiteration, redirection, or exit into observable evidence of experience. The framework also employs a generic turn-level quality rubric and a whole-session rubric to measure general role-playing quality and long-horizon interaction ability. Experiments show that, in macro average, personalized scoring preserves the human satisfaction ordering in held-out sessions better than generic scoring. Across 16 candidates, PALATE further identifies user-dependent winners and capability mismatches among the three tracks, expanding the output from a single ranking into interpretable user–RPA performance profiles.

Our contributions are threefold:

- We introduce PALATE, a scalable free multi-turn benchmark whose evaluation unit is a specific user–RPA pair. It models the same person’s behavior as a user simulator and their experience preferences as a reusable personalized rubric, then characterizes candidates along personalized experience, generic turn quality, and whole-session quality. Applied to 16 candidates, it exposes user-dependent winners and cross-track capability mismatches.
- Through a controlled experiment, we show that fixed-history role-play evaluation measures quality conditioned on an external history rather than the RPA’s own multi-turn role-playing ability. Allowing the evaluated system to participate in constructing a continuous trajectory avoids directly inheriting another




Figure 1 Free multi-turn versus fixed-history evaluation. **(a)** A user and candidate RPA co-construct the evaluation trajectory. **(b)** High-quality borrowed histories inflate the same RPA’s continuation score; degraded histories deflate it. Fixed-history scores therefore conflate candidate ability with inherited history quality.

system’s character-side history.

- We release real multi-turn role-playing conversations with user experience annotations, enabling future research on individual preferences, interaction dynamics, and evaluation methods.

2 Related Work

2.1 Role-Playing Agents

From PersonaChat’s persona-grounded dialogue (Zhang et al., 2018), modern RPAs have progressed through character-specific data, synthetic personas, instruction tuning, and self-alignment (Wang et al., 2024c; Zhou et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2025b), including coordinated multi-character portrayal and human-like reasoning (Wang et al., 2025c; Du et al., 2026a). We study their evaluation when behavior is jointly shaped by dialogue history and the particular user.

2.2 Role-Play Evaluation

Benchmarks assess character knowledge, persona maintenance, voice, and dialogue consistency (Wang et al., 2024c; Shen et al., 2023; Tu et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2025). InCharacter uses psychological interviews, while SocialBench and EmoCharacter target social and emotional capabilities (Wang et al., 2024b; Chen et al., 2024; Feng et al., 2025). Interactive benchmarks examine plot progression, dialogue points, complete trajectories, or multi-agent social simulation (Zhang et al., 2025; Wu et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025c; Shi et al., 2026). PingPong employs a scenario-conditioned interrogator (Gusev, 2024); RMTBench uses preconstructed, non-adaptive user turns (Xiang et al., 2025); and MiniMax uses manually designed synthetic users for long-horizon self-play (MiniMax, 2026b,a). Their interacting side is therefore a scenario, intent, or prompted persona rather than behavior learned from one person’s natural RPA history.

Personalized evaluation instead links participant profiles to live feedback, reveals variation hidden by aggregate rankings, or derives user-conditioned criteria from interaction histories (Kirk et al., 2024; Garbacea et al., 2026; Seo and Lee, 2026). Beyond dialogue, DeepResearch Bench conditions report evaluation on reference-based adaptive criteria with dynamic weighting (Du et al., 2026b). PALATE extends this principle from task-conditioned evaluation to person-conditioned evaluation: it induces a frozen rubric from one user’s annotated interaction history and reuses it to evaluate that user’s new trajectories. Prior work has not coupled this experience perspective to the same person’s behavior policy in free-form role-play.

2.3 User Simulators

User simulation spans agenda-based and corpus-trained task-oriented methods (Schatzmann et al., 2007; Kreyssig et al., 2018; Crook and Marin, 2017) and now supports tool-agent and interactive evaluation (Yao et al., 2025; Dou et al., 2025). Data-driven LLM simulators learn natural user turns or condition on inferred profiles (Naous et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2025a); validation tests message reproduction, preserved human judgments, human-likeness, real-versus-simulated discrimination, and responses to unseen systems (Dou et al., 2025; Hathidara et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026; Meshi et al., 2026). PALATE jointly models the same person’s behavior policy from natural RPA conversations and individual utility from experience annotations: the former constructs the candidate’s trajectory, and the latter evaluates it. The evaluation unit thus becomes a specific user–RPA pair.

3 PALATE Benchmark

PALATE closes the evaluation loop through three functional modules: user-behavior modeling, free interaction, and person-aligned evaluation (Figure 2). Its four operational steps are (1) training and validating per-user simulators; (2) freezing them for free multi-turn interaction with candidate RPAs; (3) constructing a personalized rubric from the same user’s annotated history; and (4) scoring the resulting trajectories for personalized experience, generic turn quality, and whole-session quality. The key is to learn complementary behavior policies and experience preferences from the same person: the simulator and candidate co-construct a trajectory that the personalized rubric evaluates from that user’s perspective.




Figure 2 The PALATE evaluation pipeline. **(1) Train user simulators:** per-user LoRA SFT on each person’s chat history yields the corresponding simulator. **(2) Free multi-turn role-play chat:** each simulator interacts freely with the candidate RPA to generate evaluation samples, producing distinct per-user interaction trajectories. **(3) Auto-built rubric:** a meta-prompt induces a user-exclusive personalized rubric from that person’s chat history. **(4) Three-track scoring:** evaluation samples receive Generic, Session, and Personalized scores, which are aggregated into rankings.

3.1 User-Simulator Training and Validation

Data collection and splitting. We construct 300 parallel Chinese–English structured character cards. We first extract abstract structures such as themes, relationship tensions, and interaction hooks from highly engaged characters in large public role-play communities, then rewrite them into original cards. A separate set of distinctive IP anchors probes character knowledge and recognizability; source community text is not included in the released assets. Appendix B.2 describes the field specification, screening process, and category coverage.

We build an annotation platform on which volunteers conduct natural multi-turn conversations with an RPA while providing synchronized experience annotations. The main cohort comprises five users and 5,133 user turns with turn-level satisfaction labels, approximately 1,000 turns per user. Volunteers choose characters themselves, so sessions are not uniformly distributed across the 300-card pool.

Before data collection, we pre-freeze ten character cards as the main evaluation panel. Each user’s dialogues are split by complete session into a training set and an evaluation set. The training set is used to train the user simulator; its turn-level satisfaction labels and adjacent user reactions are also provided to the automated rubric-construction procedure. The evaluation set tests whether the simulator resembles the real person and whether the frozen rubric agrees with human judgments. Its satisfaction labels are never supplied to rubric construction or per-instance scoring. The free multi-turn interactions in the main evaluation use the same frozen ten-card panel.

Following user language modeling from natural interaction traces (Naous et al., 2026), each session is converted into a user-side next-action task with two target types: free-text continuation and exit via [QUIT]. Character messages are mapped to the model input, human user messages to the output, and an explicit [QUIT] target is appended to naturally completed sessions. Training and inference use semantically identical frozen task instructions, without a handwritten user profile. The user’s register, content preferences, pacing, and exit habits must therefore be carried by that person’s own training data.

User-simulator configuration and validation. Free multi-turn evaluation requires the user-side trajectory to resemble real interaction. When a generic LLM is prompted to play the user in a conversation with an RPA, its turns often exhibit conspicuously written and narrativized language; recent user-proxy studies likewise document verbose, assistant-like, or unrealistically patient prompted behavior (Naous et al., 2026; Hathidara et al., 2026; Meshi et al., 2026). Such behavior indirectly steers the candidate RPA and introduces user-side distortion. We therefore train a dedicated simulator for each person. After exploring model scales and training methods, we apply per-user LoRA fine-tuning (Hu et al., 2022) to Qwen3.5-35B-A3B Instruct; Appendix A.2 gives the selection and comparison details.

Table 1 summarizes the effect of training on real dialogue data. **(a) Two-alternative forced choice (2AFC):** this human-simulator test follows recent pairwise and Turing-style indistinguishability validation for user proxies (Dou et al., 2025; Hathidara et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026). We replay real held-out session histories, generate the next message at each human-user position, and ask a judge to choose between the human message and the simulator message. A fooling rate closer to 0.5 means that the two are harder to distinguish. **(b)** As a complementary analysis, an identity-consistency judge sees only reference user messages from the training set, the current context, and one candidate response—without the corresponding held-out human answer—and assesses how well the response matches the target user’s personal expression and behavior.

Method	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	Macro
(a) 2AFC fooling rate (target = 0.500)						
Raw Instruct	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002
Prompted LLM	0.150	0.300	0.180	0.160	0.110	0.180
LLM + profile	0.286	0.260	0.200	0.235	0.230	0.242
Per-user LoRA	0.520	0.680	0.540	0.480	0.583	0.561
(b) Identity consistency (0–100; ↑)						
Raw Instruct	17.7	16.9	12.2	18.4	9.7	15.0
Prompted LLM	53.9	62.7	45.7	63.6	53.5	55.9
LLM + profile	54.7	67.2	66.1	66.2	54.4	61.7
Per-user LoRA	73.9	87.1	75.8	76.7	74.7	77.6

Table 1 Held-out content-response fidelity of the user simulators. **(a)** Conditional 2AFC fooling rate on nonempty responses; 0.500 is the chance-indistinguishability reference, and bold marks the closest value. **(b)** Identity consistency without the corresponding human response; bold marks the column maximum. Macro weights U1–U5 equally. Raw Instruct and LoRA use Qwen3.5-35B-A3B Instruct; prompted rows use DeepSeek V4 Flash.

3.2 Free Multi-Turn Role-Playing

The main evaluation uses the ten pre-frozen character cards. The released benchmark retains the full character pool so that future users may select alternative panels as needed. Every user simulator interacts freely with every candidate RPA on the ten cards. Each cell is independently repeated twice, yielding $5 \times 10 \times C \times 2$ trajectories. We report $C = 16$ in this paper (Section 4.1).

