
AutoGuide: Automated Generation and Selection of State-Aware Guidelines for Large Language Model Agents

Yao Fu^{*12} Dong-Ki Kim^{*1} Jaekyeom Kim¹ Sungryull Sohn¹
Lajanugen Logeswaran¹ Kyunghoon Bae¹ Honglak Lee¹²

Abstract

The primary limitation of large language models (LLMs) is their restricted understanding of the world. This poses significant difficulties for LLM-based agents, particularly in domains where pre-trained LLMs lack sufficient knowledge. In this paper, we introduce a novel framework, called `AutoGuide`, that bridges the knowledge gap in pre-trained LLMs by leveraging implicit knowledge in offline experiences. Specifically, `AutoGuide` effectively extracts knowledge embedded in offline data by extracting a set of state-aware guidelines. Importantly, each state-aware guideline is expressed in concise natural language and follows a conditional structure, clearly describing the state where it is applicable. As such, the resulting guidelines enable a principled way to provide helpful knowledge pertinent to an agent’s current decision-making process. We show that our approach outperforms competitive LLM-based baselines by a large margin in sequential decision-making benchmarks.

1. Introduction

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have empowered AI agents to address various sequential decision-making tasks and applications (Wang et al., 2023; Xi et al., 2023). The foundation of these successes involves the planning and reasoning capabilities of pre-trained LLMs, enabling agents to execute effective policies (Brohan et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022). However, the knowledge embedded in pre-trained LLMs is confined to the concepts and information present in a training dataset, which is inherently incomplete (Yin et al., 2023). This limited understanding

in pre-trained LLMs poses significant difficulties for agents, particularly in target domains with insufficient prior knowledge. For example, in web navigation, LLM agents generally achieve low success rates due to a lack of information about taking appropriate actions on real-world websites with diverse and dynamic contents (Koh et al., 2024; Deng et al., 2023; Gur et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023).

In this paper, we explore data-driven strategies that leverage offline experiences to bridge knowledge gaps between pre-trained LLMs and a downstream domain. As offline experiences implicitly convey valuable knowledge about desirable and undesirable policies in domains, they promise to serve as a useful resource for improving an LLM agent’s decision-making in situations where the pre-trained LLM lacks understanding. Despite this potential benefit, a critical challenge lies in effectively extracting the implicit information embedded in offline data. Unfortunately, the conventional method of directly providing all available experiences to an agent, as in in-context learning, is either impossible or unsuccessful due to constraints, including context length limitations, prompt sensitivity, and difficulty with complex reasoning (Lu et al., 2022; Dong et al., 2022; Min et al., 2022; Kaddour et al., 2023).

To address the challenge of extracting knowledge from offline data, we propose a novel framework, called `AutoGuide`. Specifically, `AutoGuide` automatically extracts a comprehensive set of state-aware guidelines from offline experiences. Our method then applies these state-conditional guidelines to improve an LLM agent’s performance by identifying the current state and then incorporating its corresponding guidelines into the prompt during testing (see Figure 1). Notably, we generate state-aware guidelines in concise natural language statements, efficiently compressing knowledge in offline data. Additionally, state-aware guidelines clearly describe the states where each guideline is applicable, so `AutoGuide` provides an LLM agent with guidelines that are most relevant to its current decision-making process. As a result, `AutoGuide` achieves the highest success rates compared to competitive baselines in challenging sequential decision-making benchmark environments.

^{*}Equal contribution. ¹LG AI Research ²University of Michigan. Correspondence to: Yao Fu <violetfy@umich.edu>, Dong-Ki Kim <dkkim@lgresearch.ai>, Honglak Lee <honglak@eecs.umich.edu, honglak@lgresearch.ai>. Work was partially done while Yao Fu interned at LG AI Research.




Figure 1. AutoGuide aims to extract the implicit knowledge embedded in offline experiences and help the decision-making process of an LLM agent. Specifically, our method generates a comprehensive set of state-aware guidelines from offline data and explicitly identifies when each guideline is applicable by generating its corresponding state. Our state-aware guidelines enable providing pertinent guidelines at test time by summarizing the current trajectory into the state, leading to correct decision-making compared to baselines without state-aware guidelines.

Our contribution. In summary, we present the following main contributions in this paper:

- **Principled method based on state-aware guidelines (Section 3):** We develop two modules to generate state-aware guidelines from offline experiences: the state summarization module for generating a description of a given state, and the guideline extraction module for extracting a desired guideline corresponding to the state. The outcome is a set of domain knowledge in concise natural language that enhances decision making by providing pertinent information.
- **Comprehensive evaluation of AutoGuide (Section 4.2):** We show AutoGuide’s capability in extracting helpful state-aware guidelines in various interactive benchmark domains, including navigating realistic web environments. Our results highlight the flexibility of AutoGuide, such that it can be seamlessly incorporated into an existing LLM-based method.
- **Analyses with important perspectives (Section 4.3):** We explore various aspects of AutoGuide, such as the significance of determining the applicability of each guideline based on generated states. We also investigate having only successful or unsuccessful trajectories in offline experiences, and demonstrate that AutoGuide can still extract valuable

knowledge in these corner cases.

2. Related Work

LLM agents. Language models have recently been shown to possess strong priors for sequential decision-making tasks, which has given rise to LLM-powered agents (Wang et al., 2023; Xi et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2024; Zeng et al., 2023). Agents need to possess various skills to be effective in practice including planning (Brohan et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2022; Logeswaran et al., 2022), reasoning (Wei et al., 2022; Gao et al., 2023), tool manipulation (Qin et al., 2023; Patil et al., 2023; Parisi et al., 2022; Schick et al., 2023), code generation (Sun et al., 2023; Logeswaran et al., 2022), among others. In this work we focus on building effective agents for web (Yao et al., 2022b; Zhou et al., 2023) and embodied (Shridhar et al., 2021) environments.

Self-reflection from past experiences. An important capability for agents to succeed is the ability to learn from past experiences and update their behavior based on feedback. Self-feedback (Madaan et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2023; Shinn et al., 2023) has emerged as an effective technique where a model inspects its own incorrect predictions, reflects on it to identify what went wrong and attempts to improve

its prediction. Our approach shares similar motivations to self-refinement approaches, but unlike these methods which generate reflections on the fly, our approach first attempts to distill a set of guidelines from offline experiences and then retrieves the appropriate guidelines during inference for more accurate action prediction. However, these advances are complementary to our method and can be used in conjunction with our approach (as shown in the experiments).

Leveraging natural language guidance. Natural Language can be a rich source of information for artificial agents to learn to act efficiently. Prior work has explored the notion of learning from human written text manuals which describe various details about the agent’s environment (Branavan et al., 2012; Hanjie et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2020). Recent work has explored automatically generating such guidance in the form of chain-of-thought reasoning (Wei et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2022b) which emulates a thought process or rationale for an agent’s predictions. In contrast to ReAct, which generates such guidance on the fly during inference, our approach examines successful and unsuccessful trajectories corresponding to a task to generate appropriate guidance and uses these guidelines for predicting better actions. ExpeL (Zhao et al., 2023) proposed a related approach to derive guidelines. In contrast to ExpeL, where all guidelines are provided to an agent as a prompt, our guideline selection process is contextual, where guidelines relevant to the agent’s current state are retrieved and used for prediction. We show that this substantially improves over ExpeL’s non-contextual guideline-based approach.

