

# Pathways of Thoughts: Multi-Directional Thinking for Long-form Personalized Question Answering

<sup>1</sup>Alireza Salemi, <sup>2</sup>Cheng Li, <sup>2</sup>Mingyang Zhang, <sup>3</sup>Qiaozhu Mei, <sup>2</sup>Zhuowan Li  
<sup>2</sup>Spurthi Amba Hombaiah, <sup>2</sup>Weize Kong, <sup>2</sup>Tao Chen, <sup>1</sup>Hamed Zamani, <sup>2</sup>Michael Bendersky  
 {asalemi,zamani}@cs.umass.edu  
 {chgli,mingyang,zhuowan,spurthiah,weize,taochen,bemike}@google.com  
 qmei@umich.edu

<sup>1</sup>University of Massachusetts Amherst

<sup>2</sup>Google DeepMind

<sup>3</sup>University of Michigan  
 USA

## Abstract

Personalization is essential for adapting question answering (QA) systems to user-specific information needs, thereby improving both accuracy and user satisfaction. However, personalized QA remains relatively underexplored due to challenges such as inferring preferences from long, noisy, and implicit contexts, and generating responses that are simultaneously correct, contextually appropriate, and aligned with user expectations and background knowledge. To address these challenges, we propose *Pathways of Thoughts (PoT)*, an inference-stage method that applies to any large language model (LLM) without requiring task-specific fine-tuning. The approach models the reasoning of an LLM as an iterative decision process, where the model dynamically selects among cognitive operations such as reasoning, revision, personalization, and clarification. This enables exploration of multiple reasoning trajectories, producing diverse candidate responses that capture different perspectives. *PoT* then aggregates and reweights these candidates according to inferred user preferences, yielding a final personalized response that benefits from the complementary strengths of diverse reasoning paths. Experiments on the *LaMP-QA* benchmark for personalized QA show that *PoT* consistently outperforms competitive baselines, achieving up to a 13.1% relative improvement. Human evaluation corroborates these results, with annotators preferring outputs from *PoT* in 66% of cases and reporting ties in only 15% of cases.

## ACM Reference Format:

<sup>1</sup>Alireza Salemi, <sup>2</sup>Cheng Li, <sup>2</sup>Mingyang Zhang, <sup>3</sup>Qiaozhu Mei, <sup>2</sup>Zhuowan Li, <sup>2</sup>Spurthi Amba Hombaiah, <sup>2</sup>Weize Kong, <sup>2</sup>Tao Chen, <sup>1</sup>Hamed Zamani, <sup>2</sup>Michael Bendersky. 2018. Pathways of Thoughts: Multi-Directional Thinking for Long-form Personalized Question Answering. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

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

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
 ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

Personalizing large language models (LLMs) has emerged as an important topic due to its applications in content generation, writing assistance, education, and recommendation [13, 15, 19, 20, 26]. By conditioning outputs on individual users' preferences, contexts, and needs, personalized text generation improves user engagement, satisfaction, and overall effectiveness [25]. Personalization is especially valuable in information-seeking systems, including agentic web search and question answering-based information access [28, 29]. For instance, the response to a question like "What is the best strategy to study for a difficult exam?" depends on various user-specific factors, including their background, prior knowledge, learning style, and habits. A tailored response can recommend strategies that align with the user's cognitive strengths, subject matter, and available resources, ultimately improving the effectiveness of the guidance provided. Despite its importance, personalization in question answering remains underexplored, making it a timely and significant challenge for advancing interactive and user-centric information systems, with clear applications in web search and emerging systems such as AI mode in search.<sup>1</sup>


Augmenting LLM inputs with personalized context of the user have proven effective for personalized text generation [13, 15, 24, 26]. This can be further enhanced by training the LLM to perform reasoning over the personalized context to extract the user's preferences before response generation [25]. However, in most real-world cases, fine-tuning the LLM is often infeasible for two key reasons. On one hand, many LLMs are black boxes with frozen parameters, offering no control over their internal mechanisms. This is typical of popular applications like ChatGPT<sup>2</sup> and Gemini<sup>3</sup>, which are only accessible through APIs or text interfaces. On the other hand, even with full access to model parameters, the fine-tuning process requires an inhibiting amount of computational resources for individual users. Consequently, a practical way to influence the model's output is by applying advanced strategies during inference. Recognizing this, our paper focuses on this scenario and proposes an **inference-stage strategy** to achieve better personalization.

Achieving effective personalization presents its own unique challenges. First, personalized question answering fundamentally differs

<sup>1</sup><https://search.google/ways-to-search/ai-mode/>

<sup>2</sup><https://chat.openai.com/>

<sup>3</sup><https://gemini.google.com/>



**Figure 1: Pathways of Thoughts overview: It explores multiple directions of thinking about answering the question, generates a response for each, and mix them into a response.**

from other QA tasks in its definition of correctness. A response must be correct from the user’s specific perspective, considering their preferences, context, and background. Even when two answers are factually accurate, one may be far more suitable for a user’s specific information needs. Second, user preferences are often not explicitly stated and must be inferred from personalized context, such as profiles or prior interactions. This context is frequently lengthy and noisy, making it difficult for a model to extract the relevant signals. These issues highlight that simply augmenting an LLM’s input with user context is often insufficient. Effective personalization requires the model to perform complex reasoning over noisy, implicit user data to deduce user preferences before generating a response.

To address the aforementioned challenges of personalized question answering, this paper introduces *Pathways of Thoughts (PoT)*, demonstrated in Figure 1. This approach, which can be applied to any LLM without additional training, enables the model to explore multiple thinking pathways when generating responses, each leading to a distinct response. We formalize each thinking pathway as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), where the LLM serves as both the agent and the environment. At each step, the LLM, acting as the agent, selects the most suitable action from a predefined set of cognitive operations, such as planning, reasoning, personalizing, and revising. The LLM then assumes the role of the environment, executing the chosen action and updating the state with newly acquired knowledge. This iterative process allows the model to refine its understanding of the user’s intent, extract key preferences from the user profile, and explore diverse strategies for answering the question. The process continues until the model determines that no further actions are needed, producing an initial set of responses. To generate the final personalized response, the LLM mixes outputs

from different thinking pathways into a single response, aligning them with the user’s preferences extracted from their profile. Pathways of Thoughts addresses the challenges of LLMs in personalized question answering by allowing the model to iteratively think about the next step in responding to the question and how the lengthy user context can be effectively utilized. Additionally, it explores different diverse directions and paths, considering a range of possible solutions for answering the question. Finally, aggregation ensures that the output captures the strengths of all explored pathways, resulting in a more personalized and aligned response.

We conduct our experiments on the *LaMP-QA* benchmark [28], designed for evaluating personalized question answering in three diverse domains: (1) Art & Entertainment, (2) Lifestyle & Personal Development, and (3) Society & Culture. Our results demonstrate that *PoT* achieves the best performance across all categories, with statistically significant improvements, up to 13.1% relative improvement on average compared to the baselines. Additionally, we investigate the impact of pathway length, the number of pathways, and various methods for diversifying pathways and aggregating responses on performance. We show that *PoT* generalizes to any long-context LLM without requiring additional training. Finally, human evaluation shows that *PoT* better satisfies users’ information seeking needs in 66% of cases, compared to 19% for the baseline.

