

# Look Before You Leap: Towards Decision-Aware and Generalizable Tool-Usage for Large Language Models

Anchun Gui<sup>♣\*</sup> Jian Li<sup>♣\*</sup> Yong Dai<sup>♣</sup> Nan Du<sup>♣</sup> Han Xiao<sup>♣†</sup>

<sup>♣</sup>Xiamen University <sup>♣</sup>Tencent AI Lab

anchungui@stu.xmu.edu.cn jackjianli@tencent.com

## Abstract

Tool-augmented large language models (LLMs) are attracting widespread attention when accessing up-to-date knowledge and alleviating hallucination issues. Nowadays, advanced closed-source LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT) have demonstrated surprising tool-usage capabilities through prompting and in-context learning techniques. To empower the capabilities of open-source LLMs (e.g., LLaMA) in manipulating tools, current efforts focus on either template-driven or token-triggered tool-usage. However, the former hampers LLMs’ flexibility to address diverse user’s queries due to constrained tool interactions, while the latter limits the generalizability when engaging with new tools, since tool-usage learning is based on task- and tool-specific datasets. To alleviate these concerns, in this paper, we propose a decision-aware and generalizable tool-usage framework (DEER). Specifically, we first construct the tool-usage samples with multiple decision branches via an automatic generation pipeline, thereby inspiring the decision-making awareness of LLMs under diverse scenarios. Meanwhile, we propose a novel tool sampling strategy to enhance the generalizability of LLMs over unseen tools. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our proposed DEER is effective and significantly outperforms baselines across various datasets. The source codes are available at <https://github.com/Ericmututu/ToolDEER>.

## 1 Introduction

Despite tremendous advancements in large language models (LLMs) (Touvron et al., 2023a,b; OpenAI, 2023), the issues of hallucination (Ji et al., 2022) and unaccessible up-to-date knowledge limit LLMs to address professional and real-time queries. Tool-augmented LLMs, as a promising solution,




Figure 1: Given diverse user’s queries, LLMs are expected to make optimal decisions for diverse queries to reduce unnecessary tool-usage and accelerate inference.

are receiving extensive interest (Mialon et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2023a). On one hand, tool-usage allows LLMs to access domain-specific knowledge, which is beneficial in alleviating hallucination issues. On the other hand, the use of tools enables LLMs to interact with external real-world, which provides more potential applications for LLMs, such as weather querying, hotel booking, online shopping, etc. Although some advanced closed-source LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT, GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023)) have demonstrated surprising tool-usage capabilities by leveraging the prompting and in-context learning techniques, there is still a significant gap in compact open-source LLMs (e.g., LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023a), Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023)).

Recent research on the tool-usage of open-source LLMs can be generally categorized into two paradigms, as illustrated in Figure 2: (i) Template-driven tool-usage. First, the available tools (including their names, descriptions, APIs) are provided in the system prompt. Then, for any user’s query, the model is constrained to interact with tools following a specific format (e.g., “Thought-Action-Observation”). The final answer is obtained when reaching the maximum rounds of interaction or outputting a special terminator. Representative works include ToolLLaMA (Qin et al., 2023b), ToolAlpaca (Tang et al., 2023),

\* Equal contribution. Work was done during Anchun’s internship at Tencent AI Lab.

† Corresponding author.




Figure 2: Comparison of different tool-usage paradigms. (a) In template-driven tool-usage, for any query, the interaction with tools is continuously implemented following a specific format (e.g., “Thought-Action-Observation”) until obtaining the final answer. (b) In token-triggered tool-usage, the tool can be triggered by generating a specific token (e.g., “->”) during inference. (c) In our decision-aware tool-usage, we design multiple decision branches (i.e., ①, ②, ③, ④) to address diverse user’s queries, deciding whether should search for tools and whether there are suitable tools. Note that the candidate toolset indicates the set of currently provided tools for the model.

etc. (ii) Token-triggered tool-usage. During inference, the decoding process is paused when encountering a particular token (e.g., “->”). Then, the calling command is extracted to request the corresponding API. Next, the API’s response is appended to the currently generated text before the decoding process resumes. Representative works include TALM (Parisi et al., 2022), Toolformer (Schick et al., 2023), ToolkenGPT (Hao et al., 2023), etc.

**Challenges & Motivations.** Although these methods achieve the interaction between LLMs and tools, there are still some limitations: (i) Lack of decision-making awareness for tool-usage. For template-driven tool-usage, the interaction process must follow a specific format for any user’s query, which causes LLMs to lose flexibility when handling diverse queries. In fact, an ideal scenario in Figure 1 is that, for general queries (e.g., “Can you give me five tips for keeping happy?”), LLMs should give an answer with their own knowledge rather than resorting to external tools. Besides, we expect that LLMs could stop tool calls when there is no suitable API in available tools, in case incurring invalid tool-usage and sluggish inference. (ii) Lack of generalization on unseen tools. For token-triggered tool-usage, such as Toolformer, which is trained on task- and tool-specific datasets, we cannot transfer it directly to the new tools.

To address these limitations, in this paper, we

propose a novel decision-aware and generalizable tool-usage framework (DEER) based on open-source LLMs. For the first limitation, we devise multiple decision branches based on the following questions, e.g., “Should I search for a tool? Or answer the query by myself?”, “Is there a suitable tool?”, as shown in Figure 2(c). Then, we construct the tool-usage dataset under diverse branches via an automatic generation pipeline (see Figure 3). To bolster the decision-making prowess, we employ supervised fine-tuning (SFT) to train the model on our designated dataset. For the second limitation, we propose a mixture of sampling strategies to boost the generalization of LLMs on unseen tools, where Inter-class, Intra-class, and Random sampling strategies (see Section 3.2 & 5.1) strengthen the diversity, consistency, and randomness of the available tools, respectively.

To verify the effectiveness of our proposed method, we perform extensive experiments on the tool-usage datasets. The results demonstrate that our models achieve state-of-the-art performance against other baselines. For instance, our model obtains 98.6% and 88.2% overall accuracy under the decisions of searching and calling, respectively, which significantly outperforms GPT-4 (78.1%, 87.6%). Moreover, our models also achieve superior generalization on various datasets (with the unseen tools) compared to other counterparts.




Figure 3: Pipeline of our sample generation. Detailed descriptions are presented in Section 3.1. Note that here we simplify the prompt templates and contexts for clarity, and full prompt templates are provided in Appendix A.3.