3. AutoGuide: Principled Method Based on State-Aware Guidelines

Our work is motivated by the growing availability of offline experiences that agents or humans naturally accumulate during their interactions with the environment. We focus on leveraging these offline experiences to enhance the decision-making of an LLM agent. A key question in achieving our goal is how to effectively extract implicit knowledge embedded in these experiences. This section details our method, AutoGuide, which extracts a comprehensive set of state-aware guidelines from offline data.

3.1. Problem Statement

The goal of AutoGuide is to distill knowledge from offline data into a helpful natural language format, such that the extracted information improves the decision-making of an agent during testing. Formally, AutoGuide is given offline experiences $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} = (\tau^1, \dots, \tau^N)$ that consist of N trajectories from the training tasks. Each trajectory $\tau^i := (x_0, a_0, r_0, \dots, r_T)$ is a sequence of observations, actions, and rewards following the Markov decision process (Sutton & Barto, 2018). We assume that each trajectory τ^i




Figure 2. State-aware guideline generation process based on a pair of success trajectory τ_{success}^i and failure trajectory τ_{fail}^i . In this example, the two trajectories start deviating from each other at $t = 1$. The state summarization module generates a description of a state at $t = 1$ given τ_{success}^i , and the guideline extraction module generates the corresponding guideline for that state.

can be categorized as either a success or failure determined by either direct feedback from the environment or the terminal reward (e.g., considered a success if the final reward r_T is positive) depending on the domain.

3.2. Constructing Dataset for Guideline Extraction

From an offline experience dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, we construct a paired offline dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{paired}}$ for guideline extraction:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{paired}} = ((\tau_{\text{success}}^1, \tau_{\text{fail}}^1), \dots, (\tau_{\text{success}}^n, \tau_{\text{fail}}^n)), \quad (1)$$

where $\tau_{\text{success}}^i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and $\tau_{\text{fail}}^i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ denote a success and failure trajectory in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ of the same task, respectively. In practice, we can easily collect these pairs by applying advanced LLM-based planning approaches (Yao et al., 2022b;

Algorithm 1 Collection of state-aware guidelines

Input: Paired offline dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pair}}$, state summarization module $\mathcal{M}_{\text{state}}$, guideline extraction module $\mathcal{M}_{\text{guideline}}$
 Initialize state-aware guideline dictionary \mathcal{G}
for Each pair $(\tau_{\text{success}}^i, \tau_{\text{fail}}^i) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{pair}}$ **do**
 # Summarize a trajectory into a state
 Identify target timestep t from τ_{success}^i and τ_{fail}^i
 state $\leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{state}}(\tau_{:t}^i)$
 # Check if the current state matches any existing states
 if state $\notin \mathcal{G}$ **then**
 $\mathcal{G}[\text{state}] = \{\}$
 end if
 # Generate the corresponding state-aware guideline
 guideline $\leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{guideline}}(\tau_{\text{success}}^i, \tau_{\text{fail}}^i, \text{state})$
 $\mathcal{G}[\text{state}] \leftarrow \mathcal{G}[\text{state}] \cup \{\text{guideline}\}$
end for
Return State-aware guideline dictionary \mathcal{G}

Shinn et al., 2023) or taking advantage of human demonstration datasets (Zhou et al., 2023; Deng et al., 2023). However, in rare cases, it can be challenging to obtain paired data if the offline data $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ contains only one type (either success or failure) of the trajectories. We discuss how our algorithm can be adjusted to handle such a biased dataset and its impact on the performance in Section 4.3.

3.3. Extraction of State-Aware Guidelines

AutoGuide generates state-aware guidelines by utilizing pairs of success and failure trajectories from offline data. Each state-aware guideline is expressed in concise natural language and follows a conditional structure, clearly describing the state in which this guideline is applicable. Intuitively, contrasting actions taken between τ_{success}^i and τ_{fail}^i provides important information about when and which actions are effective or ineffective. Building on this insight, we develop two modules for deriving state-aware guidelines in a conditional structure (see Figure 2):

State summarization module. The objective of this module is to generate a concise description of the state of a trajectory in natural language. Specifically, given a pair of τ_{success}^i and τ_{fail}^i from the same task, we first identify the target timestep t at which these two trajectories start deviating from each other with different actions. Then, we construct a target trajectory $\tau_{:t}^i := (x_0, a_0, \dots, x_t)$, which comprises a sequence up to t , either from a success or failure trajectory and prompt an LLM to summarize it:

$$\text{state} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{state}}(\tau_{:t}^i), \quad (2)$$

where Appendix B.1 details our prompt template. For example, Figure 2 shows trajectories related to the task i of creating a discussion post about online learning in a relevant

Algorithm 2 Applying state-aware guidelines at test time

Input: State-aware guideline dictionary \mathcal{G} , state summarization module $\mathcal{M}_{\text{state}}$, guideline selection module $\mathcal{M}_{\text{select}}$, LLM agent policy π
 Initialize test trajectory $\tau = \{x_0\}$
for Each timestep t **do**
 # Summarize a trajectory into a state
 state $\leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{state}}(\tau)$
 # Check if the current state matches any existing states.
 If matched, then perform top- k guideline selection
 if state $\in \mathcal{G}$ **then**
 guidelines $\leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{select}}(\text{state}, \mathcal{G}[\text{state}], \tau)$
 else
 guidelines $\leftarrow \emptyset$
 end if
 # Action selection based on guidelines
 $a_t \sim \pi(\tau, \text{state}, \text{guidelines})$
 Execute action a_t and observe x_{t+1}
 Update trajectory $\tau \leftarrow \tau \cup \{\text{state}, a_t, x_{t+1}\}$
end for

subReddit. Given that these two trajectories have different actions at a target timestep of $t=1$, our state summarization module generates the following state summary from $\tau_{:1}^i$ in Figure 2: “*You are on the List of forums page*”.

Guideline extraction module. The goal of this module is to generate a desired guideline corresponding to the state. We extract a useful natural language guideline by examining successful and failure trajectories with respect to the state:

$$\text{guideline} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{guideline}}(\tau_{\text{success}}^i, \tau_{\text{fail}}^i, \text{state}), \quad (3)$$

where we refer to Appendix B.2 for the prompt template we use. As an example, this module generates the following state-aware guideline for the state described in Figure 2: “*When you are on the List of forums page, ... you can click on the link that exactly matches the forum name ...*”.

Construction of state-aware guidelines. We collect state-aware guidelines \mathcal{G} by iterating through available pairs in the paired offline data and organize the guidelines in a dictionary format, using the state as the key and the corresponding guidelines as the value (see Algorithm 1). In particular, we observe that the state summarization module occasionally produces states that share the same context but are expressed slightly differently. To minimize redundancy, we employ an LLM to determine if the current state corresponds to any previously identified state. If a match is found, we reuse the existing state; otherwise, we introduce the new state into our dictionary. The specific prompt template for this state-matching procedure is outlined in Appendix B.3.




