
Differentiable User Models

Alex Hämäläinen

Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
alex.hamalainen@aalto.fi

Mustafa Mert Çelikok

Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
mustafa.celikok@aalto.fi

Samuel Kaski

Department of Computer Science, Aalto University
Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester
samuel.kaski@aalto.fi

Abstract

Probabilistic user modeling is essential for building collaborative AI systems within probabilistic frameworks. However, modern advanced user models, often designed as cognitive behavior simulators, are computationally prohibitive for interactive use in cooperative AI assistants. In this extended abstract, we address this problem by introducing widely-applicable differentiable surrogates for bypassing this computational bottleneck; the surrogates enable using modern behavioral models with online computational cost which is independent of their original computational cost. We show experimentally that modeling capabilities comparable to likelihood-free inference methods are achievable, with over eight orders of magnitude reduction in computational time. Finally, we demonstrate how AI-assistants can computationally feasibly use cognitive models in a previously studied menu-search task.

1 Introduction

User modeling enables computational systems to customize and adapt their behavior for individual users [9]. It has seen numerous applications and approaches over the years, also recently in recommender systems [11, 12], human-in-the-loop machine learning [2] and AI-assistants [6, 3]. Machine learning is needed in user modeling to infer user-specific information based on user observations. Since, in most cases, there is uncertainty about inferences from observations, it is paramount that the user modeling system can quantify the uncertainty of its estimates — this allows interactive systems to balance between exploration-exploitation trade-offs.

Recent ML research has shown significant success on learning large neural models directly from data. Unfortunately, in user modeling this is not generally feasible as typical applications are data starved. In contrast, probabilistic modeling based on behavioral user models, e.g., [7, 10], has shown encouraging results with limited data. We aim to combine the best from both worlds, flexibility of neural networks and prior knowledge from behavioral user models, into generative user models.

We consider the following probabilistic user modeling setting: a user population is engaged with a distribution of decision-making tasks $p(\theta_T)$. Each modeling scenario involves a user $\theta_U \sim p(\theta_U)$ and is described by the user and task -specific parameters $\theta = \{\theta_T, \theta_U\}$. The users are assumed to generate their policies π through an implicit process $\pi \sim p(\pi | \theta)$ which they execute to generate pairs of states and actions (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) observable by the modeling system. The system has access to a user model $p(\pi | \theta)$ approximating the true process and a corresponding prior $p(\theta)$. The key task in probabilistic user modeling is inferring the posterior $p(\theta | (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a})) \propto p((\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) | \pi)p(\pi | \theta)p(\theta)$.

For many applications, such as recommender systems, differentiable user models $p(\pi | \theta)$ with closed-form likelihood are often readily available, and the inference problem is easily solvable. In contrast, interactive scenarios typically require complex, non-differentiable simulators $\pi \sim p(\pi | \theta)$ based on, e.g., cognitive models, for which the closed-form of the likelihood may not be evaluated [7] and approximating the posterior becomes difficult. Recent research has addressed the lack of closed-form likelihood in behavioral user models with likelihood-free inference (LFI) methods [10, 7]. However, LFI techniques are not feasible for real-time inference [10].

We address the currently unaddressed problem of computationally efficient probabilistic user modeling suitable for real-time applications — especially for behavioral models lacking the closed-form likelihood. We introduce a way of learning differentiable surrogates for behavioral user models, and to generalize them over tasks and users through meta-learning. The surrogates are widely applicable with online computational cost independent of the complexity of the original models. We study neural processes as example surrogates and demonstrate comparable modeling capabilities to LFI.

2 Differentiable user models

In order to guide user-specific adaptation of interactive systems, user modeling is needed for (i) inference of user-specific information and (ii) user behavior generation, e.g., for model-based RL. Following the notation introduced in Section 1, computing the posterior $p(\theta | (s, \mathbf{a}))$ and sampling from $p(\pi | \theta)$ are the Bayesian choices for achieving these two objectives. In this work, we focus on computationally efficient solutions and generalize these operations to mappings h and g :

Definition 2.1 (Probabilistic user modeling). Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{A} denote the state and action spaces of the user and $\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_n (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})^n$ be a collection of m observed state-action pairs generated by the user θ_U in a task θ_T . Probabilistic user modeling corresponds to the task of implementing the following functionalities such that they are evaluable during online interaction:

1. Inference of user and task representations, i.e., the mapping $h : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow P(\mathcal{Z})$, where $P(\mathcal{Z})$ denotes a probability distribution over a joint user and task representation space \mathcal{Z} , which aims to capture the properties governing user behavior.
2. User behavior simulation, i.e., the mapping $g : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow P(\mathcal{A})$, where $P(\mathcal{A})$ is a probability distribution over user action space.