To summarize, our contributions are as follows:

- We propose a novel decision-aware and generalizable tool-usage framework (DEER) to enhance the decision-making awareness of LLMs when addressing diverse queries.
- We investigate the effect of diverse tool sampling strategies on model performance, and propose a mixture strategy to improve the generalizability of LLMs on new tools.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method, and our model obtains state-of-the-art performance in diverse scenarios compared to other baselines.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Tool-Augmented Language Models

Recently, several studies have demonstrated that closed-source LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT, GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023)) have surprising tool-usage capabilities via prompting and in-context learning techniques (Wei et al., 2022; Press et al., 2023; Hsieh et al., 2023). For example, ReAct (Yao et al., 2023) synergies the reasoning and acting processes using LLMs. Similar works include Chameleon (Lu et al., 2023), HuggingGPT (Shen et al., 2023), RestGPT (Song et al., 2023), GPT4Tools (Yang et al., 2023), and ART (Paranjape et al., 2023), which are based on the top of closed-source LLMs. In addition, some works propose benchmarks (e.g.,

API-Bank (Li et al., 2023), ToolQA (Zhuang et al., 2023), MetaTool (Huang et al., 2023)) to evaluate the effectiveness of LLMs’ tool-usage. Given the comprehensive investigation of closed-source LLMs, this paper primarily emphasizes enhancing the tool-usage capabilities of open-source LLMs (e.g., LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023a), Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023), Vicuna (Zheng et al., 2023)).

### 2.2 Tool-Usage with Open-Source LLMs

Currently, based on compact open-source LLMs, some works have been proposed under the template-driven paradigm, e.g., ToolLLaMA (Qin et al., 2023b), ToolAlpaca (Tang et al., 2023), Gorilla (Patil et al., 2023), and Xu et al. (2023b). Meanwhile, several studies are included in the token-triggered paradigm such as TALM (Parisi et al., 2022), Toolformer (Schick et al., 2023), ToolkenGPT (Hao et al., 2023). Although these methods allow LLMs to interact with external tools, they neglect the decision-making awareness and generalization of LLMs in diverse scenarios. For this reason, in this paper, we propose multi-decision branches of tool-usage and a novel tool sampling strategy to address these concerns.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Multi-Decision Branches Design

In contrast to previous methods that do not consider query difficulty and tool suitability, we expect the model to “Look Before You Leap” in different scenarios, as illustrated in Figure 2(c). We

achieve this goal by constructing a customized dataset with diverse branches and training our model on it. Specifically, for each query, the model is asked the first question “Should I search for a tool? Or answer the query by myself?” (denoted as Decision-Search). There are two cases: ① the query can be directly answered by the model without searching for tools; ② the query is beyond the model’s knowledge, then the currently available tools (denoted as Candidate Toolset) are provided to the model. Subsequently, based on case ②, the model is asked the second question “Is there a suitable tool?” (denoted as Decision-Call). There are also two scenarios: ③ the answer is no, where the tool-usage process is terminated then the query is still answered by the model itself (note that we provide an optional retrieval process for those domain-specific queries if the database has been constructed); ④ the answer is yes, then the interaction between LLMs and tools is indeed engaged, where the model produces the API call command then receives the corresponding response<sup>1</sup>.

**Automatic Generation Pipeline.** Based on the above considerations, we construct the tool-usage samples under diverse scenarios via an automatic generation pipeline as shown in Figure 3. To begin with, we provide the tool’s name and description in the prompt and ask GPT-4 to generate plausible function and 10 query-call pairs. Considering the randomness of generation, we filter out unreasonable pairs by leveraging GPT-4 again with another specific prompt. Then, for each query, we build a candidate toolset by sampling several tools from the set of all tools (i.e., the tool pool). There are two possible scenarios: (i) the optimal tool for the current query lies in the candidate toolset, then we fill the corresponding command of calling API in the prompt, denoted as Call sample; (ii) otherwise, we append the instruction that there is no suitable tool, denoted as NoCall sample. Next, we sample some queries from a general conversational dataset for examples that do not need to search for tools (denoted as NoSearch sample). Finally, our dataset consists of NoSearch, NoCall, and Call samples.

### 3.2 Tool Sampling

The reason why we need to construct the candidate toolset is that, limited by the maximum input length

<sup>1</sup>In fact, this process can be repeated several times, similar to the template-driven method. However, the difference in our setting is that, the model requires to determine the necessity of tool-usage before indeed implementing.




Figure 4: Illustration of different sampling strategies.

of LLMs, it is impractical to incorporate all tool information into the prompt at once. Furthermore, in real-world applications, new tools may become available and be required after model training and deployment. Therefore, we expect the model to have a good generalization capability when the unseen tools lie in the candidate toolset.

To this end, we propose to train our model under randomly sampled candidate toolsets with or without ground-truth tools, which is similar to the “Dropout” strategy during training DNNs (Srivastava et al., 2014). Specifically, we assume the set of all tools  $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $N$  is the number of tools and each tool ( $t$ ) consists of its name ( $n$ ), description ( $d$ ), and function ( $f$ ), i.e.,  $t = \{n, d, f\}$ . For the query ( $q$ ) that invokes the tool ( $t_q$ ), the candidate toolset ( $\mathcal{T}_c$ ) is constructed in the following three ways: (i) Random: we randomly take  $k$  tools from  $\mathcal{T}$  as  $\mathcal{T}_c$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_c = \{t_i | t_i \in \mathcal{T}\}_{i=1}^k$ . (ii) Inter-class: we first obtain the vectorized representation of tool  $e(t)$  by embedding the tool’s description  $d$ , i.e.,  $e(t) = \text{embedding}(t(d))$ <sup>2</sup>. Then, leveraging the K-means algorithm, we categorize all tools into  $m$  clusters, where the whole cluster set  $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^m C_i$  and each cluster  $C_i = \{t_1^{(i)}, t_2^{(i)}, \dots, t_{|C_i|}^{(i)}\}$  and  $|C_i| \geq k$ . Last, the candidate toolset is formed by  $\mathcal{T}_c = \{t | t \in C_i, C_i \in \Omega\}_{i=1}^k$ , where we first randomly select  $k$  clusters  $C_i \in \Omega$ , and then randomly select one tool  $t$  in each  $C_i$ . (iii) Intra-class: in contrast to Inter-class sampling,  $\mathcal{T}_c$  is constructed as follows:  $\mathcal{T}_c = \{t_i | t_i \in C^*, C^* \in \Omega\}_{i=1}^k$ , where we select one cluster  $C^*$  that includes the query needed tool  $t_q$ , and  $t_i$  is randomly sampled from  $C^*$ . In Section 5.1, we investigate the effectiveness of each sampling strategy, and find that the optimal performance can be obtained by

<sup>2</sup>In our experiments, we take the SentenceTransformer (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020) as the embedding model.



mixing Random, Inter-class, and Intra-class in a certain proportion (see Figure 5). The overall comparison of these three sampling strategies is illustrated in Figure 4, and the detailed algorithmic process is described in Appendix A.1.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Setup

**Datasets & Evaluation Protocols.** Firstly, we collect 977 tools (including their names and descriptions) by filtering ChatGPT-Plugins JSON<sup>3</sup>. Then, in Decision-Call scenario (i.e., Search), we construct a total of 8,650 samples based on 900 randomly selected tools, where the number of samples in NoCall and Call are 3,460 and 5,190, respectively. For those NoSearch samples, we randomly select 2,000 queries from general conversational dataset (Xu et al., 2023a). To evaluate the generalizability of models on unseen tools, we construct 743 test samples based on 77 additional tools (which are not involved in training), where the number of samples under NoCall and Call are 298 and 445, respectively. Detailed statistics of our datasets are shown in Table 2. In addition to our test set, we also conduct experiments on ToolBench (Qin et al., 2023b) and ToolCorpus (Tang et al., 2023)<sup>4</sup>.