Figure 3. Sequential decision-making benchmark domains considered in our work: ALFWorld (Shridhar et al., 2021), WebShop (Yao et al., 2022a), WebArena (Zhou et al., 2023). Graphic credit: Shridhar et al. (2020); Yao et al. (2022a); Zhou et al. (2023).

3.4. Applying State-Aware Guidelines at Test Time

After extracting a set of state-aware guidelines \mathcal{G} from offline experiences, our method employs these guidelines to enhance the decision-making of an LLM agent during testing. At each timestep, AutoGuide summarizes the current test trajectory τ into a state using our state summarization module \mathcal{M}_{state} . Then, we employ the LLM designed for identifying a matching state in Section 3.3 to find a match and retrieves its corresponding guidelines. If there are more than k guidelines related to the current state, we apply the guideline selection module to choose top- k guidelines:

$$\mathcal{M}_{select}(state, \mathcal{G}[state], \tau), \quad (4)$$

where Appendix B.4 details the prompt template for this selection procedure. Subsequently, AutoGuide incorporates both the state and guidelines into the agent’s prompt. Finally, the agent selects an action by considering the provided state and guidelines (see Figure 1 for an example). This process iterates until the end of the test trajectory (see Algorithm 2 for pseudocode).

Key benefits of AutoGuide. First, the extraction of state-aware guidelines in AutoGuide offers the inherent benefit of providing relevant guidelines for the state of interest. This capability is important since neglecting the specific context in which a guideline applies can confuse the agent’s decision-making process. The second key benefit is the generation of concise natural language guidelines, which can be seamlessly incorporated into any prompt-based LLM agent. Lastly, AutoGuide generates guidelines at the individual state level rather than at the trajectory level. Given that a single incorrect action can lead to a complete failure, it is essential to provide detailed assistance in each action selection process. With these advantages, we demonstrate in the next section that our approach significantly enhances the performance of LLM agents.

4. Evaluation

We demonstrate the efficacy of AutoGuide by conducting experiments on a diverse suite of sequential decision-making benchmark domains. We also perform important analyses about AutoGuide. Additional experimental details and hyperparameters can be found in Appendix A.

4.1. Evaluation Setup

4.1.1. DECISION-MAKING BENCHMARK DOMAINS

We consider the following interactive text-based sequential decision-making benchmarks to study different aspects of AutoGuide (see Figure 3):

- **ALFWorld (Shridhar et al., 2021):** In this embodied benchmark, an LLM agent interacts with an environment to carry out household tasks, such as placing a pan on the dining table. Observations and actions are expressed in natural language statements, and the agent must navigate through the space and manipulate objects to successfully complete the tasks.
- **WebShop (Yao et al., 2022a):** This interactive web environment simulates the task of online shopping on an e-commerce website. The agent’s goal is to understand a text instruction and buy a product that meets specified criteria. This involves querying the website’s search engine, understanding the descriptions and details of each item, and selecting necessary options.
- **WebArena (Zhou et al., 2023):** This web-based benchmark introduces realistic environments by replicating the functionality and data found in popular web domains (e.g., Gitlab, Reddit, Wikipedia). Compared to WebShop, WebArena presents more challenges and difficulties for an LLM agent due to its large observation and action space, along with tasks that involve longer planning horizons. We focus on the Reddit domain for the WebArena experiments.

Algorithm	Offline data?	State aware?	WebShop	
			Reward	Success Rate (SR)
ReAct (1-shot)	✗	✗	66.4	30%
ReAct (2-shot)	✗	✗	66.0	35%
ReAct (4-shot)	✗	✗	70.2	37%
ReAct (6-shot)	✗	✗	71.0	38%
ExpeL	✓	✗	60.9	35%
AutoGuide	✓	✓	73.4	46%
ReAct + Reflexion	✗	✗	77.1	51%
ExpeL + Reflexion	✓	✗	71.7	42%
AutoGuide + Reflexion	✓	✓	81.4	57%

Table 1. Test reward and success rate on WebShop. Agent model for all methods is based on GPT-3.5-turbo. Reflexion is done by GPT-4-turbo for at most 3 trials.

Algorithm	ALFWorld SR
ReAct	54.5%
ExpeL	59.0%
AutoGuide	79.1%

Table 2. Test result on ALFWorld.

Algorithm	WebArena SR
ReAct	8.0%
ExpeL	21.8%
AutoGuide	43.7%

Table 3. Test result on WebArena.

4.1.2. BASELINES

We compare AutoGuide against the following baseline approaches to fully show the effect of state-aware guidelines (refer to Appendix A for more details):

- **ReAct (Yao et al., 2022b)**: This LLM-based planning method integrates reasoning and acting to address sequential decision-making tasks. However, it does not leverage offline experiences and thus suffers from the limited understanding of pre-trained LLMs in downstream domains.
- **ExpeL (Zhao et al., 2023)**: This method also extracts natural language knowledge from offline data. However, it fails to consider the applicability of guidelines and does not generate state-aware guidelines. Instead, it provides all guidelines to an LLM agent without filtering out irrelevant ones based on the current state. ExpeL has two contributions, the guideline generation and in-context example selection module. Because the latter is orthogonal to our analysis and can be seamlessly combined with our method, we consider ExpeL with guidelines in our experiments.
- **Reflexion (Shinn et al., 2023)**: This approach converts environmental feedback into text statements to assist an LLM agent (e.g., ReAct) in the next trial. The baseline generates valuable feedback about solving a specific test task. We demonstrate how state-aware guidelines derived by AutoGuide can be combined with the feedback.

4.1.3. IMPLEMENTATION

We collect offline experiences either by running ReAct and Reflexion, or incorporating human demonstrations. We use ReAct with GPT-3.5-turbo as our base LLM agent for WebShop and ALFWorld and GPT-4-turbo for WebArena. For each benchmark, we apply the same GPT version for action generation, state summarization, and guideline selection. We extract state-aware guidelines from the training set with GPT-4-turbo and evaluate their effectiveness by applying them to the test set with non-overlapping tasks. We refer to Appendix A for more details.

4.2. Main Results

Q1. *How effective is AutoGuide compared to the competitive baseline methods without state-aware guidelines?*

To answer this question, we run ReAct, ExpeL, and AutoGuide on WebShop and ALFWorld benchmarks. The performance on the test datasets is presented in Tables 1 and 2. There are three notable observations:

1. **Effectiveness of state-aware guidelines.** Our approach surpasses baseline performance in both benchmarks, achieving the highest test rewards and success rates in Tables 1 and 2. These results highlight the effectiveness of employing state-aware guidelines in language-based decision-making domains. To further examine the action selection differences among ReAct, ExpeL, and our method, we present their trajectories in Figure 4. We observed that ReAct makes common mistakes such as trying to take soapbar that is not visible, or taking a soapbottle instead of soapbar due to their similar names. Both ExpeL and AutoGuide improve on this by extracting guidelines from similar mistakes in the offline experience. However, ExpeL often erroneously applies incorrect guidelines due to the availability of all guidelines at each timestep. In Figure 4, ExpeL mistakenly attends to the second guideline “ensure to specify the item’s number and location...”, leading to wrong reasoning and action. AutoGuide presents relevant guidelines at necessary moments, enabling accurate task completion by avoiding the mistakes seen in ExpeL and ReAct.

