

A Survey on Effective Invocation Methods of Massive LLM Services

Can Wang¹, Bolin Zhang¹, Dianbo Sui¹, Zhiying Tu^{1*}, Xiaoyu Liu¹, Jiabao Kang¹,

¹Harbin Institute of Technology,

23B903072@stu.hit.edu.cn, {brolin, tzy_hit,suidianbo}@hit.edu.cn,
2201110719@stu.hit.edu.cn, 18538796936@163.com

Abstract

Language models as a service (LMaaS) enable users to accomplish tasks without requiring specialized knowledge, simply by paying a service provider. However, numerous providers offer massive large language model (LLM) services with variations in latency, performance, and pricing. Consequently, constructing the cost-saving LLM services invocation strategy with low-latency and high-performance responses that meet specific task demands becomes a pressing challenge. This paper provides a comprehensive overview of the LLM services invocation methods. Technically, we give a formal definition of the problem of constructing effective invocation strategy in LMaaS and present the LLM services invocation framework. The framework classifies existing methods into four different components, including input abstract, semantic cache, solution design, and output enhancement, which can be freely combined with each other. Finally, we emphasize the open challenges that have not yet been well addressed in this task and shed light on future research.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLM) are becoming a fundamental tool for various natural language processing tasks [Yang *et al.*, 2023], as they have shown amazing emergent abilities, like in-context learning, multi-step reasoning, instruction following and tool learning. Due to commercial reasons, the potential risk of misuse and expensive tuning cost, LLMs, such as GPT-3, GPT-4 and Claude, are usually released as LLM services through application programming interface (API) instead of open sourcing model weights [Yu *et al.*, 2023], which is called Language Models as a Service (LMaaS).

Via accessing these powerful LLMs as services through their opened API, novice users do not need to possess extensive computational resources and expertise in deep learning, as they can solve the tasks of interest by crafting task-specific input query. However, invoking LLM services is not free and using them for high-throughput applications can be very expensive. Estimated by Claudia Slowik, a business supporting 15,000 customer interactions with text-davinci-003 could have a monthly cost exceeding \$14,400.

*Corresponding author.

Provider	LLM	Input Cost	Output Cost
OpenAI	gpt-4	\$30.0	\$60.0
	gpt-4-turbo	\$10.0	\$30.0
	gpt-3.5-turbo-1106	\$1.00	\$2.00
Anthropic	Claude-2.0	\$11.02	\$32.68
	Claude-instant-1.2	\$1.63	\$5.51
AI21	Jurassic-2 Ultra	\$15.0	\$15.0
	Jurassic-2 Mid	\$10.0	\$10.0
	Jurassic-2 Light	\$3.00	\$3.00
Textsynth	M2M100 1.2B	\$0.15	\$3.00
	GPT-J 6B	\$0.20	\$5.00
	Falcon 7B	\$0.20	\$5.00
	Mistral 7B	\$0.20	\$2.00
	Llama2 7B	\$0.20	\$2.00
	Flan-T5-XXL	\$0.20	\$5.00
Cohere	Falcon 40B	\$3.30	\$10.00
	command	\$1.00	\$2.00
	command-light	\$0.30	\$0.60
Baidu	Llama-2-13B-Chat	¥6.00	¥6.00
	Llama-2-70B-Chat	¥35.0	¥35.0
	ERNIE-Bot 4.0	¥150	¥300
	ChatGLM2-6B-32K	¥4.00	¥4.00
	Llama-2-7B-Chat	¥4.00	¥4.00
	ERNIE-Bot	¥12.0	¥12.0
	BLOOMZ-7B	¥4.00	¥4.00
ERNIE-Bot-turbo-0922	¥8.00	¥12.0	

Table 1: Price list of different LMaaS. The cost is priced per 1 million tokens. Note that Baidu’s LLM services are priced in Chinese Yuan (¥), while other LLM services are priced in US Dollars (\$). The data updated to 24 January 2024.

Typically, the cost of invoking LLM services consists of two components: (1) input cost (proportional to the length of the input prompt), (2) output cost (proportional to the length of the generated sequence). In Table 1, we present the cost associated with using 25 different LLM services from some top-tier providers, like OpenAI, Anthropic, AI21 and Textsynth. From the table, we could find that the costs of different LLM services can vary by up to two orders of magnitude: the input cost for 1 million tokens is \$10 for OpenAI’s GPT-4 but only \$0.2 for Mistral 7B hosted by Textsynth.

In addition to cost considerations, various factors, including performance for the same input query and response time, can also impact the user experience in the usage of LLM services. [Ahia *et al.*, 2023; Lai *et al.*, 2023] find that different languages, prompt methods or the inclusion of simple




Figure 1: Vision of efficient invocation strategy construction for massive LLM services.

enhancements can also lead to notable alterations in performance. Meanwhile, [Chen et al., 2023] discovers that affordable LLMs often complement expensive ones. For example, on the CoQA [Reddy et al., 2019] dataset, GPT-4 makes a mistake about 11% of the questions, where cheaper and smaller GPJ-J can give right answers.

