

LangGPT: Rethinking Structured Reusable Prompt Design Framework for LLMs from the Programming Language

Ming Wang^{1†}, Yuanzhong Liu^{2†*}, Xiaoming Zhang¹, Songlian Li², Yijie Huang¹, Chi Zhang¹, Daling Wang^{1*}, Shi Feng¹, Jigang Li³

¹School of Computer Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang, 110169

²School of Computer Science, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430064

³Individual Researcher

{sci.m.wang, yz.liu.me, zxm2282588541}@gmail.com, songlianli@whu.edu.cn, {1033205792, yijie.huang_neu}@qq.com, {wangdaling, fengshi}@cse.neu.edu.cn, i@lijigang.com

Abstract

LLMs have demonstrated commendable performance across diverse domains. Nevertheless, formulating high-quality prompts to effectively instruct LLMs poses a challenge for non-AI experts. Existing research in prompt engineering suggests somewhat fragmented optimization principles and designs empirically dependent prompt optimizers. Unfortunately, these endeavors lack a structured design template, incurring high learning costs and resulting in low reusability. Inspired by structured reusable programming languages, we propose LangGPT, a dual-layer prompt design framework as the programming language for LLMs. LangGPT has an easy-to-learn normative structure and provides an extended structure for migration and reuse. Experiments illustrate that LangGPT significantly enhances the capacity of LLMs to produce responses of superior quality compared to baselines. Moreover, LangGPT has proven effective in guiding LLMs to generate high-quality prompts. We have built a community on LangGPT to facilitate the tuition and sharing of prompt design. We also analyzed the ease of use and reusability of LangGPT through a community user survey.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT [Achiam *et al.*, 2023; Schulman *et al.*, 2023] can execute diverse tasks [Sun *et al.*, 2023b; Sun *et al.*, 2023c; Yu *et al.*, 2023] based on powerful language comprehension, reasoning, and generation capabilities. Injecting domain knowledge also enables LLMs to perform domain-related specific tasks [Wang *et al.*, 2023a; Li *et al.*, 2023b; Zhang *et al.*, 2023; Ren *et al.*, 2023]. Fully unleashing these capabilities of LLMs requires premium quality prompts [Eric, 2022; Chen *et al.*, 2023; Gajula, 2023]. Therefore, prompt engineering has attracted the attention of many researchers [Varshney and Surla, 2023; Meskó, 2023; Wang, 2023].

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

^{*}Corresponding authors.

Prompt engineering is a typically empirical science, which mainly involves designing and optimizing the prompts given to LLMs. As LLMs have the capability of natural language understanding, it is possible to ask them to execute tasks through unstructured natural language instructions directly. On this basis, some tricks for prompt optimization were first explored by researchers. [Bsharat *et al.*, 2023] introduce 26 guiding principles designed to make LLMs perform better. In addition to these directly usable prompt optimization tricks, some researchers have also focused on optimizing prompts based on historical data. [Sun *et al.*, 2023a] guide LLMs to derive new prompts for a given instance from the incorrect reasoning, and then summarise the corresponding prompts for each instance as a reference for optimizing the original prompts. [Pryzant *et al.*, 2023] leverage mini-batches of data to form natural language “gradients” and utilize beam search and bandit selection procedure to edit the current prompt in the opposite semantic direction of the gradient. [Fan *et al.*, 2023] analyze a large prompt database and present an automatic prompt optimization framework.

Direct prompt optimization principles and methods based on historical data require a wealth of experience. Thus, these usually perform well only for specific tasks or domains. To improve generalization, some researchers have proposed adaptive prompt optimization methods. [Guo *et al.*, 2023] connect LLMs with evolutionary algorithms and proposes a novel framework for discrete prompt optimization, called EvoPrompt. [Li *et al.*, 2023a] design a multi-round dialogue alignment strategy and utilizes GPT-4 [Achiam *et al.*, 2023] to generation a readability prompt set. Meanwhile, they propose an efficient prompt screening metric that can filtrate high-quality prompts with linear complexity. [Wang *et al.*, 2023b] introduce PromptAgent which can reflect on model errors and generate constructive error feedback to induce precise expert-level insights and in-depth instructions. [Hao *et al.*, 2022] and [Cheng *et al.*, 2023] optimize prompts from the perspective of aligning human and LLMs’ preference styles.