2. **Limitation of in-context learning.** In Table 1, while increasing the number of in-context examples (i.e., #-shot) for ReAct gradually improves performance, there is a plateau at a certain number of shots. Additionally, ReAct with more than 6 shots often exceeds the token limit of GPT-3.5-turbo. These results indicate that directly inputting raw trajectories into ReAct for in-context learning is not an effective way to fully leverage offline data. In contrast, AutoGuide extracts knowledge from entire training trajectories by summarizing them into concise state-aware guidelines, making




Figure 4. Trajectories of ReAct, ExpeL, and AutoGuide from the same test task. ReAct (Left) chose the wrong item, consequently failing the task in the end. ExpeL (middle) was confused by guidelines that were irrelevant to its state, leading to incorrect reasoning and actions. AutoGuide (right) can select useful guidelines relevant to the agent’s state, enabling the agent to efficiently accomplish the task.

them easy to integrate with prompt-based agents.

3. Importance of providing pertinent knowledge. ExpeL approach helps ReAct by extracting knowledge from offline experiences, but its impact is not as significant as AutoGuide. Recall that for ExpeL, the guidelines are neither generated for specific states at training time, nor selected to only provide state-aware guidelines at test time. As a result, irrelevant guidelines can be introduced to an agent, potentially causing confusion for the agent. Consequently, the result highlights the significance of providing relevant guidelines conditioned on states for LLM agents.

Q2. Does AutoGuide scale to more challenging and complex environments?

In this question, we highlight the scalability of AutoGuide in addressing challenging and complex domains. Specifically, we conduct experiments on WebArena-Reddit, which features more diverse tasks on realistic and complex websites requiring longer action sequences. It has the larger observation space and more complex action space (e.g., scrolling). Table 3 presents the results, where AutoGuide

achieves the highest success rate with a significant margin when compared to ReAct and ExpeL. We observe that ReAct scores low task success rate (8.0%) in WebArena due to the complex observation and action spaces and longer task horizon. In ExpeL, the issue of presenting all guidelines to an agent is exacerbated in the WebArena compared to simpler environments like ALFWorld and WebShop. WebArena’s wide variety of tasks across different domains requires a larger number of guidelines to cover the knowledge needed for all tasks and domains. This results in either an overload of irrelevant guidelines that could mislead the agent or a lack of crucial information when the number of guidelines is limited, as suggested in ExpeL (Zhao et al., 2023). In contrast, AutoGuide achieves a more significant performance enhancement (43.7%) compared to ExpeL (21.8%) by efficiently providing pertinent guidelines for each state and minimizing the burden on context capacity. Refer to Figure 15 for a list of example states and guidelines.

Q3. How does AutoGuide perform when combined with test-time self-feedback approaches like Reflexion?




Figure 5. Extracting state-aware guidelines when offline experiences have either success or failure trajectories. With minor modifications, AutoGuide can extract useful knowledge from offline data and outperform the ReAct baseline.

Our state-aware guidelines effectively provide *inter-task* knowledge by considering multiple tasks in offline data. Meanwhile, self-feedback methods (e.g., Reflexion) offer *intra-task* knowledge based on environmental feedback during test time. In this question, we explore the effectiveness of integrating both inter-task and intra-task information. The results presented in Table 1 demonstrate that the combination of AutoGuide with Reflexion achieves the highest performance in the WebShop benchmark. Hence, we find that our state-aware guidelines positively complement the intra-task knowledge of Reflexion. Another observation from Table 1 is that, while ExpeL + Reflexion outperforms ExpeL alone, this combination is not as effective as other approaches. This limitation may stem from ExpeL introducing irrelevant knowledge, potentially leading to conflicts with Reflexion’s feedback and having an adverse impact on the decision-making process.

4.3. Analysis of AutoGuide

Q4. Can AutoGuide extract state-aware guidelines when offline data has either success or failure trajectories?

We explore how AutoGuide can be adapted to address extreme types of offline data, comprising either successful or failed trajectories. Intuitively, successful trajectories exhibit shared patterns of successful behaviors, whereas unsuccessful trajectories may fail for a variety of reasons. Based on this insight, when offline experiences contain exclusively successful instances, we sample multiple trajectories and prompt GPT-4-turbo to identify states exhibiting shared common behaviors across them. Then, for each state, AutoGuide applies the state summarization and guideline extraction modules to construct state-aware guidelines. In the case of failures only, we leverage failed trajectories and a one-shot example from ReAct as a successful demonstration to generate state-aware guidelines based on our modules.

The results are shown in Figure 5. Interestingly, even without having pairs of success and failure trajectories for the same task, the different variants of AutoGuide can extract

Algorithm	SS	GES	WebShop SR
ReAct	✗	✗	30%
ReAct + SS	✓	✗	36%
ReAct + GES	✗	✓	37%
AutoGuide	✓	✓	46%

Table 4. Ablation study of AutoGuide, analyzing each module’s contribution in the WebShop benchmark. SS denotes our state summarization module, and GES denotes the guideline extraction and selection modules.

valuable knowledge from offline data, leading to improvements in test-time performance compared to ReAct, which does not leverage any offline data. As such, our method is flexible and robust to the type of available offline data. However, in general cases, we expect to have both successful and failed trajectories, which provide the most direct insights for AutoGuide to extract useful guidelines.

Q5. How does each component of AutoGuide contribute to the final results?

We evaluate the impact of different components within AutoGuide on its performance in WebShop, as detailed in Table 4. We examine two variants: ReAct+SS and ReAct+GES. The ReAct+SS, which incorporates state summaries into observations without guidelines, shows improvement over ReAct. This suggests that state summaries enhance decision-making by verifying the current state before action selection. ReAct+GES, which generates guidelines from trajectories without state summaries and employs GPT-3.5-turbo for guideline selection, also enhances performance but is less effective than the full AutoGuide. This indicates that choosing relevant guideline based on the trajectory alone is more challenging than using state summary. Therefore, integrating both state summaries and guidelines is crucial for maximizing the benefits of AutoGuide.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented AutoGuide, an effective framework for extracting and exploiting important domain knowledge from offline experiences for improving decision making with pre-trained LLMs. Pre-trained LLMs often lack the knowledge required for solving tasks in downstream domains, and to fill in such knowledge gap, we proposed to generate state-aware guidelines that can be incorporated into prompts for LLM agents. As AutoGuide extracts the guidelines by contrasting successful and failed trajectories on the same task, the resulting state-aware guidelines carry critical information for preventing failures in the domains. For inference, it provides the guidelines pertinent to each of the different states that LLM agents encounter, which can make pre-trained LLMs strong decision-making agents

in the downstream domains. Empirically, we showed that AutoGuide outperforms strong LLM-based baselines by a large margin and achieves outstanding performance in multiple sequential decision-making benchmarks.