To verify the effectiveness of our approach, we propose the following evaluation protocols: (i) In Decision-Search scenario, we define that

$$P_{\text{NoSearch}} = \frac{n_{\text{nos}}}{N_{\text{nos}}}, P_{\text{Search}} = \frac{n_s}{N_s}, P_{\text{DS}} = \frac{n_{\text{nos}} + n_s}{N_{\text{nos}} + N_s} \quad (1)$$

where  $n_{\text{nos}}$ ,  $n_s$  refer to the number of correctly predicted samples in NoSearch, Search, respectively;  $N_{\text{nos}}$ ,  $N_s$  indicate the total number of samples in NoSearch, Search, respectively. (ii) In Decision-Call scenario, we can define that

$$P_{\text{NoCall}} = \frac{n_{\text{noc}}}{N_{\text{noc}}}, P_{\text{Call}} = \frac{n_c}{N_c}, P_{\text{DC}} = \frac{n_{\text{noc}} + n_c}{N_{\text{noc}} + N_c} \quad (2)$$

where  $n_{\text{noc}}$ ,  $n_c$  refer to the number of correctly predicted samples in NoCall, Call, respectively;  $N_{\text{noc}}$ ,  $N_c$  indicate the total number of samples in NoCall, Call, respectively. Here,  $N_s = N_{\text{noc}} + N_c$ .

**Baselines.** Current advanced LLMs such as ChatGPT<sup>5</sup> and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) are introduced as

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/copilot-us/chatgpt-plugins/tree/main>

<sup>4</sup>For ToolBench, we choose G1-Category (Qin et al., 2023b) as the test set; for ToolCorpus (we named), the test set consists of the real and simulated sets (Tang et al., 2023).

<sup>5</sup>Note that ChatGPT and GPT-3.5-Turbo are equivalent in our statements, unless otherwise specified.

our strong baselines. To compare with the original model, we also introduce LLaMA2-13B-Chat (Touvron et al., 2023b) as a baseline. To evaluate their decision-making capabilities, we adopt the prompting and in-context learning techniques (where 2, 4, 6 demonstrations are employed, respectively) to ask them to make optimal decision towards diverse queries. Besides, we also introduce ToolLLaMA (Qin et al., 2023b) and ToolAlpaca (Tang et al., 2023) as the counterparts when evaluating the generalizability on unseen tools. In the experiments, our model is named as **ToolDEER**.

**Implementation.** In our experiments, LLaMA2-7B and LLaMA2-13B (Touvron et al., 2023b) are leveraged as the backbone models. During training, we fine-tune these models for several epochs on the training set via supervised fine-tuning (SFT) (Ouyang et al., 2022), then we directly evaluate the fine-tuned models on the validation and test sets. Note that the validation set is not involved in the training. In addition, to preserve the model’s original knowledge and general conversational capabilities as much as possible, we adopt LoRA-style (Hu et al., 2022) parameter-efficient fine-tuning. Finally, detailed configurations of hyperparameters (e.g., learning rate) are reported in Appendix A.2.

### 4.2 Main Results

**The decision awareness of tool-usage.** The results are reported in Table 1, from which we can draw the following observations: (i) Regarding the first level of Decision-Search, although powerful LLMs show somewhat discriminative capability, for example, GPT-4 achieves 78.1% accuracy with the help of 6 demonstrations, they still fall short of a satisfactory performance. From the comparison, our models achieve significant improvements after fine-tuning. For instance, ToolDEER-7B and ToolDEER-13B obtain 97.7% and 98.6% accuracy, respectively, in terms of determining whether a tool is needed for the query. (ii) Regarding the second level of Decision-Call, for these baselines (LLaMA2-13B-Chat, GPT-3.5-Turbo), their best discriminative capabilities (56.9%, 58.2%) are slightly better than random selection (50%). In comparison, GPT-4 achieves a highly competitive result of 87.6%. This is understandable since our datasets are generated by GPT-4. Nonetheless, ToolDEER-13B still outperforms GPT-4 by a significant margin. Considering the small-scale and open-source properties, our models are quite ap-

Method	Decision-Search			Decision-Call		
	P <sub>NoSearch</sub>	P <sub>Search</sub>	P <sub>DS</sub>	P <sub>NoCall</sub>	P <sub>Call</sub>	P <sub>DC</sub>
LLaMA2-13B-Chat (2-shot)	55.3 $\pm$ 11.6	66.5 $\pm$ 8.5	64.0 $\pm$ 6.4	54.5 $\pm$ 11.9	53.9 $\pm$ 3.9	54.2 $\pm$ 2.4
LLaMA2-13B-Chat (4-shot)	46.9 $\pm$ 7.6	73.7 $\pm$ 6.6	68.8 $\pm$ 6.7	50.1 $\pm$ 11.5	55.7 $\pm$ 7.4	52.0 $\pm$ 8.4
LLaMA2-13B-Chat (6-shot)	44.4 $\pm$ 9.1	74.4 $\pm$ 12.9	70.0 $\pm$ 7.5	73.5 $\pm$ 9.7	47.7 $\pm$ 9.8	56.9 $\pm$ 1.5
GPT-3.5-Turbo (2-shot)	53.2 $\pm$ 7.8	63.3 $\pm$ 8.8	61.4 $\pm$ 6.1	69.0 $\pm$ 10.1	51.5 $\pm$ 9.1	58.5 $\pm$ 2.2
GPT-3.5-Turbo (4-shot)	46.8 $\pm$ 5.8	68.3 $\pm$ 4.4	64.4 $\pm$ 2.8	61.2 $\pm$ 7.4	55.6 $\pm$ 10.5	57.9 $\pm$ 1.9
GPT-3.5-Turbo (6-shot)	43.8 $\pm$ 6.5	72.5 $\pm$ 1.4	67.3 $\pm$ 0.9	59.2 $\pm$ 11.7	57.4 $\pm$ 6.9	58.2 $\pm$ 0.7
GPT-4 (2-shot)	61.6 $\pm$ 9.8	78.4 $\pm$ 4.9	75.3 $\pm$ 2.8	87.1 $\pm$ 2.9	86.9 $\pm$ 1.4	86.9 $\pm$ 0.6
GPT-4 (4-shot)	70.3 $\pm$ 10.1	77.3 $\pm$ 5.2	76.1 $\pm$ 2.5	87.4 $\pm$ 2.2	87.2 $\pm$ 0.4	87.3 $\pm$ 0.8
GPT-4 (6-shot)	74.3 $\pm$ 5.7	78.9 $\pm$ 3.7	78.1 $\pm$ 2.3	87.3 $\pm$ 1.4	87.7 $\pm$ 0.8	87.6 $\pm$ 0.3
ToolDEER-7B	94.1 $\pm$ 1.6	98.4 $\pm$ 2.4	97.7 $\pm$ 2.1	83.5 $\pm$ 2.7	83.7 $\pm$ 1.8	83.4 $\pm$ 1.9
ToolDEER-13B	<b>95.9</b> $\pm$ 1.9	<b>99.2</b> $\pm$ 0.4	<b>98.6</b> $\pm$ 0.3	<b>88.9</b> $\pm$ 3.1	<b>88.4</b> $\pm$ 2.3	<b>88.2</b> $\pm$ 2.0

