

METAREFLECTION: Learning Instructions for Language Agents using Past Reflections

Priyanshu Gupta*, Shashank Kirtania*, Ananya Singha* ,
Sumit Gulwani, Arjun Radhakrishna, Sherry Shi, Gustavo Soares
Microsoft

{priyansgupta, t-skirtania, ananyasingha, sumitg, arradha, shersh,
gustavo.soares}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Despite the popularity of Large Language Models (LLMs), crafting specific prompts for LLMs to perform particular tasks remains challenging. Users often engage in multiple conversational turns with an LLM-based agent to accomplish their intended task. Recent studies have demonstrated that linguistic feedback, in the form of self-reflections generated by the model, can work as reinforcement during these conversations, thus enabling quicker convergence to the desired outcome. Motivated by these findings, we introduce METAREFLECTION, a novel technique that learns general prompt instructions for a specific domain from individual self-reflections gathered during a training phase. We evaluate our technique in two domains: Infrastructure as Code (IAC) vulnerability detection and question-answering (QA) using REACT and CoT. Our results demonstrate a notable improvement, with METAREFLECTION outperforming GPT-4 by 16.82% (IAC), 31.33% (CoT), and 15.42% (REACT), underscoring the potential of METAREFLECTION as a viable method for enhancing the efficiency of LLMs.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs), such as GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), have gained significant popularity in recent years due to their ability to generate human-like text and solve complex tasks across various domains. To leverage these models, users typically craft prompts with instructions that are tailored to a specific task. These prompts, however, are not just limited to explicit instructions, they can be enriched with additional context drawn from a variety of sources such as documentations, examples, or relevant inputs gathered from a range of other tools. This allows for a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the task at

hand, thereby aiding the model in generating more accurate and relevant outputs.

However, the process of crafting specific prompts, designed to guide LLMs in performing particular tasks, is not fairly straightforward. In fact, prompt engineers often find themselves investing a substantial amount of time in iterating and refining their prompts to optimize them for a specific task (Zamfirescu-Pereira et al., 2023; Parnin et al., 2023). This iterative, time-consuming interaction often leads to delays and inefficiencies, posing a substantial barrier to the seamless utilization of LLMs. In practice, it is common for users to engage in multiple conversational turns with an LLM-based agent, providing feedback to correct the agent’s trajectory, in order to accomplish their intended task.

Recent works (Shinn et al., 2023) have showed that the performance of language agents can be improved using *verbal reinforcement learning* during multiple conversational turns. The language agent is provided feedback at the end of a failing trajectory, and asked to reflect on its mistakes and the reflective text is stored in episodic memory to improve future trajectories on the same task. For instance, Figure 1 shows a REACT (Yao et al., 2023b) based language agent failing to complete a question-answering task from the HOTPOTQA dataset (Yang et al., 2018) because the agent got stuck in a loop looking for the very common word “goal” in a football related page. In the top two boxes on the left of Figure 1 (labelled Task and Trajectory), we show the trajectory of the agent attempting to solve the task. The box Self-Reflection from Figure 1 shows the reflection text for the above failing trajectory, pointing out the error in repeatedly searching for a common term. With this self-reflection as additional episodic memory, the next trajectory succeeds in finding the right answer. While self-reflection can significantly improve a language agent’s performance, it is an online rein-

*Equal Contribution




Figure 1: METAREFLECTION in the HotPotQA domain with ReACT reasoning

forcement process that depends on the availability of performing multiple turns with a feedback mechanism.

In this paper, we introduce METAREFLECTION, an approach to learning verbal instructions for language agents using past self-reflections. Intuitively, during a training phase, self-reflections from different tasks are gathered and generalized into a verbal ‘meta-reflection’ that takes the form of additional instructions to the language agent. In Figure 1, the self-reflection from the failing trajectory and other self-reflections over the training data are generalized into instructions that suggest that the language agent search for related terms or change the search strategy. Unlike the self-reflections, the meta-reflection instructions are not specific to any particular instance of task. In the online phase, the language agent is able to use these general instructions to search for the right term “pilot” (instead of “airline pilot”) and answer the question correctly, which it was not able to do previously. Note that there is no feedback mechanism during the inference—intuitively, we are leveraging a feedback mechanism available during the training phase to improve the language agent performance even in the absence of the feedback mechanism.