Interactive user simulation has previously been used to avoid policy mismatch in task-oriented dialogue (Cheng et al., 2022), while self-play and model-to-model dialogue support scalable multi-turn evaluation in open-domain settings (Ghandeharioun et al., 2019). In PALATE, the trajectory is constructed specifically by the learned user simulator and the candidate RPA.

Unlike settings in which an environment controller determines turn order, advances the plot, or constrains the direction of interaction, PALATE contains only alternating generations by the user simulator and the candidate RPA. Starting from the fixed opening on a character card, no external orchestrator decides who should say what or how the plot should develop, and no candidate inherits a history generated by another. The simulator may terminate the conversation by outputting [QUIT]; otherwise, the session stops at a preset depth limit.

These samples feed all three scoring tracks directly, so each evaluated system constructs its own trajectory rather than continuing a borrowed history.

3.3 Personalized Experience Rubric Construction and Three-Track Evaluation

Personalized rubric. History-conditioned criteria provide a way to make user-specific preference axes explicit (Seo and Lee, 2026). For each user, PALATE supplies the same automated meta-prompt with that person’s *training sessions and experience annotations*. The constructor contrasts high- and low-rated responses in similar situations or at similar generic quality, identifies recurring personal rewards, penalties, applicability conditions, counterexamples, and the semantics of subsequent reactions across sessions, and compiles them into an interpretable personalized experience rubric under a common schema. The objective is not to recover a user’s unobservable latent satisfaction perfectly from text, but to use costly annotations to identify experience events that matter to that person beyond generic quality, thereby creating an individual evaluation perspective for new interactions.

The rubric compresses training history into rules, triggering conditions, counterexamples, and calibration information that can be tested in new dialogues, and prohibits surface proxies such as response length or word count from standing in for experience itself. Once constructed, it is frozen; formal scoring does not retrieve the original history. All five users share the same scoring system prompt, input template, probability output over ratings 1–5, and expected-value readout. Only the semantics of the loaded rubric differ. The system prompt specifies only the task and output contract, without cohort identities, data provenance, or domain-specific hints. Appendices D.5–D.6 contain the complete construction and scoring prompts.




Figure 3 The three-track PALATE scoring structure. The inner ring shows 12 shared Generic turn-level dimensions, the middle ring shows 11 shared whole-session dimensions, and the outer ring expands four representative experience drivers induced and frozen separately for each of U1–U5. The dashed sector indicates that the same construction process can extend to new users. Personalized scoring provides user-dependent experience coordinates; the shared tracks retain cross-user comparisons of general role-playing quality and long-horizon interaction.

Three-track scoring and aggregation. Free multi-turn trajectories are evaluated along three complementary tracks (Figure 3):

- **Personalized:** the personalized rubric induced from the user’s training set scores sampled RPA responses together with their next user reactions, and the turn scores are aggregated into trajectory-level satisfaction.
- **Generic:** a shared set of generic quality dimensions scores the same sampled RPA responses.
- **Session:** a whole-session rubric reads the complete dialogue and evaluates multi-turn properties such as persona stability, relationship development, plot progression, and long-horizon coherence.

The Generic and Session rubrics draw on common dimensions from prior role-playing evaluation (Tu et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025c; MiniMax, 2026b) and expert input. Appendices C.1–C.2 give their definitions and anchors; Appendices D.5–D.6 give the personalized-rubric construction and scoring protocols.

The personalized judge outputs probabilities for ratings 1–5, whose expectation is used as the turn-level experience score. Generic and Session judges output integer scores from 1 to 5 for every diagnostic dimension and a separate overall score from 1 to 5. Dimension scores are used for the diagnostic analyses in the supplement, while main-text aggregation uses the judges’ independent overall scores. Let $P_u(c)$ denote the mean turn-level experience score of candidate c for user u , and let $G(c)$ and $S(c)$ denote the candidate’s mean

Generic and Session overall scores. For K users and a maximum score of $s = 5$, define

$$\bar{P}(c) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{u=1}^K P_u(c), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{U-Score}(c) = \frac{100}{s} \bar{P}(c), \quad (2)$$

$$\text{G-Score}(c) = \frac{100}{2s} (G(c) + S(c)), \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Overall}(c) = \frac{100}{3s} (\bar{P}(c) + G(c) + S(c)). \quad (4)$$

U-Score weights users equally, G-Score weights Generic and Session quality equally, and Overall is an equal-weight display summary of the three perspectives. The three tracks and per-user scores are the primary measurement outputs of PALATE; Overall is provided only as a compact overview and does not assume that personalized experience, generic turn-level quality, and whole-session quality can be fully represented by a single scalar.

4 Evaluation Design and Results

4.1 Candidate Set and Protocol

The main candidate set centers on recent general-purpose proprietary models, open-weight models, and role-play-specialized systems: GPT-5.4/5.1, Claude Opus 4.8/Sonnet 4.6, DeepSeek V4 Pro/Flash and V3.2, Gemini 2.5 Pro/3.5 Flash, Qwen3-Max, Qwen3.5-35B-A3B Instruct, Seed 2 Mini, Grok 4.3, GLM-5.1, MiniMax-M2-her, and CoSER-Llama-3.1-70B. We classify candidates whose weights are publicly available for download as open-weight models; the remainder are closed-source or available only via API. Table 2 reports these 16 candidates (Du et al., 2026a; Wang et al., 2025c).

The main scoring judge is GPT-5.5. To test whether the main findings depend on a single judge, Claude Opus 4.8 and DeepSeek V4 Pro additionally rejudge all three tracks on a pre-frozen stratified subset; comparisons are made within each judge.

4.2 Main Evaluation Results

Table 2 reports personalized experience for five users, generic turn-level quality, and whole-session quality across 16 candidates. Each user–candidate cell contains two independent rollouts. Personalized and Generic each score 40 frozen valid nonterminal decision points; Session scores all 20 complete trajectories. GPT-5.5 judges all tracks. Personalized scores are averaged within each cell and then equally across users.

Table 2 reveals capability mismatches across the three tracks rather than one dominant ranking. GPT-5.4’s advantage comes mainly from generic turn quality, whereas Claude Sonnet 4.6 leads Session. No candidate wins all users: U1, U2, U3/U5, and U4 favor Qwen3-Max, DeepSeek V4 Pro, Claude Opus 4.8, and Claude Sonnet 4.6, respectively. Qwen3-Max leads neither shared track but best matches U1 and ranks markedly lower for U4. Thus generic response quality, long-horizon dialogue, and person-specific satisfaction are not proportional scalings of one capability.

Model provenance and training orientation likewise do not determine interactive performance. Among open-weight models, GLM-5.1 reaches the leading tier by balancing all three tracks, whereas MiniMax M2-her and CoSER-Llama-3.1-70B remain lower despite role-play-oriented training or evaluation. Specialization therefore does not automatically produce advantages across characters and users, reinforcing the need to evaluate candidate-constructed trajectories.

The structure is stable across independent repetitions: all model-rank Spearman correlations are at least 0.959. Although scalable LLM judges (Zheng et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023) can exhibit positional and model-preference biases (Wang et al., 2024a; Panickssery et al., 2024), cross-family rejudging preserves wide-margin ordering in Personalized and Generic. Session and small top-end gaps are more judge-sensitive, so we emphasize clear cross-track differences; Appendix A.3 gives the complete results.

Candidate	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	Gen.	Sess.	U-Score	G-Score	Overall
GPT-5.4	4.18	3.69	4.13	3.43	3.84	4.73	4.18	77.08	89.05	85.06
Claude Sonnet 4.6	4.04	3.67	4.10	3.53	3.83	4.57	4.32	76.65	88.90	84.82
GPT-5.1	4.18	3.61	4.09	3.24	3.82	4.67	4.10	75.77	87.70	83.72
DeepSeek V4 Pro	4.35	3.72	4.19	3.46	3.83	4.50	4.02	78.24	85.20	82.88
GLM-5.1	4.17	3.65	4.12	3.36	3.74	4.53	3.97	76.15	85.00	82.05
Claude Opus 4.8	4.23	3.64	4.21	3.28	3.89	4.53	3.85	76.99	83.75	81.50
DeepSeek V4 Flash	4.23	3.60	4.06	3.17	3.81	4.28	3.79	75.44	80.70	78.95
DeepSeek V3.2	4.00	3.50	3.96	3.19	3.65	4.20	3.90	73.20	81.00	78.40
Gemini 2.5 Pro	4.06	3.49	3.81	3.00	3.69	4.34	3.71	72.21	80.45	77.70
Qwen3-Max	4.37	3.61	4.07	2.83	3.88	4.28	3.42	75.02	77.00	76.34
Gemini 3.5 Flash	4.07	3.63	4.04	3.07	3.71	4.10	3.57	74.06	76.65	75.79
Seed 2 Mini	3.85	3.62	3.99	3.11	3.61	3.92	3.00	72.74	69.15	70.35
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B Instr.	3.95	3.46	3.94	2.96	3.68	3.76	2.84	71.98	66.00	67.99
MiniMax M2-her	3.31	3.31	3.60	2.75	3.26	3.30	2.80	64.92	60.95	62.27
Grok 4.3	3.29	3.18	3.52	2.58	3.31	3.39	2.67	63.54	60.55	61.55
CoSER-Llama-3.1-70B	3.30	3.05	3.43	2.46	3.32	2.86	2.23	62.21	50.85	54.64

Table 2 Main PALATE results. U1–U5 measure personalized experience; Generic and Session measure turn- and session-level quality (all 1–5). U-Score, G-Score, and Overall rescale the equal-user, equal-shared-track, and equal-three-track means to 100, respectively. Overall is display-only; bold marks maxima, not significance.

4.3 Agreement with Human Experience

At each held-out turn, the judge receives the dialogue prefix, user input, RPA response, and optionally the real user’s next reaction. In free interaction, the simulator produces the analogous reaction, making it trajectory evidence rather than an extra deployment label. We cross both rubrics with reaction visibility and reconstruct a baseline from MiniMax’s public dimensions (MiniMax, 2026b); labels are used only to compute agreement.