Table 1: The comparison of model’s decision-making awareness under Decision-Search and Decision-Call scenarios, respectively. Here, the baselines (i.e., LLaMA2-13B-Chat, GPT-3.5-Turbo, GPT-4) are equipped with 2, 4, 6 demonstrations, respectively, within in-context learning. Each result is averaged over six trials, where the subscript is the standard deviation. The first and second best results are marked with **bold** and underline, respectively.

	#NoSearch	#Search		#Total
		#NoCall	#Call	
Train	1, 807	3, 114	4, 664	9, 585
Valid	193	346	526	1, 065
Test	-	298	445	743

Table 2: Statistics of our datasets. # refers to the number of samples in the corresponding decision scenario.

peeling compared to closed-source LLMs.

### The generalization of tool-usage on unseen tools.

The results are shown in Table 3, where we can observe that: (i) ToolDEER-13B achieves state-of-the-art performance across various datasets, which demonstrates the superior generalization of our method on new tools. For example, on our dataset, ToolDEER-13B obtains  $P_{DC} = 89.2\%$  and even achieves 91.5% accuracy in Call case. Moreover, based on ToolBench and ToolCorpus, ToolDEER-7B and ToolDEER-13B also outperform their counterparts with significant improvements, especially on ToolBench. (ii) Our models not only maintain high generalization on unseen tools, but also keep high accuracy in NoCall scenario. In contrast, ToolLLaMA and ToolAlpaca have almost no such capability on our dataset and ToolCorpus. Note that on ToolBench, they have 16.3% – 28.8% accuracy, which we speculate that this may be attributable to

the disparate difficulty levels of these datasets.

## 5 Analysis

### 5.1 The Effect of Tool Sampling Strategy

In the main experiments, we achieve high accuracy and strong generalization on the validation and test sets, respectively, by mixing Random, Inter-class, and Intra-class sampling strategies. Therefore, a natural research question is: How do different sampling strategies affect model performance? To this end, we individually employ each sampling strategy during training and then explore its impact on the validation set (with seen tools) and test set (with unseen tools). Here, we use consistent experimental setups with Section 4.1.

The comparisons are reported in Figure 5, where we can observe that: (i) Under Random sampling, the model only obtains moderate accuracy and generalization on the validation and test sets. (ii) Under Inter-class sampling, the model achieves superior accuracy on the validation set, but the generalization on the test set is unsatisfactory. (iii) Under Intra-class sampling, while the accuracy is decreased on the validation set, surprisingly, the gains on the test set are significant. Therefore, we can draw the following conclusions: Inter-class sampling could enhance the accuracy but limits the generalization; in contrast, Intra-class sampling decreases the accuracy yet significantly benefits the

Method	Our Dataset (Test)			ToolBench (Qin et al., 2023b)			ToolCorpus (Tang et al., 2023)		
	P <sub>NoCall</sub>	P <sub>Call</sub>	P <sub>DC</sub>	P <sub>NoCall</sub>	P <sub>Call</sub>	P <sub>DC</sub>	P <sub>NoCall</sub>	P <sub>Call</sub>	P <sub>DC</sub>
LLaMA2-13B-Chat <sup>†</sup>	76.5 $\pm$ 11.7	48.1 $\pm$ 9.4	58.4 $\pm$ 3.7	77.4 $\pm$ 5.4	33.3 $\pm$ 4.3	53.2 $\pm$ 5.6	74.5 $\pm$ 9.7	72.0 $\pm$ 9.3	73.1 $\pm$ 5.7
GPT-3.5-Turbo <sup>†</sup>	61.5 $\pm$ 4.7	59.6 $\pm$ 2.4	60.4 $\pm$ 1.3	82.1 $\pm$ 5.8	64.9 $\pm$ 4.6	71.6 $\pm$ 2.3	56.4 $\pm$ 12.8	86.9 $\pm$ 5.7	74.9 $\pm$ 6.3
GPT-4 <sup>†</sup>	<b>88.6</b> $\pm$ 3.1	89.4 $\pm$ 1.5	89.0 $\pm$ 1.2	86.5 $\pm$ 4.9	84.7 $\pm$ 3.2	85.9 $\pm$ 2.4	74.4 $\pm$ 8.3	<b>97.9</b> $\pm$ 4.6	84.2 $\pm$ 5.4
ToolLLaMA-7B	5.4 $\pm$ 1.7	79.3 $\pm$ 2.7	49.7 $\pm$ 2.8	24.7 $\pm$ 2.1	78.0 $\pm$ 0.9	55.0 $\pm$ 2.2	5.2 $\pm$ 1.7	91.8 $\pm$ 0.9	56.3 $\pm$ 0.7
ToolAlpaca-7B	1.0 $\pm$ 0.9	84.1 $\pm$ 1.2	50.8 $\pm$ 0.8	28.8 $\pm$ 1.6	58.3 $\pm$ 0.4	46.5 $\pm$ 0.7	5.4 $\pm$ 2.3	90.7 $\pm$ 1.6	56.6 $\pm$ 1.2
ToolAlpaca-13B	2.7 $\pm$ 1.7	90.3 $\pm$ 0.8	55.2 $\pm$ 0.9	16.3 $\pm$ 3.7	66.7 $\pm$ 3.1	46.5 $\pm$ 2.9	7.8 $\pm$ 1.5	93.9 $\pm$ 1.8	58.2 $\pm$ 1.4
ToolDEER-7B	84.0 $\pm$ 1.9	85.2 $\pm$ 2.1	84.5 $\pm$ 1.6	85.4 $\pm$ 0.7	83.3 $\pm$ 1.2	84.5 $\pm$ 0.9	80.4 $\pm$ 2.1	96.0 $\pm$ 1.0	89.7 $\pm$ 0.6
ToolDEER-13B	88.0 $\pm$ 2.3	<b>91.5</b> $\pm$ 1.5	<b>89.2</b> $\pm$ 1.6	<b>88.5</b> $\pm$ 1.4	<b>86.7</b> $\pm$ 0.8	<b>87.0</b> $\pm$ 1.3	<b>81.6</b> $\pm$ 2.9	97.3 $\pm$ 2.3	<b>90.5</b> $\pm$ 1.0