We evaluate METAREFLECTION across two distinct domains: vulnerability threat detection in a

new Infrastructure-as-Code (IAC) dataset¹ and retrieval and reasoning using the HOTPOTQA dataset. The IAC dataset is used to evaluate the performance of our solution in detecting vulnerabilities in cloud infrastructure configuration files. These files, written in a low-resource language known as HCL, manage computing data center infrastructure and declare resources such as virtual machines, virtual networks, and data stores. The task is to identify potential security vulnerabilities in these files, a challenge due to the complexity of configurations and the diversity of resources being handled across multiple infrastructure providers. Our technique demonstrated a 16.82% overall improvement in accuracy across all policies when compared to the baseline GPT-4 model. The second dataset, HOTPOTQA, is utilized to evaluate retrieval and reasoning capabilities of a model. This open-domain factual question answering dataset comprises 113K question-answer pairs. In our experiments, METAREFLECTION brought consistent gains in all configurations that we tested, with up to 31.33% improvement in accuracy against the baseline.

To summarize, we make the following contributions:

- We present METAREFLECTION, a technique for learning verbal instructions for language

¹<https://aka.ms/MetaReflectionDataset>

agents using past self-reflections (Section 4);

- We conducted an extensive evaluation of the METAREFLECTION technique across two distinct domains: vulnerability threat detection and causal reasoning demonstrating significant improvements in both domains over the baselines (Section 3).

2 Related Work

With the increasing ubiquity of black-box Large Language Models (OpenAI, 2023; Anil et al., 2023; Brown et al., 2020; Bai et al., 2022), there has been a growing interest in the community to develop strategies that can maximize the model’s performance on a downstream task. These techniques may involve guiding an LLM to arrive at the correct answer (Wei et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023), creating multi-step workflows and agents to achieve specific tasks (Wu et al., 2023), equipping the LLMs with tools (Yao et al., 2023b; Qin et al., 2023), output selection (Yao et al., 2023a; Poesia et al., 2022), etc. In spite of the recent advancement of these strategies, careful prompt engineering has proven to be effective in bringing complementary gains over these techniques (White et al., 2023). Coming up with best instructions for a task can be a very time consuming effort. This has motivated efforts to come up with the ‘right’ prompt automatically.

Automated Instruction Generation. *Automated Prompt Engineering (APE)* (Zhou et al., 2023) poses instruction generation as a synthesis problem and proposes techniques to effectively search over the space of instruction candidates generated by an LLM. The learned prompt can then be used during inference time in isolation. Given the potentially infinite space of instructions, recent works have studied the problem of ‘guided’ prompt search instead. To this end, *OPRO* (Yang et al., 2023) proposes a prompt ‘optimization’ technique where they come up with a prompting strategy that can enable a model to perform prompt mutations to optimize a numerical ‘metric’ like eval set performance. *HiT* (Zhu et al., 2023) proposes a method to effectively learn ‘rules’ using task plan generated by a model using techniques like COT and search through this rule library.

Instruction generation conditioned on verbal feedback. Ouyang and Li present *AutoPlan* (Ouyang and Li, 2023), an approach to gen-

erate planning instructions for interactive decision-making tasks. These instructions help the model to better plan to use external tools to add grounding to the language agents. In our work, we generate a set of broad instructions that can be used as grounding, to improve the quality of LLM responses, orthogonal to the use of external tools. *ProTeGi* (Pryzant et al., 2023) and *PE2* (Ye et al., 2023) also leverage verbal feedback to generate and/or evolve task description prompts. They start with an initial prompt, evaluate it on a batch of examples from a training set and use the failing examples to generate textual gradients to criticize the prompt. They subsequently use these gradients to produce multiple candidates per instructions and sample the best candidates at each iteration. In *PE2* they additionally, maintain an optimization history to iterative improve the prompt. In contrast, in our work, we aim at developing instruction sets instead of task description. Besides, our technique leverages free-form self-reflections to navigate the search space of possible instructions instead of sampling from a large candidate pool - leading to a relatively less costly search.

Instruction generation conditioned on inference-time input. An alternative approach to improve language agent predictions can be to *adapt* on-the-fly an initial human written instruction to a given input instance for a task. This can be done by fine-tuning a model that can generate the mutations to the initial instruction (Zhang et al., 2022b, 2023, 2022a; Deng et al., 2022) or by prompting a black-box LLM to come up with such mutations (Sun et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2023).

3 Experimental Evaluation

We evaluate the performance of METAREFLECTION on dataset from two different domains: vulnerability threat detection (IAC) and question answering (HOTPOTQA).

3.1 Vulnerability Detection in IAC Files

Infrastructure-as-Code (IAC) is a popular method of configuring cloud infrastructures, on platforms such as Azure and AWS, using a configuration coding language. These configuration files can declare resources such as virtual machines with specific capabilities, virtual networks and subnets, and data stores. IAC presents an alternative to the traditional ways of configuring cloud infrastructures, such as using a web-based graphical interface.