References

- Branavan, S., Silver, D., and Barzilay, R. Learning to win by reading manuals in a monte-carlo framework. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 43:661–704, 2012.
- Brohan, A., Chebotar, Y., Finn, C., Hausman, K., Herzog, A., Ho, D., Ibarz, J., Irpan, A., Jang, E., Julian, R., et al. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 287–318. PMLR, 2023.
- Deng, X., Gu, Y., Zheng, B., Chen, S., Stevens, S., Wang, B., Sun, H., and Su, Y. Mind2web: Towards a generalist agent for the web. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06070*, 2023.
- Dong, Q., Li, L., Dai, D., Zheng, C., Wu, Z., Chang, B., Sun, X., Xu, J., and Sui, Z. A survey for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*, 2022.
- Gao, L., Madaan, A., Zhou, S., Alon, U., Liu, P., Yang, Y., Callan, J., and Neubig, G. Pal: Program-aided language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10764–10799. PMLR, 2023.
- Gur, I., Nachum, O., Miao, Y., Safdari, M., Huang, A., Chowdhery, A., Narang, S., Fiedel, N., and Faust, A. Understanding HTML with large language models. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 2803–2821, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.185. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.185>.
- Hanjie, A. W., Zhong, V. Y., and Narasimhan, K. Grounding language to entities and dynamics for generalization in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4051–4062. PMLR, 2021.
- Huang, W., Abbeel, P., Pathak, D., and Mordatch, I. Language models as zero-shot planners: Extracting actionable knowledge for embodied agents. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9118–9147. PMLR, 2022.
- Kaddour, J., Harris, J., Mozes, M., Bradley, H., Raileanu, R., and McHardy, R. Challenges and applications of large language models, 2023.
- Kim, G., Baldi, P., and McAleer, S. Language models can solve computer tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17491*, 2023.
- Koh, J. Y., Lo, R., Jang, L., Duvvur, V., Lim, M. C., Huang, P.-Y., Neubig, G., Zhou, S., Salakhutdinov, R., and Fried, D. Visualwebarena: Evaluating multimodal agents on realistic visual web tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13649*, 2024.
- Logeswaran, L., Fu, Y., Lee, M., and Lee, H. Few-shot subgoal planning with language models. In *NAACL: HLT*, 2022.
- Lu, Y., Bartolo, M., Moore, A., Riedel, S., and Stenetorp, P. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. In *ACL*, 2022.
- Madaan, A., Tandon, N., Gupta, P., Hallinan, S., Gao, L., Wiegrefe, S., Alon, U., Dziri, N., Prabhumoye, S., Yang, Y., et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*, 2023.
- Min, S., Lyu, X., Holtzman, A., Artetxe, M., Lewis, M., Hajishirzi, H., and Zettlemoyer, L. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *EMNLP*, 2022.
- Parisi, A., Zhao, Y., and Fiedel, N. Talm: Tool augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12255*, 2022.
- Patil, S. G., Zhang, T., Wang, X., and Gonzalez, J. E. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15334*, 2023.
- Qin, Y., Liang, S., Ye, Y., Zhu, K., Yan, L., Lu, Y., Lin, Y., Cong, X., Tang, X., Qian, B., et al. Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16789*, 2023.
- Schick, T., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Dessì, R., Raileanu, R., Lomeli, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Cancedda, N., and Scialom, T. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04761*, 2023.
- Shinn, N., Cassano, F., Gopinath, A., Narasimhan, K. R., and Yao, S. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Shridhar, M., Thomason, J., Gordon, D., Bisk, Y., Han, W., Mottaghi, R., Zettlemoyer, L., and Fox, D. ALFRED: A Benchmark for Interpreting Grounded Instructions for Everyday Tasks. In *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.

- Shridhar, M., Yuan, X., Côté, M.-A., Bisk, Y., Trischler, A., and Hausknecht, M. ALFWorld: Aligning Text and Embodied Environments for Interactive Learning. In *ICLR*, 2021.
- Sun, H., Zhuang, Y., Kong, L., Dai, B., and Zhang, C. Adaplanner: Adaptive planning from feedback with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16653*, 2023.
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. The MIT Press, second edition, 2018. URL <http://incompleteideas.net/book/the-book-2nd.html>.
- Wang, L., Ma, C., Feng, X., Zhang, Z., Yang, H., Zhang, J., Chen, Z., Tang, J., Chen, X., Lin, Y., et al. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11432*, 2023.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 24824–24837, 2022.
- Xi, Z., Chen, W., Guo, X., He, W., Ding, Y., Hong, B., Zhang, M., Wang, J., Jin, S., Zhou, E., et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864*, 2023.
- Yao, S., Chen, H., Yang, J., and Narasimhan, K. Webshop: Towards scalable real-world web interaction with grounded language agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:20744–20757, 2022a.
- Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K., and Cao, Y. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022b.
- Yin, Z., Sun, Q., Guo, Q., Wu, J., Qiu, X., and Huang, X. Do large language models know what they don’t know? In *Findings of ACL*, 2023.
- Zeng, A., Liu, M., Lu, R., Wang, B., Liu, X., Dong, Y., and Tang, J. Agenttuning: Enabling generalized agent abilities for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12823*, 2023.
- Zhao, A., Huang, D., Xu, Q., Lin, M., Liu, Y.-J., and Huang, G. Expel: Llm agents are experiential learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10144*, 2023.
- Zheng, B., Gou, B., Kil, J., Sun, H., and Su, Y. Gpt-4v(ision) is a generalist web agent, if grounded. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01614*, 2024.
- Zhong, V., Rocktäschel, T., and Grefenstette, E. Rtfm: Generalising to new environment dynamics via reading. In *ICLR*, pp. 1–17. ICLR, 2020.
- Zhou, S., Xu, F. F., Zhu, H., Zhou, X., Lo, R., Sridhar, A., Cheng, X., Bisk, Y., Fried, D., Alon, U., et al. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13854*, 2023.

A. Evaluation Details

A.1. ALFWorld (Shridhar et al., 2021)

A.1.1. ENVIRONMENT DETAILS

Each task in ALFWorld starts with a description of the specific environment and the goal to achieve. At each timestep, an agent can choose one of the following actions to interact with the objects and receptacles in the environment:

- go to [recep]
- take [object] from [recep]
- put [object] in/on [recep]
- open/close/use [recep]
- clean/heat/cool [object] with [recep]

Alternatively, the agent can generate think actions for planning and reflection, which helps with decision-making but does not change the environment itself. After one action is performed, the environment returns an observation that describes view changes.

Following ReAct, we concatenate a list of (observation, action) pairs to show the entire trajectory up to the current timestep for LLM agents to generate the next action. We experiment on 134 unseen test tasks with 6 categories of `pick_and_place`, `pick_clean.then_place`, `pick_heat.then_place`, `pick_cool.then_place`, `look_at_obj`, and `pick_two_obj`. For each task, the agent is allowed to take a maximum of 50 actions.

A.1.2. BASELINE AND MODELS

For ALFWorld tasks, we follow the same setting as ReAct by providing 2 in-context examples for each of the 6 task categories. The original results of ReAct in their paper are produced based on Text-Davinci-002. However, this GPT version is no longer available, so we apply gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct instead to generate actions. For ExpeL, we directly take the guidelines from their appendix and append them to the ReAct agent at test time.