## 2 Related Work

**Personalization of LLMs.** Personalization plays a central role in search, recommendation, and text generation [5, 20, 26, 36]. To enable personalization in LLMs, Salemi et al. [26] introduced a retrieval-augmented generation framework alongside the LaMP

benchmark for short-form text, which was later extended to long-form content generation with LongLaMP [13] and to personalized QA with LaMP-QA [28]. Personalized assistants have also been studied in several recent works [15, 18, 19, 40]. Proposed approaches span a variety of techniques, including training retrieval models with user feedback [24], optimizing LLMs with personalized supervision [12], and generating personalized prompts [14]. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning has emerged as another direction [32], including its integration with retrieval-augmented methods [27]. Beyond model adaptation, reasoning and self-training strategies have been shown to improve personalization in text generation [25]. More recently, natural language feedback has proven effective for adapting systems to individual users in personalized QA [29]. Nevertheless, strategies for improving personalized QA at test time—without incurring the cost of additional training—remain underexplored, which is the focus of this work.

**Reasoners & Agents for Problem Solving.** Reasoning enables models to solve problems with step-by-step processing, known as chain-of-thought (CoT), enhancing performance in complex tasks like mathematical problem-solving, logical reasoning, and commonsense understanding [16, 34, 39]. Training LLMs to perform intermediate reasoning steps before generating responses has been effective, as seen in GPT-o1 [22] and DeepSeek-R1 [4]. Additionally, agentic and multi-turn or multi-agent systems that interact with external tools, code [7, 17, 35], simulated environments [9, 23, 33, 38], or with other agents [8] have been explored for complex problem-solving. Markov Decision Processes (MDP) have shown promise in reasoning for games and mathematical problems [9, 33]. However, these methods have not been applied to free-form text generation, particularly personalization which requires user-specific responses rather than objectively correct answers. This study adapts these approaches for personalized text generation, combining them with graph search instead of traditional tree search in MDPs.

**Scaling Inference Compute.** Recent advances in LLM reasoning for logic and mathematics show that increasing compute resources during inference can significantly enhance performance [3, 30]. This allows LLMs to explore answer spaces more thoroughly, improving accuracy in logical reasoning, math problem-solving, and code generation [1, 2, 41]. While previous research has focused on math, coding, and logic, its potential for free-form text generation, especially personalized question answering, is underexplored. Our work addresses this by using increased inference compute to better navigate response spaces, enhancing personalization.

### 3 Problem Formulation

We assume a question  $x_u$  originates from a user  $u$ , who has a set of  $n_u$  personalized information elements, denoted as  $P_u = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^{n_u}$ . Following previous work that utilizes long-term user history as the user profile [26, 28],  $P_u$  consists of the user’s previously asked questions along with their question narrative. The objective is to use this personalized information, along with the question  $x_u$ , to generate a personalized response for the user using an LLM  $\pi$ , formulated as  $\hat{y}_u = \pi(x_u, P_u)$ . To evaluate the personalized response generated for user  $u$ ’s question, we assume access to a set of  $n_{x_u}$  aspects  $E_{x_u} = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{x_u}}$  that user  $u$  expects to be addressed in the

response, extracted from a question narrative  $r_{x_u}$  written by the user  $u$ . Note that these aspects are used solely for evaluation and are not accessible to the model during response generation. Finally, a metric  $\mu(x_u, \hat{y}_u, E_{x_u}, r_u)$  is used to score the generated response based on the extent to which these aspects are covered.

## 4 Pathways of Thoughts

To address the limitations of LLMs in personalized question answering, as discussed in Section 1, we introduce *Pathways of Thoughts (PoT)*, as illustrated in Figure 1. In this approach, the LLM explores multiple thinking pathways to solve the problem, each leading to a separate response. We model the thinking process in each pathway as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), where the LLM functions as both the agent and the environment. At each step, the LLM, acting as the agent, selects an action from a set of fundamental cognitive actions, such as planning, reasoning, and revising. Then, the same LLM acts as the environment to execute the chosen action, updating the state with the newly acquired knowledge. This iterative process continues until no further actions are needed, leading to the generation of a final response. To produce a single personalized response based on all pathways, the LLM aggregates the generated responses from different thinking pathways, leveraging the strengths of each while aligning with the user’s preferences extracted from their profile. The details of this approach are provided in Algorithm 1. The following section elaborates on this method.

### 4.1 Thinking as a Markov Decision Process

The thinking process in the human mind involves leveraging and integrating a set of fundamental cognitive skills—such as reasoning, planning, and revision—that collectively form the foundation of structured thought [6, 31]. Drawing inspiration from sequential decision making in the human mind, we model the thinking process of LLMs as an MDP. Given the current thoughts and steps taken to generate a response, the model selects the next fundamental action from a predefined set to enhance its understanding of the question, refine its reasoning, or improve the response.

An MDP is defined as a quadruple  $(S, A_{s_t}, P_{a_t}, R_{a_t})$ , where  $S$  is the set of states,  $A_{s_t}$  represents the set of available actions in state  $s_t$ ,  $P_{a_t}(s_{t+1} | s_t)$  defines the probability of transitioning from state  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+1}$  given action  $a_t$ , and  $R_{a_t}(s_{t+1}, s_t)$  specifies the reward function, which assigns a reward for taking action  $a_t$  in state  $s_t$  and transitioning to  $s_{t+1}$ . In this setting, the agent  $\pi$  aims to assign a probability  $p_\pi(a_t | s_t)$  to each action based on the current state  $s_t$ .

To generate a personalized response to the question  $x_u$  from user  $u$ , we assume the agent  $\pi$  starts from an initial state  $s_0$ , which consists of the question  $q_u$  and the user profile  $P_u$ . The agent iteratively selects the most probable action at each step using the prompt shown in Figure 7 in Appendix A, continuing this process until it either chooses a halting action (as determined by the LLM) or reaches the maximum number of allowed actions, denoted as  $T$ . Since our task involves text generation and lacks an external environment enforcing termination, the agent itself determines when to stop or continues until the predefined action limit is reached. Algorithm 1 (lines 3-17) demonstrates the algorithm. The following outlines the definitions of each MDP component in our framework:

**Algorithm 1** Pathways of Thoughts Implementation using MDP and Global Search.

---

**Input:** prompt  $x_u$ , profile  $P_u$ , max path length  $T$ , number of pathways  $N$ , backbone LLM  $\pi$

**Output:** personalized output  $\hat{y}_{x_u}$

```

1:  $R_{PoT} = \{\}$            ▶ Set of all responses from different pathways
2: for  $i = 0$  to  $N$  do           ▶ Generate  $N$  pathways of thoughts
3:    $t = 0$ 
4:    $s_t = \text{init\_prompt}(x_u, P_u)$            ▶ Prompt in Figure 11
5:   while  $t < T$  do           ▶ Thinking for maximum  $T$  steps
6:      $A_{s_t} = \text{possible\_actions}(s_t, t)$            ▶ Find the possible
       actions for state  $s_t$ .
7:      $\bar{a}_p = \text{action\_selection\_prompt}(s_t, A_{s_t})$            ▶ Prompt in
       Figure 7
8:      $a_t = \pi(s_t; \bar{a}_p)$            ▶ Selecting the action (LLM as agent)
9:      $\hat{y}_t = \pi(s_t; \bar{a}_p; a_t)$            ▶ Performing the action (LLM as
       environment)
10:     $s_{t+1} = s_t; \bar{a}_p; a_t; \hat{y}_t$            ▶ new state by concatenating
       input/outputs in this time step
11:    if  $a_t = \text{finalize}$  then
12:       $R_{PoT} = R_{PoT} \cup \{\hat{y}_t\}$            ▶ Capturing the final response
       of this pathway
13:    break
14:    end if
15:     $t = t + 1$            ▶ updating the step variable
16:  end while
17: end for
18:  $\bar{I}_p = \text{important\_aspects\_prompt}(P_u)$            ▶ Prompt in Figure 8
19:  $I_u = \pi(\bar{I}_p)$            ▶ Extracting important aspects from user profile
20:  $\bar{y}_p = \text{mixture\_prompt}(I_u, x_u, R_{PoT})$            ▶ Prompt in Figure 10
21:  $\hat{y}_{x_u} = \pi(\bar{y}_p)$            ▶ Combining responses based on important
       aspects
22: return  $\hat{y}_{x_u}$            ▶ Returning final response

```

---

**Set of States ( $S$ ):** The state of the system is defined as the concatenation of the inputs, outputs, and decisions of the model into a sequence of tokens using a predefined prompt format. This representation captures the full context of the system like a conversation. The initial state of the system consists of the user’s question  $x_u$ , the personalized context  $P_u$  about user  $u$ , and a set of instructions specifying the actions and the model’s expected behavior for each action, as shown in Figure 11 in Appendix A. Given this setup, the set of all possible states corresponds to the set of all textual sequences that this initial prompt is their prefix. As a result, the state space forms an uncountable discrete set.

**Set of Possible Actions for State  $s_t$  ( $A_{s_t}$ ):** We consider the following fundamental actions that the agent can choose from in thinking process: *answering*, *planning*, *checking for personalization*, *personalizing*, *reasoning*, *clarifying*, *summarizing*, *revising*, and *finalizing*.<sup>4</sup> The detailed definition and output format of each action is provided in Appendix A.1. In the initial state, the agent is restricted to selecting the *planning* action, as it must first plan the steps required to address the user’s question. In subsequent states, the agent can choose from all the actions; however, the model can only select the

*revising* action if it has previously selected the *answering* action, as revision typically follows the generation of a response.

**Transitioning from State  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+1}$  with Action  $a_t$  ( $P_{a_t}(s_{t+1} | s_t)$ ):** We use the LLM as both the agent and the environment simultaneously: when it selects an action, it acts as the agent, and when it executes the action, it acts as the environment. This dual role allows the LLM to control the flow of thinking and performing it simultaneously. Accordingly, with the agent decision to perform action  $a_t$  at time step  $t$ , the LLM receives the state  $s_t$  and action  $a_t$  as input and generates the output  $\hat{y}_t$ . The concatenation of  $s_t$ ,  $a_t$ , and  $\hat{y}_t$  forms the next state  $s_{t+1}$ . Thus, the transition probability  $P_{a_t}(s_{t+1} | s_t)$  is defined by the LLM itself.

**Reward Function ( $R_a(s_{t+1}, s_t)$ ):** Since our agent is used without training due to optimization costs, an explicit reward function is not required; we assume the agent makes reasonable choices. However, in general, an outcome reward function can be employed to assign rewards to actions based on the evaluation of the LLM’s final response to the question.

## 4.2 Multi-Directional Thinking by Diverse Planning and Mixture-of-Responses

We observed that when the agent selects *planning* as the first action, the subsequent steps consistently follow the outline of the generated plan. This suggests that encouraging multi-directional thinking about responding to the question can be achieved by generating a variety of plans, each exploring a different strategy for addressing the question. We study two methods for diverse planning:

- **Initial State Alteration:** If the initial state is modified before executing the planning action, the LLM can produce different plans, as the changes in personalized context influences the planning process. This can be modeled by varying the amount of past user history accessible to the agent, effectively addressing the challenge of long personal context. To implement this, we randomly select  $N$  subsets of the user profile  $P_u$ , each of size  $\tau \times |P_u|$ , where  $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$ . Starting from these  $N$  diverse initial states lead to different planning trajectories and thinking pathways.
- **Planning Action Variation:** Another way to generate different plans from the same initial state is to use a higher sampling temperature  $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$  during plan generation, which increases the randomness in the generated plans, leading to more diverse outputs. Thus, we generate  $N$  different plans from the same initial state (created using the whole profile  $P_u$ ) by setting a high temperature  $\tau$ , leading to different thinking pathways.

Each thinking pathway results in a response, and together they form a set of response proposals  $R_{PoT} = \{r_i\}_{i=1}^N$ . To produce the final response  $\hat{y}_{x_u}$  for the user, we need to ensure that it is the most suitable one for the user. To achieve this, we first use the LLM  $\pi$  to extract the important aspects  $I_u$  for user  $u$  from their user profile  $P_u$  using the prompt shown in Figure 8 in Appendix A.2. This serves as an intermediate step to learn about the user’s individual preferences. Based on this, there are two methods to generate the final response:

- **Best-of-N:** Given the extracted important aspects  $I_u$  for the user  $u$  and the input  $x_u$ , the LLM  $\pi$  selects the best response from the set of responses resulted from multi-directional thinking  $R_{PoT}$ , using the prompt shown in Figure 9 in Appendix A.2.

<sup>4</sup>This action, *finalizing*, also referred to as halting, terminates the process.

**Table 1: Performance on LaMP-QA. † and ‡ show statistically significant improvement over the single and multiple inference best baseline, respectively, using t-test ( $p < 0.05$ ). In this experiment, Gemini 1.5 Pro has been used as the backbone LLM for all the methods.**

| Method   | Arts & Entertainment       | Lifestyle & Personal Development | Society & Culture          | Average (macro)            |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Single Inference   |                            |                                  |                            |                            |
| (1) No Personalization                                       | 0.1741                     | 0.2863                           | 0.2996                     | 0.2533                     |
| (2) In-Context Personalization                               | 0.1722                     | 0.3022                           | 0.3482                     | 0.2742                     |
| (3) In-Context Personalization w/ CoT                        | 0.2119                     | 0.3862                           | 0.4230                     | 0.3403                     |
| (4) <b>Pathways of Thoughts (<math>N = 1, T = 8</math>)</b>  | <b>0.2499<sup>†</sup></b>  | <b>0.3966</b>                    | <b>0.4490<sup>†</sup></b>  | <b>0.3651<sup>†</sup></b>  |
| Multiple Inference   |                            |                                  |                            |                            |
| (5) In-Context Personalization w/ Best-of-32                 | 0.2248                     | 0.3753                           | 0.4303                     | 0.3434                     |
| (6) In-Context Personalization w/ CoT & Best-of-32           | 0.2607                     | 0.4380                           | 0.4789                     | 0.3925                     |
| (7) Tree of Thoughts ( $K = 32, B = 2$ )                     | 0.2054                     | 0.4178                           | 0.4546                     | 0.3592                     |
| (8) <b>Pathways of Thoughts (<math>N = 16, T = 8</math>)</b> | <b>0.2999<sup>†‡</sup></b> | <b>0.4960<sup>†‡</sup></b>       | <b>0.5362<sup>†‡</sup></b> | <b>0.4440<sup>†‡</sup></b> |