Considering the heterogeneity in pricing does not necessarily correlate with the user experience, it is a great need to explore effective invocation methods for LLM services in practice. As shown in Figure 1, we expect to make use of massive LLM services to construct an effective invocation strategy according to different methods, meeting targets in different scenarios. To this end, we attempt to provide a comprehensive study of the development and recent advances on effective invocation methods in LMaaS. In detail, we first formalize the task of constructing effective invocation strategy as a multi-objective optimization problem. This entails simultaneous consideration of latency, performance, and cost factors. Then, we propose a taxonomy to provide a unified view on effective invocation methods in LMaaS where the existing methods are categorized into: input abstract, semantic cache, solution design, and output enhancement. These four components can be flexibly combined and unified in a flexible framework. Finally, we highlight the challenges and potential directions and hope our work can provide a useful roadmap for beginners interested in this area and shed light on future research.

The contributions of this survey can be concluded as follows:

- **Comprehensive Taxonomy.** As shown in Figure 2, a taxonomy of effective invocation methods in LMaaS is proposed, which categorizes existing methods from four different aspects: input abstract, semantic cache, solution design and output enhancement.
- **Flexible Framework.** As shown in Figure 3, the framework can unify the four type components, allowing each of them to work independently or simultaneously, during the life cycle of the LLM service invocation.
- **Related Resources.** To facilitate the methods of this task, the price rules of popular LMaaS products is present in Table. 1 and the paper list of existing works is available. ¹

¹<https://github.com/W-caner/Effective-strategy-for-LMaas>

The rest of the survey is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the task definition of constructing effective invocation strategy for LMaaS and outlines the unified LLM services invocation framework. Section 3 reviews the input abstract component, Section 4 reviews the semantic cache component, Section 5 reviews the solution design component and Section 6 reviews the output enhancement component. Section 7 emphasizes the open challenges and future direction of this task and summarizes the paper.

2 Background

2.1 Task Definition

In our topic, the problem is defined as how to construct an effective (low-latency, high-performance, and cost-saving) invocation strategy s given a task T among massive LLM services $LLMs$. The given task T consists of multiple identical query-answer pairs, represented as $T = \{(q_1, a_1), (q_2, a_2), \dots, (q_n, a_n)\}$, where q represents input query and a represents output answer. Let, considering a fixed LLM , a LLM service published through API. Input a query q , by invocation the service, the process of getting the response \tilde{a} can be represented as:

$$\tilde{a} = LLM(q) \quad (1)$$

To characterize the concerns for the construction of effective invocation strategy with a given query q and LLM service LLM , we use three functions: latency $f_l(LLM, q)$, performance $f_p(LLM, q)$, and cost $f_c(LLM, q)$. These three functions are fixed values in a specific practical invocation and can be estimated using certain methods. For example, f_l might be a function of the length of the input and output tokens. f_p often uses a metric function $r(\cdot)$ to compare the difference between a and \tilde{a} . While f_c involves two different pricing components we mentioned before. We adopt the definition of the sum of the number of input tokens multiplied by the price of input tokens and the number of generated tokens multiplied by the price of generated tokens, as shown in the Eq. 2, where α_i is a constant representing the unit price.

$$f_c \triangleq \alpha_1 ||\tilde{a}|| + \alpha_2 ||q|| + \alpha_3 \quad (2)$$

Then we extend a single LLM service to K different LLM services, $LLM_s = \{LLM_1, LLM_2, \dots, LLM_K\}$. Our problem is formalized as Eq. 3, where in the search space S , we seek the optimal invocation strategy s that minimizes latency f_l , maximizes performance f_p , and minimizes cost f_c on task T . The best strategy s includes a sequence of selected LLM services, represented as $s = \{LLM_1, LLM_i, \dots, LLM_k\}, k \leq K$, which is highly flexible, such as choosing a single service or accessing some in a specific order.

$$\min_{LLM_i \in s, q_j \in T} F(f_l(LLM_i, q_j), -f_p(LLM_i, q_j), f_c(LLM_i, q_j)) \quad (3)$$

This is a multi-objective optimization problem, and here, we combine them in a simplified form using the function F . In the construction strategy of a specific invocation, weighted averages may be used, or constraints may be introduced, treating certain targets as conditions while optimizing others. For example, in the scenario of limited funds, the cost f_c is used as a condition to obtain a invocation strategy with high-performance f_p and low-latency f_l .




Figure 2: Taxonomy of effective invocation methods of LMaaS

2.2 LLM Services Invocation Framework

Similarly, we focus solely on the methods related to LLM services invocation and do not consider others related to the internal details of LLM. According to the different construction ways, the methods are summarized into four categories, as shown in Figure 2.

Using the taxonomy, we proposed the effective LLM services invocation framework illustrated in Figure 3, where different categories represented in the form of components that can work independently or simultaneously. Following the idea that building an effective invocation strategy requires an understanding of the key resources involved in the LLM service life cycle [Bai et al., 2024], we divide the LLM services invocation into three phases : before invocation, invocation and after invocation.

Before invocation, the user enters a query q , and we consider that in general, q consists of a question and multiple possible prompts. Where the question represents the user’s goal, and the prompts are optional information to help accomplish the goal.

The processing of the input query q to express more meaningful information in a more concise language is the first step to construct an effective invocation strategy. The methods in this aspect are summarized as **input abstract** (Section 3), which is divided into **sentence simplification** and **prompt optimization** according to the different ways. The former reduce the latency f_l and cost f_c by simplifying the query without changing its semantics. The latter is used to improve the prompts for better performance f_p .