Because ratings concentrate at the high end, absolute error could reward constant near-mean predictions. We instead form within-session pairs with different ratings and measure recovery of their order; ties score 0.5 and chance is 0.500. Appendices C.5 and D.6–D.7 give the protocol and prompts; the five frozen rubrics will be released.

Personalized with reaction has the best macro agreement (0.613 versus 0.551 without it); Generic changes from 0.480 to 0.507, and MiniMax-aligned obtains 0.467 (Table 3). Gains are positive for every user, indicating that user-specific rules extract useful reaction evidence. The full setting beats both baselines per user, although U2 favors Generic; it therefore improves the equal-user signal without universal dominance.

Rubric	Next	U1	U2	U3	U4	U5	Macro
Personalized	Yes	0.540	0.544	0.712	0.743	0.526	0.613
Personalized	No	0.494	0.524	0.658	0.585	0.494	0.551
Generic overall	No	0.410	0.574	0.421	0.529	0.469	0.480
Generic overall	Yes	0.455	0.556	0.479	0.621	0.427	0.507
MiniMax-aligned	No	0.389	0.442	0.463	0.582	0.461	0.467

Table 3 Within-session pairwise agreement on held-out turns. Macro is the equal-user mean; chance is 0.500; bold marks maxima. “Yes” includes the next reaction. MiniMax-aligned reconstructs six public dimensions under our judge, not its unreleased protocol or scores.

5 Conclusion

Fixed-history evaluation places an RPA in a trajectory that it did not help construct, thereby mixing its own capability with the influence of the external history. User-independent scoring further compresses genuine individual differences in satisfaction into a single standard. PALATE uses simulators trained from real user histories to generate free multi-turn dialogues and evaluates candidates along personalized, generic turn-level, and whole-session tracks. It further decomposes one person into a behavior policy learned from real dialogue and an individual utility supervised by experience annotations, changing the basic unit of role-play evaluation

from an isolated RPA to a user-RPA pair. This introduces a user-perspective satisfaction reference while retaining general quality evaluation. Across 16 candidates, advantages on the three tracks do not coincide, and the five users do not share a single best candidate. The central output of PALATE is therefore not another scalar leaderboard, but an interactive evaluation profile that locates cross-track capability mismatches and per-user differences.

6 Limitations

PALATE currently covers five extensively annotated users. Because collecting long conversations and turn-level satisfaction labels—and repeatedly asking the same people to evaluate every candidate—is costly, we validate user-simulator behavioral fidelity and agreement between personalized scoring and human judgments on disjoint held-out sessions, but do not yet have an end-to-end human-ranking reference spanning every candidate in the main table. The held-out experiments validate the benchmark’s two key components, while the main evaluation demonstrates the comparative structure that PALATE can reveal for these five users. Expanding the user panel and calibrating cross-candidate rankings against human judgments are the next steps.

7 Ethics Statement

This study involves real role-playing conversations and turn-level experience annotations. All participants provided informed consent before data collection, received compensation, and explicitly authorized the use and public release of de-identified research data and the per-user LoRA weights trained from their data.

References

- Hongzhan Chen, Hehong Chen, Ming Yan, Wenshen Xu, Gao Xing, Weizhou Shen, Xiaojun Quan, Chenliang Li, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. SocialBench: Sociality evaluation of role-playing conversational agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 2108–2126, 2024. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.125. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.125/>.
- Qinyuan Cheng, Linyang Li, Guofeng Quan, Feng Gao, Xiaofeng Mou, and Xipeng Qiu. Is MultiWOZ a solved task? an interactive TOD evaluation framework with user simulator. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 1248–1259, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.findings-emnlp.90. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-emnlp.90/>.
- Paul Crook and Alex Marin. Sequence to sequence modeling for user simulation in dialog systems. In *Interspeech*, pages 1706–1710, 2017.
- Yao Dou, Michel Galley, Baolin Peng, Chris Kedzie, Weixin Cai, Alan Ritter, Chris Quirk, Wei Xu, and Jianfeng Gao. Simulatorarena: Are user simulators reliable proxies for multi-turn evaluation of ai assistants? In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 35212–35290, 2025. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.1786. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.emnlp-main.1786/>.
- Chengyu Du, Xintao Wang, Aili Chen, Weiyuan Li, Rui Xu, Junteng Liu, Zishan Huang, Rong Tian, Zijun Sun, Yuhao Li, Liheng Feng, Deming Ding, Pengyu Zhao, and Yanghua Xiao. HER: Human-like reasoning and reinforcement learning for llm role-playing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pages 25725–25762, 2026a. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.1283. <https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-acl.1283/>.
- Mingxuan Du, Benfeng Xu, Chiwei Zhu, Licheng Zhang, Xiaorui Wang, and Zhendong Mao. DeepResearch Bench: A comprehensive benchmark for deep research agents. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026b. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hQ0K2Hhq7H>.
- Qiming Feng, Qiujie Xie, Xiaolong Wang, Qingqiu Li, Yuejie Zhang, Rui Feng, Tao Zhang, and Shang Gao. EmoCharacter: Evaluating the emotional fidelity of role-playing agents in dialogues. In *Proceedings of NAACL 2025*, pages 6218–6240, 2025. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.316. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-long.316/>.
- Cristina Garbacea, Heran Wang, and Chenhao Tan. Personalized benchmarking: Evaluating LLMs by individual preferences. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pages 639–675, San Diego,

- California, United States, 2026. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.31. <https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-acl.31/>.
- Asma Ghandeharioun, Judy Hanwen Shen, Natasha Jaques, Craig Ferguson, Noah Jones, Agata Lapedriza, and Rosalind Picard. Approximating interactive human evaluation with self-play for open-domain dialog systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/fc9812127bf09c7bd29ad6723c683fb5-Paper.pdf.
- Ilya Gusev. PingPong: A benchmark for role-playing language models with user emulation and multi-model evaluation, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.06820>.
- Ashutosh Hathidara, Julien Yu, Vaishali Senthil, Sebastian Schreiber, and Anil Babu Ankisetipalli. Mirrorbench: A benchmark to evaluate conversational user-proxy agents for human-likeness, 2026. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.08118>.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZeVKeeFYf9>.
- Robert Irvine, Douglas Boubert, Vyas Raina, Adian Liusie, Ziyi Zhu, Vineet Mudupalli, Aliaksei Korshuk, Zongyi Liu, Fritz Cremer, Valentin Assassi, Christie-Carol Beauchamp, Xiaoding Lu, Thomas Rialan, and William Beauchamp. Rewarding chatbots for real-world engagement with millions of users, 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.06135>.
- Hannah Rose Kirk, Alexander Whitefield, Paul Röttger, Andrew Bean, Katerina Margatina, Juan Ciro, Rafael Mosquera, Max Bartolo, Adina Williams, He He, Bertie Vidgen, and Scott A. Hale. The PRISM alignment dataset: What participatory, representative and individualised human feedback reveals about the subjective and multicultural alignment of large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 105236–105344. Curran Associates, Inc., 2024. doi: 10.52202/079017-3342. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/file/be2e1b68b44f2419e19f6c35a1b8cf35-Paper-Datasets_and_Benchmarks_Track.pdf.
- Florian Kreyssig, Iñigo Casanueva, Paweł Budzianowski, and Milica Gašić. Neural user simulation for corpus-based policy optimisation of spoken dialogue systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 60–69, 2018. <https://aclanthology.org/W18-5007/>.
- Chia-Wei Liu, Ryan Lowe, Iulian Serban, Mike Noseworthy, Laurent Charlin, and Joelle Pineau. How NOT to evaluate your dialogue system: An empirical study of unsupervised evaluation metrics for dialogue response generation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2122–2132, 2016. <https://aclanthology.org/D16-1230/>.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. G-eval: NLG evaluation using GPT-4 with better human alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2511–2522, Singapore, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.153. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.153/>.
- Keming Lu, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Large language models are superpositions of all characters: Attaining arbitrary role-play via self-alignment. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7828–7840, 2024. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.423. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.423/>.
- Ofer Meshi, Krisztian Balog, Sally Goldman, Avi Caciularu, Guy Tennenholtz, Jihwan Jeong, Amir Globerson, and Craig Boutilier. Convapparel: A benchmark dataset and validation framework for user simulators in conversational recommenders. In *Proceedings of the 19th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5270–5304, 2026. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.eacl-long.244. <https://aclanthology.org/2026.eacl-long.244/>.
- MiniMax. The minimax-m2 series: Mini activations unleashing max real-world intelligence, 2026a. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.26494>.
- MiniMax. Role-play benchmark. Hugging Face dataset, 2026b. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/MiniMaxAI/role-play-bench>.
- Tarek Naous, Philippe Laban, Wei Xu, and Jennifer Neville. Flipping the dialogue: Training and evaluating user language models. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ykSmkVqzn4>.