Table 3: The comparison of generalizability on unseen tools. The baselines<sup>†</sup> are equipped with 6 demonstrations within in-context learning. The first and second best results are marked with **bold** and underline, respectively.




Figure 5: Comparisons of diverse tool sampling strategies (in the first row) and sampling ratios (in the second row, where “Random : Intra-class : Inter-class” in the  $x$ -axis). Here, the experiments of the first, second, and third columns are conducted on the NoCall, Call, and Decision-Call scenarios (i.e., P<sub>NoCall</sub>, P<sub>Call</sub>, P<sub>DC</sub>), respectively. Note that the valid(ation) and test sets are built on seen and unseen tools, respectively.

generalization; Random makes a trade-off between accuracy and generalization. This is understandable, here we provide some intuitive explanations from the perspective of contrastive learning. For Inter-class sampling, it enhances the diversity of candidate toolset by introducing “negative” tools from different clusters, which allows the model to identify the optimal tool in an easy mode. However, it also hinders the model from distinguishing among similar tools. In contrast, Intra-class sampling builds the candidate toolset by introducing “positive” tools from the cluster where the optimal tool is located, which results in highly similar tools in the current candidate toolset. Nevertheless, the model can still select the optimal tool through SFT training, which strongly boosts the model’s

understanding and discriminative capabilities for diverse tools. This may explain to some extent why the generalization on the test set is significantly improved under Intra-class strategy.

Based on above observations, we propose to mix these three sampling strategies to achieve both high accuracy and strong generalization. The experimental results also support our assumption, referring to the Mixture sampling in Figure 5. In addition, we also explore the influence of sampling ratio in the second row of Figure 5, where the state-of-the-art performance is obtained when Random : Intra-class : Inter-class = 2 : 1 : 2.




Figure 6: Ablation experiments of hyperparameters, where the dashed line refers to the average of all metrics, # indicates the number (or size) of corresponding item, and \* denotes the setting we used in our experiments.

Method	BLEU	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L
ToolLLaMA-7B	3.5	26.0	9.3	16.6
ToolAlpaca-7B	5.7	31.0	12.7	18.9
ToolDEER-7B	<b>10.9</b>	<b>42.7</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>26.5</b>

Table 4: The comparison with the original model on maintaining general conversational capacity.

## 5.2 Ablation Study

In this section, we mainly investigate the following research questions<sup>6</sup>. **RQ1:** How many samples in NoSearch scenario can preserve the model’s general conversational capability? **RQ2:** How does the size of tool pool ( $|\mathcal{T}|$ ) affect model performance? **RQ3:** How does the number of tools in the candidate toolset ( $|\mathcal{T}_c|$ ) affect the performance? **RQ4:** In Intra- and Inter-class sampling, does the number of clusters ( $|\Omega|$ ) affect the performance? To answer these questions, we conduct extensive experiments under various settings in Figure 6, from which we can observe that: (i) Overall, the performance is improved with the increasing of NoSearch samples and  $|\mathcal{T}|$ . (ii) The model is more likely to identify the most appropriate tool when the size of  $|\mathcal{T}_c|$  and  $|\Omega|$  are 5 and 30, respectively. And, more tool clusters may yield negative effects rather than further improving the performance.

## 5.3 Assessment of General Dialogue Capacity

As we illustrated in Section 1, previous paradigms such as template-driven tool-usage would limit LLMs’ general conversational capabilities, since they are constrained to following specific generation templates to answer user’s queries. To this end, in our tool-usage strategy, we reserve a quick decision path (i.e., NoSearch), where the query can be directly answered by LLMs without searching for

<sup>6</sup>The experiments in this section are performed on the validation set using LLaMA-7B as the backbone model. More experiments on hyperparameters are presented in Appendix A.2.




Figure 7: Examples of calling the real-world APIs (e.g., `get_weather`, `get_stock_exchange`)<sup>7</sup>, where the gray is an intermediate reasoning step (invisible for the user), the green is final response to the user’s query.

the tool. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our strategy, we provide quantitative comparisons with baselines in Table 4. Specifically, on 1,000 queries randomly selected from the general conversational dataset, we take the output of original model as the ground-truth, and then measure the discrepancy between diverse model’s output and ground-truth via BLEU and ROUGE-1/2/L (F1 score) metrics (Papineni et al., 2002; Lin, 2004). As can be seen from Table 4, the outputs of our model have a high consistency with the original model compared to baselines, which suggests that our method greatly maintains the general dialog capability. More detailed examples are presented in Appendix A.2.

## 5.4 Case Study: Call the Real-World APIs

Although our datasets are partially synthesized by GPT-4, in fact, this would not affect the usage of real-world tools based on our proposed framework. To demonstrate this, we provide some practical examples of calling real-world APIs in Figure 7. It can be seen that our model could generalize to real-world tools well, simply by describing the new tool following our format in the candidate toolset. More examples are shown in Appendix A.2.

<sup>7</sup>For the weather: <https://openweathermap.org/>; for the stock: <https://site.financialmodelingprep.com/>.



## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a decision-aware and generalizable tool-usage framework (DEER) to enhance LLMs’ decision-making awareness when addressing diverse user’s queries. Meanwhile, we propose a mixture of tool sampling strategy to further improve the generalization of LLMs over unseen tools. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed methods.

## Limitations

In this work, we propose a decision-aware and generalizable tool-usage framework for large language models and demonstrate its advantages compared to the baselines through extensive experiments. However, there are some limitations so far: (i) Considering that collecting numerous tool APIs from the real-world is labor-intensive and time-consuming and in this paper we focus on exploring the LLMs’ decision-making awareness and the generalizability of tool-usage, therefore, it is feasible to synthesize diverse tool APIs through GPT-4. In addition, we also demonstrate in Section 5.4 that this tool-usage framework we proposed can directly generalize the real-world tool APIs. (ii) Limited by computational resources, we do not scale our method on larger LLMs (e.g., LLaMA2-70B). Nonetheless, the improvements are observed from LLaMA-7B to LLaMA-13B, thus we believe that better results can be obtained with larger models.