Semantic cache (Section 4) is also an important strategy to improve service performance, reduce latency and cost before invocation, which is divided into **traditional cache** and **neural cache** according to different structures. It checks whether there is a semantically similar query in the cache, if so, it directly returns, otherwise it goes into the invocation phase.

Solution design (Section 5) aims to construct the best invocation solution s by leveraging the complementary capabilities of massive LLM services. It evaluates LLM services LLM_i with a given query q , and the method of evaluation is called **scoring function**. It is often done before the invocation, such as an estimate of f_c can be used to guide the design of a low-cost solution. And in the invocation phase, the scoring function is used to guide the organized routing between services, which is called **LLM router**. Through different routing structures, the advantages of different services are utilized to build a satisfactory solution for users.

After invocation, **output enhancement** (Section 6) focuses on the information returned to the user. The output \tilde{a} is adjusted to suit different targets and returned in a suitable form. In addition, the input and output of this invocation are stored into the semantic cache for future invocations.

3 Input Abstract

Input abstract is designed to reduce the length of the input query without changing the semantics, while optimizing the prompt for better performance at lower cost and latency to invoke a given LLM.




Figure 3: LLM services invocation framework, shown by the phase of invocation.

The generalization and in-context capabilities allow LLM services to get good answers on untrained samples [Dong et al., 2023]. Thus, a variety of different natural language tasks can be accomplished just by inputting different queries. This also leads to the LLM service’s dependence on input when invoked. After the service is selected, the input content and quality directly affect the latency, price and performance of the service. For example, concatenating the prompt “just tell me the option, do not explain other things” with the question as input to the LLM will generate shorter output, reducing invocation cost and latency. However, it may at the same time cause the LLM to lose its ability to think step by step, resulting in performance degradation.

We grouped the methods into two categories based on different goals. Most LLM services charge based on the length of tokens. Therefore, by reducing the input length, sentence simplification can effectively reduce the use cost and latency. Prompt optimization ensures the quality of the information and improves the performance for the invocation.

3.1 Sentence Simplification

Sentence simplification aims to improve the performance of language models, reduce latency and cost by reducing the complexity and length of language expressions. In short, it is the process of making input more concise while retaining its core meaning by modifying, removing, or replacing words, phrases, or structures in a sentence.

This problem is similar to the summarization task, and many methods used in summarization can be applied [Huang et al., 2021; Watanangura et al., 2024; Antony et al., 2023; Mridha et al., 2021]. We collate the methods available for LMaaS and divide them into extractive and generative methods based on whether they derived entirely from the original input.

Extractive methods. From long original input, extractive methods select sentences by extracting key sentences or phrases to form a new input, where the content is entirely sourced from original. Pruning semantically irrelevant tokens

according to the relevance to the contexts is a good choice [Liu et al., 2023a]. By employing an intermediate “attacker” and using a greedy invocation, iterative deletion and substitution of tokens are performed on the input [Si et al., 2023]. [Kim et al., 2022] based on the attention mechanism, to remove unimportant tokens.

This approach is straightforward and efficient, making it very convenient for immediate use. However, the extraction idea may ignore the global information. Furthermore, it has limitations in tasks such as language translation, as it cannot discern which parts need to be translated or deleted.

Generative methods. The generative methods refers to the compression and rewriting of the content based on the original input, allowing for the generation of new words. Language encoding is a simple processing method applied to the input, [Ahia et al., 2023] conducted extensive experiments with different languages and tokenizers, where the cost varied by up to 5 times. AE.studio² employs encryption to provide an online platform that sacrifices readability, reducing the length of input tokens by half. Utilizing fast and low cost generative natural language models [Liu et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023] also presents a viable option for sentence simplification.

This category of methods is more flexible, as the generated sentences contain less redundant information while preserving the main content. However, it may introduce grammatical or factual errors. And this approach may rely on complex structures such as graphs, trees, or neural networks.

3.2 Prompt Optimization

Prompt optimization is the design and adjustment of user-provided input prompts to guide LLMS to produce output that more accurate, useful, or tailored. The effectiveness of prompt optimization stems from the LLM’s ability to learn from the

²Prompt Reducer-Cut Down GPT-4 Token Costs (<https://www.promptreducer.com/>)

few-shot or even zero-shot [Liu *et al.*, 2023b], where appropriate prompts can complement the context of the task, highlight key information, or improve the explain ability.

Based on the different granularity of optimization objective, we distinguish two types of prompt optimization methods. By selecting or combining some prompts, it is possible to guide LLM to handle various inputs more effectively and efficiently. Prompt enhancement is concerned with the quality of the content and wants to maximize the potential of the context.

Prompt selection. Prompt selection selects the most meaningful prompt from possible prompts to accurately guide LLM. It removes the interference of irrelevant prompts, and helps in efficient invocation. [Zhou *et al.*, 2020] selecting representative samples and it can be highly beneficial in few-shot tasks. Another way for prompt selection is to combine the prompts for the same type tasks, allowing LLM to process prompt information shared by multiple queries at once. [Santra *et al.*, 2023] combines various methods involving instructions, examples, and additional context to propose a more compact method for providing historical information in dialogues. [Arefeen *et al.*, 2023] considers the concatenation of prompts and retrieves the most important k sentences using comparative methods, enabling the shared use of prompts for similar questions.

