

Causal Reinforcement Learning based Agent-Patient Interaction with Clinical Domain Knowledge

Wenzheng Zhao¹, Ran Zhang², Ruth Palan Lopez³, Shu-Fen Wung⁴, Fengpei Yuan¹

¹Dept. of Robotics Engineering, Worcester Polytechnic Institute

²Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

³School of Nursing, MGH Institute of Health Professions

⁴School of Nursing, University of California, Davis

wzhao8@wpi.edu, rzhang8@charlotte.edu, rlopez@mghihp.edu, swung@health.ucdavis.edu, fyuan3@wpi.edu

Abstract

Reinforcement Learning (RL) faces significant challenges in adaptive healthcare interventions, such as dementia care, where data is scarce, decisions require interpretability, and underlying patient-state dynamic are complex and causal in nature. In this work, we present a novel framework called Causal structure-aware Reinforcement Learning (CRL) that explicitly integrates causal discovery and reasoning into policy optimization. This method enables an agent to learn and exploit a directed acyclic graph (DAG) that describes the causal dependencies between human behavioral states and robot actions, facilitating more efficient, interpretable, and robust decision-making. We validate our approach in a simulated robot-assisted cognitive care scenario, where the agent interacts with a virtual patient exhibiting dynamic emotional, cognitive, and engagement states. The experimental results show that CRL agents outperform conventional model-free RL baselines by achieving higher cumulative rewards, maintaining desirable patient states more consistently, and exhibiting interpretable, clinically-aligned behavior. We further demonstrate that CRL’s performance advantage remains robust across different weighting strategies and hyperparameter settings. In addition, we demonstrate a lightweight LLM-based deployment: a fixed policy is embedded into a system prompt that maps inferred states to actions, producing consistent, supportive dialogue without LLM finetuning. Our work illustrates the promise of causal reinforcement learning for human-robot interaction applications, where interpretability, adaptiveness, and data efficiency are paramount.

Code — Link-will-be-released-upon-publication

Datasets — Link-will-be-released-upon-publication

Introduction

Personalized and adaptive AI is critical for effective human-agent interaction in healthcare, particularly in sensitive domains like dementia care where patient needs vary significantly and evolve over time. While reinforcement learning (RL) offers a powerful framework for sequential decision-making, its application in healthcare faces fundamental challenges: extensive data requirements, poor sample efficiency, and lack of interpretability—limitations that become prohibitive in clinical contexts where data is scarce, exploration must be safe, and decisions require clinical justification.

Submitted to Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). Workshop




Figure 1: The Agent-Environment interaction from Causal Reinforcement Learning (CRL).

Causal reasoning has emerged as a promising approach to address these limitations in RL (Pearl 2009; Seitzer, Schölkopf, and Martius 2021). By enabling agents to reason about interventions and counterfactual outcomes, causal methods can significantly improve both sample efficiency and interpretability. However, despite this potential, the integration of causal reasoning into human-agent interaction systems for clinical environments remains underexplored. Current approaches in dementia care exemplify this gap: existing systems rely either on model-free RL methods that lack transparency and clinical interpretability (Yuan et al. 2021), or on rigid, rule-based or data-heavy agents that cannot adapt to individual patient needs (Hung et al. 2019; Bevilacqua et al. 2023). This dichotomy between data-driven adaptability and safe, interpretable decision-making presents a critical barrier to deploying AI in real-world clinical settings.

We address this gap by introducing a Causal RL (CRL) framework that integrates structured clinical domain knowledge into the agent’s learning loop. Our approach leverages causal discovery to model latent cognitive-emotional states and action effects, constructing a causal world model that explicitly guides policy learning through causal inference. This enables the agent to reason counterfactually about action outcomes, leading to more data-efficient learning and clinically-justifiable decisions. Our main contributions are:

- We propose a novel causality-aware RL framework that systematically embeds clinical domain knowledge through causal discovery and reasoning. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to integrate expertise in this manner for efficient reasoning in agent-patient interactions.
- We demonstrate that our causality-informed RL agent achieves improved sample efficiency and generalization by inferring the consequences of actions, thereby reduc-

ing its dependence on exhaustive and potentially unsafe trial-and-error.

- We validate our approach in a simulated patient-robot interaction environment for cognitive rehab therapy (remembrance therapy). Experimental results show that causal-informed agent significantly outperforms traditional RL baselines in both performance, sample efficiency, and transparency.