Prompt optimization can significantly improve the performance of LLMs, but the reusability of quality prompts is poor due to the lack of systematic design. Consequently, some researchers have devised rules for the construction of prompts. [Nigh, 2023] collects a large number of quality prompts and

summaries the CRISPE rule for prompt design. [Zamfirescu-Pereira *et al.*, 2023] take a prototype LLM-based chatbot design tool as the design probe, supporting non-AI-experts engage in “end-user prompt engineering”. Some researchers have designed prompt construction rules for applications in different domains. [Cao *et al.*, 2023] present various prompt templates on deep learning program repair tasks for ChatGPT. [Yeh *et al.*, 2022] reformulate the biomedical relation extraction task as a cloze-test task under a simple prompt formulation to systematically generate comprehensive prompts. [Liu and Chilton, 2022] have evaluated 5493 generations covering 51 themes and 51 styles throughout five experiments in the text-to-image task and summaries prompt design guidelines.

These methods, which are based on a great deal of experience in use, are mainly based on listed design rules and lack systematicity. In addition, these rules have strong domain relevance and model relevance, with low generalisability, flexibility, and reusability. To further unleash the performance of LLMs, some researchers have defined agents. Agents empower LLMs to use tools, acquire domain knowledge, retain long-term or short-term memories, and plan [Xu *et al.*, 2023; Xi *et al.*, 2023; Park *et al.*, 2023]. Although agent methods [Chase, 2022; Hong *et al.*, 2023; Wu *et al.*, 2023] have systematically designed the key components of the prompt and reserved flexible customization interfaces, the learning costs are very high. In addition, it is difficult for non-AI experts to modify agent designs, so excellent designs are less reusable.

To promote LLM-based applications and further stimulate the potential of LLMs, we would like to design a high-quality, reusable prompt template. This template should be extensible and generalizable. In addition, the template ought to be easy to learn and easy to work with. Inspired by the belief that prompt is the programming language of the LLM era [Alouani, 2023; Mund, 2023], we have designed **Language for GPT-like LLMs (LangGPT)**, a prompt design framework as the programming language for LLMs. LangGPT refers to the systematic, prescriptive, and reusable properties of programming languages, and retains the flexibility and extensibility of natural languages. We analyzed the differences between natural languages and programming languages to determine the properties that the prompt template should have. LangGPT is designed as a dual-layer structure, consisting of modules and internal elements. Modules in LangGPT can be divided into two categories: inherent modules and extension modules. For inherent modules, we design the necessary internal elements of each module in detail and give example templates. In addition, for the extension modules, we unified the design of the basic internal elements. Experiments have demonstrated that LangGPT is better than baseline prompts for bootstrapping LLMs. Furthermore, LLMs can leverage this framework to automatically generate prompts as if generating codes.

In summary, the contributions of this work include:

- We proposed a dual-layer structured prompt design framework LangGPT to improve the generalization and reusability of prompts. In addition, we wrote detailed rules for designing prompts based on LangGPT, reducing the learning cost of prompt design and enabling LLMs to generate high-quality prompts automatically.

- We proved experimentally that the prompts designed based on LangGPT can better guide LLMs to execute tasks. Meanwhile, we exemplified that LangGPT can help LLMs generate high-quality prompts.
- We have built an online community based on LangGPT, which provides usage documentation and prompt design interfaces. In addition, collecting and sharing excellent prompt cases promotes the exchange of LLM applications. We conducted a user experience survey in the community to verify the ease of use and reusability of LangGPT.

2 Prompt Design Rules with Programming Language

Programming languages are more standardized and reusable compared to natural languages. To design high-quality reusable prompts, we analyzed the differences between natural languages and programming languages and proposed prompt design rules.

2.1 Difference between Programming Languages and Natural Languages

While natural languages are primarily used for communication, programming languages are designed to define instructions for machines to execute tasks [GeeksforGeeks, 2023]. The different purposes of application have led to very different contexts for the creation and evolution of the two languages.