Prompt selection can directly guide LLM to focus on specific aspects of information and understand user needs more accurately. For some generic tasks, standard selection methods can be used without too much personalization. However, for complex prompts, this approach does not maximize its potential because no additional knowledge is introduced.

Prompt augmentation. Prompt augmentation considers the understanding ability of LLM to elicit more accurate and desirable responses. Knowledge retrieval is a direct method of enhancement, it helps achieve a comprehensive understanding during model inference. [Haurum *et al.*, 2023] investigates the limitations of factual knowledge in LLMs and optimizes the reasoning process with minimal retrieval cost. Optimization through fine-tuning is a recent advance, [Yu *et al.*, 2023; Zhou *et al.*, 2020] proposes a black-box fine-tuning framework that accesses only API to optimize continuous prompts using non-derivative methods. Model alignment [Liu *et al.*, 2023c] and chain of thought reasoning [Wu *et al.*, 2023], are also key focuses in prompt optimization.

The improvement in invocation performance through prompt augmentation is significant, despite the likelihood of resulting in more complex processing procedures. And the general method is difficult to explore, which requires some professional knowledge.

4 Semantic Cache

Semantic cache is an approach to improve LLM invocation efficiency and performance by storing and quickly retrieving semantic information. Different from traditional data cache, semantic cache focuses more on storing high-level semantics such as meaning, context and relationship of data, rather than just raw data. The semantic cache is checked before the service is invoked. If hit, the output given by the cache is returned without the follow cumbersome procedures.

Cache technology often requires long-term data accumulation and is not suitable for cold start scenarios. However, with the gradual increase in the scale of LLM, it plays a more important role in accelerating computation, reducing data trans-

mission costs, and supporting high concurrent requests [Miao *et al.*, 2023], providing users with low-cost, low-latency and high-performance services.

There are two typical structures for the implementation of semantic cache in LMaaS, and unlike other subsections, they generally cannot be used together. Traditional caches use key-value pairs for storage and retrieval. When similar input appears again, the system can quickly search the semantic cache by the key and return the same value. Neural cache borrows ideas from neural networks to response in a predictive rather than retrieval way. It learns semantic relationships between input data without relying on a specific storage structure.

4.1 Traditional Cache

The current paradigm of traditional cache consists of three parts: the cache manager, similarity evaluator, and post processor. The cache manager is responsible for storing content in the form key-value pairs, and managing eviction. The similarity evaluator is used to determine if any of the keys in the cache match the input query. The post processor organizes the final response to be returned to the user. If no similar query is found in the cache, the LLM service is invoked by the post processor to generate the output and then the generated output is stored in the cache.

[Bang, 2023] represents a typical application of traditional cache, which utilizes question embeddings for similarity matching and provides various matching methods such as exact match and embedding distance. The open-source application Zep³ also supports storage, aggregation, embedding, and indexing of LLM applications. Through theoretical proof, [Zhu *et al.*, 2023] gives the cache scheme with minimum expected cost considering the query frequency. Furthermore, methods for query and conversations cache [Tao *et al.*, 2021; Barrios and Kumar, 2024] can be easily migrated to LMaaS.

Implementing traditional cache is usually relatively simple, requiring only basic data structures such as hash that are easy to manage. This approach is general, but it may not capture semantic similarity between inputs because it relies heavily on the key matching.

4.2 Neural Cache

Neural cache uses neural networks or deep learning models to learn and store data representations. It maps the input data into a high-dimensional space by learning the representation of the data. The learned representation should capture the semantic similarity of the input data so that similar inputs are close in the representation space.

[Ramírez *et al.*, 2023] trains a student model using T5-base⁴ for providing early feedback in classification tasks, and the model is periodically updated. To address the effectiveness testing issue of semantic cache, [Rasool *et al.*, 2024] generates similar input to hit the cache as much as possible. Additionally, a retrieval-based dialogue response selection model can also serve as an alternative choice. [Tao *et al.*, 2021] provides a survey that categorizes most models into three framework and among them, representation-based model can be used as neural cache.

³Zep: Fast, scalable building blocks for LLM apps (<https://github.com/getzep/zep>)

⁴T5-base model (https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/t5)

These types of methods often outperform traditional cache especially in domain-specific problems. However, their implementation and updates can be relatively complex. And it is important to carefully consider the effectiveness of the cache to avoid incurring unnecessary waste.

5 Solution Design

Solution design is an approach to leveraging LLM services with heterogeneous costs and performance. It considers different scenarios and different targets, dynamically selects one or more LLM services that are most suitable for a specific invocation according to the query, and organizes them in some form to provide flexible and efficient solutions. This method allows users to select LLM services that best suit their specific needs. When new queries arise or requirements change, the configuration of the solution can be flexibly updated to achieve the best performance and cost effectiveness.

Solution design has two main parts that work together to achieve dynamic LLM services selection and routing. The scoring function is responsible for evaluating the performance of each available LLM service, which can reflect the concerned indicators of the invocation such as quality, speed, and so on. The router, based on the evaluation results of the scoring function, performs query routing between services and selects the appropriate one in a dynamic manner.