## Ethics Statement

Our proposed tool-usage framework can effectively reduce the resource consumption of LLMs when manipulating diverse tools. It could be helpful in decreasing carbon emissions, thus making the application and deployment of LLMs more environmentally friendly and sustainable. In addition, all models and datasets used in our experiments are publicly available and have not been reported to carry social bias against any sensitive attributes, and the method we propose would not explicitly introduce new negative societal impacts.

## References

Tri Dao, Daniel Y. Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. [FlashAttention: Fast and Memory-Efficient Exact Attention with IO-Awareness](#). arXiv:2205.14135.

Shibo Hao, Tianyang Liu, Zhen Wang, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. [ToolkenGPT: Augmenting Frozen Language Models with Massive Tools via Tool Embeddings](#). arXiv:2305.11554.

Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Si-An Chen, Chun-Liang Li, Yasuhisa Fujii, Alexander Ratner, Chen-Yu Lee, Ranjay Krishna, and Tomas Pfister. 2023. [Tool Documentation Enables Zero-Shot Tool-Usage with Large Language Models](#). arXiv:2308.00675.

Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Yue Huang, Jiawen Shi, Yuan Li, Chenrui Fan, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Yixin Liu, Pan Zhou, Yao Wan, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, and Lichao Sun. 2023. [Meta-Tool Benchmark: Deciding Whether to Use Tools and Which to Use](#). arXiv:2310.03128.

Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Wenliang Dai, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2022. [Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation](#). *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38.

Minghao Li, Feifan Song, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Zhoujun Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023. [API-Bank: A Benchmark for Tool-Augmented LLMs](#). arXiv:2304.08244.

Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Pan Lu, Baolin Peng, Hao Cheng, Michel Galley, Kai-Wei Chang, Ying Nian Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. [Chameleon: Plug-and-Play Compositional Reasoning with Large Language Models](#). arXiv:2304.09842.

Grégoire Mialon, Roberto Dessì, Maria Lomeli, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Ram Pasunuru, Roberta Raileanu, Baptiste Rozière, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Asli Celikyilmaz, Edouard Grave, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Augmented Language Models: A Survey](#). arXiv:2302.07842.

OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4 Technical Report](#). arXiv:2303.08774.

Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). arXiv:2203.02155.

- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: A Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Bhargavi Paranjape, Scott Lundberg, Sameer Singh, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Marco Tulio Ribeiro. 2023. [ART: Automatic multi-step reasoning and tool-use for large language models](#). arXiv:2303.09014.
- Aaron Parisi, Yao Zhao, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. [TALM: Tool Augmented Language Models](#). arXiv:2205.12255.
- Shishir G. Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2023. [Gorilla: Large Language Model Connected with Massive APIs](#). arXiv:2305.15334.
- Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2023. [Measuring and Narrowing the Compositionality Gap in Language Models](#). arXiv:2210.03350.
- Yujia Qin, Shengding Hu, Yankai Lin, Weize Chen, Ning Ding, Ganqu Cui, Zheni Zeng, Yufei Huang, Chaojun Xiao, Chi Han, Yi Ren Fung, Yusheng Su, Huadong Wang, Cheng Qian, Runchu Tian, Kunlun Zhu, Shihao Liang, Xingyu Shen, Bokai Xu, Zhen Zhang, Yining Ye, Bowen Li, Ziwei Tang, Jing Yi, Yuzhang Zhu, Zhenning Dai, Lan Yan, Xin Cong, Yaxi Lu, Weilin Zhao, Yuxiang Huang, Junxi Yan, Xu Han, Xian Sun, Dahai Li, Jason Phang, Cheng Yang, Tongshuang Wu, Heng Ji, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023a. [Tool Learning with Foundation Models](#). arXiv:2304.08354.
- Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023b. [ToolLLM: Facilitating Large Language Models to Master 16000+ Real-world APIs](#). arXiv:2307.16789.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools](#). arXiv:2302.04761.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. 2023. [Hugging-GPT: Solving AI Tasks with ChatGPT and its Friends in HuggingFace](#). arXiv:2303.17580.
- Yifan Song, Weimin Xiong, Dawei Zhu, Cheng Li, Ke Wang, Ye Tian, and Sujian Li. 2023. [RestGPT: Connecting Large Language Models with Real-World Applications via RESTful APIs](#). arXiv:2306.06624.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. [Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(56):1929–1958.
- Qiaoyu Tang, Ziliang Deng, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Qiao Liang, Boxi Cao, and Le Sun. 2023. [ToolAlpaca: Generalized Tool Learning for Language Models with 3000 Simulated Cases](#). arXiv:2306.05301.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. [Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model](#). GitHub.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023a. [LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models](#). arXiv:2302.13971.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, and Kevin Stone. 2023b. [Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models](#). arXiv:2307.09288.
- 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 *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023a. [WizardLM: Empowering Large Language Models to Follow Complex Instructions](#). arXiv:2304.12244.
- Qiantong Xu, Fenglu Hong, Bo Li, Changran Hu, Zhengyu Chen, and Jian Zhang. 2023b. [On the Tool Manipulation Capability of Open-source Large Language Models](#). arXiv:2305.16504.
- Rui Yang, Lin Song, Yanwei Li, Sijie Zhao, Yixiao Ge, Xiu Li, and Ying Shan. 2023. [GPT4Tools: Teaching Large Language Model to Use Tools via Self-instruction](#). arXiv:2305.18752.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R. Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. [ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric. P Xing, Hao Zhang,

Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena](#). arXiv:2306.05685.

Yuchen Zhuang, Yue Yu, Kuan Wang, Haotian Sun, and Chao Zhang. 2023. [ToolQA: A Dataset for LLM Question Answering with External Tools](#). arXiv:2306.13304.

## A Appendix

### A.1 More Details of Implementation

In our experiments, we employ the transformers library from HuggingFace to fine-tune our models, where the default configurations of Trainer (e.g., AdamW optimizer) are used in the training process. Meanwhile, we deploy the LoRA-style parameter-efficient fine-tuning by using HuggingFace PEFT library. In addition, we also leverage Flash Attention (Dao et al., 2022) and DeepSpeed<sup>8</sup> technologies to reduce the requirement of GPU memory in our experiments. Note that all experiments are conducted on 8 NVIDIA V100 GPUs (32G). In addition, we describe the detailed algorithmic process of sampling strategies in Algorithm 1.