- **Mixture-of-N:** Given the extracted important aspects  $I_u$  for the user  $u$  and the input  $x_u$ , the LLM  $\pi$  combines different aspects of the generated responses from the set of multi-directional thinking outputs  $R_{PoT}$ . The final response is denoted as  $\hat{y}_{x_u} = \pi(x_u, R_{PoT}, I_u)$ , using the prompt shown in Figure 10 in Appendix A.2. This mimics how humans solve problems by exploring multiple solutions and synthesizing a new solution that incorporates the strengths of each solution. This is particularly beneficial for open-ended text generation, where there is no definitive right or wrong response. By aggregating the strengths of all responses, it generates a response that aligns with user preferences, ensuring a more personalized output. In PoT, we use this approach as the primary response aggregation method.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets.** We conduct experiments on the LaMP-QA benchmark [28], the only publicly available dataset for personalized QA. LaMP-QA covers three diverse domains: (1) Art & Entertainment (767 questions), (2) Lifestyle & Personal Development (989 questions), and (3) Society & Culture (1074 questions).<sup>5</sup> Each LaMP-QA example contains a user query, the user’s question history (serving as a profile), a narrative that reflects the user’s perspective and intent, and a set of personalized rubrics specifying the aspects an ideal response should address. For evaluation, we adopt the procedure of Salemi and Zamani [28], but replace their suggested evaluator (Qwen-2.5, 32B) with Gemini 1.5 Pro, a more capable model. For each question, the evaluator checks whether the generated response addresses each personalized aspect, assigning scores in the range

<sup>5</sup>Other datasets for personalized text generation, such as LaMP [26] and LongLaMP [13], are not suitable for our setting for two main reasons. First, they primarily target open-ended content generation, which differs from the QA focus of this work (Section 1). Second, unlike LaMP-QA, which provides explicit ground-truth annotations of user expectations, they include only a single reference response. This restricts their ability to capture the diversity of valid personalized outputs and can lead to misalignment with user expectations, as noted by Salemi and Zamani [28]. These limitations are particularly problematic for our feedback-based approach, where convergence to a single reference response is both infeasible and suboptimal for reliable evaluation.

[0, 2]. These are normalized to [0, 1], and the final response score is computed as the mean normalized score across all aspects. For details, we refer the reader to Salemi and Zamani [28]. In one experiment, we corroborate our findings through a side-by-side human evaluation comparing PoT to the strongest baseline.

**PoT’s Configurations.** We use Gemini 1.5 Pro as the backbone LLM. To show the generalizability of PoT, we use GPT-4o-mini<sup>6</sup> [21] using our most representative experiment configurations. For single pathways, we use Nucleus sampling [10] with a temperature of  $\tau = 0.1$ . For multi-directional pathways, we use the same setting, except for the *Planning Action Variation*, where a temperature of  $\tau = 0.9$  is used exclusively for the *planning* action. For generating diverse plans, we use *Planning Action Variation* by default and *Mixture-of-N* for response aggregation, unless otherwise specified. We set the context length to 32k, the maximum number of actions per pathway to  $T = 8$ , and the number of pathways to  $N = 16$ . In ablations, we reduce the number of pathways to  $N = 4$  to save costs, unless otherwise specified. For personalized context, we use the 10 recent questions of the user with the same order as they appear in the LaMP-QA [28] dataset.

**Baselines.** We use 6 baselines: (1) LLM without personalized context to directly answers the question, (2) LLM with access to personalized context, and (3) LLM with access to personalized context that first performs reasoning over the context to extract important aspects relevant to the question before generating the response. The two latter use the prompts shown in Figures 12 and 13 in Appendix B. These baselines all use Nucleus sampling with a temperature of  $\tau = 0.1$ . We extend the latter two baselines by doing multiple inferences and Best-of-N [2, 11] to evaluate their performance when test-time compute scales, to form baselines (4) and (5). Additionally, we include the (6) Tree of Thoughts (ToT) [37] as a baseline, leveraging its test-time compute scaling. We follow their setup, particularly in the creative writing task, as it is the closest task they studied to personalized question answering. This setup consists of

<sup>6</sup>Available at: <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o-mini>




Figure 2: Effect of the maximum number of actions per pathway on the performance.




Figure 3: Effect of the number of pathways on the performance.

an intermediate planning step, where a set of plans is generated and the best plan is selected, followed by a final response generation step, where a set of responses is generated and the best response is chosen. For planning, we use the prompts shown in Figure 14, and for response generation, we refer to Figure 15, both in Appendix B. We observed that the baselines generate, on average, half the number of tokens compared to *PoT*. To ensure a fair comparison, we set the best of  $N$  baselines to generate double the number of responses, with  $N = 32$  and a sampling temperature of  $\tau = 0.9$  to ensure diverse responses. For the Best-of- $N$  approach, we utilize the method introduced in Section 4.2. For ToT, following Yao et al. [37] and their setup for the creative writing task that is the most similar to our task, we set the tree depth to  $B = 2$ . For fair comparison with *PoT*, we generate  $N = 32$  plans and responses at each node with a sampling temperature of  $\tau = 0.9$ . The prompts for selecting the best plan is shown in Figure 16 in Appendix B. For selecting the best response, we utilize the method introduced in Section 4.2.

## 5.2 Empirical Findings

**Comparison with baselines.** The results of this experiment are reported in Table 1. The findings show that *PoT* statistically significantly outperforms all the baselines across all categories, achieving a **13.1%** relative improvement on average over the best baseline (row 6). This clearly demonstrates the superiority of *PoT* compared to the baselines. To compare our thinking-as-an-MDP method with baselines, we also report the results using only a single inference (rows 1-4). The results from this experiment show that our method (row 4) outperforms all single inference baselines (rows 1-3), with statistically significant improvements in two out of three categories and overall performance. Specifically, our method achieves a **7.2%**

relative improvement in average performance, suggesting that our thinking approach is significantly more effective than CoT.

**Effect of the maximum number of actions in *PoT*.** For this, we focus on a single inference ( $N = 1$ ) using *PoT* and vary the maximum number of actions it can perform. The performance across all categories is shown in Figure 2. The findings show that increasing the number of actions improves performance up to a certain point (8 actions per pathway), after which performance declines. This occurs because, with too few actions, the LLM cannot construct effective pathways to solve the problem. Conversely, when given too many actions, the LLM may overthink the problem, performing unnecessary actions that degrade performance.

**Effect of the number of pathways in *PoT*.** We set the maximum number of actions per pathway to  $T = 8$  and vary the number of pathways. The performance across all categories is shown in Figure 3. The findings indicate that increasing the number of pathways consistently improves performance; however, as the number grows, the improvements become smaller. This occurs because there is a limited set of different ways for answering the question, and after a certain point, the solutions start to repeat, leading to diminishing returns in performance with additional pathways.