5.1 Scoring Function

The scoring function is a comprehensive evaluation of LLM services given a specific task or query, considering both targets and scenarios, and often used to guide the routing path in the solution. It may be influenced by multiple factors such as response time, query cost, accuracy of answers, etc. The scoring function plays a decision-making role, and helps to understand the relative performance of each LLM service so that it can make more intelligent choices.

Defined metrics. Defined metrics provide a measurable way to achieve direct quantification of the factors of concern. For instance, accuracy in classification tasks, BLEU score in generation tasks, metrics like packet loss, and quality of service (QoS) are all applicable indicators. [Ramírez et al., 2023] use interval sampling and predictive entropy to determine whether to invoke LLM services for different time dimensions of the invocation. Considering three sources of consistency, decision-making for LLM services is performed through sampling and voting [Yue et al., 2023]. Cost expectations between two models are calculated, [Zhu et al., 2023] extend the selection invocation to multiple LLMs. Reward ranking from answers provided by different services is used as an evaluation criterion by [Lu et al., 2023], incurring minimal computational cost in the solution.

The defined metrics are intuitive and easily understandable. They are often based on statistical data or experiments, providing high reliability and being less susceptible to subjective factors. However, setting thresholds can be challenging and may not adapt well to dynamic and changing environments. Additionally, certain crucial factors may be difficult to capture with specific metrics, leading to limitations in scoring.

Scorers. A scorer is a tool for scoring each LLM services based on metrics that are not defined by a particular formula. The scorer utilizes prior knowledge, training data, or rules to provide scores in an often less interpretable manner, typically

using smaller neural networks [Chen et al., 2023]. AI-Bert is employed as a scorer, with the query and predicted output as x , the accuracy of predicted output and label as y during training [Sakota et al., 2023]. Another method involves using DistilBert as a scoring model, with query and model ID as x , and whether it can solve the problem as y during training [Shnitzer et al., 2023]. A comparison of LLM performances on different benchmark datasets is conducted, [Zhang et al., 2023] modeling it as a binary selection problem, providing guiding suggestions. For specific tasks, such as the execution results in the task of code generation [Zhang et al., 2023], the classifier according to the query difficulty in the task of question and answer [Anonymous, 2024; Madaan et al., 2023], and estimate the capabilities of LLM services in the task of dataset benchmark test [Shnitzer et al., 2023] are all reasonable scorers.

Compared to metrics defined by formulas, scorers can be updated based on real-time data and feedback, demonstrating strong generalization across different scenarios. However, this approach is equivalent to scoring using a more powerful model, incurring scorers own training and usage costs. And it still requires some labeled examples, leading to the fact that it makes sense only when the query dataset is larger than the training.

5.2 LLM Router

LLM routing emphasizes the organizational structure between services, connecting multiple independent services in a specific order logically. It focus on constructing a flexible and reusable LLM service solution to address continuously changing queries or targets. Depending on the different scoring function and position used, LLM routing can construct target-oriented solution, such as cost-oriented or performance-oriented.

Sequential Structure. The simplest method is to select one or several models from the massive LLM services available and invoke them sequentially. A scoring function is employed to decide whether to accept the answer or proceed to the next step in routing [Chen et al., 2023]. When using a sequential structure, the number of models is typically limited to three, and possible options are determined through permutation, with pruning techniques applied [Ramírez et al., 2023; Yue et al., 2023]. The use of small models as a cache, with large models being invoked in sequence when cache misses occur, can be considered a fixed sequential structure [Ramírez et al., 2023; Yue et al., 2023]. For problems like code generation [Zhang et al., 2023], an initial response is obtained using a cost-effective LLM, and successful information is tracked as context for subsequent queries.

This structure is simple and effective, and a limited number of permutations can be searched quickly in the entire space. However, the sequential structure may result in the invocation of all models in the sequential structure. And it is difficult to extend the structure, which all models need to be rearranged when adapting to new requirements.

Other Structure. A parallel structure, similar to the bagging and boosting in machine learning, can enhance the correctness and consistency of LLM services, with task decomposition and merging being key aspects [Jiang et al., 2023]. A star-shaped structure, as seen in [Sakota et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2023], involves decision-making by a meta-model, allocating the current query to the most suitable model. For the third category of unsolvable queries, pruning is applied by [Madaan et al., 2023] to prevent unnecessary expenses for par-




Figure 4: A simple invocation strategy composed of existing methods, using Prompt Reducer in input abstract, Zep in semantic cache, FrugalGPT in solution design, and nothing in output enhancement.

ticularly challenging problems. The tree structure is considered promising, combining aspects of both star-shaped and sequential structures. It initially routes query to the most probable branch, and then invokes services in sequence. Additionally, certain selection solutions specific to HTTP services [Hossein-zadeh *et al.*, 2020; Manqele *et al.*, 2017] are also noteworthy for inspiration.

6 Output Enhancement

Output Enhancement refers to the process of further optimizing and adjusting the output generated by the invocation. This process aims to improve the syntactic correctness, semantic accuracy, and overall fluency of the generated output to meet the needs of the user and the specific scenario.