### A.2 More Experimental Results

To determine the optimal setting of hyperparameters during training, we conduct extensive experiments on the bottleneck size of LoRA, the batch size, the learning rate, and the number of epochs. The results are shown in Figure 8. Here, we also provide more practical examples in Figure 9 to demonstrate that our tool-usage framework can seamlessly transfer to real-world tools. In addition, more comparisons of general conversational capability are presented in Figure 10 and Figure 11.

### A.3 More Details of Templates

In this section, we present all the templates used in our experiments. In the data generation process, we first prompt GPT-4 to generate tool’s API and the corresponding query-call pairs using the template in Figure 12, and then check whether the generated query-call pair is reasonable by using the template in Figure 13. During the training and inference, we employ the template in Figure 14 as the system template. Besides, to evaluate the decision-making awareness of baselines (i.e., ChatGPT, GPT-4, LLaMA2-13B-Chat), we adopt the template in Figure 15 with some demonstrations. Similarly, the template in Figure 16 is utilized in the Decision-Call. Finally, for the inference of ToolAlpaca and ToolLLaMA on unseen tools, we use their original templates except for introducing a new tool (i.e., “NoCallAPI”) as a flag for not calling the tool, as shown in Figure 17 and Figure 18. Note that  $\{\dots\}$  in templates refers to the variable that will be populated in the implementation.

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed>

---

### Algorithm 1 Sampling Strategies for Constructing the Candidate Toolset

---

**Input:** The set of all tools  $\mathcal{T} = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , the user’s query  $q$  and corresponding tool  $t_q$  (with its description  $d$ ). The number of candidate tools and clusters are  $k$  and  $m$ , respectively. The sampling strategy is  $\text{mode} \in \{\text{random}, \text{inter-class}, \text{intra-class}\}$ .

**Output:** The candidate toolset  $\mathcal{T}_c$ .


```
1: # Step-1: Embedding
2: for  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}$  do
3:    $e(t_i) = \text{embedding}(t_i(d))$ 
4: end for
5: The tool’s vectorized set  $\mathcal{E} = \{e(t_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ .
6: # Step-2: Clustering
7:  $\Omega \leftarrow \text{K-means}(\mathcal{E}, m)$ 
8: where  $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^m (C_i = \{t_1^{(i)}, t_2^{(i)}, \dots, t_{|C_i|}^{(i)}\})$ .

9: # Step-3: Sampling
10: if  $\text{mode} == \text{random}$  then
11:   for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  do
12:      $t_i \leftarrow \mathcal{T}$  # randomly sampling
13:   end for
14:    $\mathcal{T}_c = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^k$ 
15: else if  $\text{mode} == \text{inter-class}$  then
16:    $\Omega_c \leftarrow \Omega$  # randomly sampling
17:   where  $\Omega_c = \{C_i\}_{i=1}^k$ .
18:   for  $C_i \in \Omega_c$  do
19:      $t_i \leftarrow C_i$  # randomly sampling
20:   end for
21:    $\mathcal{T}_c = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^k$ 
22: else if  $\text{mode} == \text{intra-class}$  then
23:    $C^* \leftarrow \Omega$ 
24:   where we ensure that  $t_q \in C^*$ .
25:   for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  do
26:      $t_i \leftarrow C^*$  # randomly sampling
27:   end for
28:    $\mathcal{T}_c = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^k$ 
29: end if
```


---

<sup>9</sup>Weather API: <https://openweathermap.org/>; Stock API: <https://site.financialmodelingprep.com/>; Wikipedia API: <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?search={ }>; Wolframalpha API: <https://products.wolframalpha.com/api/>; Coordinates & Distance API: <https://lbsyun.baidu.com/faq/api?title=webapi>.







(a) Bottleneck Size



(b) Batch Size



(c) Learning Rate



(d) Number of Epochs

Figure 8: More experiments on hyperparameters during training. \* denotes the setting we used in our experiments.



Figure 9: More examples of calling the real-world APIs (e.g., get\_weather, get\_stock\_price, get\_wikipedia\_info, get\_wolframalpha, get\_coordinates, get\_distance)<sup>9</sup>, where the gray is an intermediate reasoning step (invisible for the user), the green is final response to the user's query.

## How can I improve my productivity at work?



### LLaMA2-7B-Chat (Original)

To improve your productivity at work, consider the following tips:

1. **Prioritize your tasks:** Make a list of everything you need to do and prioritize them based on importance and urgency.
2. **Set specific goals:** Set clear and achievable goals for yourself, both short-term and long-term.
3. **Minimize distractions:** Identify things that distract you the most, such as social media or email, and eliminate them while you work.
4. **Take breaks:** Take regular breaks throughout the day to recharge and avoid burnout.
5. **Stay organized:** Keep your workspace organized and clutter-free, this will help you stay focused and avoid wasting time searching for things.
6. **Learn to say no:** Be mindful of taking on too much work or responsibilities, and learn to say no when necessary.
7. **Use productivity tools:** Experiment with different productivity tools, such as project management software, time tracking apps, or browser extensions, to find what works best for you.



### LLaMA2-7B-Chat (fine-tuned)

#Begin# Don't need to look up the API Pool, I can answer this question with my own knowledge. #End#

1. **Prioritize your tasks:** Make a list of all the tasks you need to complete and prioritize them based on their importance and urgency.
2. **Set clear goals:** Set specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals for yourself. This will help you stay focused and motivated.
3. **Minimize distractions:** Identify the things that distract you the most (e.g., social media, email, phone calls) and eliminate them while you work.
4. **Take breaks:** Take regular breaks throughout the day to recharge and refocus.
5. **Stay organized:** Keep your workspace organized and clutter-free. This will help you stay focused and avoid wasting time searching for misplaced items.
6. **Learn to say no:** Don't overcommit yourself by taking on too many tasks. Learn to say no to requests that don't align with your goals or values.
7. **Use technology:** Use technology to your advantage by setting reminders, using productivity apps, and automating repetitive tasks.

Figure 10: An example of comparing general conversational capability based on LLaMA2-7B.



Can you give me five tips for keeping happy?



### LLaMA2-13B-Chat (Original)

Sure, here are five tips for keeping happy:

1. **Practice gratitude:** Take time each day to reflect on the things you are thankful for. This can help shift your focus away from negative thoughts and cultivate a more positive mindset.
2. **Get enough sleep:** Lack of sleep can negatively impact your mood and overall well-being. Aim for 7-9 hours of sleep each night to help you feel rested and refreshed.
3. **Exercise regularly:** Physical activity releases endorphins, which are chemicals in the brain that act as natural painkillers and mood elevators. Find an activity you enjoy and aim to do it for at least 30 minutes each day.
4. **Connect with others:** Social connections are important for our emotional well-being. Make an effort to stay in touch with friends and family, and try to meet new people through hobbies or social activities.
5. **Practice mindfulness:** Mindfulness is the practice of being present in the moment, without judgment. This can help you let go of worries about the past or future and focus on the present moment. Try incorporating mindfulness into your daily routine through activities like meditation or deep breathing.