A.1.3. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS OF AUTOGUIDE

We run the first 100 training tasks of ALFWorld to collect $(\tau_{\text{success}}, \tau_{\text{fail}})$ pairs with ReAct+Reflexion and extract state-dependant guidelines on the collected data. For state summarization, we provide 2-shot demonstrations for each of the 6 task categories. The corresponding prompt templates can be found in appendix B. All parameter details are shown in Table 5.

Parameter name	Value
Allowed Episode Length	50
n-shots	2
Agent Model	gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct
State Summarization Model	gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct
Guideline Selection Model	gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct
Guideline Extraction Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
top-k guideline selection	2

Table 5. Experiment hyperparameters on ALFWorld. The maximum allowed episode length and n-shots follow the same setup in ReAct.

A.2. WebShop (Yao et al., 2022a)

A.2.1. ENVIRONMENT DETAILS

WebShop provides an e-commerce environment, where the objective is to find and buy the product that matches the task-specific Instruction. The agent can select one of the following actions to perform:

- search[query]
- click[button]

Following ReAct, the agent can generate think actions to do planning or reflection. After buying a product, the environment returns a reward showing how well the bought product matches the target one in type, price, buying options, and attributes. The reward is calculated by:

$$r = r_{\text{type}} \cdot \frac{|U_{\text{att}} \cap Y_{\text{att}}| + |U_{\text{opt}} \cap Y_{\text{opt}}| + \mathbb{1}[y_{\text{price}} \leq u_{\text{price}}]}{|U_{\text{att}}| + |U_{\text{opt}}| + 1}$$

where y is the bought product and u is the target product. Same as ALFWorld, for WebShop, the agent takes $(\text{obs}_t, \text{act}_t)$ pairs for every previous timestep t as input to generate the next action.

A.2.2. BASELINE AND MODELS

Following ReAct, experiments are done in a one-shot setting. We apply gpt-3.5-turbo-0613 to generate actions, but when the token number exceeds the token limit (for example, for the n-shot ReAct experiments in Table 1), we use the 16k version of gpt-3.5-turbo-0613 instead. For ExpeL, we could not find how many training tasks the framework used for training. Therefore, we directly apply the guidelines from the appendix of their paper at test time. We only consider ExpeL with guidelines, not ExpeL with in-context example selection in our experiments for a fair comparison. The in-context example selection method is orthogonal to our work and can be easily combined with our method. For Reflexion, as shown in their paper, their 2-shot Reflexion prompt does not work well on WebShop. Therefore, we

re-write a zero-shot prompt and apply gpt-4-1106-preview to generate episode-level reflections for all Reflexion experiments. Following Reflexion and ExpeL, the evaluation is done on 100 test tasks. The maximum number of allowed actions for each task is 15. At the same time, each search action shows the top 3 products for the search query. Please refer to Table 6 for more details about the experiments.

A.2.3. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS OF AUTOGUIDE

We randomly sample 50 training tasks from the training set of WebShop, on which we run ReAct+Reflexion to collect pairs and generate guidelines. The state summarization prompt is one-shot, which is shown in appendix B. At test time, we ask gpt-3.5-turbo-0613 to select the most relevant top 2 guidelines for each state.

Parameter name	Value
Allowed Episode Length	15
# of Search Results	3
n-shots	1
Agent Model	gpt-3.5-turbo-0613
State Summarization Model	gpt-3.5-turbo-0613
Guideline Selection Model	gpt-3.5-turbo-0613
Guideline Extraction Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
Reflexion Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
top-k guideline selection	2

Table 6. Experiment hyperparameters on WebShop. The maximum allowed episode length, the number of search results per page, and n-shots follow the same setup in ReAct.

A.3. WebArena (Zhou et al., 2023)

A.3.1. ENVIRONMENT DETAILS

WebArena provides web-based benchmark environments that closely follow the data and functionality of real-world websites. Unlike other benchmarks like WebShop that provide clean text of website information as observation, WebArena’s webpage content is represented as an accessibility tree, which is a subset of the DOM tree with useful elements of a webpage. For our experiments, we focus on WebArena Reddit, which simulates the real Reddit websites with users, forums, and posts with abundant text information.

For each task in WebArena, the agent is expected to achieve a task-specific intent. At each timestep, WebArena provides a list of opened tabs, the accessibility tree of the focused webpage, and the URL of the current page as observation. For WebArena, each observation is long. Therefore, following the baseline in WebArena, at each timestep, we only provide the observation of the current timestep to the agent. We additionally provide up to 5 past actions for the agent to understand what it did in the past. The allowed actions in

WebArena include the following:

- goto[url]
- click[element_id]
- type[text][1 for enter or 0 for not enter]
- press[key_combination]
- scroll [up or down]
- go_back

The maximum allowed number of actions for a single task is 20. Note that WebArena does not provide training tasks, but the work provides 19 demonstrations for Reddit, each of a different category. Therefore, we set these 19 tasks as the training tasks and then test on the rest 87 tasks.

A.3.2. BASELINE AND MODELS

We directly run the two-shot ReAct-style baseline in the official codebase of WebArena using gpt4-preview-1106. For ExpeL, the original paper does not include experiments on WebArena, therefore we try our best to implement our own version and run on the same training tasks as our method.

A.3.3. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS OF AUTOGUIDE

Among the 19 human demonstrations provided in WebArena, 17 of them successfully complete the tasks. We directly run ReAct on the successful tasks to collect failure actions and generate guidelines correspondingly. We take advantage of the URL and webpage titles, which are a part of the observation for this benchmark, to help with state summarization.

Parameter name	Value
Allowed Episode Length	20
n-shots	2
Agent Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
State Summarization Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
Guideline Selection Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
Guideline Extraction Model	gpt-4-1106-preview
top-k guideline selection	2

Table 7. Experiment hyperparameters on WebArena. The number of shots follows the same setup in ReAct.

B. Prompt Templates

B.1. State Summarization

We present our prompt templates for state summarization with \mathcal{M}_{state} (Equation (2) from Section 3.3) for WebShop, ALFWorld, and WebArena in Figures 6, 7 and 8, respectively. In ALFWorld, there exist six categories of tasks, and

State Summarization Prompt for WebShop

Instruction Now, you'll get a snippet of a trajectory. Your job is to generate a brief and general summarization of the current status. Keep it broad and general, avoid any information about specific instructions, products, or buying options. For different 'Instructions' with the same status, the summarization should be the same.