- Arjun Panickssery, Samuel R. Bowman, and Shi Feng. LLM evaluators recognize and favor their own generations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 68772–68802. Curran Associates, Inc., 2024. doi: 10.52202/079017-2197. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/7f1f0218e45f5414c79c0679633e47bc-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Jost Schatzmann, Blaise Thomson, Karl Weilhammer, Hui Ye, and Steve Young. Agenda-based user simulation for bootstrapping a pomdp dialogue system. In *Human Language Technologies 2007: NAACL, Companion Volume*, pages 149–152, 2007. <https://aclanthology.org/N07-2038/>.
- Kwangwook Seo and Dongha Lee. P-check: Advancing personalized reward model via learning to generate dynamic checklist. In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 43447–43471, San Diego, California, United States, 2026. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.acl-long.2011. <https://aclanthology.org/2026.acl-long.2011/>.
- Tianhao Shen, Sun Li, Quan Tu, and Deyi Xiong. RoleEval: A bilingual role evaluation benchmark for large language models, 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.16132>.
- Wenlong Shi, Jianxun Lian, Mingqi Wu, Haiming Qin, Mingyang Zhou, Xing Xie, Naipeng Chao, and Hao Liao. PersonaArena: Dynamic simulation for evaluating and enhancing persona-level role-playing in large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pages 9685–9719, 2026. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.471. <https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-acl.471/>.
- Quan Tu, Shilong Fan, Zihang Tian, Tianhao Shen, Shuo Shang, Xin Gao, and Rui Yan. CharacterEval: A chinese benchmark for role-playing conversational agent evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 11836–11850, 2024. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.638/>.
- Kuang Wang, Xianfei Li, Shenghao Yang, Li Zhou, Feng Jiang, and Haizhou Li. Know you first and be you better: Modeling human-like user simulators via implicit profiles. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 21082–21107, 2025a. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.acl-long.1025/>.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Liang Chen, Zefan Cai, Dawei Zhu, Binghui Lin, Yunbo Cao, Lingpeng Kong, Qi Liu, Tianyu Liu, and Zhifang Sui. Large language models are not fair evaluators. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9440–9450, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.511. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.511/>.
- Xiaoyang Wang, Hongming Zhang, Tao Ge, Wenhao Yu, Dian Yu, and Dong Yu. Opencharacter: Training customizable role-playing llms with large-scale synthetic personas, 2025b. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.15427>.
- Xintao Wang, Yunze Xiao, Jen-tse Huang, Siyu Yuan, Rui Xu, Haoran Guo, Quan Tu, Yaying Fei, Ziang Leng, Wei Wang, Jiangjie Chen, Cheng Li, and Yanghua Xiao. InCharacter: Evaluating personality fidelity in role-playing agents through psychological interviews. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1840–1873, 2024b. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.102. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.102/>.
- Xintao Wang, Heng Wang, Yifei Zhang, Xinfeng Yuan, Rui Xu, Jen-tse Huang, Siyu Yuan, Haoran Guo, Jiangjie Chen, Shuchang Zhou, Wei Wang, and Yanghua Xiao. CoSER: Coordinating llm-based persona simulation of established roles. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 267 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 64822–64858, 2025c. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/wang25dk.html>.
- Yingshan Susan Wang, Cedegao E. Zhang, Linlu Qiu, Zexue He, Pengyuan Li, Alex Pentland, Roger P. Levy, and Yoon Kim. Learning user simulators with turing rewards, 2026. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.19336>.
- Zekun Moore Wang, Zhongyuan Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhan Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Jian Yang, Man Zhang, Zhaoxiang Zhang, Wanli Ouyang, Ke Xu, Wenhao Huang, Jie Fu, and Junran Peng. RoleLLM: Benchmarking, eliciting, and enhancing role-playing abilities of large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 14743–14777, 2024c. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.878/>.
- Bowen Wu, Kaili Sun, Ziwei Bai, Ying Li, and Baoxun Wang. RAIDEN benchmark: Evaluating role-playing conversational agents with measurement-driven custom dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 11086–11106, 2025. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.coling-main.735/>.
- Hao Xiang, Tianyi Tang, Yang Su, Bowen Yu, An Yang, Fei Huang, Yichang Zhang, Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Jingren Zhou, and Le Sun. RMTBench: Benchmarking llms through multi-turn user-centric role-playing. In

- Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, pages 13555–13571, 2025. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.findings-emnlp.730. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.findings-emnlp.730/>.
- Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan. τ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12045>.
- Pinyi Zhang, Siyu An, Lingfeng Qiao, Yifei Yu, Jingyang Chen, Jie Wang, Di Yin, Xing Sun, and Kai Zhang. RolePlot: A systematic framework for evaluating and enhancing the plot-progression capabilities of role-playing agents. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 12337–12354, 2025. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.603. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.acl-long.603/>.
- Saizheng Zhang, Emily Dinan, Jack Urbanek, Arthur Szlam, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. Personalizing dialogue agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too? In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2204–2213, 2018. doi: 10.18653/v1/P18-1205. <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1205/>.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-Bench and chatbot arena. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. doi: 10.52202/075280-2020. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/91f18a1287b398d378ef22505bf41832-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html.
- Jinfeng Zhou, Zhuang Chen, Dazhen Wan, Bosi Wen, Yi Song, Jifan Yu, Yongkang Huang, Pei Ke, Guanqun Bi, Libiao Peng, JiaMing Yang, Xiyao Xiao, Sahand Sabour, Xiaohan Zhang, Wenjing Hou, Yijia Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, Hongning Wang, Jie Tang, and Minlie Huang. CharacterGLM: Customizing social characters with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 1457–1476, 2024. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-industry.107. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-industry.107/>.
- Jinfeng Zhou, Yongkang Huang, Bosi Wen, Guanqun Bi, Yuxuan Chen, Pei Ke, Zhuang Chen, Xiyao Xiao, Libiao Peng, Kuntian Tang, Rongsheng Zhang, Le Zhang, Tangjie Lv, Zhipeng Hu, Hongning Wang, and Minlie Huang. CharacterBench: Benchmarking character customization of large language models. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 39(24):26101–26110, 2025. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v39i24.34806. <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/34806>.

A Experimental Details

A.1 Controlled Fixed-History Experiment

Construction. We select five real platform conversations containing more than 20 user–character rounds. For every conversation, all user turns, character actions, relationships, prior commitments, and plot events are fixed. We retain the original character-side history and rewrite it into two realizations:

- **HQ:** specific, natural, persona-grounded language that responds closely to user actions;
- **Degraded:** the same facts, events, and continuation compatibility, rendered in more generic, repetitive, and less detailed language;
- neither rewrite may add or remove plot facts, create contradictions, refuse, break character explicitly, or introduce unsafe content.

The complete rewriting prompt is in Section D.9.

The original arm supplies one shared reference at each conversation–depth position, for $5 \times 20 = 100$ replies; it is not rerun per candidate. Four candidates continue only the HQ and degraded histories, with 100 replies per candidate per arm (800 rewritten-arm replies). A probe at depth d receives the frozen history through $d - 1$ and the d th real user message. Candidate output is not written back, making depths and arms independent. The 900 replies are scored with the benchmark’s Generic rubric.

Candidate	History condition		Difference		
	HQ	Degraded	Δ HQ	Δ Degraded	HQ–Degraded
Claude Sonnet 4.6	4.70	4.33	+0.27	−0.10	+0.37
DeepSeek V4 Pro	4.42	3.85	−0.01	−0.58	+0.57
Gemini 2.5 Pro	4.63	4.34	+0.20	−0.09	+0.29
GPT-5.1	4.79	4.69	+0.36	+0.26	+0.10
All	4.64	4.30	+0.21	−0.13	+0.33

Table A.1 Fixed-history three-arm results. Original is a shared reference ($n = 100$); HQ and degraded each have $n = 100$ per candidate. Per-candidate differences from Original therefore use the same original mean of 4.43.

The effect is not a shared translation of every candidate. DeepSeek V4 Pro is most sensitive to inherited history (0.57); GPT-5.1 stays strong in both arms and has the smallest gap (0.10), consistent with high continuation quality partially compensating for a weak preceding realization. Claude Sonnet 4.6 ranks above Gemini 2.5 Pro under HQ history but below it under degraded history.

Crossed visible-history analysis. To separate changes in generation from direct judge response to visible history, we freeze the continuations y^+ and y^- produced from the two histories in all 400 candidate–conversation–depth cells, then swap the history shown to the judge.

History visible to judge	Weaker continuation y^-	Stronger continuation y^+
HQ H^+	3.85	4.64
Degraded H^-	4.30	4.50

Table A.2 Mean overall scores in the 2×2 crossed analysis; each cell has $n = 400$.

The aggregate continuation main effect is +0.49, whereas the visible-history main effect is −0.16. For every candidate, the latter is negative: an identical weak continuation looks worse after an HQ history because the contrast is sharper, rather than receiving a positive “good history” halo. The larger positive continuation effects show that the three-arm result is principally driven by inherited history changing what the candidate generates.

Candidate	Continuation	Visible history	Interaction	Recovered gap
Claude Sonnet 4.6	+0.62	−0.25	+0.61	+0.37
DeepSeek V4 Pro	+0.75	−0.18	+0.57	+0.57
Gemini 2.5 Pro	+0.41	−0.12	+0.70	+0.29
GPT-5.1	+0.21	−0.11	+0.47	+0.10
All	+0.49	−0.16	+0.59	+0.33

Table A.3 Decomposition of the crossed analysis. “Recovered native gap” is the sum of the continuation and visible-history main effects and equals the HQ-degraded gap in Table A.1.

A.2 User-Simulator Training and Selection

Each session becomes a user-side next-action task: RPA messages are inputs, human user messages are targets, and naturally ended sessions receive a [QUIT] target. Training and inference use the same frozen task instruction (Section D.2). Per-user models receive no name, demographic attributes, or handwritten profile.

We compare Qwen3.5-4B and Qwen3.5-35B-A3B, Base and Instruct initialization, and no adaptation, per-user LoRA, and full-parameter tuning on the same frozen decision points for U3 and U4. Each judge column in Table A.4 is the user-macro 2AFC fooling rate over 40 points per user. LoRA uses rank 16, $\alpha = 32$, dropout 0.05, 1 epoch, learning rate 10^{-4} , cosine decay, and 3% warmup. Full tuning uses 1 epoch and learning rate 10^{-5} .

Backbone	Init.	Training	GPT-5.5	Sonnet 4.6
Qwen3.5-4B	Instruct	None	0.000	0.000
Qwen3.5-4B	Base	LoRA	0.431	0.475
Qwen3.5-4B	Instruct	LoRA	0.425	0.425
Qwen3.5-4B	Instruct	Full	0.588	0.546
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	Instruct	None	0.000	0.000
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	Base	LoRA	0.363	0.450
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	Instruct	LoRA	0.467	0.551
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	Instruct	Full	0.650	0.588

Table A.4 Simulator training ablation on U3/U4.