**Effect of different plan diversification and response aggregation in *PoT*.** We evaluate all possible combinations of the methods introduced in Section 4.2. Specifically, we consider four configurations: 1) *Planning Action Variation w/ Best-of-N*, 2) *Planning Action Variation w/ Mixture-of-N*, 3) *Initial State Alteration w/ Best-of-N*, and 4) *Initial State Alteration w/ Mixture-of-N*. Additionally, we explore different values of the hyperparameter  $\tau$  for both *Planning Action Variation* and *Initial State Alteration*. The results of this experiment are shown in Figure 4. Our analysis reveals several key




Figure 4: Effect of planning diversification and response aggregation methods on the performance.




Figure 5: Performance of Pathways of Thoughts and baselines with GPT-4o-mini as the backbone LLM.

observations. Most notably, *Mixture-of-N* consistently outperforms *Best-of-N* regardless of the plan diversification method. This can be attributed to the fact that *Best-of-N* selects only one response from the generated candidates, whereas *Mixture-of-N* enables the combination of strengths from multiple responses, resulting in a more comprehensive and higher-quality output. We observe that increasing the hyperparameter  $\tau$  improves performance. In *Planning Action Variation*, a higher  $\tau$  leads to a more diverse set of generated plans due to higher sampling temperature, resulting in more varied thinking pathways that may produce more tailored responses. In *Initial State Alteration*, increasing  $\tau$  provides each pathway with more user-specific information, enabling more personalized responses. Comparing the two, *Planning Action Variation* generally outperforms *Initial State Alteration* in terms of average performance. However, as  $\tau$  increases, the performance gap narrows. Overall, *Planning Action Variation w/ Mixture-of-N* achieves the best performance for personalized question answering.

**PoT’s generalizability and independence of LLM.** In the same setting as Gemini 1.5 pro, we apply PoT and the best performing baselines to another backbone LLM, GPT-4o-mini, to demonstrate its effectiveness across different LLMs with long context windows. The average performance across all categories is presented in Figure 5. The results indicate that, similar to Gemini 1.5 Pro, GPT-4o-mini with PoT outperforms all baselines on all categories. It achieves a statistically significant 9.4% relative improvement on average across all datasets compared to the best baseline. These findings suggest that PoT enhances the performance of LLMs in personalized QA regardless of the underlying backbone LLM.

**Human evaluation.** We randomly sample 100 examples from LAMP-QA and generate outputs using PoT and In-Context Personalization w/ CoT & Best-of-32. Human annotators evaluate the outputs based on their alignment with the user’s question narrative. Each example is annotated twice, yielding an inter-annotator agreement Cohen’s kappa of 0.613. The results indicate that annotators preferred PoT in 66% of the cases, the baseline in 19%, and reported tie in 15% of cases. These results show that PoT achieves considerably higher alignment with human preferences.

### 5.3 Case Study

We observe that PoT ( $N = 16, T = 8$ ) generates 1943 unique pathways, defined by distinct action sequences chosen by the LLM. Specifically, *Art & Entertainment* yields 1109, *Lifestyle & Personal Development* produces 814, and *Society & Culture* results in 1182 unique pathways. On average, each example generates 11.1 unique pathways with on average 7.19 actions. As a case study demonstrating the effectiveness of PoT, we present an example in Figure 6:

- **Thinking Pathways & Generated Responses:** To conserve space, we present in Figure 6 only the sequence of steps taken in each pathway, rather than the full generated text, and the response in each pathway. Each pathway corresponds to a distinct reasoning trajectory generated by PoT. For example, in the illustrated case, PoT selects different pathways depending on whether personalization is required. Some pathways generate a direct response without personalization (e.g., Pathway 7), while others involve multiple rounds of reasoning that integrate various aspects of the query with the user profile before producing an answer (Pathways 1–6, 9–11, 13–15). Certain pathways also




Figure 6: A case study of Pathways of Thoughts with  $N = 16$  and  $T = 8$  for question: 'What's the best way for me to bring up a topic of political concern if the business I work for is minority-led?'

involve revision (Pathways 12, 15, and 16) or clarification (Pathway 4). Notably, we observed that for some trajectories PoT omit personalization entirely (Pths 7, 8, and 11). This shows that PoT deliberately explores a diverse range of reasoning strategies, producing responses from multiple perspectives that are subsequently combined into a final answer encompassing the advantages of each. Although responses across pathways share common elements, each retains distinctive characteristics, reflecting the variation in underlying reasoning strategies.

• **Final Response:** Figure 6 shows the final response to the user's question, produced by aggregating and integrating components from multiple pathway outputs into a single coherent answer. The contributions of different pathways are indicated in brackets (()). This shows how PoT leverages the complementary strengths of diverse reasonings, combining them into a unified response that aligns with the user's preferences and key information needs.

## 6 Conclusions

This paper addresses the critical yet under-explored problem of personalized question answering. We propose *Pathways of Thoughts (PoT)*, a novel approach that models the LLM's thinking process as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) during test time. By enabling the exploration of multiple thinking pathways and aggregating diverse responses, *PoT* effectively captures user preferences to generate highly personalized answers. Our experimental results on *LaMP-QA* demonstrate that *PoT* achieves substantial improvements over baseline methods, with performance gains of up to 13.1%. Furthermore, human evaluation confirms the effectiveness of our approach, showing a strong user preference over existing baselines. This paper focuses solely on personalized question answering; however *Pathways of Thoughts* is a general framework and future work can explore the potential of *Pathways of Thoughts* for long-form text generation tasks beyond personalization.