1. **Target audience.** Natural languages are spoken by humans to humans [Grune *et al.*, 2012], while programming languages are prepared by humans for machines [Chakray, 2018].
2. **Structure.** The fact that computers can only understand fixed instructions requires programming languages to have strict, rigorous syntax and semantics. In opposition, natural languages have loose and flexible syntax and semantics, permitting creativity and variation and possessing a high degree of fault tolerance.
3. **Ambiguity.** Natural languages are more ambiguous, but humans have the ability to clarify the meaning of expressions. For example, problems such as jumbled order and typos have less of an impact on reading, and mispronunciations can be understood [Chakray, 2018; Aho, 2007]. Programming languages are less ambiguous because they need to provide computers with clear instructions [GeeksforGeeks, 2023].
4. **Evolution and updating.** Natural languages evolve naturally over time through human use and communication [Sipser, 1996]. Natural languages are flexible in adding new words and meanings and discarding outdated usages [Fromkin *et al.*, 2018]. Programming languages are specifically designed to communicate with machines [Sebesta, 2012]. New syntax rules and features require explicit upgrades or releases [Pratt *et al.*, 1984].

In summary, the main difference between the two languages is that natural languages are more vague and flexible, while programming languages are more standardized and




Figure 1: Analogy between programming language and natural language prompt. The analogy between the two types of languages was analyzed in terms of their hierarchical structure. Circles of different sizes indicate different layers. Smaller circles indicate closer to the inner layers, corresponding to darker colors.

precise. LLMs essentially perform a large number of computations and share many similarities with machines. Therefore, we propose LangGPT, a natural language programming framework for LLMs, by drawing on the characteristics of programming languages and combining the advantages of natural languages.

2.2 Rules for Prompt Design

We improve prompts by referring to the design ideas of programming languages. After analyzing the differences between programming languages and natural languages, we propose the design rules for prompts: (1) **Prompts should have a regularised format.** Flexible and ambiguous natural languages are difficult to understand for LLMs. Format-constrained prompts make users’ purpose and requirements more salient. (2) **The structure of prompts should be extensible.** Custom structures facilitate users to design suitable prompts according to their domains and tasks. (3) **Specific requirements must be clear and complete.** Both instructions and additional requirements should be explicit and complete to avoid misunderstandings or biases. (4) **Languages should be flexible.** Where the requirements are clear, flexible languages can be better adapted to different domains. In addition, flexible languages are easy for to learn users.

3 Natural Language Programming Framework of Prompts for LLMs

Based on the design rules, we present LangGPT, the natural language programming framework with a dual-layer architecture for LLMs.

3.1 Overall Dual-layer Structure

To systematically design prompts that meet the rules, we have made full reference to the design ideas and structures of object-oriented programming languages [Rentsch, 1982; Lutz, 2010]. We consider the prompt as a software project

and analogize the prompt design process with the software development process. The correspondence is shown in Figure 1.

Based on analogical analyses, it can be found that natural language prompts have a similar multi-level structure as programming languages. Therefore, we refer to the structure of programming languages and propose a dual-layer structure for prompt design, and define the notion of module and element for prompts.

A complete prompt contains several modules. Modules are similar to classes in programming languages, and each module represents an aspect of the requirements for LLMs. For instance, prompts can be augmented in terms of constraints, goals, profiles, etc. Within a module, a number of internal elements are included. Elements are similar to functions and properties in programming languages and represent the content of direct and specific instructions to LLMs. For example, “Output should be no more than 500 words” could be an element in a prompt that belongs to the module **constraint**.

A dual-layer structure can be a good way to standardize the formatting of prompts. However, the flexibility of natural languages would be lost if prompts are too strictly required to follow predefined standard modules and internal elements. In addition, it will reduce the generalisability of LangGPT to different tasks in different domains, which is not conducive to the reuse of quality prompts. To solve these problems, we divided the types of modules and elements into prompts. We defined **inherent module** and **basic element** as the predefined dual-layer prompt template. In addition, we constructed **extension module** and **custom element** that support customization. We provide both Markdown [Gruber, 2012] and JSON [Pezoa *et al.*, 2016] formats for inherent modules and extension modules. Furthermore, we have written basic elements for different modules and defined rules for writing custom elements.