### LLaMA2-13B-Chat (fine-tuned)

#Begin# Don't need to look up the API Pool, I can answer this question with my own knowledge. #End#

1. **Practice gratitude:** Make a conscious effort to focus on the positive aspects of your life and express gratitude for what you have. Keep a gratitude journal to help you stay on track.
2. **Get enough sleep:** Lack of sleep can negatively impact your mood and overall well-being. Aim for 7-9 hours of sleep each night and establish a consistent bedtime routine.
3. **Exercise regularly:** Regular exercise can boost your mood and energy levels. Find an activity you enjoy and aim to do it at least three times a week.
4. **Connect with others:** Social connections are important for our happiness and well-being. Make an effort to stay in touch with friends and family, join a club or group that interests you, and volunteer in your community.
5. **Practice mindfulness:** Mindfulness involves paying attention to the present moment without judgment. Practice mindfulness through meditation, deep breathing, or simply paying attention to your senses.

Figure 11: An example of comparing general conversational capability based on LLaMA2-13B.



## Template for generating APIs and query-call pairs

Here is a tool for you, which can help it solve users' requests better. The tool's name, the description of users, and the description of ChatGPT are as follows:

The name of tool: `${tool_name}$`

The description of users: `${des_user}$`

The description of ChatGPT: `${des_gpt}$`

Please devise an API function (including potential parameters) to call this tool, and give 10 examples where you would use this tool to answer a user's query and you should tell me what users will say and how to call the API function.

Please ensure that the provided examples are distinct from one another. Feel free to employ various sentence styles, such as instructions or requests, and vary the level of detail as needed.

The format of your answer should be like:

API function: `${tool_name}$(args1: str, args2: int, ...)`

1. `{"query": "xxx", "call": "${tool_name}$(args1=xxx, args2=yyy, ...)"}"`

2. `{"query": "xxx", "call": "${tool_name}$(args1=xxx, args2=yyy, ...)"}"`

...

Note that

(1) the args filled in the call should appear in query or can be inferred from query;

(2) the generated sample with `{}` can be successfully loaded by `json.loads()`.

Figure 12: Template of GPT-4 for generating the tool's API and the corresponding query-call pairs.

### Template for checking the generated query-call pairs

Now, giving the following information:

The API function's format:  $\{\text{api\_function}\}$

The user's query:  $\{\text{query}\}$

The user's call:  $\{\text{call}\}$

Please check whether the user's call meets the following conditions:

1. Conform to the call format of the API;
2. The parameters filled in the call appear in query or can be inferred from query;

Please give your answer [YES] or [NO], without additional output.

Figure 13: Template of GPT-4 for checking whether the generated query-call pairs make sense.

### Template of system prompt

A chat between a curious user and an artificial intelligence assistant who can use external tools and APIs to solve the user's question. The assistant gives tools and APIs calling processes or final answer to the human's question.

Human:  $\{\text{query}\}$

Assistant:

Figure 14: Template of system prompt in our all experiments (including training and inference).

### Template of baselines in (No)Search scenario

Now, you need to decide whether to select an external tool to address the current user's query. Here are two possible scenarios:

1. If you can answer the user's query with your own knowledge, please output: `#NoSearchAPI#`
2. If the user's query is beyond your knowledge and need to call an external tool, please output: `#SearchAPI#`

Note that DO NOT output extra content or explanation. Below are some examples:

`${demonstration_1}$`

...

`${demonstration_n}$`

Query: `${query}$`

Answer:

Figure 15: Template of baselines (i.e., ChatGPT, GPT-4, LLaMA2-13B-Chat) in Decision-Search scenario.

### Template of baselines in (No)Call scenario

Now, you need to select an appropriate API from the API Pool to address the current user's query. There are two possible scenarios:

1. If there is a suitable tool API to address the user's query, please output the tool's name in the following format: `#CallAPI# api_name #EndAPI#`
2. If there is no suitable tool API to address the user's query, please directly output: `#NoCallAPI#`

Note that DO NOT output extra content or explanation. Below are some examples:

`${demonstration_1}$`

...

`${demonstration_n}$`

Query: `${query}$`

API: `${candidate_toolset}$`

Answer:

Figure 16: Template of baselines (i.e., ChatGPT, GPT-4, LLaMA2-13B-Chat) in Decision-Call scenario.

## Template of ToolApaca in tool-usage scenario

Answer the following questions as best you can. You have access to the following tools:

`${candidate_toolset}$`

NoCallAPI: If you believe that there are no suitable tool to address the query, you can use this.

Parameters: `{"is_call": "bool."}`

Output: Successful response.

Use the following format:

Question: the input question you must answer

Thought: you should always think about what to do

Action: the action to take, should be one of `${tool_list}$`

Action Input: the input to the action, in JSON format.

Observation: the result of the action

... (this Thought/Action/Action Input/Observation can repeat N times)

Thought: I now know the final answer

Final Answer: the final answer to the original input question

Begin!

Question: `${query}$`

Thought:

Figure 17: Template of ToolAlpaca for evaluating the generalization on unseen tools.



## Template of ToolLLaMA in tool-usage scenario

System: You are AutoGPT, you can use many tools(functions) to do the following task.

First I will give you the task description, and your task start.

At each step, you need to give your thought to analyze the status now and what to do next, with a function call to actually excute your step.

Your output should follow this format:

Thought:

Action

Action Input:

After the call, you will get the call result, and you are now in a new state.

Then you will analyze your status now, then decide what to do next...

After many (Thought-call) pairs, you finally perform the task, then you can give your finial answer.

Remember:

1.the state change is irreversible, you can't go back to one of the former state, if you want to restart the task, say "I give up and restart".

2.All the thought is short, at most in 5 sentence.

3.You can do more then one trys, so if your plan is to continusly try some conditions, you can do one of the conditions per try.

Let's Begin!

Task description: You should use functions to help handle the real time user querys. Remember:

1.ALWAYS call "Finish" function at the end of the task. And the final answer should contain enough information to show to the user,If you can't handle the task, or you find that function calls always fail(the function is not valid now), use function Finish->give\_up\_and\_restart.

2.Do not use origin tool names, use only subfunctions' names.

You have access of the following tools: [\${candidate\_toolset}\$, {'name': 'NoCallAPI', 'description': 'If you believe that there are no suitable tool to address the query, you can use this.', 'parameters': '{}'}]

User:

\${query}\$

Assistant:

Figure 18: Template of ToolLLaMA for evaluating the generalization on unseen tools.