## References

- [1] Zhenni Bi, Kai Han, Chuanjian Liu, Yehui Tang, and Yunhe Wang. 2024. Forest-of-Thought: Scaling Test-Time Compute for Enhancing LLM Reasoning. arXiv:2412.09078 [cs.CL]
- [2] Bradley Brown, Jordan Juravsky, Ryan Ehrlich, Ronald Clark, Quoc V. Le, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. 2024. Large Language Monkeys: Scaling Inference Compute with Repeated Sampling. arXiv:2407.21787 [cs.LG]
- [3] Yanxi Chen, Xuchen Pan, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. A Simple and Provable Scaling Law for the Test-Time Compute of Large Language Models. arXiv:2411.19477 [cs.CL]
- [4] DeepSeek-AI. 2025. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:2501.12948 [cs.CL]
- [5] Andrew Fowler, Kurt Partridge, Ciprian Chelba, Xiaojun Bi, Tom Ouyang, and Shumin Zhai. 2015. Effects of Language Modeling and Its Personalization on Touchscreen Typing Performance. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (*CHI '15*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 649–658. doi:10.1145/2702123.2702503
- [6] Peter Frensch and Joachim Funke. 2002. Thinking and problem solving. *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)*, *Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford, UK* (01 2002).
- [7] Yao Fu, Dong-Ki Kim, Jaekyeom Kim, Sungryull Sohn, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Kyunghoon Bae, and Honglak Lee. 2024. AutoGuide: Automated Generation and Selection of Context-Aware Guidelines for Large Language Model Agents. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=mRIQz8Zd6O
- [8] Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V. Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. 2024. Large Language Model Based Multi-agents: A Survey of Progress and Challenges. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-24*, Kate Larson (Ed.). International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8048–8057. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2024/890 Survey Track.
- [9] Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Jiahua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. Reasoning with Language Model is Planning with World Model. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTWWvYtF1R
- [10] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. The Curious Case of Neural Text Degeneration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=rygQYrFvH
- [11] Yuki Ichihara, Yuu Jinnai, Tetsuro Morimura, Kenshi Abe, Kaito Ariu, Mitsuki Sakamoto, and Eiji Uchibe. 2025. Evaluation of Best-of-N Sampling Strategies for Language Model Alignment. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2025). https://openreview.net/forum?id=H4S4ETc8c9
- [12] Joel Jang, Seungone Kim, Bill Yuchen Lin, Yizhong Wang, Jack Hessel, Luke Zettlemoyer, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Yejin Choi, and Prithviraj Ammanabrolu. 2023. Personalized Soups: Personalized Large Language Model Alignment via Post-hoc Parameter Merging. arXiv:2310.11564
- [13] Ishita Kumar, Snigdha Viswanathan, Sushrita Yerra, Alireza Salemi, Ryan A. Rossi, Franck Dernoncourt, Hanieh Deilamsalehy, Xiang Chen, Ruiyi Zhang, Shubham Agarwal, Nedim Lipka, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. LongLaMP: A Benchmark for Personalized Long-form Text Generation. arXiv:2407.11016 [cs.CL]
- [14] Cheng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, Weize Kong, and Michael Bendersky. 2024. Learning to Rewrite Prompts for Personalized Text Generation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024 (WWW '24)*. ACM, doi:10.1145/3589334.3645408
- [15] Cheng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, Yaqing Wang, Spurthi Amba Hombaiah, Yi Liang, and Michael Bendersky. 2023. Teach LLMs to Personalize – An Approach inspired by Writing Education. arXiv:2308.07968
- [16] Hanmeng Liu, Zhiyang Teng, Leyang Cui, Chaoli Zhang, Qiji Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023. LogiCoT: Logical Chain-of-Thought Instruction Tuning. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=qlCtkvgQJH
- [17] Yanming Liu, Xinyue Peng, Jiannan Cao, Shi Bo, Yuwei Zhang, Xuhong Zhang, Sheng Cheng, Xun Wang, Jianwei Yin, and Tianyu Du. 2025. Tool-Planner: Task Planning with Clusters across Multiple Tools. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=dRz3cizfU
- [18] Zhuoran Lu, Sheshera Mysore, Tara Safavi, Jennifer Neville, Longqi Yang, and Mengting Wan. 2024. Corporate Communication Companion (CCC): An LLM-empowered Writing Assistant for Workplace Social Media. arXiv:2405.04656
- [19] Sheshera Mysore, Zhuoran Lu, Mengting Wan, Longqi Yang, Steve Menezes, Tina Baghaee, Emmanuel Barajas Gonzalez, Jennifer Neville, and Tara Safavi. 2023. PEARL: Personalizing Large Language Model Writing Assistants with Generation-Calibrated Retrievers. arXiv:2311.09180
- [20] Maxim Naumov, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Hao-Jun Michael Shi, Jianyu Huang, Narayanan Sundaraman, Jongsoo Park, Xiaodong Wang, Udit Gupta, Carole-Jean Wu, Alisson G. Azzolini, Dmytro Dzhulgakov, Andrey Mallevich, Iliia Cherniavskii, Yinghai Lu, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Ansha Yu, Volodymyr Kondratenko, Stephanie Pereira, Xianjie Chen, Wenlin Chen, Vijay Rao, Bill Jia, Liang Xiong, and Misha Smelyanskiy. 2019. Deep Learning Recommendation Model for Personalization and Recommendation Systems. arXiv:1906.00091 [cs.IR]
- [21] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o System Card. arXiv:2410.21276 [cs.CL]
- [22] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI o1 System Card.
- [23] Sungjin Park, Xiao Liu, Yeyun Gong, and Edward Choi. 2024. Ensembling Large Language Models with Process Reward-Guided Tree Search for Better Complex Reasoning. arXiv:2412.15797 [cs.CL]
- [24] Alireza Salemi, Surya Kallumadi, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Optimization Methods for Personalizing Large Language Models through Retrieval Augmentation. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Washington DC, USA) (*SIGIR '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 752–762. doi:10.1145/3626772.3657783
- [25] Alireza Salemi, Cheng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, Weize Kong, Tao Chen, Zhuowan Li, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2025. Reasoning-Enhanced Self-Training for Long-Form Personalized Text Generation. arXiv:2501.04167 [cs.CL] https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.04167
- [26] Alireza Salemi, Sheshera Mysore, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. LaMP: When Large Language Models Meet Personalization. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 7370–7392. https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.399
- [27] Alireza Salemi and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Comparing Retrieval-Augmentation and Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning for Privacy-Preserving Personalization of Large Language Models. arXiv:2409.09510 [cs.CL]
- [28] Alireza Salemi and Hamed Zamani. 2025. LaMP-QA: A Benchmark for Personalized Long-form Question Answering. arXiv:2506.00137 [cs.CL]
- [29] Alireza Salemi and Hamed Zamani. 2025. Learning from Natural Language Feedback for Personalized Question Answering. arXiv:2508.10695 [cs.CL] https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10695
- [30] Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. 2024. Scaling LLM Test-Time Compute Optimally can be More Effective than Scaling Model Parameters. arXiv:2408.03314 [cs.LG]
- [31] Robert J. Sternberg and Talia Ben-Zeev. 2001. Complex Cognition: The Psychology of Human Thought.
- [32] Zhaoxuan Tan, Zheyuan Liu, and Meng Jiang. 2024. Personalized Pieces: Efficient Personalized Large Language Models through Collaborative Efforts. arXiv:2406.10471
- [33] Chaojie Wang, Yanchen Deng, Zhiyi Lyu, Liang Zeng, Jujie He, Shuicheng Yan, and Bo An. 2024. Q\*: Improving Multi-step Reasoning for LLMs with Deliberative Planning. arXiv:2406.14283 [cs.AI]
- [34] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) (*NIPS '22*). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 1800, 14 pages.
- [35] Chengxing Xie and Difan Zou. 2024. A Human-Like Reasoning Framework for Multi-Phases Planning Task with Large Language Models. In *ICML 2024 Workshop on LLMs and Cognition*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=BX6wC2452j
- [36] Gui-Rong Xue, Jie Han, Yong Yu, and Qiang Yang. 2009. User Language Model for Collaborative Personalized Search. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 27, 2, Article 11 (mar 2009), 28 pages. doi:10.1145/1462198.1462203

```

Action Selection Prompt

# Your Task
Your task is to select one of the actions between the given actions. The actions should be chosen considering that the main goal is generating a personalized response to the question. The action you choose should be the next best step toward the final goal, which is generating a personalized response to the question. The valid actions that you can choose from are:

(list of actions)
{action 1}
{action 2}
...
{action n}

You cannot choose any action that is not in the aforementioned valid actions list.

# Your output
Your output for selecting an action should be a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json``` block, with the following fields:
- action: a string representing your selected action.
- reason: a string representing the reason for why the action is selected and how it is helpful to reach the final goal, which is generating a personalized response to the question.
- actionOutput: a json representing the output of the action based on the defined output format for the selected action.
    
```