	Per-policy data statistics			Prec.	Base Rec.	Acc.	METAREFLECTION			Delta Acc.
	#Modules	#Vulnerable	#Non-vul.				Prec.	Rec.	Acc.	
networkPolicyEnabled	23	10	13	45	100	48	61	100	72	23
kubeDashboardDisabled	29	3	26	48	100	89	64	100	93	4
reme_keyVaultAuditLoggingEnabled	44	10	34	28	60	55	89	70	90	35
reme_containerRegistryResourceLock	35	9	26	33	81	53	100	94	99	46
reme_appGatewayWAFEnabled	59	36	23	75	81	72	98	88	92	20
networkPort22ExposedToInternetAz	27	4	23	83	75	94	100	75	96	2
networkPort22ExposedToPublicAz	35	6	29	83	83	94	83	83	94	0
reme_noSecurityGroupAssociated	90	60	30	76	81	70	92	91	89	19
reme_checkStorageContainerAccess	19	5	14	100	67	91	100	73	93	2
reme_resourceGroupLock	55	43	12	82	98	81	85	98	85	4

Table 1: Results on the IAC tasks

There are numerous IAC platforms currently available for various cloud computing platforms. Here, we focus on Terraform, a leading IAC platform by Hashicorp (HashiCorp, 2023), as well as Azure, the cloud computing platform by Microsoft. Related Terraform resource declarations are grouped together into Terraform modules which act as a basic, reusable configuration component.

Task. Cloud infrastructures are prone to security vulnerabilities such as open ports and exposed administrator accounts (Tenable, 2023). Vulnerability detection via static analysis of IAC files is a hard problem due to the expressivity of the configuration language, the complexity of configurations and the diversity of the resources being handled across multiple infrastructure providers (e.g., Amazon AWS and Microsoft Azure). Further, Terraform uses a low-resource language - HashiCorp Configuration Language (HCL).

Terrascan (Tenable, 2023) is a static analyzer for detecting security vulnerabilities in Terraform modules, and supports over 500 security policies, including 178 policies specific to Azure. Figure 2 shows the description and definition of a Terrascan policy that checks if every Azure virtual network subnet is configured with a corresponding network security policy. Note that the Terrascan policy is *syntactic*, i.e., it is checking for a declaration of an `azurerem_virtual_network` with a field named `subnet`, and so on. Hence, Terrascan-like static analysis based vulnerability detection is fragile and prone to both false positives and false negatives due to being sensitive to syntax. The task at hand is to check if a given Terraform module violates a given Terrascan policy.

Data collection. We collected 202 Terraform modules by mining GitHub repositories for IAC code written in HCL. These repositories corresponded to a diverse range of applications including load balancers, machine learning operations

Description: *Ensure that Azure Virtual Network subnet is configured with a Network Security Group*

Definition:

```

{{.prefix}}noSecurityGroupAssociated[retVal] {
  vn := input.azurerem_virtual_network[_]
  vn.type = "azurerem_virtual_network"
  object.get(vn.config, "subnet", \
    "undefined") != "undefined"
  not sgExists(vn.config)

  traverse = "subnet[0].security_group"
  retVal := {
    "Id": vn.id,
    ...
    "Attribute": "subnet.security_group",
    "Expected": "${<security_group_name>.id}",
    "Actual": ""
  }
}

sgExists(cfg) { ... }
<56 lines altogether>

```

Figure 2: Rego code for the Terrascan policy `reme_noSecurityGroupAssoc`.

managers, and domain-specific data-stores. For policies, we selected the 10 most commonly violated Terrascan policies. Of the 2020 module-policy pairs, we eliminated a significant fraction of cases where the policies were not applicable to the module. For example, if the policy was for a specific resource type and the module did not contain declarations of that resource type, the pair was eliminated. After this process, we were left with 648 module-policy pairs, for which we manually annotated whether the module violated the policy (see Table 1 for the exact breakdown). Note that this ground-truth annotation was with respect to the description of Terrascan policy, not the definition—that is, we use the intention behind the policy, not the letter of the definition. That is, we do not take the output of Terrascan as ground truth as it can be inaccurate, and instead manually examine if the policy (as per description) is violated. This data was then split into train and test sets in a 40 : 60 ra-

You are an expert in [Task]. Given the following task description [and examples] come up with a set of instructions that can help you perform the task effectively.

Task Description: ...

Figure 3: Prompt for generating task-specific instructions in the LLMINSTRUCTION baseline

tio per policy, taking care to balance the vulnerable and non-vulnerable classes.

Experimental setup. As a baseline language agent, we use GPT-4 with an appropriate prompt that provides the code of the Terraform module and the description of the Terrascan policy, and asks if the module is vulnerable. While training, the agent is given a 0-1 feedback on whether its response is correct or not, and the model is asked to self-reflect if the response is incorrect. For each policy, we run the METAREFLECTION algorithm on the training set and report the accuracy numbers for both the baseline agent and the agent with the instructions learned through METAREFLECTION. We also compare to LLMINSTRUCTION as another baseline—here the language model is asked to come up with instructions for a task given its description (Figure 3), and then these instructions are provided when the task is being performed.