The inference problem is currently addressed exclusively with LFI-methods if the user model cannot be evaluated in closed form. Although LFI is computationally infeasible with complex behavioral models, it can not support real-time inference even with computationally cheap simulators [10]. Consequently, we aim to learn computationally efficient implementations for both of the mappings h and g . Formally, let $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $(s, \mathbf{a}) = \{(s_1, a_1), \dots, (s_n, a_n)\} \in \mathcal{O}$. We implement h and g , i.e., the posterior $p_\psi(z | (s, \mathbf{a}))$ and the likelihood $p_\phi(a | s, z)$ with optimizable parameters $\{\psi, \phi\}$. The meta-learning task for generalizing over the ground-truth user/task population can be written as:

$$\min_{\phi, \psi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim p(\theta), s \in \mathcal{S}, z \sim p_\psi(z | (s, \mathbf{a}))} \left[\delta \left[\pi(a | s), p_\phi(a | s, z) \right] \right], \quad (1)$$

where δ is a dissimilarity function and the observations (s, \mathbf{a}) are generated by the user’s policy π .

Algorithm 1 specifies the proposed meta-training procedure but should still be complemented with an appropriate meta-learning method for optimizing $\{\psi, \phi\}$, matching the chosen implementations for h and g . The meta-testing phase is straightforward: mappings h and g with optimized parameters can be utilized for inferring user representations $p_\psi(z | (s, \mathbf{a}))$ w.r.t. observed (s, \mathbf{a}) and for simulating user behaviors $p_\phi(a | s, z)$ on states of interest $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

Algorithm 1 Meta-training for user modeling

Require: Distribution over users and tasks: $p(\theta_U), p(\theta_T)$

Require: A generative process: $p(\pi | \theta)$

Initialize h and g with $\{\psi, \phi\}$

repeat

Sample $\theta = \{\theta_U, \theta_T\}, \theta_U \sim p(\theta_U), \theta_T \sim p(\theta_T)$

Initialize environment \mathcal{M}_{θ_T}

Generate $\pi \sim p(\pi | \theta)$

Generate n trajectories (s, \mathbf{a}) by executing π on \mathcal{M}_{θ_T}

Optimize $\{\psi, \phi\}$ with respect to (s, \mathbf{a})

until done

Table 1: Modeling accuracy as a function of the number of observed context trajectories in the Experiment 2.

N	ANP	MAML	Transformer	Oracle	Context-Free
0	0.937 ± 0.031	0.774 ± 0.033	0.920 ± 0.035	0.970 ± 0.002	0.921 ± 0.012
1	0.953 ± 0.008	0.916 ± 0.026	0.922 ± 0.021
2	0.954 ± 0.007	0.928 ± 0.025	0.931 ± 0.017
5	0.955 ± 0.006	0.943 ± 0.021	0.926 ± 0.012
9	0.955 ± 0.006	0.952 ± 0.014	0.928 ± 0.009

If a behavioral user model is available, the user model and the corresponding parameter prior can be utilized in place of true user data in meta-training. Importantly, if behavior data from the true population becomes available, the meta-training can be repeated by incorporating the data. We demonstrate that this approach enables elegant balancing between modeling accuracy and data requirements helps addressing user model misspecification.

2.1 User modeling with neural processes

We use neural processes (NP) [5] for implementing and learning the mappings h and g of Definition 2.1. Neural processes are differentiable solutions for representing uncertainties over functions that may be utilized for few-shot approximation. Considering the requirements of Definition 2.1 and our meta-learning objective (Eq. 1), these properties allow NPs to act as suitable surrogates. For details regarding NPs, we encourage the reader to refer to [5].

First, we recognize that Equation 1 is a function approximation problem and can be matched to NP formalism — the true generative process $p(\pi | \theta)$ can be treated as a stochastic processes \mathcal{P} where each instantiation $\pi \sim \mathcal{P}$ represents a policy. The NP latent variable z is utilized for capturing user/task representations and the mappings h and g are implemented with the NP encoder $p_\phi(\pi | z)$ and conditional decoder $p_\psi(z | (s, a))$ respectively. The meta-training procedure is adapted as follows: the sampled behaviors (s, a) are split into context and target sets and the parameters $\{\psi, \phi\}$ can be optimized according to NP-ELBO. Our experiments use attentive NP (ANP) models [8].