Figure 7: Action selection prompt used in PoT.

```

Important Aspects Extraction from Profile

You are a personalized search assistant with great rating capabilities. Your task is to look at the previous questions and post details of a user, and infer what are the aspects that is important for the user and the user expect to see them in a response to their query.

# your input:
Your input is the previous questions and details of them that asked by the user.
# your output:
You should generate a valid JSON list of objects, enclosed in ```json``` block, each object with the following fields:
- aspect: The aspect that is important for the user.
- description: The description of the aspect.

previous questions and details:
{question & details 1}
...
{question & details |P|}

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 8: Prompt for extracting important aspects from the user profile used in PoT.

[37] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik R Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate Problem Solving with Large Language Models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5Xc1ecxO1h>

[38] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2022. ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629* (2022).

[39] Han Yin, Jianxing Yu, Miaopei Lin, and Shiqi Wang. 2024. Answering Spatial Commonsense Questions Based on Chain-of-Thought Reasoning with Adaptive Complexity. In *Web and Big Data*, Wenjie Zhang, Anthony Tung, Zhonglong Zheng, Zhengyi Yang, Xiaoyang Wang, and Hongjie Guo (Eds.). Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 186–200.

[40] Kai Zhang, Yangyang Kang, Fubang Zhao, and Xiaozhong Liu. 2024. LLM-based Medical Assistant Personalization with Short- and Long-Term Memory Coordination. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 2386–2398. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-long.132>

[41] Kexun Zhang, Shang Zhou, Danqing Wang, William Yang Wang, and Lei Li. 2024. Scaling LLM Inference with Optimized Sample Compute Allocation. *arXiv:2410.22480* [cs.CL]

## A PoT’s Implementation Details

### A.1 Actions Definition

We define an action as a means by which the agent interacts with the text generation environment, specifically the LLM, by instructing it to perform a particular operation. Each action is associated with a specific output format that the LLM generates in response to the instruction. In this paper, we consider the following actions as the operations the model can take to respond to a question:

- *answering*: This action instructs the model to generate a personalized response to the question, provided that personalization can enhance the response. It should be selected when the model

```

Best-of-N

You are a personalized search assistant with great rating capabilities. Your task is to select the best answer to the question of the user, considering the aspects that are important for the user.

# your input:
- aspects: a json list of aspects that are important for the user. Aspects are in the following format:
  - aspect: The aspect that is important for the user.
  - description: The description of the aspect.
- question: The question asked by the user.
- responses: a list of responses to the question of the user. Responses are in the following format:
  - response: The generated response to the question of the user.
  - index: The index of the response.

# Your task: Your task is to select the answer to the question of the user that covers the most of aspects that are important for the user.
## your output:
You should generate a valid JSON object, enclosed in ```json``` block that contains the best answer to the question of the user, in the following format:
- index: The index of the best answer to the question of the user that covers the most number of aspects that are important for the user.
- reason: a string that shows the reason for this selection.

# aspects:
{aspect: aspect 1, description: description aspect 1}
...
{aspect: aspect K, description: description aspect K}
# question: {question}
# responses:
{index: 1, response: response 1}
...
{index: N, response: response N}

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 9: Prompt for selecting the best response out of N generated responses used in PoT.

```

Mixture-of-N

You are a personalized search assistant with great rating capabilities. Your task is to look at a set of personalized responses to the user’s question and combine them into a single personalized response, considering the aspects that are important for the user.

# your input:
- aspects: a json list of aspects that are important for the user. Aspects are in the following format:
  - aspect: The aspect that is important for the user.
  - description: The description of the aspect.
- question: The question asked by the user.
- responses: a list of responses to the question of the user. Responses are in the following format:
  - response: The generated response to the question of the user.
  - index: The index of the response.

# Your task: Your task is to look at a set of personalized responses to the user’s question and combine them into a single personalized response, considering the aspects that are important for the user.
## your output:
You should generate a valid JSON object, enclosed in ```json``` block that contains the best answer to the question of the user, in the following format:
- personalizedAnswer: The final combined personalized response to the user’s question considering all the generated responses and the important aspects for the user.

# aspects:
{aspect: aspect 1, description: description aspect 1}
...
{aspect: aspect K, description: description aspect K}
# question: {question}
# responses:
{index: 1, response: response 1}
...
{index: N, response: response N}

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 10: Prompt for mixing the N generated responses into a single response used in PoT.

is prepared to answer the question, ensuring that all necessary information is available and there is no ambiguity.

- *planning*: This action instructs the model to generate a plan of steps required to address all aspects of the question. It should be executed when the question has multiple components, and the model recognizes that planning the next steps is necessary to adequately respond to the user’s query.
- *checking for personalization*: This action asks the model to evaluate whether the user’s question can benefit from personalization. It is useful when determining whether personalizing the response is necessary or if a generic response would suffice.
- *personalizing*: This action asks the model to identify relevant information from the user profile and summarize how it can be used to answer the question. It is executed when personalized information is necessary to enhance the quality of the response.
- *reasoning*: This action prompts the model to break down one aspect of the question and think through it step by step. It is

Initial State & Action Definition Prompt