Related Work

Causal Reinforcement Learning

Integrating causal reasoning into reinforcement learning (RL) has shown significant potential in improving sample efficiency, policy robustness, and interpretability (Pearl 2009; Deng et al. 2023). Recent efforts have incorporated causal reasoning into reinforcement learning to improve sample efficiency and generalization (Seitzer, Schölkopf, and Martius 2021; Wang, Yang, and Wang 2021). These methods often rely on discovering or leveraging causal graphs to guide exploration and avoid spurious correlations. However, these causal enhanced RL framework have yet to be thoroughly explored within interactive human-centered domains such as cognitive care scenarios. Our work fills this critical gap by integrating causal discovery with RL in a realistic dementia care setting, demonstrating enhanced policy performance and interpretability.

Causal Reasoning and RL in Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)

RL has been applied in HRI to learn personalized dialogue strategies or adaptive interaction behaviors, especially for socially assistive robotics (Yuan et al. 2021). However, most existing approaches are model-free and lack causal interpretability. In contrast, several recent works have begun to explore the integration of causal reasoning mechanisms into HRI systems: (Spitale et al. 2025) proposed an approach for robotic mental well-being coaching that employs structural equation models to characterize causal relationships between robot behaviors, facial valence and speech duration. Their framework enables the robot to adapt its strategies based on inferred causal structures, improving interaction outcomes. (Tung et al. 2024) proposed a method based on mutual information estimation to quantify the causal influence of robot actions on human behavioral responses, underscoring the significance of identifying when and how robot behavior causally shapes human interaction dynamics for more effective HRI strategy design. These studies demonstrate a growing trend in HRI research toward embedding causal reasoning to improve interpretability, adaptiveness, and robustness. Moreover, their methodologies provide valuable ideas and motivation for the causal reinforcement learning framework proposed in this work.

Modeling Cognitive States in Assistive Robotics

Robotic systems designed to assist individuals with cognitive impairments frequently model user cognitive and emotional states to enable personalized interaction strategies (Chung, Ellis-Hill, and Coleman 2008). (Yuan et al.

2025) proposed a framework that integrates reinforcement learning (RL), large language model (LLM)-based user simulators, and clinical domain knowledge to represent the evolving cognitive and emotional trajectories of persons living with dementia (PLWDs), allowing socially assistive robots to dynamically tailor their conversational and assistance behaviors in simulated care scenarios. Earlier, (Rudicz et al. 2015) conducted real-world speech interaction experiments with older adults with Alzheimer’s disease, demonstrating that frequent confusion behaviors, such as ignoring prompts, are prevalent during human-robot interaction. These findings collectively underscore the importance of accurately modeling cognitive state fluctuations to inform and optimize robot behavior in assistive contexts.

Behavioral-Level Human-AI Interaction in Dementia Care

Social robots have been increasingly explored in dementia care as tools for emotional and behavioral support. For example, robot-assisted therapy has been reported to improve mood, encourage social interaction, and facilitate communication among individuals with dementia (Bevilacqua et al. 2023; Hung et al. 2019). Beyond physical robot (Rashid et al. 2023), conversational agents have also been investigated as tools to deliver reminiscence therapy or cognitive training to persons living with dementia (PLWDs). More recently, (Chorbadzhieva et al. 2025) introduced an AI-driven reminiscence companion powered by large language models to adaptively engage PLWDs in long-term care environments. However, these studies highlight the growing interest in behavioral-level human-AI interaction for dementia care. However, existing approaches remain limited by heavy reliance on scripted or data-intensive methods, and rarely incorporate causal or reinforcement learning frameworks. Our work addresses this gap by introducing a causal reinforcement learning paradigm that enables adaptive, interpretable, and sample-efficient strategies tailored to the evolving cognitive and emotional states of PLWDs.

Proposed Causal Reinforcement Learning Framework

In our design, as shown in Algorithm 1, we introduce causal reasoning into the RL loop (Q-learning-based) to reduce the amount of data required for training and to improve policy generalization. By explicitly modeling the causal relationships within the environment, the agent can leverage clinical domain knowledge to make informed decisions, rather than relying solely on extensive trial-and-error exploration. This capability is particularly important in high-risk, high-cost domains such as healthcare, where safe, efficient, and adaptive online learning is essential. We implemented and evaluated our Algorithm 1 using the simulation model of person with dementia (PwD)-robot interaction in the context of reminiscence therapy (Yuan et al. 2021).