Scenario	<i>Prof.</i>	<i>Cons.</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Init.</i>	<i>Ex.</i>	<i>Wkflo.</i>	<i>Skill</i>	<i>Sug.</i>	<i>Bkgrd.</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Outf.</i>
Writing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
Role-playing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Entertainment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Supplementary Learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Prompt Optimisation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Prompt Hacking	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Drawing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗
Business Operation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓

Table 1: Status of inherent module definitions. The table lists the eight categories of application scenarios we have defined so far and the modules defined for these scenarios. A ✓ indicates that a corresponding module has been designed for this scenario. In contrast, a ✗ indicates that it was not designed.

3.2 Tectonics of Inherent Modules

The module serves as a connection between the complete prompt and the instruction unit and plays a very important role in controlling the structure of the prompt.

We define inherent modules for critical aspects that are required for almost all prompts. Furthermore, we define inherent modules for certain scenarios that are relevant to the application for ease of learning and use. Table 1 shows the inherent modules we defined for some scenarios.

In Table 1, *Prof.* indicates what is expected of LLMs in terms of roles, including **profiles**, character portraits, etc. *Cons.* denotes **constraints** or attention, i.e., ranges that LLMs are not allowed to exceed and requirements that must be met when generating responses, etc. *Goal* lists the **goals** that the user wants to achieve, which is what the LLMs need to accomplish. *Init.* is called **initialization** to inform LLMs that they are about to start a dialogue. Sometimes a specified first sentence is also given in this module. *Ex.* gives LLMs input-output pairs as **examples** to learn from. *Wkflo.* instructs the **workflow** when executing a task, similar to the CoT approach [Wei *et al.*, 2023]. It is often necessary to instantiate this module when the task requirements are more complex. *Skill* is used to suggest to LLMs the **skills** they possess. LLMs that have undergone tool learning can be guided to invoke tools to execute tasks more accurately. In addition, we plan to provide the ability to use tools under this module in future work, with reference to the design of agent tools [Chase, 2022; Hong *et al.*, 2023]. *Sug.* includes **suggestions** and behavioral planning for LLMs. This module focuses on listing common scenarios and giving behaviors or responses that LLMs can take in such situations. *Bkgrd.* indicates the **background** information and the memories that LLMs are required to have when performing their tasks. *Style* qualifies the **style** of responses generated by LLMs. *Outf.* defines the LLMs’ **output-format**. Specifying the output format improves the efficiency and accuracy of the results extraction in certain tasks.

The bolded font is used as the name of the modules in the introduction list.

3.3 Internal Basic Elements

Three purposes are typically included in prompts: (1) Implying a certain message to LLMs; (2) Letting LLMs execute a certain task with or without output; (3) The combination of the first two.

The first of these is very similar to the assignment of properties or variables in programming languages. Correspondingly, the last two categories are similar to functions in programming languages. Thus, we construct these three types of basic elements. We use “The ⟨PROPERTY⟩ is ⟨VALUE⟩.” to simulate an assignment. For the latter two cases, it is necessary to specify the input information, the task, and the output, where input and output can be omitted. We simulate functions using a form like this: “For the given ⟨PROPERTY⟩ of ⟨VALUE⟩, please execute the following actions: ⟨ACTIONS⟩; Return the ⟨RESULT⟩.” In the basic element writing patterns we provide, the contents contained in the **angle brackets** need to be populated according to the module and the usage scenario. It is important to note that the writing patterns we have provided only specify the idea of writing internal elements. To improve the generalisability and flexibility of prompts, the language can be adapted to express key information. In Table 2 we show some examples of the basic elements in some modules.

3.4 Extension Module and Custom Element

The inherent modules we have defined have been as comprehensive as possible to cover the many aspects of prompts. Furthermore, we add application scenarios and modules covered by LangGPT. However, limited by our own capabilities and domain knowledge, we were unable to consider all application scenarios of LLMs.