Full tuning has the highest point estimate in this small ablation, supporting the importance of user-specific training. We select 35B-A3B Instruct + LoRA for the main experiment because its fidelity is already near the chance-indistinguishable region while each user requires only a lightweight adapter. Training, storing, and deploying a full model per user is substantially more expensive; with fewer than 1,000 examples per user, full updating also carries greater individual-data overfitting risk.

A.3 Repeat Stability and Cross-Judge Rejudging

Metric	Spearman ρ	Pearson r
Personalized experience	.959	.985
Generic overall	.967	.988
Session overall	.971	.978
G-Score	.974	.988
Overall	.988	.991

Table A.5 Agreement between the two rollout repetitions across 16 candidate rankings and scores.

Cross-judge evaluation freezes 4 Personalized points, 4 Generic points, and 2 Session trajectories from every candidate–user–repetition cell, for 1,600 inputs. The two additional judges receive identical inputs.

Rejudge model	Personalized	Generic	Session	Overall
Claude Opus 4.8	.909	.886	.697	.744
DeepSeek V4 Pro	.924	.842	.529	.700

Table A.6 Spearman correlation of candidate rankings with GPT-5.5 on the same stratified rejudging subset.

B Dataset and Character Panel

B.1 Human Data and Splits

All human data come from volunteer interactions with one DeepSeek V4 Flash RPA. A common collection model controls the source environment; simulators initially learn user behavior in that environment and are then frozen for reuse across 16 candidates. We do not assume that these histories cover every behavior a human might show toward every candidate.

User	User turns	Train SFT	Held out	Satisfaction
U1	1,003	822	195	4.74
U2	1,002	743	271	3.77
U3	1,006	732	275	4.63
U4	1,107	858	252	3.68
U5	1,015	804	240	4.15
Total / macro	5,133	3,959	1,233	4.20

Table B.1 Human data statistics. Satisfaction means are user-level raw turn-rating means; the final mean is a user macro-average.

Splits are isolated by complete session. All 1,233 held-out user turns enter applicable simulator tests. Of these, 1,206 also contain a valid RPA reply, human satisfaction label, and adjacent reaction required by the scoring protocol. Training satisfaction labels may be used for rubric construction; held-out satisfaction is accessed only during final agreement calculation.

B.2 The 300 Character Cards

The pool contains 240 original cards and 60 distinctive IP anchors. Every card has parallel bilingual fields for name, introduction, description, opening, and a structured candidate-side persona. Original cards borrow only abstract themes, relationship tensions, and interaction hooks from public communities; names, backgrounds, relationships, and wording are newly authored, and community text is not included in released assets. All cards undergo manual review for user-agency violations, scene contradictions, residual editing instructions, and designs that primarily test refusal behavior.

The bilingual persona schema follows the same field order:

[Character] [Identity] [Personality] [Speaking Style]
 [Likes and Dislikes] [Background] [Current Scene]
 [Example Dialogue] [Interaction Guidelines].

B.3 Frozen Ten-Card Panel

The panel was frozen from card metadata and text before candidate results were inspected. Constraints require 8 original and 2 IP cards, 5 female and 5 male characters, ten distinct archetypes, complete bilingual fields, self-consistent openings, and preservation of user agency.

ID	Character	Archetype	Primary stressor
ip_007	Furina	anime IP	Theatrical voice, knowledge, vulnerability
ip_053	Bruce Wayne	scenario RPG	Evidence, principles, planning, recovery
ocp_032	Sloane Whitfield	sci-fi	Hidden motives, negotiation, information
ocp_106	Diane Foster	antagonist tension	Power conflict, accountability, repair
ocp_119	Joan Whitaker	slice of life	Relationship repair, identity anxiety, boundaries
ocp_029	Helena Draycott	romance drama	Slow trust, diplomacy, intimacy pacing
ocp_181	Marcus Doyle	mentor/helper	Discipline, compassion, counterfactual reflection
ocp_188	Shadowstep	companion	Nonverbal interaction, trust, agency
ocp_203	Mateo Duarte	mystic fantasy	World continuity, mystery, memory
ocp_216	Finn Callahan	comedy	Improvisation, failure recovery, object interaction

Table B.2 Frozen evaluation panel. Character names are English release renderings of the bilingual cards.

These cards may occur in a user’s training conversations. The panel therefore tests new free trajectories and cross-candidate reuse within a familiar character domain, not character-level holdout generalization.

C Three-Track Scoring Instruments

C.1 Generic Turn-Level Rubric

Generic uses 12 dimensions shared across users and an independent overall score. Dimension values are diagnostic; the main paper’s Generic column, G-Score, and Overall use the separately output overall.

ID	Dimension	Central question
G-FLU	Fluency and naturalness	Is expression natural and readable?
G-LEX	Lexical richness and diversity	Does it avoid templated repetition?
G-COH	Coherence and relevance	Does it directly follow the current input?
G-KNW	Character knowledge	Does it respect knowledge and epistemic bounds?
G-PER	Persona behavior	Is behavior consistent with the character?
G-STY	Character voice	Is the language style distinctive?
G-EMO	Emotion recognition	Are emotional signals recognized correctly?
G-EMP	Response adaptation	Is the emotional response appropriate?
G-INT	Intent response	Does it understand and serve current intent?
G-ACT	Action and agency	Does it follow actions without controlling the user?
G-NAR	Local narrative contribution	Does it add meaningful progress?
G-ITR	Interaction appeal	Does it leave a natural hook for continuation?

Table C.1 Generic rubric dimensions. Complete definitions and 1/3/5 anchors are inserted into the prompt template in Section D.7.

Candidate	FLU	LEX	COH	KNW	PER	STY	EMO	EMP	INT	ACT	NAR	ITR	Overall
GPT-5.4	4.96	3.95	4.92	4.79	4.92	4.88	4.46	4.73	4.87	4.96	3.88	4.11	4.725
Claude Sonnet 4.6	4.99	3.96	4.87	4.67	4.63	4.46	4.42	4.65	4.71	4.70	3.88	3.95	4.570
GPT-5.1	4.94	3.99	4.89	4.75	4.79	4.69	4.39	4.69	4.79	4.66	3.95	4.13	4.670
DeepSeek V4 Pro	4.96	4.13	4.63	4.32	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.60	4.42	4.04	4.22	4.500
GLM-5.1	4.97	3.96	4.84	4.58	4.59	4.59	4.28	4.54	4.71	4.53	3.95	4.04	4.530
Claude Opus 4.8	4.98	4.03	4.82	4.56	4.50	4.38	4.53	4.62	4.70	4.37	3.98	4.12	4.525
DeepSeek V4 Flash	4.93	4.04	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.15	4.13	4.31	4.40	4.28	3.90	3.88	4.280
DeepSeek V3.2	4.99	3.79	4.62	4.38	4.39	4.35	3.76	4.11	4.45	4.72	3.72	3.67	4.200
Gemini 2.5 Pro	4.93	3.94	4.75	4.38	4.58	4.28	4.12	4.26	4.55	4.48	3.77	3.83	4.335
Qwen3-Max	5.00	4.06	4.63	4.05	4.29	4.22	4.22	4.31	4.49	4.01	3.92	4.00	4.280
Gemini 3.5 Flash	4.80	3.84	4.65	4.24	4.12	4.10	4.14	4.16	4.46	4.17	3.62	3.77	4.095
Seed 2 Mini	4.66	3.37	4.41	4.10	4.21	4.24	3.88	3.94	4.28	4.46	3.19	3.42	3.915
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B Instr.	4.53	3.48	4.26	3.89	3.77	3.95	3.90	3.77	4.17	3.98	3.39	3.64	3.760
MiniMax M2-her	4.44	2.46	4.01	3.65	3.62	3.54	3.24	3.24	3.55	4.68	2.56	2.62	3.295
Grok 4.3	4.22	2.52	4.09	4.01	3.95	3.92	3.39	3.42	3.70	4.78	2.39	2.66	3.385
CoSER-Llama-3.1-70B	3.91	2.39	3.53	3.29	3.01	2.74	3.02	2.89	3.26	3.62	2.27	2.33	2.855

Table C.2 Generic per-dimension diagnostics. Values are aggregated within each user–candidate unit and then macro-averaged over users. Overall is the independent score used in the main paper. Dimension definitions are given in Table C.1.

The dimension profile clarifies why Generic overall does not reduce to fluency. GPT-5.4 leads the independent overall and is strongest on coherence, character knowledge, persona behavior, voice, response fit, intent response, and action continuity. DeepSeek V4 Pro instead leads lexical richness, local narrative contribution, and interaction appeal, while Qwen3-Max attains the highest fluency. Thus different candidates reach similar aggregate quality through different turn-level strengths.

C.2 Whole-Session Rubric

Session reads a continuous trajectory and uses 11 shared dimensions plus an independent overall. Unobservable dimensions receive null; short sessions are not mechanically penalized.

ID	Dimension	Central question
S-PER	Persona stability	Is the character stable across turns?
S-MOT	Motivational consistency	Are motives continuous and credible?
S-EMO	Emotional development	Are changes emotionally prepared?
S-REL	Relationship development	Does interaction accumulate into change?
S-PAC	Pacing and boundaries	Is progress suited to the user?
S-COP	Instruction cooperation	Does it continually serve user intent?
S-PRG	Plot progression	Does the trajectory make meaningful progress?
S-DIV	Structure and diversity	Does it avoid loops and sustain variation?
S-LOG	Cross-turn logic	Are facts and causality consistent?
S-MEM	Long-term memory	Are important details retained?
S-REC	Adaptation and recovery	Can it repair misunderstanding?

Table C.3 Session rubric dimensions. Complete definitions and anchors are inserted into Section D.8.