Results. The results of the experiment are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 (last 2 cols). On the whole, across all policies, meta-reflection shows a 12–17% accuracy improvement over the baselines depending on the batch size. As Table 1 shows, meta-reflection provides consistent gains in accuracy for all policies over the GPT-4 baseline, with 32% in the best case. The precision with METAREFLECTION is significantly better for all policies, while the recall decreases for some.

Exemplar case. We discuss the case of security policy `reme_noSecurityGroupAssociated` from Figure 2, i.e., that all Azure virtual network subnets are configured with a network security group (NSG). The main difficulty here is that HCL and Terraform offer many different ways of (a) associating a subnet with a virtual network, and (b) associating a NSG with a subnet. By default, the baseline GPT-4 agent fails to handle certain ways of specifying these associations, while spuriously assuming certain other associations. In Figure 4a, the baseline consistently failed to recognize a subnet-NSG association expressed using Method 2, i.e., using an explicitly declared association. On the other hand, it mis-identified declarations similar to the one in

Figure 4b as valid subnet-NSG associations—here, the NSG is associated with a virtual machine’s network interface (that is connected to the subnet) instead of the subnet itself. These limitations lead to both false positives and false negatives. With meta-reflection, we are able to learn the instructions in Figure 4c, using which the agent easily handles these kinds of cases.

```
// Method 1: For inline defintions
resource "azurerm_virtual_network" "example" {
  ...
  subnet {
    ...
    security_group = ...
  }
}

// Method 2: Explicitly declared association
resource "azurerm_subnet_nsg_association" {
  subnet_id = ...
  network_security_group_id = ...
}
```

(a) Associating a subnet with a NSG

```
resource "azurerm_virtual_network" "vnet" { ... }
resource "azurerm_subnet" "subnet" {
  name = "subnet1" ...
}
resource "azurerm_network_interface" "nic" {
  network_security_group_id = ...
  ip_configuration { subnet_id = "subnet1" }
}
resource "azurerm_virtual_machine" "... " {
  network_interface_ids = [ "nic" ]
  ...
}
```

(b) NSG associated with a VM’s network interface instead of subnet.

4. Remember that the association between `"azurerm_virtual_network"` and a NSG may not be direct. It could be done through a separate resource block such as `"azurerm_subnet_nsg_association"`

7. Do not confuse NSG associations with network interfaces of VMs and the subnet of the Azure Virtual Network. The policy specifically requires the NSG be associated with the subnet.

(c) Instructions learned through meta-reflection

Figure 4: `reme_noSecurityGroupAssociated`: Checking Subnet-NSG associations

Discussion. As the above exemplar case shows, METAREFLECTION is able to learn very domain-specific instructions to fix both false positives and false negatives. Other instructions include aspects like handling of wildcards for port numbers, step-by-step strategies for specific policies, etc. Note that these instructions not only include planning (or

	HOTPOTQA						IAC vulnerability	
	CoT (GT)		CoT (Distractor)		REACT		detection	
	Acc.	σ	Acc.	σ	Acc.	σ	Acc.	σ
GPT-4	20.67	3.79	32.67	3.21	19.58	1.91	73.36	0.012
LLMINSTRUCTION	20.67	4.51	30.67	9.81	27.5	2.5	73.31	0.43
METAREFLECTION (batch size = 1)	24.67	3.51	38.00	2.65	30.41	0.72	87.17	0.63
METAREFLECTION (batch size = 2)	50.33	0.58	48.67	2.52	35.00	1.25	85.09	0.4
METAREFLECTION (batch size = 4)	52.00	2.00	50.67	1.53	31.67	1.44	90.18	0.28

Table 2: Results on HOTPOTQA and IAC with GPT-4

trajectory directing) instructions, but also grounding instructions—i.e., external facts that are not initially available.

In general, the experimental results show that meta-reflection is able to reduce the number of errors, i.e., improve the accuracy across a broad range of cases. However, one noticeable issue from the above results is the drop in recall for several policies. While the high recall in the baseline is artificial, coming at the cost of low precision, this is still an important issue to address. Our 0-1 feedback to the self-reflection agent does not state that false negatives are worse than false positives in the security domain. In the future, we plan to explore domain-specific feedback and self-reflection mechanisms that can account for the nature of errors, as well as better versions of the ShowsImprovement function that are aware of such domain-specific preferences.