In-Context Example

<p>Webshop Instruction: i would like a bottle of bright citrus deodorant under 50 dollars [Search] SUMMARIZATION: The assistant is on the search page with a [Search] box.</p> <p>Action: search[bright citrus deodorant] Observation: [Back to Search] Page 1 (Total results: 3) [Next \$>\$] [B078GWRC1J] Bright Citrus Deodorant \$10.99 [B078GTKVXY] Ginger Fresh Deodorant \$10.99 [B08KBVJ4XN] Barrel and Oak - Aluminum-Free Deodorant \$15.95 SUMMARIZATION: The assistant is on the search result page with a list of products.</p> <p>Action: click[B078GWRC1J] Observation: [Back to Search] [\$>\$ Prev] scent [assorted scents][bright citrus][ginger fresh] size [travel set (4-pack)][(pack of 1)][3-ounce (2-pack)] Bright Citrus Deodorant Price: \$10.99 Rating: N.A. [Description]</p>	<p>[Features] [Reviews] [Attributes] [Buy Now] SUMMARIZATION: The assistant is on a product's main page.</p> <p>Action: click['bright citrus' '(pack of 1)'] Observation: Invalid Action! SUMMARIZATION: The assistant failed to click on a button and got 'Invalid Action!'.</p> <p>Action: click[bright citrus] Observation: You have clicked bright citrus. SUMMARIZATION: The assistant has successfully clicked on a button.</p> <p>Action: click[Description] Observation: [Back to Search] [\$<\$ Prev] Bright Citrus Deodorant for sensitive skin SUMMARIZATION: The assistant clicked on and navigated to a product's subpage(one of [Description], [Features], [Reviews], and [Attributes]).</p> <p>Action: click[Buy Now] Observation: Invalid Action! SUMMARIZATION: The assistant failed to click on a button and got 'Invalid Action!'.</p> <p>Action: search[bright citrus deodorant under 50] Observation: Invalid Action! SUMMARIZATION: The assistant failed to search on the page and got 'Invalid Action!'.</p>
--	---

Input Now it's your turn:
{Current trajectory}

Figure 6. Our prompt template for state summarization (Equation (2) from Section 3.3) in the WebShop domain.

we use state summarization prompting with 2-shot examples for each task, following the practice by Yao et al. (2022b). Figure 7 shows one example for the `pick_and_place` tasks.

B.2. Guideline Extraction

In Figures 9, 10 and 11, we state the prompt templates we use with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{guideline}}$ for extracting guidelines (Equation (3) from Section 3.3) in the WebShop, ALFWorld, and WebArena domains.

B.3. State Matching

Figure 12 shows our prompt template for matching the summarized state with one of the existing states if there is any

similar state, for the construction of the set of state-aware guidelines (Section 3.3) and the retrieval of relevant guidelines during testing (Section 3.4) in all the three domains: WebShop, ALFWorld, and WebArena.

B.4. Guideline Selection

For selecting only k most relevant guidelines in case there are more corresponding state-aware guidelines during testing (Equation (4) from Section 3.4), we use the prompt with Figure 13 for WebShop and ALFWorld and Figure 14 for WebArena.

State Summarization Prompt for ALFWorld

Instruction	<p>You'll get a snippet of a trajectory of an text-based ALFRED task. Your job is to generate a brief and general summarization of the current status following 'SUMMARIZATION: '.</p> <p>Keep it broad and general, avoid any information about specific objects and locations.</p> <p>Here are two examples:</p>	
In-Context Example	<p>You are in the middle of a room. Looking quickly around you, you see a cabinet 4, a cabinet 3, a cabinet 2, a cabinet 1, a coffeemachine 1, a countertop 1, a diningtable 3, a diningtable 2, a diningtable 1, a drawer 1, a fridge 1, a garbagecan 1, a microwave 1, a sidetable 1, a sinkbasin 1, and a toaster 1.</p> <p>Your task is to: find some apple and put it in sidetable.</p> <p>> think: To solve the task, I need to find and take an apple, then put it in sidetable.</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>> think: First I need to find an apple. An apple is more likely to appear in fridges (1), diningtables (1-3), sidetables (1), countertops (1), sinkbasins (1), garbagecan (1). I can check one by one, starting with fridge 1.</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>> go to fridge 1</p> <p>The fridge 1 is closed.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Looking for an object here, but it is closed.</p> <p>> open fridge 1</p> <p>You open the fridge 1. The fridge 1 is open. In it, you see a lettuce 2, a mug 2, a potato 2, and a tomato 1.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Looking for an object, but it's not here.</p> <p>> go to table 1</p> <p>Nothing happens.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Tried to go to a location but failed.</p>	<p>> go to diningtable 1</p> <p>On the diningtable 1, you see nothing.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Looking for an object, but it's not here.</p> <p>> go to garbagecan 1</p> <p>On the garbagecan 1, you see a apple 3, and a egg 3.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Looking for an object and found the desired object here.</p> <p>> think: Now I find an apple (3). Next, I need to take it.</p> <p>> take apple 3 from garbagecan 1</p> <p>You pick up the apple 3 from the garbagecan 1.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Successfully took an object.</p> <p>> think: Now I find an apple (3). Next, I need to put it in/on sidetable 1.</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>> go to sidetable 1</p> <p>On the sidetable 1, you see nothing.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Looking for a location to put an object in/on.</p> <p>> put apple 3 in/on sidetable</p> <p>Nothing happens.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Tried to put an object in/on a location but failed.</p> <p>> put apple 3 in/on sidetable 1</p> <p>You put the apple 3 in/on the sidetable 1.</p> <p>SUMMARIZATION: Successfully put an object in/on a location.</p>
In-Context Example	...	
Input	<p>Now it's your turn:</p> <p>{Current trajectory}</p>	

Figure 7. Our prompt template for state summarization (Equation (2) from Section 3.3) in the ALFWorld domain.

State Summarization Prompt for WebArena

Instruction	<p>You are an autonomous intelligent agent tasked with navigating a web browser. You will be provided with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a snippet of the current web page's accessibility tree: a simplified representation of the webpage with key information. 2. the current web pages' URL. <p>Given the information above, please generate a 'state summarization' following these rules:</p> <p>If the URL match the formats below, answer correspondingly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 'http://<your_server>/user/<username>/<subpage>', answer: You are on the <subpage> page of a user. 3. 'http://<your_server>/f/<forum name>', answer: You are on the main page of a forum. 4. 'http://<your_server>/f/<forum name>/<subpage>', answer: You are on the <subpage> page of a forum. 5. 'http://<your_server>/f/<forum name>/<any number>/<anything>', answer: You are on the page of a post. 6. 'http://<your_server>/search?q=<searchquery>', answer: You are on the search result page. <p>For other cases, denote the <page name> in beginning of the accessibility tree in "RootWebArea '<page name>' focused: True" as <page name>.</p> <p>Directly answer: You are on the <page name> page.</p>
Input	<p>Here are the inputs:</p> <p>{Current trajectory}</p>

Figure 8. Our prompt template for state summarization (Equation (2) from Section 3.3) in the WebArena domain.

Guideline Extraction Prompt for WebShop

Instruction	<p>{Task description}. You will be provided with a failed and a successful trajectory of the same task. What is the first action that differs between the two trajectories? Why do you think it makes one trajectory failed and the other successful? Based on your answer, generate an action guideline to make future task avoid the same mistake. The guideline should specify what to do in what situation in the format of "When in what status, you should (or should not)...". On a product's page with product information, strictly refer to the option buttons as 'buying options such as sizes, colors, scents, and flavors', and clearly say that buying options are not subpages like [Description] and [Attributes] when you mention buying options. Your guideline must be general enough for any task, therefore never include any task-specific information, instead, refer to all the requirements as the requirements in Instruction. Strictly follow what the successful trajectory does and never suggest actions that the successful trajectory didn't do. When referring to actions, use the allowed action format. You should make your answer concise, limit your answer within 256 tokens, and put your answer in this format: 'Reasoning: ... Guideline: ...'.</p>
Input	<p>Failed Trajectory: {Failed trajectory} Successful Trajectory: {Successful trajectory}</p>

Figure 9. Our prompt template for guideline extraction (Equation (3) from Section 3.3) in the WebShop domain.