Candidate	PER	MOT	EMO	REL	PAC	COP	PRG	DIV	LOG	MEM	REC	Overall
GPT-5.4	4.86	4.87	4.29	4.14	3.86	4.73	3.19	2.81	4.64	4.87	4.23	4.180
Claude Sonnet 4.6	4.71	4.68	4.46	4.29	4.05	4.38	3.76	3.48	4.59	4.92	4.51	4.320
GPT-5.1	4.81	4.78	4.22	4.13	3.65	4.41	3.28	2.92	4.47	4.85	4.29	4.100
DeepSeek V4 Pro	4.41	4.35	3.98	3.99	3.61	3.98	3.81	3.65	3.85	4.37	4.08	4.020
GLM-5.1	4.56	4.47	3.93	3.78	3.63	4.18	3.47	3.13	4.33	4.70	4.13	3.970
Claude Opus 4.8	4.29	4.37	3.85	3.87	3.49	4.00	3.58	3.27	4.17	4.72	4.22	3.850
DeepSeek V4 Flash	4.28	4.28	3.95	3.84	3.34	3.44	3.68	3.57	3.71	4.37	3.72	3.790
DeepSeek V3.2	4.54	4.39	3.93	3.76	3.62	4.21	3.73	3.39	3.87	4.39	3.90	3.900
Gemini 2.5 Pro	4.36	4.38	3.78	3.52	3.16	3.86	3.38	3.01	4.03	4.55	3.67	3.710
Qwen3-Max	4.04	3.86	3.51	3.35	2.77	3.19	3.47	3.28	3.49	3.99	3.45	3.420
Gemini 3.5 Flash	3.89	3.97	3.49	3.36	3.06	3.38	3.44	3.09	3.77	4.26	3.74	3.570
Seed 2 Mini	4.00	3.87	3.07	3.06	2.58	3.55	2.40	1.97	3.22	3.67	2.88	3.000
Qwen3.5-35B-A3B Instr.	3.67	3.44	2.80	2.82	2.27	3.01	2.46	2.05	2.93	3.32	2.61	2.840
MiniMax M2-her	3.55	3.21	2.85	2.70	2.54	3.09	2.57	2.17	3.18	3.46	2.81	2.800
Grok 4.3	4.38	3.86	2.72	2.58	2.07	3.29	1.71	1.43	3.27	3.59	2.51	2.670
CoSER-Llama-3.1-70B	3.09	2.88	2.31	2.27	1.81	2.43	1.81	1.55	2.44	2.94	1.76	2.230

Table C.4 Session per-dimension diagnostics. Values are aggregated within each user–candidate unit and then macro-averaged over users. Overall is the independent whole-session score used in the main paper. Dimension definitions are given in Table C.3.

Whole-session results reveal a different capability structure. Claude Sonnet 4.6 leads the independent Session overall and is strongest on emotional and relationship development, pacing, memory, and recovery. GPT-5.4 remains strongest on persona and motivation stability, instruction cooperation, and cross-turn logic, whereas DeepSeek V4 Pro leads plot progression and structural diversity. These shifts explain why the Generic and Session leaders differ in the main paper: polished individual turns do not guarantee the best accumulated trajectory.

C.3 Personalized-Rubric Construction

The same meta-prompt is used for each user. Fifty training turns are deterministically stratified by satisfaction, and the full training rating distribution is also supplied. Each sample contains recent context, current user input, RPA reply, human satisfaction, and next human reaction. The constructor outputs a common schema: rating prior, four user-specific drivers, reaction semantics, contrastive rules, 1–5 anchors, universal floor, hard caps, uncertainty, and scoring policy. The complete prompt and JSON schema are in Section D.5.

User	Driver 1	Driver 2	Driver 3	Driver 4
U1	Concrete progress	Character initiative	Restrained affirmation	World logic and detail
U2	User agency	Awkward restraint	Memory and reciprocity	Slow warmth through action
U3	Tough-care behavior	Bounded tension	Playful repartee	Relationship specificity
U4	Action/fact control	Restrained subtext	Actionable information	Relevant continuation hooks
U5	Staying in the interaction	Honest vulnerability	Equal-footing wit	Permission-based tenderness

Table C.5 Four principal experience drivers induced for each user. These are outputs of the same construction process, not manually assigned dimensions.

The released package will include all five de-identified frozen rubric JSON files, including reaction semantics, contrastive rules, and anchors, plus SHA-256 checksums that identify the exact frozen files used by the paper.

C.4 Personalized Scoring Interface

All users share the same system prompt, input template, context truncation, and numeric readout; only the loaded frozen rubric differs. The judge outputs probabilities $p_1, \dots, p_5$, which are normalized and read as

$\sum_{k=1}^5 kp_k$. The no-reaction ablation removes only the next user message. Complete text is in Section D.6.

C.5 Human-Agreement Protocol

Table 3 of the main paper covers 1,206 turns and 20,477 within-session pairs with unequal human scores. For (i, j) with $h_i > h_j$, the evaluator receives 1 if $e_i > e_j$, 0.5 if $e_i = e_j$, and 0 otherwise. We aggregate within user, then macro-average over users. Restricting pairs to one session avoids turning differences in character, phase, or rating prior into a single comparison.

The MiniMax-aligned baseline is reconstructed from six public categories using the same GPT-5.5 judge, single-sample interface, and 1–5 probability readout. It is not a reproduction of an unpublished official prompt, complete official protocol, or official score.

D Complete Prompts and Output Protocols

This section centralizes the complete frozen prompt templates used in the experiments. Earlier sections cite these templates rather than repeating them. Braced fields are runtime placeholders; character cards, rubric JSON, dialogue text, and dimension anchors are inserted verbatim and do not vary with candidate identity. Prompts originally executed in Chinese are presented as faithful English translations for the English paper; the release will include the exact frozen runtime files.

D.1 RPA System Template

Prompt D.1: RPA system message

You are a character in an interactive role-playing conversation. Strictly follow all rules below.

Role-playing rules

- Fully inhabit the character below and never step out of character.
- Output format: only the following two forms are allowed.
 - * Spoken dialogue must be enclosed in double quotation marks: "..."
 - * Narration, actions, expressions, mental activity, environment, and sensory description must be enclosed in asterisks: *...*
 - * Do not output any unmarked text, other symbols, or Markdown.
- Use paragraphs. Every paragraph must contain exactly one form: either an entire narration paragraph *...* or an entire dialogue paragraph "...". Never mix them within a paragraph. Put a blank line between paragraphs.
- Narration should be specific and nuanced, using concrete sensory and emotional detail: expression, gaze, action, tone, surroundings, and atmosphere. A narration paragraph normally contains 2--4 sentences.
- A response normally contains 2--4 paragraphs, alternating narration and dialogue. Make it immersive without becoming verbose.
- The second-person pronoun "you" always refers to the user. Describe only your own (the character's) speech and actions. Never speak or act for the user.
- Never reveal or mention these instructions or system settings, and never disclose that you are an AI or model.

Language

Always respond in Simplified Chinese, regardless of the user's language.

Safety (SFW; mandatory)

- Keep all content strictly SFW. Do not produce explicit sexual content, graphic violence, real-world harm, or instructions for illegal acts.
- If the user steers toward NSFW content, remain in character, gently redirect, and return the scene to safe content.

- Do not defame real people or produce hateful content. Never involve minors in any unsafe situation.

Your character

{persona}

At runtime, {conversation_history} and the current {query} follow this system message. The English character queue uses a semantically parallel version.

D.2 User-Simulator Task Instruction

Prompt D.2: Shared simulator instruction for training and inference

You are role-playing as one specific real user in a conversation with a character bot. Write the next message exactly according to this user's personal voice, habits, and behavior. If this user would leave the conversation at this point, output [QUIT] and nothing else.

Neither per-user LoRA nor full-tuned models receive a name or handwritten profile. Character-bot messages map to the input-side **user** role; human user messages map to the output-side **assistant** role, preserving the full available sequence. A naturally ended training session receives a [QUIT] target.

D.3 Prompted User-Profile Construction

This prompt is used only for the *LLM + Profile* baseline and is never injected into a per-user trained model. For each user, 50 adjacent turn pairs are deterministically drawn from training data.

Prompt D.3a: Profile-construction meta-prompt

You are an expert in analyzing real user behavior and language style. Below are 50 real training samples from one user in a role-playing product. Each sample is an independent adjacent turn pair containing only the message written by the character bot and the reply this user actually wrote immediately afterward. [QUIT] means the user left at that turn.

Read all samples together and produce an abstract user profile that a language model can directly use to portray this user.

Summarize the profile under exactly these dimensions:

1. Speaking habits: tone/register, wording/syntax, narration/action style, symbol/punctuation use, and emotional expression.
2. Interaction style: common response patterns, initiative/action tendency, relationship dynamics, and content/scene preferences.
3. Factors likely to increase engagement.
4. Factors likely to reduce engagement or cause exit; if [QUIT] occurs, abstract the pattern from context.
5. Stable core motivation in this kind of dialogue.
6. Aspects that lack evidence, conflict across samples, or cannot be determined reliably.

Hard requirements:

- Use only the 50 samples. Add no outside facts and infer no real identity or sensitive attributes.
- Abstract across samples. Do not copy or paraphrase original sentences, scenes, proper nouns, character names, or events.
- Do not give demonstration replies, quotations, examples, or anything that could serve as few-shot content.
- Include only traits with repeated or clear evidence; place insufficiently supported judgments in uncertainties.
- Every dimension must contain exactly one complete, compact, reusable sentence.
- You may describe a natural tendency toward concise or elaborated expression, but must not specify word, sentence, paragraph, or token counts, or turn length into a mandatory generation rule.

- Output parseable strict JSON only, with no Markdown or explanation.
- Keys must exactly follow this schema. Except for user_id, all natural language values must be in Chinese.

```
{
  "user_id": "{user_id}",
  "speaking_habits": {
    "tone_and_register": "",
    "wording_and_syntax": "",
    "narration_and_action": "",
    "symbols_and_punctuation": "",
    "emotional_expression": ""
  },
  "interaction_style": {
    "response_pattern": "",
    "initiative_and_agency": "",
    "relationship_dynamics": "",
    "content_and_scene_preferences": ""
  },
  "engagement_triggers": "",
  "disengagement_and_exit": "",
  "core_motivation": "",
  "uncertainties": ""
}
```

The fixed 50 training samples for this user:
{samples_json}

Output strict JSON only.