3.2 HOTPOTQA

HOTPOTQA (Yang et al., 2018) is an open-domain factual question answering dataset consisting of 113K question-answer pairs. The original paper proposes to use the data in 2 settings: (a) *Distractor* setting - where each question is to be answered using 10 wikipedia article excerpts; and (b) *Full-Wiki* setting which is a retrieval and reasoning task, where a given question is supposed to be answered after retrieving relevant context from wikipedia. Notably, an answer is marked correct only if it matches *exactly* with the ground truth.

Similar to Shinn et al. (Shinn et al., 2023), we design the following agents that operate over the dataset: (a) REACT- for the *Full-Wiki* setting (b) CoT (Distractor) - for the *Distractor Distractor* setting (c) CoT (GT) - a variant of CoT (Distractor) with access to only ground truth articles.

Data Sampling. For each agent setting, we adversarially sample subsets of the HOTPOTQA train

split of 90K samples to create train and test sets. To perform adversarial sampling, we first identify samples where the base agent fails consistently in a given setting. On these failing examples we perform upto 3 self-reflection trials to get the model to the right response. If the agent is not able to get to the correct response even after self-reflection, we discard these samples. This strategy ensures that we get a set of hard examples in which the agents fail most of the times to get to the right answer in a single try, while also making sure that we filter examples that may be noisy due to missing context, incorrect questions etc. To account for randomness and given our computational budget, we sample 40 and 80 examples for the REACT train set and test set respectively. For CoT settings, we pick 50 and 80 example respectively.

Experimental setup. We reuse the CoT agent from (Wei et al., 2023) for the chain-of-thought experiments and use a re-implementation of (Yao et al., 2023b) for the REACT experiments. The REACT agent is allowed at most 6 ACTION steps after which the trajectory is automatically determined to be a failure. Similar to Section 3.1, we evaluate HOTPOTQA configurations for: (a) METAREFLECTION with batch sizes 1, 2, and 4; and (b) GPT-4 and LLMINSTRUCTION as baselines. In addition to this, we also evaluate variants of the agents powered by GPT-3.5-TURBO instead of GPT-4, while using GPT-4 for METAREFLECTION.²

Results. We find that the generated METAREFLECTION instruction consistently improved performance across different agent settings for HOTPOTQA. In Table 2, we present results using GPT-4 for both the agents and METAREFLECTION. We observe that METAREFLECTION help us achieve gains up to 32% for CoT (GT), 18% for CoT (Distractor), and 15.5% for REACT, over the respective

²A similar experiment on the IAC domain wasn't possible due to large context length of the Terraform modules

	CoT (GT)		CoT (Distractor)		REACT	
	Acc.	σ	Acc.	σ	Acc.	σ
GPT-3.5-TURBO	23.00	2.65	30.00	5.00	8.33	2.60
LLMINSTRUCTION	25.67	6.03	31.00	10.00	20.83	4.83
METAREFLECTION (batch size = 1)	29.0	1.00	41.67	2.52	26.67	4.73
METAREFLECTION (batch size = 2)	38.67	2.52	30.67	1.15	17.08	2.60
METAREFLECTION (batch size = 4)	44.33	0.58	39.33	1.15	22.08	5.64

Table 3: Results on HOTPOTQA with GPT-3.5-TURBO powering the agents and GPT-4 for reflections and METAREFLECTION

test sets. Interestingly, higher batch sizes almost always help, reinforcing the importance of batching as observed in related works (Ouyang and Li, 2023; Ye et al., 2023).

In Table 3, we report results when using GPT-3.5-TURBO to power the client agents. We see gains of upto 21% gains for CoT (GT), 12% for CoT (Distractor) and 18.33% for the REACT case. Here, we observe that batching doesn't strictly improve the performance. Examining the data qualitatively, this difference can be attributed to the nature of the instructions generated in the two settings. In general we observe that with a small batch size, METAREFLECTION produces a large amount of very specific instructions. On the contrary batching helps generalize these instructions into more widely applicable rules. GPT-4, being more powerful than GPT-3.5-TURBO, is able to better follow these abstract instructions, while specific instructions work better for GPT-3.5-TURBO.

```
// Chain-of-thought
(A) Provide direct and concise responses to the question, using precise language that matches the specificity and terminology of the question, including singular or plural forms and definite articles as needed.
(B) If the context suggests multiple valid answers, choose the one that best matches the question's wording and the most direct information provided.
// React
(C) When a question asks for a specific detail such as a 'full name', ensure to find and provide that exact information. Don't make assumptions based on limited or incomplete information.
(D) If you're not finding the desired information or stuck in a loop of looking up a keyword, consider changing the keyword and search strategy. The information might be located further down the page.
(E) When a question involves comparison, such as 'who received more rewards', ensure to search for each entity individually, gather all necessary information, and then make a comparison based on the data found.
(F) Be mindful of potential spelling errors or variations in the names of entities. If a search for a specific term doesn't yield results, consider possible alternative spellings or forms of the term.
```

Figure 5: Instructions learned via the METAREFLECTION technique for the CoT and REACT reasoning on HOTPOTQA.