State and Action Space Definition

Based on the simulation environment of PwD-robot interaction during reminiscence therapy, the Markov Decision

Algorithm 1: Causal Structure-Aware Q-learning (CRL)

```

1: Initialize  $Q(s, a) \leftarrow 0$ , for all  $s \in S, a \in A$ 
2: for each epoch  $e = 1$  to  $E$  do
3:   for each episode  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
4:     Initialize state  $s_0 = [NR, Neu, No]$ ,  $done \leftarrow \text{False}$ 
5:     while not  $done$  do
6:       if agent observed negative emotion or confusion persistence then
7:          $a_t \leftarrow a_6$  (GiveChoice)
8:       else
9:         Compute mixed policy weights ( $w_{RL}, w_{DAG}$ ) based on CRL-static/dynamic rule
10:        Sample coin  $\in [0, 1]$ 
11:        if coin  $\leq w_{RL}$  then
12:           $a_t \leftarrow$  action from  $\epsilon$ -greedy w.r.t.  $Q$ 
13:        else if coin  $\leq w_{RL} + w_{DAG}$  then
14:           $a_t \leftarrow$  action suggested by learned DAG
15:        else
16:           $a_t \leftarrow$  random action
17:        end if
18:      end if
19:      Execute  $a_t$ , observe reward  $r_t$ , next state  $s_{t+1}$ 
20:      Update  $Q(s_t, a_t)$ 
21:       $s_t \leftarrow s_{t+1}$ 
22:    end while
23:  end for
24: end for

```

Process (MDP) is defined over a structured state space that captures three key dimensions of the PwD’s condition: (i) **Response Relevance**: the relevance of the PwD’s response to the robot’s prompt, categorized as no response (NR), irrelevant response (IR), or relevant response (RR), i.e., $\{0 : \text{NR}, 1 : \text{IR}, 2 : \text{RR}\}$; (ii) **Emotional State (Pleasure)**: the detected emotion level, categorized as negative, neutral, or positive, i.e., $\{-1 : \text{Neg}, 0 : \text{Neu}, 1 : \text{Pos}\}$; (iii) **Confusion Condition**: whether the PwD is confused, with two possible values, $\{0 : \text{No}, 1 : \text{Yes}\}$. The complete state space S is the Cartesian product of the three dimensions above, resulting in a total of $3 \times 3 \times 2 = 18$ discrete states. The action space A includes six potential robot actions: $\{0: \text{EasyPrompt}, 1: \text{ModeratePrompt}, 2: \text{DifficultPrompt}, 3: \text{Repeat}, 4: \text{Explain}, 5: \text{Comfort}\}$. These actions are designed to either stimulate engagement (e.g., by prompting the PwD with varying difficulty), support comprehension (e.g., repeating or explaining prompts), or provide emotional reassurance.

Reward Function Design

The reward function $R(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$ is designed to align with the dual objectives of robot-assisted reminiscence therapy (RT): (i) encouraging verbal engagement from the person with dementia (PwD), and (ii) maintaining the PwD in a generally positive affective and cognitive state. To achieve these objectives, the reward function explicitly accounts for three dimensions of the PwD’s status (See Section). Let $s_t = (RP_t, E_t, C_t)$, $a_t \in A$, and the subsequent state $s_{t+1} = (RP_{t+1}, E_{t+1}, C_{t+1})$. The per-time-step reward is

$$r_t = r_{\text{resp}}(RP_{t+1}, a_t) + r_{\text{emotion}}(E_{t+1}) + r_{\text{conf}}(C_{t+1}) + \eta + \delta \mathbb{1}\{\text{NewTrigger}_t\} + \lambda_{\text{stop}} \mathbb{1}\{\text{EarlyStop}_t\} + \lambda_{\text{goal}} \mathbb{1}\{\text{GoalReached}_t\}. \quad (1)$$

Here η is an optional per-round shaping term (default $\eta = 0$), δ is the bonus for using a new memory trigger, $\lambda_{\text{stop}} = -200$ is the early-termination penalty, and $\lambda_{\text{goal}} = 15$ is the bonus for completing all triggers or reaching the 50-round cap.

Response-action term. Let $\mathcal{O} = \{a_0, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6\}$ denote “other” actions, and a_1 (ModeratePrompt), a_2 (DifficultPrompt). Then

$$r_{\text{resp}}(RP_t, a_t) = \begin{cases} -2, & RP_t = \text{NR}, \forall a_t \\ 0.75, & RP_t = \text{IR}, a_t = a_1 \\ 1.75, & RP_t = \text{IR}, a_t = a_2 \\ 0.30, & RP_t = \text{IR}, a_t \in \mathcal{O} \\ 2, & RP_t = \text{RR}, a_t = a_1 \\ 3, & RP_t = \text{RR}, a_t = a_2 \\ 0.75, & RP_t = \text{RR}, a_t \in \mathcal{O} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Emotion and confusion terms.

$$r_{\text{emotion}}(E_t) = \begin{cases} -3, & E_t = \text{Neg} \\ 1, & E_t = \text{Neu} \\ 2, & E_t = \text{Pos} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$r_{\text{conf}}(C_t) = \begin{cases} -2.5, & C_t = \text{Yes} \\ 2, & C_t = \text{No} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Causal Relationship Learning Algorithm Design