To the best of our knowledge, the output enhancement methods still relies on the methods mentioned above, but it emphasizes customization according to the needs of specific tasks, improving the adaptability of the model to application, reducing the need for subsequent manual intervention, and providing users with low-latency, high-performance, and low-latency services. For example, [Liu *et al.*, 2023b] guides the LLM to make concise answers can reduce unnecessary output tokens. Aggregating responses from multiple low-cost models is another way to improve quality [Chen *et al.*, 2022], and is often used for multi-label tasks. Work on model alignment [Shen *et al.*, 2023] can also be used to correct syntax and logic to reduce the need for subsequent manual work.

7 Conclusion and Challenges

In conclusion, this paper has provided a comprehensive overview of effective invocation methods in the realm of LMaaS. Through the establishment of a taxonomy, we categorize existing methods into four categories: input abstract, semantic cache, solution design, and output enhancement. Then we formalize the problem of effective LLM services strategy construction, and propose a LLM services invocation framework. Each component in the framework can work independently or simultaneously to form effective strategy for LLM service invocation that are low-latency, high-performance, and cost-saving.

Existing methods tend to focus on only one component of the framework, and we can use them as plugins. A case is shown in Figure 4, a simple invocation strategy constructed from three existing methods. The development prospects of this field are promising, and here are some open challenges.

Input Abstract. In the input abstract component, one of the main challenges faced is multi-modal input processing [Yin

et al., 2023]. More comprehensive and balanced methods are needed to shorten and optimize multiple types of input such as text, image, and speech. Input abstract methods to dynamically changing inputs are also worth exploring, such as real-time data streaming [Räth *et al.*, 2023] or user interaction with the system. Furthermore, depending on the granularity, the input abstract can also be divided into document level, sentence level and phrase level. methods at different granularities may interoperate and often compose multi-stage methods.

Semantic Cache. In the semantic cache part, how to design and select cache methods [Brais *et al.*, 2021] more efficiently to accommodate different types of inputs and queries is the main challenge faced in traditional cache, while semantic representation [Brito, 2023] is concerned by neural cache.

Solution Design. In terms of solution design, the evaluation problem of LLM services [Chang *et al.*, 2023] is an extension of scoring function, which needs to pay more attention to adaptation and interpretability in the future. While LLM router will focus on designing more powerful services integration methods, not only focusing on the task itself, but also considering the requirements of different resources [Xu *et al.*, 2024]. A more effective combination of the two, such as dynamic decision making, will lead to a better solution.

Output Enhancement. The importance of output enhancement is also gradually seen by people. The balance between specification and diversity of output is a key issue. When the task is completed, the user’s satisfaction is then an important indicator to measure the service quality, and future research may focus on building more intelligent and user-oriented [Jeung and Huang, 2023] output enhancement methods.

Other Challenges. Basic work such as qualitative description and quantitative comparison in experiments is still a gap to be filled, and the lack of data sets makes there is no uniform standard for the comparison of service methods. Some technical details, such as how to choose the tokenizer [Alyafeai *et al.*, 2023] with the shortest input, the guidance on the cache size [Vavouliotis *et al.*, 2022], and the choice of different pricing methods for the same LLM service, need to be explored. In additionally, We specifically call for attention to fairness [Sah *et al.*, 2024] and privacy issues [Luo *et al.*, 2024; Utpala *et al.*, 2023] in LMaaS. The efficient construction of methods using middleware could potentially be exploited for personal gain or malicious purposes. We look forward to future research further advancing the field, providing users with low-latency, high-performance, and cost-effective LLM services solution, and promoting the healthy development of the LMaaS ecosystem.

