Bonus Assignment - Survey

Thank you for completing the bonus assignment! This survey will help us understand your experience, challenges, and suggestions for improving the framework. Your responses are invaluable for our research. Please answer the following questions thoughtfully.

Section 1: Implementation Result

- 1. Please record the command you use to create, run, and evaluate the framework.
 - Create:

```
python create.py --config ./examples/113840.json --output-dir
./examples/stackoverflow_assistant
```

- Run:

```
python run.py --input-dir ./examples/stackoverflow_assistant
```

- Evaluation:

```
python eval.py --model_api http://127.0.0.1:8000/eval/chat --config
./examples/stackoverflow_assistant_config.json --documents_dir
./examples/stackoverflow_assistant --output-dir
./examples/stackoverflow_assistant --max_turns 8
```

2. Please copy and paste a sample conversation where you interacted with your created Agent.

```
Description in the control of the co
```

```
Here is the first part of service service service service service services services
```

3. Which of the following components did you use to create your Agent? (Check all that apply.)

\checkmark	Interactive Panel to customize task planning
\checkmark	Taskgraph Generation
\checkmark	Worker Customization
	Evaluation

Section 2: Feedback on Components

4. For the fields in the config file, Which field(s) in the config file were most useful for creating your Agent? Which field(s) did you find least important? Are there additional fields or features you would suggest adding to improve the Agent's capabilities?

I feel that the fields "role," "user_objective," "builder_objective," and "domain" are quite useful. A clear description of the agent can improve the quality of responses. For "task_docs" and "rag_docs," I think the variable numbers are good, but the algorithm used for retrieving all the links is not satisfactory. A complex website might have many links that are not relevant to the descriptions provided in "task_docs" and "rag_docs." For example, one may want to include only the help and contact pages, but the generator might visit other irrelevant pages. (I think most of

the time, one can detect what to expect from the URL, e.g., having the same subdomain or path. Maybe having an LLM for filtering could be useful). Moreover, some websites have link in javascript and do not use <a>, this could be a problem.

I really like the "Tasks" field, as it allows for custom steps. However, sometimes the steps can become very complex, depending on different factors, like a tree. I am curious if a tree-like task structure could be more effective (e.g., allowing certain steps to be skipped under specific conditions).

I have also added another field for a list of APIs. The logic is to have a list of APIs such that, when creating an agent, a JSON file is generated with information about the APIs (e.g., description, API URL, parameter rules, etc.), and a worker decides which API to call and how to call it (function call).

Personally, I did not find "task_docs" useful due to the nature of my agent (I need to perform tasks across very different websites and not a fixed set of websites).

5. Were the instructions for constructing the config file clear? Please specify areas where improvements are needed.

I think the instructions were pretty straightforward and easy to follow.

6.	6. How well did the generated task planning (without modification) cover the tasks					
	you expected the Agent to handle?					
	☐ AII					
	✓ Most					
	some					
	☐ Few					
	☐ None					
7.	How useful were the steps generated in the task planning (without modification)?					
	Rate their usefulness on a scale from 1 to 5. (1: Not Useful at All, 5: Very Useful)					
	□ 1					
	□ 2					
	□ 3					
	✓ 4					
	□ 5					
8.	If you used the Interactive Panel for customizing task planning, how useful was it?					
	Rate its usefulness on a scale from 1 to 5. (1: Not Useful at All, 5: Very Useful)					
	□ 1					
	□ 2					
	□ 3					
	✓ 4					
	□ 5					

9. Follow up to question 8: Based on your experience in customizing task planning:
How much of the original task planning did you modify?
□ 80%+
□ 60%+
☐ 40%+
☐ <20%
10. If you designed your own worker, what are they and how were they used?
I have designed a worker to handle StackOverflow API calls. It is specific for StackOverflow as there are some specific rules in their APIs, but I believe one can have a generic API worker (maybe not working perfectly, but should work well on most of the APIs given a clear documentation).
I think a worker that combines different workers would be super useful. Especially, when more workers are built, each one can be independent of each other. The current logic is one create a worker and use workflow to connect different functions. But having a worker that automatically selects the workers and combines them would be cool.
Another worker that could be useful is a search worker but to some specific link(s), Tavily is powerful but there might be some cases where I would love to imitate the search process like humans do instead of using Tavily that has some limitations.
11. Follow up to question 10: How difficult did you find customizing the Worker framework? Rate the difficulty on a scale from 1 to 5. (1: Very Easy, 5: Very Difficult)
□ 1
□ 2
□ 4
□ 5
12. How useful was the user simulator for evaluating your Agent? Rate its usefulness
on a scale from 1 to 5. (1: Not Useful at All, 5: Very Useful)
□ 1
□ 2
□ 3
\Box 4
☑ 5
13. What issues did you identify in your Agent during evaluation, and how did you
address them?

I encountered different issues:

- Default Worker does not return the correct worker. E.g. When the task is about clarification, it still returns the worker that calls directly the APIs despite the fact that in the description of API worker I clearly stated that the worker is not useful for clarification

- questions. Solution: I did prompt engineering, and got a prompt that is working better than the one before (still not good in some scenarios) -> I think the problem is Ilm gives more priority to the historical conversation than task.
- The output of Ilm might not follow the format that I gave to it, leading to error when evaluation. Solution: handle these exceptions and return some error messages to the user.
- I have encountered a situation where task value (i.e. state["orchestrator_message"]["task"]) is an empty string. Not sure why I am having this problem.

Section 3: Feedback on Framework

14	4. How would you r	ate the overall diffi	iculty of using th	e Agent First Orga	nization
	framework? (1: V	ery Easy, 5: Very Di	ifficult)		
	□ 1				
	□ 2				
	□ 3				
	✓ 4				
	□ 5				

15. What improvements would you suggest for the framework?

I think it is a very interesting framework. I can see the potential of this framework and what it is capable of achieving. However, I believe there are some functions missing in the current framework. Additionally, I think one issue with the framework is that it can be quite difficult to debug. Fixing one bug in a specific conversation might lead to another error in a different conversation that was previously working correctly.

16. Additional comments or suggestions?

I believe that the tree-like task procedure could be highly effective. One key advantage of this approach is that it would make the configuration file much simpler. (I think it is currently possible to achieve the same outcome by creating different tasks for each path to the leaf.) A tree structure would also be beneficial when tasks share the same prefix task, as it would allow for faster processing, especially as tasks become more complex.

Another consideration is that LLM calls are quite time-intensive. While I feel these calls are generally necessary, finding a balance between LLM calls and predefined rules could be valuable. For example, in some task steps, it is quite obvious which worker to use, so it would make sense to directly assign that worker instead of relying on the default worker. I know this logic already exists, but I don't think it is functioning effectively when selecting the worker in taskgraph.json.

```
"2",
{
    "name": "DefaultWorker",
    "attribute": {
        "value": "",
        "task": "Utilize the StackOverflowAPIWorker to search Stack Overflow for existing solutions or discussions related to the provided error details.",
        "directed": false
    },
    "limit": 1
}
```