3 Experiments

Experiment 1: Gridworld environment The first experiment considers modeling Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [1] agents with unknown reward functions and MCTS parameters on a 10×10 gridworld. The environment is a partially observable Markov decision process where the action space consists of four actions corresponding to relocating to adjacent states. The environment contains two reward states - one with a positive and one with a negative reward. Each modeling scenario assigns the modeling system with a varying number of context trajectories and a truncated target trajectory generated with the agent. The task is to predict the remaining actions of the target trajectory based on the context trajectory. Prediction accuracy evaluates the simulation quality but also indirectly the quality of the user representations $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ as the predictions depend on them. We compare our approach against two alternative surrogate models, model-agnostic meta-learning (MAML) [4] and transformer, a Bayesian Optimization (BO) and a context-free baselines, and an oracle. The oracle is the user model parametrized with ground-truth parameters θ . Further details are given in the Appendix.

From the results in Figure 1, we observe that the ANP surrogate improves as more trajectories are observed converging close to the performance of the oracle. Although given clearly the most computation time, it is likely that the BO-baseline has not properly converged due to the computational complexity of the problem. The MAML and transformer models are unable to generalize to the task, likely due to the limited amount of training data.

Experiment 2: Menu search environment Our second experiment is based on the Menu Search model of Kangasrääsiö et al. [7]. This model is a cognitive model describing human search behavior in terms of eye saccades when searching for a target item in a computer dropdown menu. The model




Figure 1: Accuracies at different numbers of observed context trajectories in Experiment 1.

Table 2: Search times to find the target element and modeling/simulation times with different assistant systems.

Assistant	Search time (s)	Time saved (%)	Modeling time per action (ms)
No assistance	4.774 ± 0.235	—	—
MAML	3.705 ± 0.409	22.4	1250.264 ± 62.387
Transformer	2.918 ± 0.191	38.8	1.140 ± 0.442
ANP	2.590 ± 0.226	45.7	8.460 ± 6.495
Full knowledge	2.577 ± 0.162	46.0	—

simulates user behaviors as a result of RL-based optimization given their cognitive constraints. The details are given in the Appendix.

We apply our method for modeling deep Q-learning agents following the Menu Search model. Table 1 summarizes the obtained accuracies: after one observed trajectory, the ANP-based model achieves results comparable to the oracle. Here, LFI-methods would require > 700h CPU time to converge on a single inference task [7]. Our approach enables modeling in < 10ms, corresponding to over eight orders of magnitude smaller computation time. We further study the utility of user models by repeating the task with a misspecified Menu Search model that models ~ 35% of the saccades incorrectly. We repeat the meta-training at different percentages of true user data; the results are shown in Figure 2. Our approach remains robust against model misspecification, even surpassing the oracle at high misspecification rates.

Experiment 3: Menu search assistant The third experiment demonstrates the utility of our approach for interactive systems by extending the Menu Search environment into a relatively realistic AI-assistant scenario. We scale the environment to have a two-level hierarchy: the menu consists of a main menu whose elements act as links to sub-menus similar to the menus in the previous experiment. We introduce an AI assistant equipped with the proposed ANP surrogate, utilized to infer the target items of the users based on observed behaviors, to help users find their targets. The assistant is a rule-based agent that conditions its actions on simulated user behaviors. Details are included in the Appendix.

Table 2 compares the resulting assistant against a non-assisted user, a similar assistant with oracle access to users’ targets, and MAML and transformer -based solutions. The ANP-guided assistant significantly reduces the user search time while nearing the performance of the oracle-guided assistant. For MAML, the modeling time was longer than human response time, reducing the assistant’s utility.

4 Discussion

This work addressed the so-far unaddressed problem of probabilistic user modeling with complex behavioral models for real-time applications. We introduced a meta-learning framework for training widely applicable differentiable surrogates for behavioral user models. We studied neural process models as example surrogates and demonstrated comparable modeling performance to LFI with computational cost suitable for online applications. We showed that our solution enables AI-assistants to utilize cognitive user models computationally feasibly in a previously studied menu-search task.

As the established LFI methods are computationally intractable in our settings, we are unaware of previous comparable solutions. The main limitation of our work is that the currently we have experimented only with neural process surrogates and compared them against MAML, transformer and BO baselines. Although the comparisons with the oracle demonstrated comparable modeling capabilities with respect to modeling with LFI-based methods, future research is still required to adapt alternative solutions to the proposed meta-learning problem. Further research should also take ethical considerations, such as possible privacy issues, into account. We also recognize that user modeling could potentially be abused to serve other interests than those of users. To avoid such scenarios, we recommend considering angles such as privacy preservation with differential privacy.