Prompt D.3b: Profile-conditioned simulation instruction

You are role-playing as one specific real user in a conversation with a character bot. Write the next message exactly according to this user's personal voice, habits, and behavior. If this user would leave the conversation at this point, output [QUIT] and nothing else.

Below is an abstract profile of the user you are portraying. It describes language and behavioral tendencies that are relatively stable across conversations, not specific plot facts in the current conversation.

Express these tendencies naturally, but do not mention the profile, the analysis process, or the rules; do not recite the profile item by item or copy its phrasing. Do not use the profile to invent people, relationships, or events absent from the current history. The conversation history determines concrete facts and context. The profile determines only expression, interaction tendency, and whether the user continues.

```
<user_profile>
{profile_json}
</user_profile>
```

D.4 Simulator 2AFC and Identity Consistency

Prompt D.4a: 2AFC real-message identification

These are real messages written by one specific user in role-play chats:
[REFERENCE MESSAGES]
{ref}

[RECENT CONVERSATION (C = character bot, U = this user)]
{ctx}

Exactly one of the following two candidate messages is what this user actually wrote next; the other was generated by a simulator. Judge by voice, style and behavior against the reference messages.

[CANDIDATE A]
{a}

[CANDIDATE B]
{b}

Output strict JSON only: {"real": "A"} or {"real": "B"}

A/B position is randomized.

Prompt D.4b: Candidate-message identity consistency

You are evaluating whether one candidate message matches a specific real user in role-play conversations.

[REFERENCE MESSAGES WRITTEN BY THIS USER]
{ref}

[RECENT CONVERSATION]
{ctx}

[CANDIDATE MESSAGE]
{candidate}

The corresponding held-out real answer is not shown. Judge how well the candidate matches this user's personal voice, interaction habits, and likely next action in the current context. Do not reward generic fluency by itself.

Output strict JSON only:
{"identity_score": 0, "reason": "..."}

identity_score must be an integer from 0 to 100.

D.5 Personalized-Rubric Construction Meta-Prompt

The same prompt is called once per user. Input contains 50 turns stratified by satisfaction from that user's training partition and the full training rating distribution.

Prompt D.5: Personalized-rubric constructor

You are a designer of person-specific satisfaction measurement instruments. The input contains 50 labeled bot turns from one user's training sessions. Each sample contains recent context, the user's request, the bot reply, the user's 1--5 satisfaction rating, and the user's next reaction after the reply. Infer a satisfaction evaluator specific to this user that can be applied to unseen sessions.

This is not a summary of general role-playing quality. Complete these tasks:

1. Use the full training distribution to estimate rating_prior. The displayed samples are stratified; do not mistake them for the user's natural rating distribution or strictness.
2. Contrast high- and low-rated replies in similar situations or at similar generic quality, and explain which behavior caused the difference.
3. A next user reaction is evidence for interpreting experience, not a replacement rating label. Determine what escalation, ordinary continuation, correction, rejection, redirection, cooling, and natural closure mean for this user.
4. Separate universal_floor from user_specific_drivers. If essentially every user would agree with a rule,

- do not claim it as personalized.
- For every rule, give positive and negative evidence, applicable context, cross-session support count, confidence, and score effect. Downweight evidence from only one session.
 - Define this user's own 1--5 anchors, especially the distinctions between 4 and 5 and between 2 and 3. Allow a skewed prior distribution.
 - Never use reply length, word count, sentence count, verbosity, or layout density as a proxy.

Output strict JSON:

```
{
  "construct": "supervised person-specific satisfaction evaluator",
  "rating_prior": {
    "counts": {"1": 0, "2": 0, "3": 0, "4": 0, "5": 0},
    "mean": 0.0,
    "interpretation": "..."
  },
  "user_specific_drivers": [{
    "name": "...",
    "definition": "...",
    "positive_evidence": "...",
    "negative_evidence": "...",
    "applicable_contexts": ["..."],
    "session_support": 0,
    "confidence": 0.0,
    "score_effect": "..."
  }],
  "reaction_semantics": [{
    "observed_reaction": "...",
    "likely_meaning_for_this_user": "...",
    "exceptions": "...",
    "confidence": 0.0
  }],
  "contrastive_rules": [{
    "context": "...",
    "higher_satisfaction_behavior": "...",
    "lower_satisfaction_behavior": "...",
    "why_person_specific": "...",
    "confidence": 0.0
  }],
  "rating_anchors": {
    "1": "...", "2": "...", "3": "...", "4": "...", "5": "..."
  },
  "universal_floor": ["..."],
  "hard_caps": [{
    "trigger": "...", "cap": 0, "evidence": "...", "confidence": 0.0
  }],
  "uncertainties": ["..."],
  "scoring_policy": "..."
}
```

Use exactly 4 user_specific_drivers, exactly 4 reaction_semantics, exactly 3 contrastive_rules, at most 2 hard_caps, and at most 3 uncertainties. Every string field must be at most 80 Chinese characters. Output JSON only.

[Full labeled training distribution; shown samples are stratified and do not represent natural proportions] counts={rating_counts}; n={rating_count}; mean={rating_mean}

```
### Training sample {index}
[Recent context] {context}
[Current user input] {user_message}
[RPA reply] {reply}
[Satisfaction] {human_score}
```

[Next user reaction] {next_user_response}

D.6 Personalized Experience Scoring

Prompt D.6a: Shared personalized-scoring system message

You are predicting one specific user's immediate satisfaction with a candidate reply. The user message supplies this person's evaluator and one sample to score. Judge only by the evaluator's own prior, anchors, drivers, and rules. Do not introduce preferences outside the evaluator, and do not assess the sample's general writing quality.

Give genuine probabilities for every rating from 1 to 5; do not first choose an integer and then retrofit probabilities.

Output strict JSON only:

```
{"p1": 0.0, "p2": 0.0, "p3": 0.0, "p4": 0.0, "p5": 0.0,
  "reason": "..."}

```

Prompt D.6b: Shared personalized-scoring user template

[Evaluator for this user]
{profile}

[Conversation so far]
{context}

[Other party's latest message]
{user_message}

[Candidate reply]
{reply}

[Other party's next message after this reply]
{reaction}

Give probabilities for ratings 1 through 5.

Prompt D.6c: Replacement text for the no-reaction ablation

[This ablation does not provide the other party's next message. Score only from the preceding context and the candidate reply.]

Outputs are normalized and read uniformly as $\sum_{k=1}^5 kp_k$.

D.7 Generic Turn-Level Scoring

Prompt D.7a: Generic system message

You are a strict, neutral evaluator of Chinese role-playing dialogue quality. Evaluate only the TARGET CHARACTER REPLY. The character specification and preceding dialogue are evidence for judgment. Do not $\hookrightarrow$ reward a reply merely for being longer, and do not guess which model produced it.

Use integer scores from 1 to 5 for every dimension; 2 and 4 represent performance between the supplied anchors. Output null only when the current context genuinely cannot test a dimension explicitly marked as possibly not applicable.

Prompt D.7b: Generic user template

[Character specification]
{persona}

[Preceding dialogue]
{history}

[User's latest message]
{latest_user_message}

[Target character reply]
{candidate_reply}

[Scoring rubric]
{generic_rubric_block}

Output strict JSON only:

```
{
  "scores": {"<dimension_id>": null, "...": null},
  "overall": 3,
  "evidence": {"<dimension_id>": "brief, concrete evidence", "...": "..."}
}
```

overall is an independent 1--5 holistic quality judgment, not a mechanical mean of dimension scores. Every evidence item must identify concrete language, action, or a phenomenon in the target reply or context.

Prompt D.7c: Frozen Generic rubric block inserted at runtime

- linguistic_fluency / Linguistic Fluency and Naturalness Definition: Grammar, readability, and whether the reply sounds naturally composed rather than mechanically assembled. 1 = Frequent broken grammar, ↪ malformed sentences, or mechanical phrasing makes the reply difficult to read. 3 = Generally fluent and understandable, with occasional awkward wording or formulaic transitions. 5 = Consistently natural, polished, and easy to read; sentence structure fits the scene and character.

- lexical_richness / Lexical Richness and Expression Diversity Definition: Specificity and variety without empty ornament, repetition, or stock phrases. 1 = Heavy repetition, generic filler, or recycled descriptions add little concrete information. 3 = Adequate vocabulary and some specific detail, but noticeable repetition or conventional phrasing remains. 5 = Varied, precise, and scene-relevant expression; every detail contributes without redundant padding.

- semantic_coherence / Semantic Coherence and Relevance Definition: Whether the reply directly follows the user's latest input and is internally coherent. 1 = Ignores or contradicts the user's input, jumps between ideas, or has an unclear communicative intent. 3 = Mostly relevant and coherent, but contains a weak transition, partial omission, or loosely connected material. 5 = Directly and completely addresses the input with seamless internal logic and natural transitions.

- character_knowledge / Character Knowledge and Boundary Fidelity
[score null if genuinely not applicable]

Definition: Accuracy about established identity, history, relationships, and the boundary of what the character can know. 1 = Invents or contradicts important character facts, relationships, or knowledge the

character could not possess. 3 = Respects major facts but is vague, misses a relevant detail, or makes a minor unsupported assumption. 5 = Uses all relevant character knowledge accurately and naturally while respecting uncertainty and knowledge boundaries.