Guideline Extraction Prompt for ALFWorld

Instruction	<p>{Task description}. You will be provided with a failed and a successful trajectory of the same task. What is the first action that differs between the two trajectories? Why do you think it makes one trajectory failed and the other successful? Based on your answer, generate an action guideline to make future task avoid the same mistake. The guideline should specify what to do in what situation in the format of "When in what status, (optional: if you want to ...) you should (or should not)... (optional: a short example for demonstration.)". For the 'When in what status' part, directly use the words in SUMMARIZATION. Here are two examples: Example 1: When looking for an object, if you want to find a kitchen-related object like a spatula, you should start from the most possible locations. Example 2: When looking for an object and found the desired object at the location, You should only take the exact object that you want. Strictly follow what the successful trajectory does and never suggest actions that the successful trajectory didn't do. When referring to actions, use the allowed action format. You should make your answer concise, limit your answer within 128 tokens, and put your answer in this format: 'Reasoning: ... Guideline: ...'.</p>
Input	<p>Failed Trajectory: {Failed trajectory} Successful Trajectory: {Successful trajectory}</p>

Figure 10. Our prompt template for guideline extraction (Equation (3) from Section 3.3) in the ALFWorld domain.

C. Example State-Aware Guidelines

In Figure 15, we show a list of possible states and state-aware guidelines on WebArena.

Guideline Extraction Prompt for WebArena

Instruction	<p>{Task description} You just finished a task but failed. For this failed task, we provide a human demonstration for you. Please compare the demonstration with your generated action at each step, reason about the intention of the correct action, and then generate an action guideline for future tasks to avoid the same mistake and make the future tasks successful.</p> <p>Here's the information you'll have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current observation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The task objective: the task you're trying to complete. * The current web page's accessibility tree: a simplified representation of the webpage, providing key information. * The current web page's URL: the link of the page you're currently on. * The open tabs: the tabs you have opened. * The previous actions: a sequence of past actions that you performed. 2. The action you generated in the failed run. 3. The correct action that you should take. 4. Demonstration actions in later steps on the same page. <p>Based on the information, please generate a short and concise guideline that guide you to issue the correct action. Important: The guideline should be general enough to generalize to all similar tasks, not only this task. Therefore do not include any task-specific information in your guideline, for example a user name, a specific forum, the specific text you want to enter, or any number ID in [] in front of each element, for example [123], the numbers are randomly generated therefore never include them in your guideline. However, for other non-specific elements like</p>	<p>"link 'Forums'" or "button 'Create submission'", you should specifically include them in the exact text in your guideline. When referring to a url in your guideline, specify it as detailed as possible, only replace the task specific information as a palceholder, for example, replace a forum iphone with <forum_name> and specify the url in full, starts with http://.</p> <p>The guideline should be less than 128 tokens. Please refer to "the previous actions" and "Demonstration actions in later steps" to generate more accurate descriptions of your purpose and the sequence of actions to achieve the purpose. make sure to emphasize the order of the actions, do not miss any single action, and put them in 1. 2. 3. ..., for example 'after you typed in all the text, you should do these sequentially: 1. ..., 2. You must strictly follow the order."</p> <p>When you mention multiple steps of actions, also mention in the guideline that you should refer to the PREVIOUS ACTIONS to reason about which actions you did and what you should do next. Specify that you should not repeatedly issue the same action, but should move on to the next action instead.</p> <p>Only specify what to do or what not to do, don't explain why.</p> <p>It is important to clearly specify when to issue a stop action when the stop action is either the correct action or in the 'Demonstration actions in later steps on the same page.', do not specify the 'answer' in 'stop [answer]' because answer is different for different tasks, and do not mention anything about stop if this action is neither in "The correct action that you should take." nor "Demonstration actions in later steps on the same page."</p> <p>Please strictly adhere to the 'correct action that you should take', do not propose other actions.</p>
Input	<p>Here are the information you need:</p> <p>{Observation}</p> <p>The action you generated in the failed run: {Predicted action}</p> <p>The correct action that you should take: {Demo action}</p> <p>Demonstration actions in later steps on the same page: {Later action}</p> <p>Please put your answer in this format: Reasoning: ... Guideline: ...</p>	

Figure 11. Our prompt template for guideline extraction (Equation (3) from Section 3.3) in the WebArena domain.

State Matching Prompt

Instruction	<p>{Task description} A task trajectory can be long. Therefore the assistant summarizes the status of each step. For different task with the same status, the summarization should be the same, therefore please ignore any information about instructions or products. You will be provided with the following: 1. A list of summarizations the assistant saw in the past. 2. A newly generated summarization. Please determine if any summarization from the list matches the exact same status as the newly generated one. If yes, answer the index of the corresponding summarization, for example "Answer: 2"; otherwise, "Answer: None".</p>
Input	<p>Seen Summarizations: {List of state summaries}</p>

Figure 12. Our prompt template for state matching (Sections 3.3 and 3.4) in all the WebShop, ALFWorld, and WebArena domains.

Guideline Selection Prompt for WebShop and ALFWorld

Instruction	<p>{Task description}. You will be equipped with the following resources: 1. A list of action guidelines with valuable guidelines. 2. Trajectory history, which includes recent observations and actions. Not all guidelines are useful to generate the next action. Please select the guidelines that are useful and relevant to the next action given the trajectory and recent observations. To generate the next action, which guidelines from the provided guidelines are most useful to directly tell you what to do for the next action? You can select up to 2 guidelines, and put the indices of the selected guidelines in a python list. For example if you select guideline 1, 5, answer: [1, 5]. If none of them are useful for generating the next action, answer the empty list [].</p>
Input	<p>{List of guidelines} {Current trajectory}</p>

Figure 13. Our prompt template for selecting most relevant state-aware guidelines during the test time (Equation (4) from Section 3.4) in the WebShop and ALFWorld domains.

Guideline Selection Prompt for WebArena

Instruction	<p>{Task description}. At each time step, you need to generate one action given the current observation. You will be equipped with the following resources: 1. A list of action guidelines with valuable guidelines. 2. The intent of the task, which is the objective/goal that you should achieve. 3. Trajectory history, which includes the current observation and a sequence of past actions. Not all guidelines are useful to generate the next action. Please select the guidelines that are useful and relevant to the next action given the current observation and past actions. To generate the next action, which guidelines from the provided guidelines are most useful to directly tell you what to do for the next action? You can select 3 guidelines (or less if there are less than 3 guidelines), and put the number indices of the selected guidelines in a python list. For example if you want to select guideline 2 and 5, answer [2, 5]. If none of them are relevant, answer [].</p>
Input	<p>{List of guidelines} {Current trajectory}</p>

Figure 14. Our prompt template for selecting most relevant state-aware guidelines during the test time (Equation (4) from Section 3.4) in the WebArena domain.



Figure 15. Example states and corresponding guidelines for WebArena.