```

Your task is to answer a user's question from a post in a personalized way by considering the user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions. This is a multi turn task and you don't need to answer the question in one turn. In each turn, you can perform one action in that turn.
# Your context information:
- The user's current question from a post.
- The user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.
# Actions:
## answer:
### Definition: This action asks you to generate a personalized response to the question, if the question can benefit from personalization. Therefore, you should choose this action when you are ready to answer the question. This action should be executed when there is no ambiguity and all the information needed for answering the question is available.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- personalizedAnswer: a string representing your personalized answer to the user's current question considering the personalized context and previous taken steps.
## check_personalization:
### Definition: This action ask you to see if the question asked by the user can benefit from personalization or not. This action can be useful when you want to decide if you need to personalize the response or not.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- needs_personalization: a boolean that is true if the question can benefit from personalization and false if personalization cannot help.
- reason: a string representing the reason why the question can or cannot benefit from personalization.
## personalize
### Definition: This action asks you to find the relevant information about the question from the context and summarize how it can be helpful for answering the question. This action should be executed when you think personalized information is needed to answer the question.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- personalizedSummary: a string representing your summary of user context and how it is helpful to answer the question.
## plan
### Definition: This action asks you to generate a plan of steps that we can take to answer all the aspects of the question. This action should be executed when you think the the question has multiple aspects and planning future steps that you need to take to answer the question is necessary.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- plan: a string representing your plan of steps that we can take to answer the question.
## reason
### Definition: This action asks you to think step by step about one aspect of the question. This action should be executed when you know different aspects of the question and you want to think step by step about one aspect of the question and how it can be answered.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- aspect: a string representing the aspect of the question.
- reason: a string representing your reasoning of the question aspect and how it can be answered.
## clarify
### Definition: This action asks you to check if the question is ambiguous and how it can be clarified. This action should be executed when you think the current information needs more clarifying.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- ambiguous: a boolean indicating whether the question is ambiguous or not.
- clarification: a string representing your clarification questions of the current information and steps.
- clarification_response: a string representing your response to the clarification question. You should generate a reasonable response to clarification questions. This field should be empty if the question is not ambiguous.
## summarize
### Definition: This action summarizes all available information and findings about the question. This action should be executed when you think the current information needs more summarization.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- summarization: a string representing your summarization of the current information and steps.
## revise
### Definition: This action asks you to revise the current response to the question. This action should be executed when you provided an answer to the question and you want to revise the current response.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- revised: a string representing your revised response to the question.
## finalize
### Definition: This action will finalize the response to the question. This action should be executed when you think the response is finalized and no more action is required to answer or revise the answer to the question.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- personalizedAnswer: a string representing your finalized response to the question.
# Your task:
This is a multi turn task and you don't need to answer the question in one turn. In each turn, you can perform multiple actions from an action list. Then, based on the definition of the action, you can do that action in that turn and provide the response. Therefore, your task in each turn consists of two steps:
## Step 1: Selecting one of the actions that the user provides for you as the possible next actions. In this case, you should choose one of the actions considering that the main goal is generating a personalized response to the question. The action you choose should be the next best step toward the final goal, which is generating a personalized response to the question.
## Step 2: In this step, based on the action definition, you can do that action in the same turn.
### Output format:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json ``` block, with the following fields:
- action: a string representing your selected action. This text should be one of the valid actions that user provides.
- reason: a string representing the reason for why the action is selected and how it is helpful to reach the final goal, which is generating a personalized response to the question.
- actionOutput: a json representing the output of the action based on the defined output format for the selected action.
# Your input:
## Past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions:
{profile}
## Current post question:
{query}

```

Figure 11: Initial state and actions definition prompt used in Pathways of Thoughts.

executed when questions involve multiple aspects, and the model needs to focus on and consider how to address a specific aspect.

- *clarifying*: This action prompts the model to assess whether the question is ambiguous and determine how it can be clarified. It is executed when the model identifies that the current information is insufficient or unclear, requiring further elaboration.

- *summarizing*: This action instructs the model to summarize all available information and findings. It should be executed when the model determines that the current information needs to be consolidated or synthesized to ensure a clearer understanding before continuing with the response generation.
- *revising*: This action instructs the model to revise the current response to the question. It should be executed when the model has

```

In-context Personalization

Your task is to answer a user's question from a post in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your input:
- The user's current question from a post.
- The user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your task:
Answer the user's current question in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your output:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json``` block, with the following fields:
- personalizedAnswer: a string representing your personalized answer to the user's current question by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# input:
## Past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions:
(profile)
## Current post question:
(query)

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 12: Prompt for the In-Context Personalization.

```

Response Generation in Tree-of-Thoughts

Your task is to answer a user's question from a post in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your input:
- The user's current question from a post.
- The user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.
- The plan that guides you to answer the question.

# Your task: Your task is to generate a response to the user's question in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of them and the given plan on how to answer the question.

# Your output: You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json``` block, with the following fields:
- personalizedAnswer: a string representing your personalized answer to the user's current question by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions and the given plan on how to answer the question.

# Your input:
## Past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions:
(profile)
## Current post question:
(query)
## Plan:
(plan)

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 15: Prompt for the response generation step in ToT.

```

In-context Personalization w/ CoT

Your task is to answer a user's question from a post in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your input:
- The user's current question from a post.
- The user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your task:
Answer the user's current question in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions. You should do this using the following steps:
- step 1: From the previous questions and their detailed descriptions, you should first identify the aspects that are important for the user to include in the response to their question.
- step 2: Based on the extracted important aspects for the user, you should answer their current question in a personalized way.

# Your output:
You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json``` block, with the following fields:
- importantAspects: a string representing the important aspects for the user extracted from their previous questions and their details explanation.
- personalizedAnswer: a string representing your personalized answer to the user's current question by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# input:
## Past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions:
(profile)
## Current post question:
(query)

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 13: Prompt for In-Context Personalization with CoT.

```

Plan Selection in Tree-of-Thoughts

You are a personalized search assistant with great rating capabilities. Your task is to select the best plan to answer the question of the user, considering the aspects that are important for the user.

# your input:
- aspects: a json list of aspects that are important for the user. Aspects are in the following format:
  - aspect: The aspect that is important for the user.
  - description: The description of the aspect.
- question: The question asked by the user.
- plans: a list of plans to answer the question of the user. Plans are in the following format:
  - plan: The generated response to the question of the user.
  - index: The index of the response.

# Your task: Your task is to select the plan to answer the question of the user that covers the most of aspects that are important for the user.

## your output: You should generate a valid JSON object, enclosed in ```json``` block that contains the best answer to the question of the user, in the following format:
- index: The index of the best plan to answer the question of the user that covers the most number of aspects that are important for the user.
- reason: a string that shows the reason for this selection.

# aspects:
(aspects)
# question:
(question)
# plans:
(plans)

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 16: Prompt for the plan selection step in Tree of Thoughts [37]. The important aspects extracted for the user are generated using the prompt shown in Figure 8.

```

Planning in Tree-of-Thoughts

Your task is to answer a user's question from a post in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your input:
- The user's current question from a post.
- The user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your task: Your task is to generate a plan for responding to the user's question in a personalized way by considering this user's past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions.

# Your output: You should generate a valid JSON, enclosed in ```json``` block, with the following fields:
- plan: a string representing a plan of steps that we can take to answer all the aspects of the question.

# Your input:
## Past post questions and detailed descriptions of these questions:
(profile)
## Current post question:
(query)

output: ```json
    
```

Figure 14: Prompt for the planning step in ToT.

already generated an initial response but believes the response can be improved or adjusted to better address the user's query or to incorporate additional insights or information.

- *finalizing*: This action finalizes the response. It should be executed when the model believes the response is complete, accurate, and addresses the user's query. No further actions or revisions are necessary, and the response is ready to be presented.

## A.2 Details of Response Aggregation Methods

An essential component of Pathways of Thoughts involves aggregating the candidate responses generated across different thinking

pathways into a single output. Each pathway produces a candidate response, collectively forming a set of response proposals, denoted as  $R_{PoT}$ . To generate the final response  $\hat{y}_{x_u}$  personalized for the user, it is crucial to select the most suitable candidate. To achieve this, we first employ the LLM  $\pi$  to extract the key aspects  $I_u$  relevant to user  $u$  from their user profile  $P_u$ . This extraction process is guided by the prompt illustrated in Figure 8, acting as an intermediate step to capture the user's individual preferences. Based on this, there are two methods to generate the final response:

- *Best-of-N*: Given the extracted important aspects for the user and the input, the LLM selects the optimal response from the set of candidate responses generated through multi-directional thinking. This is guided by the prompt shown in Figure 9.
- *Mixture-of-N*: Given the extracted important aspects for the user and the input, the LLM integrates different aspects of the candidate responses from the set of multi-directional thinking outputs, guided by the prompt in Figure 10. This method emulates human problem-solving by exploring multiple solutions and synthesizing a new response that leverages the strengths of all candidates.

## **B Baselines Prompts**

Figures 12 and 13 present the prompts used for the personalized baselines without and with chain-of-thought reasoning, respectively. For the Tree of Thoughts baseline, Figure 14 shows the planning prompt, Figure 15 illustrates the response generation prompt, and Figure 16 provides the plan selection prompt.