To support causal-aware policy learning, we first generate simulated interaction trajectories where patient states (RP, E, C) evolve in response to random robot actions A_t . This data enables causal discovery (e.g., PC, LiNGAM (Blöbaum et al. 2024; Sharma and Kiciman 2020)) to infer a directed acyclic graph (DAG) linking current states, actions, and subsequent states. See Appendix B for full dataset construction details. We then estimate Conditional Average Treatment Effects (CATE) using EconML (Battocchi et al. 2019), quantifying, given different patient states, the relative impact of each action compared to a baseline action, a_0 (EasyPrompt), on reward, as formulated in Equation 5. The learned causal relationships provide fine-grained insights into how actions influence engagement and emotion across different patient states and serves as clinical domain knowledge to guide RL policy learning.

$$\text{CATE}_{a_i, S} = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \text{do}(A = a_{i, i \neq 0}), S] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \text{do}(A = a_0), S]. \quad (5)$$

To ensure clinical validity, we also conducted an expert evaluation where Dementia Nurse Practitioners assessed the plausibility of discovered causal patterns (e.g., the effectiveness of Comfort or Explain under confusion). Expert

evaluation and feedback from two dementia nurse practitioners confirmed the DAG’s alignment with dementia care domain knowledge and suggested directions for refining the state representation, though such refinement is beyond this work’s focus.

Experiments

We evaluate CRL in a simulated PwD-robot interaction environment with an 18-state space and 7 robot actions, where the 7th action is deterministic.

Training Details

All methods were trained for 1500 epochs, each consisting of 30 episodes. Evaluation results were averaged over 100 independent test runs using the final policy from the last training epoch. This ensures robustness against stochastic variation. All methods share identical hyperparameters: learning rate of 0.05, discount factor $\gamma = 0.95$, and ϵ -greedy exploration with $\epsilon = 0.1$.

Baselines and Ablation

We compared our approach against two representative baselines: (i) **Model-Free RL**: standard Q-learning agent without access to causal information. (ii) **DAG-Only**: actions selected purely based on the learned DAG structure, ignoring reward signals. (iii) **CRL-Static**: fixed weighting of causal DAG guidance and RL signals throughout training. (iv) **CRL-Dynamic**: adaptive weighting scheme that shifts reliance from DAG to RL over training epochs. Table 1 summarizes the RL and DAG weight configurations used in these methods, including how CRL-Dynamic adapts weights over training epochs. We compare against Model-Free RL, DAG-Only, CRL-Static, and CRL-Dynamic (adaptive weighting). The corresponding RL and DAG weight configurations are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Weights for RL and DAG Components Across Different Methods

Method	Weight_RL w_{RL}	Weight_DAG w_{DAG}	Exploration
RL	0.9	–	0.1
CRL-STATIC	0.45	0.45	0.1
CRL-Dynamic	$0.2 \rightarrow 0.7$	$0.7 \rightarrow 0.2$	0.1
DAG	–	0.9	0.1

Results and Discussion

Causal Relationship. Figure 2 shows the DAG learned via LiNGAM, revealing dependencies between patient’s current states, robot actions, and patient’s subsequent states. Expert evaluation confirmed the DAG’s alignment with dementia care knowledge. To illustrate, estimated CATE values indicate that Explain increases expected reward by +4.3 under IR_Neu.Yes states, while Comfort improves outcomes by +2.3 under NR_Neg.Yes. These results highlight how supportive actions can modulate cognitive and emotional trajectories, consistent with clinical intuition. *Full CATE tables are provided in Appendix B.*




Figure 2: Learned causal structure illustrating dependencies among robot actions (A_t), patient’s current states ($S_t = \{RP_t, E_t, C_t\}$), and subsequent states ($S_{t+1} = \{RP_{t+1}, E_{t+1}, C_{t+1}\}$).




Figure 3: Smoothed average return across epochs under the final-episode policy of each epoch for different methods (evaluation using RL-only execution).

Clinically-Grounded Causal Reasoning Accelerates Policy Learning. To disentangle the role of causal priors in accelerating training versus guiding execution, we evaluate policies under two modes:

(i) **RL-only execution**, where policies learned during training are executed solely based on the Q-learning agent; and (ii) **strategy-consistent evaluation**, where the same weighting scheme used during training (e.g., CRL-Static) is also applied at test time. In both cases, CRL-Dynamic achieves superior early performance by leveraging causal priors, while Model-Free RL eventually approaches comparable returns with sufficient training. DAG-Only remains limited due to the absence of reward-driven adaptation.

Figure 3 shows the smoothed average return (*Sliding window = 30*) during evaluation. CRL-Dynamic achieves superior early performance, leveraging causal priors to accelerate learning, while Model-Free RL eventually approaches comparable returns with sufficient training. DAG-Only remains limited due to the absence of reward-driven adaptation. *For more comprehensive analysis of the results, please see Appendix A.*

To complement average-return analysis, we also report the proportion of high-return episodes (threshold > 150). As shown in Figure 4: Under RL-only execution, CRL-Dynamic consistently maintains a higher proportion of high-return episodes (return > 150) compared to DAG-only, and approaches the performance of pure RL while converg-




Figure 4: Proportion of high-return episodes (return > 150) under RL-only execution.