References

- [Ahia *et al.*, 2023] Orevaoghene Ahia, Sachin Kumar, Hila Gonen, Jungo Kasai, David R. Mortensen, Noah A. Smith, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Do all languages cost the same? tokenization in the era of commercial language models. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, 2023.
- [Alyafeai *et al.*, 2023] Zaid Alyafeai, Maged Saeed Al-Shaibani, Mustafa Ghaleb, and Irfan Ahmad. Evaluating various tokenizers for arabic text classification. *Neural Process. Lett.*, 2023.
- [Anonymous, 2024] Anonymous. Hybrid LLM: Cost-efficient and quality-aware query routing. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2024.
- [Antony *et al.*, 2023] Dinu Antony, Sumit Abhishek, Sujata Singh, Siddu Kodagali, Narayana Darapaneni, Mukesh Rao, Anwesh Reddy Paduri, and Sudha BG. A survey of advanced methods for efficient text summarization. In *13th IEEE Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference, CCWC 2023, Las Vegas, NV, USA, March 8-11, 2023*, 2023.
- [Arefeen *et al.*, 2023] Md. Adnan Arefeen, Biplob Debnath, and Srimat Chakradhar. Leancontext: Cost-efficient domain-specific question answering using llms. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Bai *et al.*, 2024] Guangji Bai, Zheng Chai, Chen Ling, Shiyu Wang, Jiaying Lu, Nan Zhang, Tingwei Shi, Ziyang Yu, Mengdan Zhu, Yifei Zhang, Carl J. Yang, Yue Cheng, and Liang Zhao. Beyond efficiency: A systematic survey of resource-efficient large language models. *CoRR*, 2024.
- [Bang, 2023] Fu Bang. Gptcache: An open-source semantic cache for llm applications enabling faster answers and cost savings. 2023.
- [Barrios and Kumar, 2024] Carlos Barrios and Mohan Kumar. Service caching and computation reuse strategies at the edge: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 2024.
- [Brais *et al.*, 2021] Hadi Brais, Rajshekar Kalayappan, and Preeti Ranjan Panda. A survey of cache simulators. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 2021.
- [Brito, 2023] Eduardo Brito. *Explainable Resource-Aware Representation Learning via Semantic Similarity*. PhD thesis, 2023.
- [Chang *et al.*, 2023] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Linyi Yang, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2022] Lingjiao Chen, Matei Zaharia, and James Zou. Efficient online ML API selection for multi-label classification tasks. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2022.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2023] Lingjiao Chen, Matei Zaharia, and James Zou. Frugalgpt: How to use large language models while reducing cost and improving performance. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Dong *et al.*, 2023] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning, 2023.
- [Haurum *et al.*, 2023] Joakim Bruslund Haurum, Sergio Escalera, Graham W. Taylor, and Thomas B. Moeslund. Which tokens to use? investigating token reduction in vision transformers. In *Proc. of ICCV*, 2023.
- [Hosseinzadeh *et al.*, 2020] Mehdi Hosseinzadeh, Hawkar Kamaran Hama, Marwan Yassin Ghafour, Mohammad Masdari, Omed Hassan Ahmed, and Hemn Khezri. Service selection using multi-criteria decision making: A comprehensive overview. *J. Netw. Syst. Manag.*, 2020.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2021] Yi-Chong Huang, Xia-Chong Feng, Xiao-Cheng Feng, and Bing Qin. The factual inconsistency problem in abstractive text summarization: A survey. *CoRR*, 2021.
- [Jeung and Huang, 2023] Jun Li Jeung and Yi-Ching Janet Huang. Correct me if I am wrong: Exploring how AI outputs affect user perception and trust. In *Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, CSCW 2023, Minneapolis, MN, USA, October 14-18, 2023*, 2023.
- [Jiang *et al.*, 2023] Dongfu Jiang, Xiang Ren, and Bill Yuchen Lin. Llm-blender: Ensembling large language models with pairwise ranking and generative fusion. In *Proc. of ACL*, 2023.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2022] Sehoon Kim, Sheng Shen, David Thorsley, Amir Gholami, Woosuk Kwon, Joseph Hassoun, and Kurt Keutzer. Learned token pruning for transformers. In *Proc. of KDD*, 2022.
- [Lai *et al.*, 2023] Viet Dac Lai, Nghia Trung Ngo, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Hieu Man, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, and Thien Nguyen. Chatgpt beyond english: Towards a comprehensive evaluation of large language models in multilingual learning. In *Proc. of EMNLP Findings*, 2023.
- [Li *et al.*, 2023] Jiazheng Li, Runcong Zhao, Yulan He, and Lin Gui. Overprompt: Enhancing chatgpt capabilities through an efficient in-context learning approach. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023a] Junyi Liu, Liangzhi Li, Tong Xiang, Bowen Wang, and Yiming Qian. TCRA-LLM: token compression retrieval augmented large language model for inference cost reduction. In *Proc. of EMNLP Findings*, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023b] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023c] Yixin Liu, Budhaditya Deb, Milagro Teruel, Aaron Halfaker, Dragomir Radev, and Ahmed Hassan Awadallah. On improving summarization factual consistency from natural language feedback. In *Proc. of ACL*, 2023.
- [Lu *et al.*, 2023] Keming Lu, Hongyi Yuan, Runji Lin, Junyang Lin, Zheng Yuan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Routing to the expert: Efficient reward-guided ensemble of large language models. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Luo *et al.*, 2024] Jinglong Luo, Yehong Zhang, Jiaqi Zhang, Xin Mu, Hui Wang, Yue Yu, and Zenglin Xu. Secformer: Towards fast and accurate privacy-preserving inference for large language models. *CoRR*, 2024.