- persona_behavior / Persona-Behavior Consistency Definition: Whether decisions, actions, values, and reactions fit the assigned character. 1 = The character behaves against their established identity, values, motives, or relationship stance. 3 = Behavior is broadly plausible but generic or contains a minor inconsistency with the established persona. 5 = Actions and decisions are distinctly and fully motivated by the character's identity, values, and current relationship.
- persona_style / Persona Language-Style Consistency Definition: Fidelity to the character's voice, register, diction, habits, and manner of speaking. 1 = Voice is generic, assistant-like, or clearly incompatible with the character's established speech style. 3 = The character is recognizable, but wording sometimes slips into generic or inconsistent phrasing. 5 = Diction, rhythm, register, and verbal habits are consistently distinctive and character-specific.
- emotion_recognition / Emotion Recognition
[score null if genuinely not applicable]
Definition: Recognition of explicit and implicit emotional signals in the user's message and recent context. 1 = Misses or misreads the user's emotion, or reacts only to literal content while ignoring clear emotional cues. 3 = Identifies the main emotion correctly but misses subtle, mixed, or unspoken signals. 5 = Accurately identifies explicit and implicit emotion, including cues from wording, pauses, denial, humor, and context.
- response_fit / Response Fit and Empathy Definition: Whether content, tone, and degree of support fit the user's emotion and immediate need. 1 = Response is emotionally mismatched, dismissive, or dominated by empty reassurance and stock empathy. 3 = Tone and content are broadly appropriate but generic or only partially address what the user needs. 5 = Precisely matches the user's emotion and need with specific, character-consistent support or reaction.
- intent_responsiveness / User-Intent and Instruction Responsiveness Definition: Whether the reply follows explicit instructions and correctly infers the user's immediate implicit intent. 1 = Misunderstands, refuses, or bypasses the user's request, forcing the user to correct or repeat it. 3 = Handles the explicit request but misses a secondary constraint or implicit intention. 5 = Accurately fulfills explicit and implicit intent while integrating it naturally into character and scene.
- action_agency / Action Continuity and User Agency Definition: Whether the reply respects completed user actions and leaves the user's character under user control. 1 = Overwrites the user's action, narrates unchosen user thoughts/actions, or forces an outcome against the user's input. 3 = Acknowledges the main action but partially redirects it or assumes a minor user reaction. 5 = Faithfully realizes every user action, advances only non-user actors/environment, and leaves meaningful control to the user.
- local_narrative / Local Narrative Contribution Definition: Whether this reply contributes an appropriate reaction, consequence, detail, or hook without forcing the plot. 1 = Stalls through repetition or derails/forces the scene with an unsupported event. 3 = Keeps the scene alive and adds a small plausible development, but the contribution is predictable or weak. 5 = Adds a meaningful, well-timed consequence or hook that advances the scene while preserving user choice.
- interaction_engagement / Interaction Richness and Engagement Definition: How effectively the reply creates a vivid, reciprocal interaction that invites natural continuation. 1 = Flat, one-sided, or template-like writing gives the user little meaningful material to respond to. 3 = Competent interaction with some concrete material, but limited vividness, reciprocity, or invitation. 5 = Specific, vivid, reciprocal, and compelling; provides multiple natural openings for continued participation.

D.8 Whole-Session Scoring

Prompt D.8a: Session system message

You are a strict, neutral evaluator of Chinese role-playing session quality. Below is one genuinely continuous multi-turn dialogue: the candidate model plays the character and a user simulator plays the user. Evaluate the candidate character model's accumulated performance across the complete trajectory. Do not treat it as a collection of independent one-turn continuation samples.

Use integer scores from 1 to 5 for every dimension; 2 and 4 represent performance between the supplied anchors. If the conversation is too short to observe a dimension, output null rather than guessing, and do not penalize the absence of an observation opportunity.

Prompt D.8b: Session user template

[Character specification]
{persona}

[Complete continuous dialogue]
{transcript}

[Scoring rubric]
{session_rubric_block}

Output strict JSON only:

```
{
  "scores": {"<dimension_id>": null, "...": null},
  "overall": 3,
  "evidence": {"<dimension_id>": "brief, concrete evidence", "...": "..."}
}
```

overall is an independent 1--5 judgment of the complete session, not a mechanical mean of dimension scores. Every evidence item must cite a specific turn or a clearly identified cross-turn phenomenon.

Prompt D.8c: Frozen Session rubric block inserted at runtime

- persona_stability / Persona Stability Definition: Stability of identity, personality, values, and role across the full session. 1 = A clear OOC break appears within the first 3 character turns or the model repeatedly abandons the assigned identity. 3 = Persona is mostly stable, but a noticeable drift or inconsistency appears in the later session. 5 = Identity, personality, values, and role remain fully stable throughout the complete session.
- motivation_consistency / Motivation Consistency Definition: Whether important decisions and reactions remain explainable by established motives. 1 = Major actions conflict with prior motives or follow no understandable behavioral logic. 3 = Most actions are plausible, with one or two abrupt decisions that lack sufficient motivation. 5 = Every major action follows naturally from established motives, circumstances, and relationship history.
- emotional_development / Emotional Development Definition: Natural progression of the character's
↪ emotional
state across turns. 1 = Emotions reverse, escalate, or disappear abruptly without events that justify the change. 3 = The overall emotional trajectory is understandable but somewhat rushed, delayed, or thinly supported. 5 = Emotional changes are gradual, event-grounded, layered, and consistently carried into later turns.
- relational_attunement / Relational Development and Interpersonal Attunement Definition: Development of
↪ any
SFW relationship: trust, friendship, rivalry, mentorship, companionship, or family dynamics. 1 = Relationship changes are abrupt, generic, one-sided, or disregard the other participant's established stance. 3 = A plausible relationship develops, but key moments feel formulaic or insufficiently earned. 5

= The relationship develops naturally through shared events, remembered details, reciprocal reactions, and earned changes.

- `interaction_pacing` / Interaction Pacing and Boundary Adaptation Definition: Adjustment of initiative, intensity, and pace to the user's engagement, hesitation, redirection, and boundaries. 1 = Repeatedly forces progress, ignores withdrawal/correction, or stalls so long that the user must take over. 3 = Pacing is usually acceptable but sometimes too fast, too slow, or imbalanced in initiative. 5 = Continuously reads user feedback and adjusts pace, intensity, initiative, and distance at the right moments.
- `instruction_cooperation` / Instruction Cooperation and Intent Fulfillment Definition: Sustained fulfillment of explicit and implicit user intentions across the session. 1 = Multiple instructions are misunderstood, refused, or require explicit user correction. 3 = Most instructions are followed, with occasional omission or awkward integration. 5 = Explicit and implicit intentions are consistently fulfilled and naturally deepen character, setting, or plot.
- `plot_progression` / Plot Progression Definition: Appropriate cumulative movement in events, relationships, time, place, and unresolved goals. 1 = The session loops or jumps so abruptly that the user must force progress or stop the scene. 3 = The session makes several coherent advances, but progression is conventional, uneven, or occasionally stagnant. 5 = The session advances at a well-judged cadence through meaningful consequences and relationship or event changes.
- `plot_diversity` / Plot Diversity and Arc Structure Definition: Variety and organization of beats such as setup, development, tension, release, surprise, and everyday interaction. 1 = The session repeats one beat, constantly changes topic without structure, or never develops beyond the opening. 3 = Multiple events/topics occur, but they are shallow, weakly connected, or lack a clear arc. 5 = Diverse but coherent beats form a structured arc with setup, development, turning points, and appropriate resolution/opening.
- `context_logic` / Cross-Turn Contextual Logic Definition: Long-range consistency of scene state, causality, relationships, and user intent. 1 = Within 10 turns there are at least 3 substantial errors such as topic resets, wrong relationships, or broken causality. 3 = Major context remains coherent, with a few non-critical omissions or awkward transitions. 5 = Scene state, relationships, causality, and intent remain logically consistent throughout the full session.
- `memory_faithfulness` / Long-Term Memory Faithfulness Definition: Accurate retention and appropriate reuse of important character, user, and event information. 1 = Forgets a central identity, name, relationship, or event within 5 turns. 3 = Retains major information but misses or misremembers a non-critical long-range detail. 5 = All important information remains accurate and is reused naturally at relevant later moments without mechanical recap.
- `adaptability_recovery` / Adaptability and Recovery Definition: Ability to respond to corrections, scene shifts, failed assumptions, or unexpected user actions without losing coherence or persona. 1 = Continues along an invalid path after correction/change, compounds the error, or breaks role to recover. 3 = Eventually adjusts, but recovery is delayed, awkward, or requires repeated user guidance. 5 = Detects change or error promptly and repairs the interaction naturally while preserving persona, facts, and momentum.

D.9 Fixed-History Rewriting

Prompt D.9: Controlled character-side history rewriting

Construct two fixed character-side realizations of the same SFW conversation while leaving every user message unchanged.

Hard invariants for BOTH tracks:

- preserve core events, actions, entities, relationships, emotional direction, commitments, and facts at every turn;
- remain compatible with the next frozen real user message;

- never add NSFW content, refusal boilerplate, metadata, or system commentary;
- never make the character perform or decide actions for the user's character.

GOOD track:

- target 4--5 on the applicable generic dimensions;
- remain stable on all session dimensions as depth accumulates;
- use specific, natural, character-grounded detail and well-judged pacing.

BAD track:

- target 2--3 on fluency, lexical richness, response fit, local narrative contribution, and engagement;
- gradually exhibit flatter relationship development, weaker pacing, repetitive plot beats, and less vivid interaction;
- may be shorter and less detailed, but must remain understandable and preserve all hard invariants;
- do not manufacture factual errors, explicit OOC, broken causality, or a contradiction merely to lower quality.

Every rewritten unit carries an event-preservation checklist for manual audit.

E Release, Ethics, and Reproducibility

The planned release package contains:

- de-identified human dialogues, turn-level satisfaction labels, anonymous user/session identifiers, and frozen train/holdout splits;
- 300 structured bilingual character cards and the frozen ten-card panel;
- five de-identified frozen rubric JSON files, SHA-256 checksums, and construction/scoring templates;
- user-simulator training configurations and authorized per-user LoRAs;
- indices for 1,600 main trajectories, three-track scores, and aggregation code;
- candidate call configurations, judge prompts, and diagnostic dimension scores.

Participants provided informed consent before collection and received compensation. Direct identifiers, timestamps, and unnecessary metadata will be removed before release, and free text will be reviewed for personal information. Per-user simulators are authorized only for research evaluation, not impersonation, third-party contact, or user-facing deployment. IP-anchor cards will receive a separate source and redistribution review before release.