Inference without meta-reflection

Solve a question answering task by having a Thought, then Finish with your answer. Thought can reason about the current situation. Finish[...] returns the answer and finishes the task.

Question: What is one name for the Cassava after it is marketed as a paste and often served with palm nut soup?

Thought: The question is asking for a name of cassava when it is marketed as a paste and often served with palm nut soup. From the context provided, I can see that cassava paste is referred to as "Akpu" in Nigeria and is often eaten with soups such as Egusi soup. Although palm nut soup is not explicitly mentioned in the context of Akpu, it is a type of soup that could be served with cassava paste, as indicated by the information about palm nut soup being used to accompany dishes like fufu, which is similar to Akpu in that they are both made from cassava.

Action: Finish|Akpu

Inference with meta-reflection

Answer a question interleaving Thought, Action, and Observation steps. Actions can be Search[...], Lookup[...], ...

Instructions: ...
 If the context suggests multiple valid answers, choose the one that best matches the question's wording and the most direct information provided.
 In cases of ambiguity or multiple interpretations, provide an answer that adheres to the most common understanding of the question's terms and context.
 ...

Question: What is one name for the Cassava after it is marketed as a paste and often served with palm nut soup?

Thought: The question is asking for a name of cassava when it is marketed as a paste and often served with palm nut soup. From the context provided, I can see that cassava paste is referred to as "Akpu" in Nigeria and is often eaten with Egusi soup. However, since the question specifically mentions palm nut soup, I should look for a name that is associated with cassava paste served with palm nut soup. The context also mentions "Plakali" as a staple food made of cassava dough and eaten with palm nut soup in Ghana. However, "Plakali" is described as cassava dough cooked in hot water, not as a marketed paste. The most direct match for cassava marketed as a paste and associated with palm nut soup is "Fufu," which is mentioned as a staple food often served with palm nut soup.

Action: Finish|Fufu

Figure 6: METAREFLECTION in the HOTPOTQA domain with CoT style of reasoning

Exemplar case. Consider an example question from Figure 6. The question seeks information about the product made from Cassava and served with palm nut soup. The context presented within the CoT (Distractor) setting includes articles about *Akpu* and *Fufu*, both of which are quite similar, being made from Cassava paste. However, the key distinction lies in *Fufu* being served with palm nut soup, while *Akpu* is served with Esupi soup. The baseline CoT agent returns the incorrect response on this question: it is distracted by the related but incorrect articles, and makes an incorrect assumption and jumps to the wrong conclusion. The METAREFLECTION technique learns an instruction that suggests looking for multiple valid answers and selecting the one most related to the

question. When inferring with the meta-reflection instructions, it is clear from the thought that the agent did encounter the misleading answers, but was able to produce the right one by focusing on the specific key point “served with palm nut soup” mentioned in the question.

Similarly, in the REACT case (see Figure 1), we see the learned instruction enhancing search strategy by looking into the information further down the page rather looping around. This rule further aids the model in successfully concluding the trial where it was previously failing. The model uses the rule to explicitly guide the action space to look further down the context page and look up the right keyword, leading to the correct response, Bruce Dickinson. In contrast, in the baseline attempt, it ran out of trials by getting stuck in a loop.

Discussion. As we can see from the results, meta-reflection can produce significant improvements in accuracy in the question answer setting. This is especially promising given that the dataset was sampled using an adversarial sampling technique. The HOTPOTQA domain also shows the diversity of instructions learned by METAREFLECTION—a small selection of instructions learned in the CoT and REACT settings are shown in Figure 5. We have instructions that are: i. specifically tuned to satisfy the overly strict rubric of the HOTPOTQA dataset (A); ii. domain-specific instructions for specific one-step actions in a RL trajectory (C); iii. directly the high-level strategy to be taken by the trajectory (D, E); and iv. for disambiguating answers (B) and questions (E). Further, the results on GPT-3.5-TURBO experiments reveal that METAREFLECTION can be useful to enhance the performance of smaller models by providing instructions rich in specific insights from a more powerful LLMs like GPT-4. This shows some resemblance to task-specific distillation and can be interesting to explore further in future works.

4 METAREFLECTION

Algorithm 1 shows the outline of the METAREFLECTION process. At its core, the algorithm works by starting with an empty set of instructions and iteratively improving the instructions using small training batches.