Figure 2: **Left:** Accuracies of the ANP-surrogate when trained at different shares of data coming from a misspecified model. **Right:** Accuracies of the oracle at different misspecification rates. Key: Figure 1

References

- [1] Browne, C. B., Powley, E., Whitehouse, D., Lucas, S. M., Cowling, P. I., Rohlfshagen, P., Tavener, S., Perez, D., Samothrakis, S., and Colton, S. A survey of monte carlo tree search methods. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in games*, 4(1):1–43, 2012.
- [2] Dae, P., Peltola, T., Vehtari, A., and Kaski, S. User modelling for avoiding overfitting in interactive knowledge elicitation for prediction. In *23rd International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pp. 305–310, 2018.
- [3] Dafoe, A., Bachrach, Y., Hadfield, G., Horvitz, E., Larson, K., and Graepel, T. Cooperative ai: machines must learn to find common ground, 2021.
- [4] Finn, C., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1126–1135. PMLR, 2017.
- [5] Garnelo, M., Schwarz, J., Rosenbaum, D., Viola, F., Rezende, D. J., Eslami, S., and Teh, Y. W. Neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622*, 2018.
- [6] Horvitz, E. J., Breese, J. S., Heckerman, D., Hovel, D., and Rommelse, K. The Lumiere project: Bayesian user modeling for inferring the goals and needs of software users. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.7385*, 2013.
- [7] Kangasrääsiö, A., Jokinen, J. P., Oulasvirta, A., Howes, A., and Kaski, S. Parameter inference for computational cognitive models with approximate Bayesian computation. *Cognitive science*, 43(6):e12738, 2019.
- [8] Kim, H., Mnih, A., Schwarz, J., Garnelo, M., Eslami, A., Rosenbaum, D., Vinyals, O., and Teh, Y. W. Attentive neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.05761*, 2019.
- [9] Li, S. and Zhao, H. A survey on representation learning for user modeling. In *IJCAI*, pp. 4997–5003, 2020.
- [10] Moon, H.-S., Do, S., Kim, W., Seo, J., Chang, M., and Lee, B. Speeding up inference with user simulators through policy modulation. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–21, 2022.
- [11] Yu, Z., Lian, J., Mahmood, A., Liu, G., and Xie, X. Adaptive user modeling with long and short-term preferences for personalized recommendation. In *IJCAI*, pp. 4213–4219, 2019.
- [12] Yuan, F., He, X., Karatzoglou, A., and Zhang, L. Parameter-efficient transfer from sequential behaviors for user modeling and recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pp. 1469–1478, 2020.

A Appendix

A.1 Experiment 1 details

Setting. The first experiment scenario considers modeling Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [1] agents in a simple 10×10 gridworld environment. The gridworld environment is defined as a partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP) with deterministic transition dynamics. The action space consists of four possible actions that correspond to the agent relocating from its current state to adjacent states. Each gridworld scenario always contains one positive and one negative reward state, which are sampled independently for each agent. The agents gain no rewards or penalties other than from the given states.

The agents are fully described by their generative process $\pi \sim p(\pi | \theta)$ (MCTS) and parameters $\theta \sim p(\theta)$ for which the corresponding priors are described in Table 2. In addition to the reward function (i.e., reward states), the prior determines the agent memory, observation function, and MCTS planning-tree depth. The agent memory is defined as a binary parameter determining if the agents utilize the planning tree from previous time steps for subsequent planning instead of starting from scratch. The agents are divided into two subspecies depending on their observation function. Specifically, the complete gridworld is fully observable for half of the agent population, while the other half cannot observe reward states that are located beyond planning-tree depth. In practice, such agents avoid exploring the environment if the positive reward is not directly observed.

Table 3: Uniform prior on user model parameters for the user population in gridworld experiment.

User Parameter	Distribution
Reward States (x, y)	$\mathcal{U}\{1, \dots, 10\}$
Memory	$\mathcal{U}\{0, 1\}$
Observation function	$\mathcal{U}\{0, 1\}$
Tree Depth	$\mathcal{U}\{5, \dots, 10\}$

Implementation and training details. All NP models are implemented on the basis of the `NeuralProcesses.jl` library, a Julia variant of the neural process library of Dubois et al., (2020). The MCTS agents are implemented by utilizing the `POMDPs.jl` (Egorov et al., 2017) library. The code used to produce all the results in this paper can be found at <https://github.com/hamalajaa/DifferentiableUserModels>.