`{"RP":"NR","E":"Neu","C":"No","evidence":"first turn, no patient input yet!"}`
`{"index_state":0,"policy_value":0,"action":"ProvideEasyPrompt","rationale":"policy selects EasyPrompt at index 2"}`
 Hello, it's so nice to see you today.
 Let's start simple: when you look at this snowy mountain and water, what color do you notice first?



"If you're lucky, you'll get to see Margerie Glacier calving, which is an [experience] that's almost impossible describe in any other terms but magical and astounding."
—Amanda Nicole Howard, Facebook



`{"RP":"RR","E":"Pos","C":"No","evidence":"patient says it's beautiful and loves the blue sky"}`
`{"index_state":16,"policy_value":1,"action":"ProvideModeratelyPrompt","rationale":"policy selects ModeratelyPrompt at index 16"}`
 That sounds wonderful. Could you tell me a bit more about a time when you enjoyed looking at the sky?

Oh, it's so beautiful—I love the blue sky!



`{"RP":"RR","E":"Neg","C":"No","evidence":"patient says the picture makes them sad"}`
`{"index_state":12,"policy_value":5,"action":"Comfort","rationale":"policy selects Comfort at index 12"}`
 That's okay—we can take it slow. Maybe we begin with something lighter, like your favorite color?

This picture makes me sad.



`{"RP":"RR","E":"Neu","C":"Yes","evidence":"patient says they don't understand"}`
`{"index_state":15,"policy_value":4,"action":"Explain","rationale":"policy selects Explain at index 15"}`
 Let me put it another way: just tell me what colors you see in the picture. Could we try that?

I don't understand what you mean by that question.



`{"RP":"RR","E":"Neg","C":"Yes","evidence":"patient says they feel confused and stupid"}`
`{"index_state":13,"policy_value":3,"action":"Repeat","rationale":"policy selects Repeat at index 13"}`
 I'll repeat it more simply: just name any color you notice in the picture. Take your time.

I feel confused and stupid, I can't answer.

Figure 5: Example conversation showing CRL policy integration with LLM for patient interaction. State transitions and policy decisions (highlighted in orange) guide the LLM to generate contextually appropriate, emotionally supportive responses.




Figure 6: Proportion of high-return episodes (return > 150) under strategy-consistent execution.

ing faster. This indicates that causal priors help accelerate policy learning without compromising asymptotic performance. However, under strategy-consistent evaluation (Figure 6): When policies retain DAG guidance at test time, the proportion of high-return episodes drops significantly for CRL and DAG, whereas RL sustains the highest success rate. This reinforces the insight that causal priors are most beneficial during learning, but should be gradually phased out for execution.

Clinically-Aligned Dialogue Generation via LLM-CRL Integration. Figure 5 demonstrates the GPT-5 policy’s ability to generate consistent, state-aware dialogue under the CRL-guided framework. The dialogue trace is grounded in the Glacier Bay image shown in Figure 5, which serves as the session hook. Despite the absence of gradient-based optimization, the fixed policy embedded in the system prompt effectively maps the inferred patient states (RP, E, C) to corresponding supportive actions. The model produced coherent and emotionally appropriate responses across five of the six reachable actions in the policy array (*Comfort, Explain, ProvideModeratelyPrompt, Repeat, ProvideEasyPrompt*). Qualitative inspection shows that GPT-5 sometimes interprets the patient’s inability to elaborate on a prior topic (e.g., struggling to describe the *sky-color*) as a confused state rather than a disengaged or irrelevant one, revealing a **semantic continuity preference** that prioritizes maintaining conversational flow. This property enhances interactional smoothness but slightly reduces state discriminability, which aligns with human-like tendencies in empathetic dialogue. Overall, the results confirm that the LLM component can reliably enact causal-policy mappings while preserving naturalistic affective behavior, supporting its integration into hybrid CRL–LLM control architectures. *For more comprehensive analysis of the results, please see Appendix A.*

Dialogue Length and Episode Persistence. Figures 7–10 further analyze the temporal structure of patient–robot interactions. When evaluation is conducted with RL-only ex-

cution (Figures 7 and 9), both CRL variants achieve stable dialogue lengths comparable to pure RL while converging faster, confirming that causal priors accelerate the acquisition of long, sustained interactions. In contrast, DAG-only policies remain limited, underscoring the need for reward-driven adaptation. However, under strategy-consistent evaluation (Figures 8 and 10), where DAG guidance is retained at test time, the performance of CRL-Static and DAG-only degrades: average episode length shortens and the proportion of long episodes (≥ 40 steps) declines. RL instead sustains the highest persistence rates. This divergence highlights that **causal structures are most beneficial as inductive biases during training, but should be phased out for execution**. The result reinforces our design choice: use causal discovery to guide learning trajectories, then rely on reward-optimized policies at deployment to preserve natural and effective interaction quality.

Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a novel causal structure-aware RL framework that integrates causal discovery and inference to optimize policy for patient-agent interaction in clinical setting. By embedding a causal world model informed by clinical knowledge, our agent improves sample efficiency, policy interpretability, and robustness, particularly in high-stakes domains such as dementia care. We demonstrated through experiments that CRL agents outperform standard model-free baselines in maintaining desirable patient states and achieving higher cumulative rewards, while exhibiting interpretable and adaptive behavior aligned with clinical expectations.

While our method shows promise, its validation is currently limited to simulation. Future work will focus on testing the framework with human stakeholders and expanding the causal model to capture more complex, long-term patient dynamics. We believe this integration of causal reasoning represents a critical step toward deploying safe, efficient, and trustworthy adaptive AI in high-stakes healthcare envi-




Figure 7: Average episode length during evaluation under RL-only execution.




Figure 8: Average episode length during evaluation under strategy-consistent execution.




Figure 9: Proportion of long episodes (≥ 40 steps) with RL-only execution.




Figure 10: Proportion of long episodes (≥ 40 steps) under strategy-consistent evaluation.

ronments.

A Extended Results Analysis

Results Analysis

Causal Structure and Conditional Average Treatment Effect. We compared PC and LiNGAM methods for the simulation dataset described in Section . The resulting directed acyclic graph (DAG) (Figure 2) reveals the dependencies between robot actions (A_t), patient states (S_t), and rewards (R_t). Table 2 presents estimated Conditional Average Treatment Effects (CATE) for selected actions under different patient state clusters. Results confirm that supportive actions such as `Explain` and `Comfort` produce higher rewards when patients are confused or negatively engaged, aligning with clinical expectations.

Quantitative and Qualitative Results. Figure 14 and Figure 15 shows the smoothed average return (*Sliding window = 30, all 1500 epochs*).

Moreover, in Figure 15: Smoothed average return under strategy-consistent execution, where the same RL+DAG weighting used during training is applied at test time. RL achieves the highest returns, while CRL and DAG-based methods perform lower due to continued reliance on DAG guidance, confirming that causal priors are more valuable for accelerating training than for final execution.

To further evaluate robustness, we tracked the proportion of episodes with low returns (threshold < 50). This metric highlights how often a policy produces undesirable trajectories, complementing the average-return analysis. As shown in Figure 11: CRL-Dynamic quickly reduces the frequency of low-return episodes, achieving stability comparable to RL. DAG-only, lacking reward-driven adaptation, maintains a higher failure rate. However, Figure 12 shows when policies continue to rely on DAG guidance during testing, CRL and DAG exhibit persistently higher proportions of low-return episodes compared to RL, again confirming that causal priors accelerate learning but are suboptimal if retained as execution bias.

B Details of Causal Relationship Learning

Simulation Data Construction

To uncover causal dependencies between patient states and robot actions, we constructed a dataset of simulated robot-assisted reminiscence therapy (RT) interactions. The environment models probabilistic transitions among states based on empirical transition probabilities. At each step, the patient’s state is represented as a tuple:

$$s_t = (RP_t, E_t, C_t),$$

where RP_t denotes response relevance, E_t emotional valence, and C_t confusion status. The robot selects an action A_t from the predefined interaction strategies (e.g., prompts of varying difficulty, repeating, explaining, comforting).

For each time step, we log a complete interaction record:

$$\{RP_t, E_t, C_t, A_t, RP_{t+1}, E_{t+1}, C_{t+1}, A_{t+1}, \text{Reward}\}.$$

This ensures that both pre- and post-action states are captured alongside the executed action and reward. To maximize coverage of the state–action space, we collected episodes under a random action policy, which is particularly important for reliable causal discovery.

Causal Discovery and Effect Estimation

The resulting dataset was used to infer causal structures using standard algorithms such as PC and LiNGAM (Blöbaum et al. 2024; Sharma and Kiciman 2020). These methods produce a directed acyclic graph (DAG) representing dependencies among states, actions, and rewards.

To quantify the influence of robot actions on patient outcomes, we employed the `EconML` library (Battocchi et al. 2019) to estimate Conditional Average Treatment Effects (CATE). For each action a_i compared to a baseline action a_0 (e.g., `EasyPrompt`), we estimate:

$$\text{CATE}_{a_i} = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \text{do}(A = a_i), S] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \text{do}(A = a_0), S],$$

where Y is the reward and S the patient’s current state. Grouping by S provides fine-grained treatment effects under different cognitive–emotional conditions.