- [Madaan *et al.*, 2023] Aman Madaan, Pranjal Aggarwal, Ankit Anand, Srividya Pranavi Potharaju, Swaroop Mishra, Pei Zhou, Aditya Gupta, Dheeraj Rajagopal, Karthik Kappaganthu, Yiming Yang, Shyam Upadhyay, Mausam, and Manaal Faruqi. Automix: Automatically mixing language models. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Manqele *et al.*, 2017] Lindelweyizwe Manqele, Mqhele E. Dlodlo, Louis Coetzee, and George Sibiyi. A survey for service selection approaches in dynamic environments. In *IEEE AFRICON 2017, Cape Town, South Africa, September 18-20, 2017*, 2017.
- [Miao *et al.*, 2023] Xupeng Miao, Gabriele Oliaro, Zhihao Zhang, Xinhao Cheng, Hongyi Jin, Tianqi Chen, and Zhihao Jia. Towards efficient generative large language model serving: A survey from algorithms to systems. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Mridha *et al.*, 2021] Muhammad F. Mridha, Aklima Akter Lima, Kamruddin Nur, Sujoy Chandra Das, Mahmud Hasan, and Muhammad Mohsin Kabir. A survey of automatic text summarization: Progress, process and challenges. *IEEE Access*, 2021.
- [Ramírez *et al.*, 2023] Guillem Ramírez, Matthias Lindemann, Alexandra Birch, and Ivan Titov. Cache & distil: Optimising API calls to large language models. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Rasool *et al.*, 2024] Zafaryab Rasool, Scott Barnett, David Willie, Stefanus Kurniawan, Sherwin Balugo, Srikanth Thudumu, and Mohamed Abdelrazek. Lms for test input generation for semantic caches, 2024.
- [Räth *et al.*, 2023] Timo Räth, Ngozichukwuka Onah, and Kai-Uwe Sattler. Interactive data cleaning for real-time streaming applications. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Human-In-the-Loop Data Analytics, HILDA 2023, Seattle, WA, USA, 18 June 2023*, 2023.
- [Reddy *et al.*, 2019] Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. Coqa: A conversational question answering challenge. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 2019.
- [Sah *et al.*, 2024] Chandan Kumar Sah, Xiaoli Lian, and Muhammad Mirajul Islam. Unveiling bias in fairness evaluations of large language models: A critical literature review of music and movie recommendation systems. *CoRR*, 2024.
- [Saha *et al.*, 2023] Swarnadeep Saha, Omer Levy, Asli Celikyilmaz, Mohit Bansal, Jason Weston, and Xian Li. Branch-solve-merge improves large language model evaluation and generation. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Sakota *et al.*, 2023] Marija Sakota, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. Fly-swat or cannon? cost-effective language model choice via meta-modeling. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Santra *et al.*, 2023] Bishal Santra, Sakya Basak, Abhinandan De, Manish Gupta, and Pawan Goyal. Frugal prompting for dialog models. In *Proc. of EMNLP Findings*, 2023.
- [Shen *et al.*, 2023] Tianhao Shen, Renren Jin, Yufei Huang, Chuang Liu, Weilong Dong, Zishan Guo, Xinwei Wu, Yan Liu, and Deyi Xiong. Large language model alignment: A survey. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Shnitzer *et al.*, 2023] Tal Shnitzer, Anthony Ou, Míriam Silva, Kate Soule, Yuekai Sun, Justin Solomon, Neil Thompson, and Mikhail Yurochkin. Large language model routing with benchmark datasets. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Si *et al.*, 2023] Wai Man Si, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. Mondrian: Prompt abstraction attack against large language models for cheaper API pricing. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Tao *et al.*, 2021] Chongyang Tao, Jiazhan Feng, Rui Yan, Wei Wu, and Daxin Jiang. A survey on response selection for retrieval-based dialogues. In *Proc. of IJCAI*, 2021.
- [Utpala *et al.*, 2023] Saiteja Utpala, Sara Hooker, and Pin-Yu Chen. Locally differentially private document generation using zero shot prompting. In *Proc. of EMNLP Findings*, 2023.
- [Vavouliotis *et al.*, 2022] Georgios Vavouliotis, Gino Chacon, Lluc Alvarez, Paul V. Gratz, Daniel A. Jiménez, and Marc Casas. Page size aware cache prefetching. In *Proc. of MI-CRO*, 2022.
- [Watanangura *et al.*, 2024] Patcharapruek Watanangura, Sukit Vanichrudee, On Minteer, Theeranat Sringamdee, Natapong Thanngam, and Thitirat Siriborvornratanakul. A comparative survey of text summarization techniques. *SN Comput. Sci.*, 2024.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023] Dingjun Wu, Jing Zhang, and Xinmei Huang. Chain of thought prompting elicits knowledge augmentation. In *Proc. of ACL Findings*, 2023.
- [Xu *et al.*, 2024] Mengwei Xu, Wangsong Yin, Dongqi Cai, Rongjie Yi, Daliang Xu, Qipeng Wang, Bingyang Wu, Yihao Zhao, Chen Yang, Shihe Wang, Qiyang Zhang, Zhenyan Lu, Li Zhang, Shangguang Wang, Yuanchun Li, Yunxin Liu, Xin Jin, and Xuanzhe Liu. A survey of resource-efficient LLM and multimodal foundation models. *CoRR*, 2024.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2023] Jingfeng Yang, Hongye Jin, Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Qizhang Feng, Haoming Jiang, Bing Yin, and Xia Hu. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Yin *et al.*, 2023] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2023] Lang Yu, Qin Chen, Jiaju Lin, and Liang He. Black-box prompt tuning for vision-language model as a service. In *Proc. of IJCAI*, 2023.
- [Yue *et al.*, 2023] Murong Yue, Jie Zhao, Min Zhang, Liang Du, and Ziyu Yao. Large language model cascades with mixture of thoughts representations for cost-efficient reasoning. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023] Jieyu Zhang, Ranjay Krishna, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, and Chi Wang. Ecoassistant: Using LLM assistant more affordably and accurately. *CoRR*, 2023.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2020] Jianyi Zhou, Feng Li, Jinhao Dong, Hongyu Zhang, and Dan Hao. Cost-effective testing of a deep learning model through input reduction. In *31st IEEE International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering, ISSRE 2020, Coimbra, Portugal, October 12-15, 2020*, 2020.
- [Zhu *et al.*, 2023] Banghua Zhu, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Clark W. Barrett, Michael I. Jordan, and Jiantao Jiao. On optimal caching and model multiplexing for large model inference. *CoRR*, 2023.