All NP models are meta-trained on a single GPU (NVIDIA Quadro P2200). Each user θ_U , used in training, generates $n \sim \mathcal{U}\{1, \dots, 8\}$ trajectories of length 10, each with different initial states $x, y \sim \mathcal{U}\{1, \dots, 10\}$. One trajectory is truncated at length $l \sim \mathcal{U}\{1, \dots, 9\}$ to form a local context trajectory which is concatenated with the remaining full global context trajectories — the rest of the truncated trajectory acts as the target for NP training. The base-architecture is shared among all NP models (summarized in Table 4). We implement the MAML as first-order MAML [4] to reduce test-time computation. The MAML and transformer details are included in Tables 5 and 6 (Remark: here, the 'fifth' action corresponds to 'staying still' when the positive reward is found.)

Table 4: Base-architecture shared by all NP models in experiment 1.

Encoder		Decoder	
Number of layers	6	Number of layers	6
Activations	Leaky ReLU	Activations	Leaky ReLU
Hidden dimensions	128	Hidden dimensions	128
Latent distribution	Gaussian	Output distribution	Categorical
Input dimensions	2	Output dimensions	5

A.2 Experiment 2 details

Setting. The second experiment is based on the Menu Search model of Kangasrääsiö et al. [7]. The Menu Search model is a cognitive model describing human search behavior in terms of eye movements (saccades) when searching for a target item in a computer dropdown menu. The model

Table 5: The architecture shared by MAML and transformer in experiment 1.

Architecture	
Layers	Transformer + 6 MLP
Activations	ReLU (+ softmax)
Hidden dimensions	128
Input dimensions	2
Output dimensions	5

Table 6: MAML and transformer training and evaluation details in experiment 1.

Training	MAML	Transformer
Optimizer and learning rate	-	Adam, $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Meta optimizer	Gradient descent, $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$	-
Batch optimizer	Gradient descent, $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$	-
Loss	Cross entropy	Cross entropy
Evaluation		
Optimizer and learning rate	Gradient descent, 0.01	-
N of gradient steps	32	-

simulates user behaviors as a result of optimization with RL given their cognitive constraints. In this experiment, we implement the users as deep Q-learning agents to reduce data generation costs.

Formally, the environment is specified as a POMDP where states contain information about (1) the user’s current knowledge about the menu elements, (2) the current gaze focus, and (3) whether or not the user has closed the menu (i.e., quit). We consider a menu of eight elements, where each element is described with its semantic relevance and length given the user’s target element. At each step, the user can either fixate on a menu element or quit the scenario. Fixating on a menu element has a chance to reveal the given element while also having a chance to reveal the adjacent elements via peripheral vision. If user action results in revealing the target element, the element is automatically selected, and a significant positive reward is given.

The target word is not present in 10% of the generated menus. If the user recognizes that the target element is not present and quits the menu, a large reward is emitted. For each action, the user is otherwise given a small negative reward based on the duration of the action specified by cognitive parameters presented in Table 7 as priors. When entering a menu for the first time, there is a chance, p_{rec} , that the user recalls the menu, completely revealing the entire menu layout.

Table 7: Distributions for user cognitive properties used in the second experiment.

User Parameter		Distribution
Menu recall probability	p_{rec}	$Beta(3.0, 1.35)$
Eye fixation duration	f_{dur}	$\mathcal{N}(3.0, 1.0)$
Target item selection delay	d_{sel}	$\mathcal{N}(0.3, 0.3)$

Implementation and training details. Similarly as in the first experiment, the ANP-based user model is meta-trained on a single GPU. Each user completes $n \sim \mathcal{U}\{1, \dots, 8\}$ search tasks with independently sampled menus and target elements constructing n trajectories. A new menu menu is sampled for each modeling scenario. Similarly, as in the first experiment, we truncate one of the trajectories to form global and local contexts and the prediction target for ANP training. The ANP, MAML and transformer architectures follow the design used in the first experiment (except for the input and output dimensions).

Experiment with the misspecified user model. The misspecified user model is the menu search model but 40% of user saccades are directed randomly, resulting in modeling roughly 35% of the saccades into incorrect locations. This kind of random action noise is arguably the ideal scenario in terms of the robustness of ANP predictions — in contrast, misspecification in realistic user model may often also introduce systematic biases. While our approach does not offer innate robustness

against this, it can be effectively mitigated by re-training the model with observations from the true population, as demonstrated in our second experiment.