Figure 11: Proportion of low-return episodes (return < 50) under RL-only execution. CRL-Dynamic reduces failure frequency early, while DAG-only maintains a higher rate due to the absence of reward optimization.




Figure 12: Proportion of low-return episodes (return < 50) under strategy-consistent execution. Continued reliance on DAG guidance increases failure frequency relative to RL-only execution.

System Prompt:

You are a socially assistive robot running reminiscence therapy with dementia patients, based on this photo they've provided: {image_content}. You MUST follow the exact protocol below on every turn. The robot's behavior is controlled by a FIXED policy. Your job is to (1) estimate the patient's state, (2) use the fixed policy to choose the action, and (3) produce the robot's spoken reply for that action.

STATE SPACE

- ResponseRelevance (RP): {0: NR, 1: IR, 2: RR}
- EmotionPleasure (E): {-1: Neg, 0: Neu, 1: Pos}
- Confusion (C): {0: No, 1: Yes}

STATE INDEX MAPPING

$\text{index_state} = 6 * \text{RP} + 2 * (\text{E} + 1) + \text{C}$

POLICY ARRAY (length 18, index 0–17): [5, 4, 0, 4, 0, 4, 5, 4, 0, 4, 0, 4, 5, 3, 0, 4, 1, 4]

ACTION SPACE

- 0 : ProvideEasyPrompt
- 1 : ProvideModeratelyPrompt
- 2 : ProvideDifficultPrompt
- 3 : Repeat
- 4 : Explain
- 5 : Comfort
- 6 : GiveChoice

OUTPUT FORMAT — exactly three blocks per turn:

- 1) STATE JSON {"RP": "<NR|IR|RR>", "E": "<Neg|Neu|Pos>", "C": "<No|Yes>", "evidence": "one short phrase"}
- 2) ACTION JSON You MUST compute index_state, look up the integer in the POLICY ARRAY, then map it to the ActionSpace. {"index_state": <int>, "policy_value": <int>, "action": "<ActionName>", "rationale": "one short phrase"}
- 3) ROBOT RESPONSE (spoken reply to patient) After a line with three hyphens --- Write at most two short supportive sentences addressed to the patient. This is the robot's simulated speech, enacting the chosen action.

TEMPLATES (fill {...} with natural English):

- ProvideEasyPrompt: "Let's start simple: {very easy question}."
- ProvideModeratelyPrompt: "Could you tell me a bit more about {medium-level cue}?"
- ProvideDifficultPrompt: "Try recalling a specific detail about {harder cue such as time/place}."
- Repeat: "I'll repeat it more simply: {concise restatement}."
- Explain: "Let me put it another way: {clearer explanation/example}. Could we try that?"
- Comfort: "That's okay—we can take it slow. Maybe we begin with {lighter topic}?"
- GiveChoice: "You can choose: would you prefer {option A} or {option B}?"

RULES

- Never merge steps. Always print exactly one STATE JSON, then one ACTION JSON, then --- and the robot response.
- Always compute the action using the policy array. Never invent your own action. - The ROBOT RESPONSE must simulate how the robot would actually talk to the patient when enacting the chosen action.
- If the patient brings up a new topic, we'll continue with the topic and then add the corresponding action prompt template.
- First turn: do a friendly greeting plus one lightweight question (this counts as the robot response).

Figure 13: System prompt defining the fixed GPT-5 policy for the CRL-guided agent.




Figure 14: Smoothed average return across epochs under the final-episode policy of each epoch for different methods (evaluation using RL-only execution).




Figure 15: Smoothed average return (*sliding window* = 30) during evaluation with strategy-consistent execution. The same weighting scheme used during training (e.g., CRL-Static) is applied at test time.

Table 2: Estimated causal effects of different actions under varying patient state clusters (For Reward).