Client, Feedback, and Self-reflection agents. Being built upon the self-reflection technique, the METAREFLECTION procedure uses the same com-

Algorithm 1 METAREFLECTION with Batch Chaining

Require: Training data T , Client agent A_C
Require: Feedback agent A_F , Self-reflection agent A_{SR} ,
Require: Meta-reflection agent A_{MR}
Ensure: Meta-reflection instructions $Instr$

- 1: $Instr \leftarrow \perp$
- 2: **for all** batch \in Batch(T) **do**
- 3: Initialize A_C with $Instr$
- 4: reflections $\leftarrow \{ \text{SelfReflect}(t, A_C, A_F, A_{SR})$
- 5: $\mid t \in \text{batch} \}$
- 6: $Instr^* \leftarrow \text{MetaReflect}(Instr, \text{batch}, \text{reflections}, A_{MR})$
- 7: **if** ShowsImprovement($Instr^*$, $Instr$, batch) **then**
- 8: $Instr \leftarrow Instr^*$
- 9: **return** $Instr$

ponents at its core: (a) a client agent (i.e., an RL actor) that is based on a language model, (b) an evaluation or feedback agent that can provide feedback on the client agent’s trajectory, and (c) a self-reflection agent that produces a verbal reinforcement given a RL trajectory. Additionally, we assume that the client agent can be parameterized by a set of instructions in addition to the standard task description. In our implementation and experiments, we use several different client agents based on REACT (Yao et al., 2023b), CoT (Wei et al., 2023), and a vanilla one-shot language model. For the feedback agent, we consider multiple variants based on the application domain: a 0-1 boolean feedback agent and an exact match checker.

The METAREFLECTION step. The meta-reflection agent is designed to take as input a prior set of instructions $Instr$, a set of self-reflections reflections, and the training data, and will produce an updated set of instructions $Instr^*$. For the meta-reflection agent, we use a standard language model with a prompt that instructs the model to observe the reflections, the training data, and produce new non-case specific instructions. Further, the prior instructions are also passed as input so that the output is a generalization of the prior instructions. In our implementation, this meta-reflection and generalization are done in the same prompt for efficiency. then combined with previous instructions are also possible. Alternatively, new instructions can be generated first and then combined with existing ones.

We specify that the instructions need to take the form of a list. Hence, the meta-reflection agent typically either (a) updates the list by adding a new item, or (b) combines one or more previous items with learnings from the self-reflections to produce

a shorter list. For example, one meta-reflection instruction learned during our HOTPOTQA experiments suggested including the profession when searching for a person to narrow down results. In a subsequent batch, the self-reflection agent produces a reflection that mentions adding search terms like release date when searching for movies. The meta-reflection agent may combine the previous instructions with the current self-reflections either by appending a new item to the list clarifying the strategy to search for movies, or may generalize the previous item to something like "When searching for specific entities, use additional contextual information to augment the primary search terms with secondary keywords corresponding to the characteristics of the entity".

The validation step. In each iteration, after the meta-reflection step, we validate the quality of the new instructions. Due to sparse reward signals leading to poor self-reflections or over-generalization of the meta-reflection instructions, we may end up with instructions that are of a poorer quality than the prior instructions. The poorer instructions may also be due to general capricious, unpredictable nature of large language models. Therefore, we validate the new instructions by testing them on training data to ensure that they perform better than the prior instructions. Ideally, we would do this validation over the full training data or a substantial held-out dataset. However, in our case, we only validate on the current batch to balance quality of instructions and efficiency.

As an example, in the previous paragraph the meta-reflection step replaced the specific instruction on how to search for persons with a more general instruction on how to search for entities. However, it is possible that these general instructions are too vague (especially for smaller, less capable models) and the client agent is not able to apply them correctly to the case of searching for persons. In such a case, we do not use the new updated instructions and revert back to the prior instructions.

Other augmentations. In practice, we use several other augmentations to the meta-reflection procedure in Algorithm 1. These augmentations are not a core part of the technique, but instead optimizations that may help in specific cases and domains. The first of these is to use certain parts of the full trajectory in addition to the self-reflections during the meta-reflection step in line 6. For exam-

ple, if the client agent is a CoT agent, it may be helpful to append the inner thought steps from the trajectory to the self-reflections. Another augmentation is to use multiple attempts at meta-reflection for each batch. If the validation step fails at line 7, instead of rejecting the new instructions Instr^* altogether, we may rerun the loop with the same batch, but this time initializing the client agent with Instr^* instead of Instr . This process may be repeated multiple times till the validation step succeeds—in practice, we limit the repetition to 3 times. Similarly, the whole algorithm can be repeated multiple times over all the batches of the full training dataset. That is, repeat the algorithm starting with the previous iterations results in line 3 as long as the instructions improve at the end of the algorithm (validated over the whole training set). While we have anecdotally seen improvements in accuracy of instructions by repeating the whole algorithm in certain domains, we do not do this by default in our implementation.