A.3 Experiment 3 details

The third experiment extends the menu search environment into a relatively realistic AI-assistant scenario. First, the menu environments are scaled to consider two levels of hierarchy: each full menu consists of a main menu whose elements correspond to labels that (1) act as links to sub-menus and (2) summarize the contents of these menus. Secondly, we introduce an AI assistant equipped with the proposed user modeling system. The task of the assistant is to utilize the modeling system to propose sub-menus for the users. Intuitively, a successful assistant should guide the users to menus that are likely to contain the true target to shorten their search time.

Environment. The hierarchical menu search environment introduces an 8×8 two-level menu setting. Importantly, the environment behaves otherwise similarly to the original non-hierarchical version, with the exception of introducing a main menu that allows a user to navigate between multiple menus. In addition, we introduce a simple mapping between user observations (semantic relevancies and lengths w.r.t. the target element) and assistant observations (logical groups). Specifically, each scenario introduces a set of 8 logical groups $\mathcal{S}_{AI} = \{1, \dots, 8\}$ and 4 semantic relevance groups $\mathcal{S}_{user} = \{target(1), high(2), medium(3), low(4)\}$ and an independently generated bidirectional mapping between \mathcal{S}_{AI} and \mathcal{S}_{user} . The mapping initializes an ordered set of relevancies as $r = \{4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3\}$ and assigns a relevance for each logical group with a randomized circular shift on r . The intuition of the mapping is simply to mask the semantic information regarding the target element (via randomization) while allowing a soft prior heuristic for the assistant by conserving semantic similarity between similar logical groups. We similarly mask the item lengths via randomization.

After the mapping between the observation spaces \mathcal{S}_{AI} and \mathcal{S}_{user} is constructed, we sample two logical groups for each sub-menu (such that each group occurs exactly twice in the full menu) and determine a semantic label for the menus summarizing the relevancies of their respective logical groups. The target element is then assigned randomly into one of the sub-menus that includes a logical group with *high* relevance. The contents for each sub-menu are otherwise determined by mapping the semantic labels of their logical groups into individual items according to the original menu search model specifications. The main menu similarly follows the original specifications — however, we utilize the semantic labels of the corresponding sub-menus as the relevancies for the main menu elements. At the main menu level, we also replace the item length information with a binary variable denoting if the user has already opened the corresponding sub-menu. Finally, the transition dynamics between the main menu and sub-menus are defined as follows: selecting an element at the main menu -level transitions the user to the corresponding sub-menu, while quitting a sub-menu transitions the environment state back to the main menu. Otherwise, all the transition and reward dynamics follow the original environment specifications.

Assistant. The hierarchical menu search setting involves a simple search assistant guided by a pre-trained ANP-based user model (user model implementation and training details are described below). In each scenario, the assistant is initially inactive and only activates if the user fails to find the target element from the first sub-menu it explores. When activated, the assistant may suggest and highlight an individual main menu element when the user is at the main menu level. A highlighted main menu element is assumed to attract the attention of the user at its next action and the user’s gaze is guided towards the highlighted element. Simultaneously, we assume that the user features some degree of trust towards the assistant’s suggestion and the semantic relevance score of the highlighted element is increased by one level. In practice, this allows the user also to reject poor suggestions.

We implement the assistant as a simple rule-based agent that continuously updates the user model as new user actions are observed. We assume that the assistant can track users’ gaze locations but that it does not have access to the semantic relevancies of the items. Instead, the assistant updates its estimate on the currently observed (and unobserved) menu elements in terms of the observation space \mathcal{S}_{AI} specified above. When activated, the assistant simulates one user action at fully observed main menu -level conditioned on the observed user search behavior: $a \sim p_\phi(a | s, z)$, $z \sim p_\psi(z | (\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}))$. The main menu element corresponding to the estimated most likely user action is then selected as the assistant’s suggestion.

Implementation and training details. The ANP-based user model is meta-trained on a single GPU. Each user generates 1 trajectory which is split at length $l \sim \mathcal{U}\{2, \dots, 10\}$ into context and target trajectories for ANP training. The base architectures of the ANP, MAML and transformer models are identical to the previous experiment. The online prediction times reported in Table 2 are run on a laptop CPU (Intel Core i7-7700HQ).