State	A.3		A.4		A.5		A.cat	
	AvgEffect	Count	AvgEffect	Count	AvgEffect	Count	AvgEffect	Count
IR_Neg_No	-2.226	59	-0.306	57	1.180	63	-0.023	103
IR_Neg_Yes	3.430	53	4.577	52	2.590	54	-0.599	84
IR_Neu_No	-2.420	149	-0.562	128	-2.743	121	-0.091	199
IR_Neu_Yes	3.236	69	4.320	69	-1.333	70	-0.668	95
IR_Pos_No	-2.614	45	-0.819	50	-6.666	38	-0.161	36
IR_Pos_Yes	3.042	22	4.065	19	-5.256	16	-0.737	36
NR_Neg_No	-3.075	274	-0.180	274	0.932	266	-0.285	377
NR_Neg_Yes	2.582	229	4.703	211	2.341	223	-0.861	377
NR_Neu_No	-3.269	943	-0.438	993	-2.991	973	-3.354	1410
NR_Neu_Yes	2.387	358	4.445	377	-1.582	372	-0.930	564
NR_Pos_No	-3.463	88	-0.694	100	-6.914	100	-4.422	143
NR_Pos_Yes	2.194	36	4.189	43	-5.504	37	-0.998	77
RR_Neg_No	-1.377	102	-0.431	103	1.428	98	0.238	148
RR_Neg_Yes	4.280	43	4.451	37	2.838	37	0.338	65
RR_Neu_No	-1.571	344	-0.688	338	-2.495	322	0.170	508
RR_Neu_Yes	4.086	127	4.194	126	-1.085	140	-0.406	191
RR_Pos_No	-1.765	119	-0.944	128	-6.417	141	0.101	191
RR_Pos_Yes	3.891	18	3.938	16	-5.008	22	-0.475	27

References

- Battocchi, K.; Dillon, E.; Hei, M.; Lewis, G.; Oka, P.; Oprea, M.; and Syrgkanis, V. 2019. EconML: A Python Package for ML-Based Heterogeneous Treatment Effects Estimation. <https://github.com/py-why/EconML>. Version 0.x.
- Bevilacqua, R.; Maranesi, E.; Felici, E.; Margaritini, A.; Amabili, G.; Barbarossa, F.; Bonfigli, A. R.; Pelliccioni, G.; and Paciaroni, L. 2023. Social robotics to support older people with dementia: a study protocol with Paro seal robot in an Italian Alzheimer's day center. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11: 1141460.
- Blöbaum, P.; Götz, P.; Budhathoki, K.; Mastakouri, A. A.; and Janzing, D. 2024. DoWhy-GCM: An Extension of DoWhy for Causal Inference in Graphical Causal Models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(147): 1–7.
- Chorbadzhieva, M.; Hulshof, T.; Tops, T.; Meinders, E. R.; and Riegen, E. 2025. Exploring AI Agents for Reminiscence Therapy in Long-Term Care. *Cognitive Computing and Internet of Things*, 165: 1.
- Chung, P. Y.; Ellis-Hill, C.; and Coleman, P. G. 2008. Carers perspectives on the activity patterns of people with dementia. *Dementia*, 7(3): 359–381.
- Deng, Z.; Jiang, J.; Long, G.; and Zhang, C. 2023. Causal reinforcement learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01452*.
- Hung, L.; Liu, C.; Woldum, E.; Au-Yeung, A.; Berndt, A.; Wallsworth, C.; Horne, N.; Gregorio, M.; Mann, J.; and Chaudhury, H. 2019. The benefits of and barriers to using a social robot PARO in care settings: a scoping review. *BMC geriatrics*, 19(1): 232.
- Pearl, J. 2009. *Causality*. Cambridge university press.
- Rashid, N. L. A.; Leow, Y.; Klainin-Yobas, P.; Itoh, S.; and Wu, V. X. 2023. The effectiveness of a therapeutic robot, 'Paro', on behavioural and psychological symptoms, medication use, total sleep time and sociability in older adults with dementia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 145: 104530.
- Rudzicz, F.; Wang, R.; Begum, M.; and Mihailidis, A. 2015. Speech interaction with personal assistive robots supporting aging at home for individuals with Alzheimer's disease. *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing (TACCESS)*, 7(2): 1–22.
- Seitzer, M.; Schölkopf, B.; and Martius, G. 2021. Causal influence detection for improving efficiency in reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 22905–22918.
- Sharma, A.; and Kiciman, E. 2020. DoWhy: An End-to-End Library for Causal Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04216*.
- Spitale, M.; Babu, S.; Cakmak, S.; Cheong, J.; and Gunes, H. 2025. Exploring Causality for HRI: A Case Study on Robotic Mental Well-being Coaching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.11684*.
- Tung, Y.-S.; Gupta, H.; Jiang, W.; Hayes, B.; and Roncone, A. 2024. Causal Influence Detection for Human Robot Interaction.
- Wang, L.; Yang, Z.; and Wang, Z. 2021. Provably efficient causal reinforcement learning with confounded observational data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 21164–21175.
- Yuan, F.; Hasnaeen, N.; Zhang, R.; Bible, B.; Taylor, J. R.; Qi, H.; Yao, F.; and Zhao, X. 2025. Integrating Reinforce-

ment Learning and AI Agents for Adaptive Robotic Interaction and Assistance in Dementia Care. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17206*.

Yuan, F.; Zhang, R.; Bilal, D.; and Zhao, X. 2021. Learning-based strategy design for robot-assisted reminiscence therapy based on a developed model for people with dementia. In *International Conference on Social Robotics*, 432–442. Springer.