5 Conclusion

Large language models (LLMs) form a critical component in the development of AI-based systems. However, crafting prompt instructions can be a non-trivial task. In this paper, we have taken a significant step forward to improve this process by introducing METAREFLECTION. This innovative approach employs past self-reflections to learn instructions used to guide LLMs. In our experiments, we show that instructions learned using METAREFLECTION significantly improve the accuracy of GPT-4 predictions.

We believe that integrating LLMs with domain-specific insights, such as our use of past self-reflections, can solve previously challenging problems. In future work, we plan to explore the application of METAREFLECTION in other contexts and refine its capabilities, aiming to enhance the performance of language models across diverse domains.

References

Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez

- Abrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland, Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui, Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Kenealy, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Moussalem, Zachary Nado, John Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Castro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone, Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang, Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.10403.
- Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, Carol Chen, Catherine Olsson, Christopher Olah, Danny Hernandez, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Ethan Perez, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Jeffrey Ladish, Joshua Landau, Kamal Ndousse, Kamile Lukosuite, Liane Lovitt, Michael Sellitto, Nelson Elhage, Nicholas Schiefer, Noemi Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Robert Lasenby, Robin Larson, Sam Ringer, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Stanislav Fort, Tamera Lanham, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Conerly, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Samuel R. Bowman, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Ben Mann, Dario Amodei, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Tom Brown, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.08073.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.14165.
- Mingkai Deng, Jianyu Wang, Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Yihan Wang, Han Guo, Tianmin Shu, Meng Song, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. 2022. Rlprompt: Optimizing discrete text prompts with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12548*.
- HashiCorp. 2023. Terraform by hashicorp.
- Geunwoo Kim, Pierre Baldi, and Stephen McAleer. 2023. Language models can solve computer tasks. *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.17491.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Siqi Ouyang and Lei Li. 2023. AutoPlan: Automatic planning of interactive decision-making tasks with large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3114–3128, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chris Parnin, Gustavo Soares, Rahul Pandita, Sumit Gulwani, Jessica Rich, and Austin Z. Henley. 2023. Building your own product copilot: Challenges, opportunities, and needs. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.14231.
- Gabriel Poesia, Alex Polozov, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Gustavo Soares, Christopher Meek, and Sumit Gulwani. 2022. Synchromesh: Reliable code generation from pre-trained language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023. Automatic prompt optimization with “gradient descent” and beam search. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7957–7968, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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. 2023. Tool learning with foundation models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.08354.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2023. Reflexion: language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Haotian Sun, Yuchen Zhuang, Linghai Kong, Bo Dai, and Chao Zhang. 2023. Adaplaner: Adaptive planning from feedback with language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.16653.
- Tenable. 2023. Terrascan sandbox | tenable.

- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Jules White, Quchen Fu, Sam Hays, Michael Sandborn, Carlos Olea, Henry Gilbert, Ashraf Elnashar, Jesse Spencer-Smith, and Douglas C. Schmidt. 2023. A prompt pattern catalog to enhance prompt engineering with chatgpt. *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.11382.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Ryen W White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. 2023. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework.
- Chengrun Yang, Xuezhi Wang, Yifeng Lu, Hanxiao Liu, Quoc V. Le, Denny Zhou, and Xinyun Chen. 2023. Large language models as optimizers. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.03409.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik R Narasimhan. 2023a. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023b. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Qinyuan Ye, Maxamed Axmed, Reid Pryzant, and Fereshte Khani. 2023. Prompt engineering a prompt engineer. *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.05661.
- J.D. Zamfirescu-Pereira, Richmond Y. Wong, Bjoern Hartmann, and Qian Yang. 2023. Why johnny can't prompt: How non-ai experts try (and fail) to design llm prompts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '23, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Tianjun Zhang, Xuezhi Wang, Denny Zhou, Dale Schuurmans, and Joseph E Gonzalez. 2022a. Tempera: Test-time prompting via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11890*.
- Yue Zhang, Hongliang Fei, Dingcheng Li, and Ping Li. 2022b. Promptgen: Automatically generate prompts using generative models. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- Zhihan Zhang, Shuohang Wang, Wenhao Yu, Yichong Xu, Dan Iter, Qingkai Zeng, Yang Liu, Chenguang Zhu, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Auto-instruct: Automatic instruction generation and ranking for black-box language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.13127.
- Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06117.
- Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. 2023. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhaocheng Zhu, Yuan Xue, Xinyun Chen, Denny Zhou, Jian Tang, Dale Schuurmans, and Hanjun Dai. 2023. Large language models can learn rules. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.07064.