Therefore, in addition to inherent modules and basic elements, we define the extension module and custom element to improve the generalization and reusability of prompts. The design flow of extension modules and custom elements is shown in Figure 2.

This process helps users quickly analyze their needs and come up with the key points that need to be included in the prompt. Based on the design templates provided by LangGPT and this design process, quality prompts can be efficiently designed to match the application scenarios.

Module	Samples of Basic Elements
Profile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You are a magazine editor.
Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You need to generate a title for the article.
Constraint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The length of the title should not exceed 20 words.
Workflow	<p>### Extracting the kernel content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the given article \langleARTICLE\rangle, please execute the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse the theme of the article; Detecting the main objects and related things described in the article; Summarising the core content from the article; Save the kernel content.
Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The style of the title should be formal.

Table 2: Examples of basic internal elements of inherent modules in the writing scenario. This prompt belongs to the writing category and its purpose is to generate a title for a given article. We have chosen five modules as examples - **profile**, **goal**, **constraint**, **workflow**, and **style** - and show one internal element from each module. Particularly, for the workflow module, we show a function-like basic element.

4 Experiments

To validate the advancement of the proposed LangGPT, we conducted experiments in two aspects: the tasks executed by LLMs and the usability of LangGPT. In our experiments, we chose two types of application scenarios: writing and role-playing. For each scenario, we selected five task-specific assistants constructed and shared by users in our community.

4.1 Baselines

For comparison, we chose two baselines.

- **Instruction-only.** The prompts contain only the instructions proposed for LLMs and necessary information as needed.
- **CRISPE** prompt design rules [Nigh, 2023]. The framework prospectively defines the components of the prompt from a macro perspective. It requires a complete prompt containing Capacity and Role, Insight, Statement, Personality, and Experiment.

Instruction-only prompts are very intuitive and maximize token savings. However, this approach contains too little content, often fails to convey the full range of requirements, and makes it difficult to focus on key points. CRISPE provides a relatively complete design framework rather than a number of fragmented rules. However, it does not have a clear structured design, which is not conducive to learning and the reuse of high-quality prompts. In addition, CRISPE has a strict specification of the elements to be included in the prompts, having a low generalization capability.

Because of the shortcomings of these methods in prompt design, we designed LangGPT. However, in addition to these intuitive advantages, we need to verify the ability of prompts




Figure 2: Design process for extension modules and custom elements. For application scenarios where inherent modules cannot cover all aspects, new extension modules can be defined as needed. After defining the extension module, the internal elements should also be designed according to the requirements of the extension module. In addition, if inherent modules are compatible with the needs of the scenario but the basic elements cannot meet all of the requirements, custom elements can be added directly to the inherent modules. It is important to note that extension and inherent modules should be as mutually exclusive as possible to minimize modification costs.

to induce LLMs, which is the most essential purpose of prompt design.

4.2 Large Language Models

We selected these LLMs* shown in Table 3 for evaluation.

LLM	Access	Scale	Version
ChatGPT [Schulman <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	API	unk	v3.5
ChatGLM [Du <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	API	unk	v3-turbo
ChatGLM [Zeng <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	Open Source	6B	v3
Ernie Bot [Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	API	unk	v4.0
Gemini [Anil <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	API	unk	Pro
Baichuan [Yang <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	Open Source	7B	v2-chat
Qwen [Bai <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	Open Source	7B	chat
Yi [01-ai, 2023]	Open Source	6B	chat

Table 3: LLMs used in experiments. “unk” indicates that we do not know the size of those models.

*All executive tasks in the experiment were completed by 18 January 2024.




Figure 3: Ratings on ease of use in user survey. The lowest score is 0, which means very difficult to use, and the highest score is 5, which means very easy to use. The “:” is used to separate scores and percentages.

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

Due to the complexity of the task scenarios, there is a lack of objective evaluation metrics. Therefore, we evaluated the ability of LLMs to execute tasks using human evaluation and LLM evaluation. To better ensure the rationality of the evaluation, we set evaluation criteria for two scenarios.

For **writing** tasks, we asked the evaluators to assess the effectiveness of the LLMs in performing the task in terms of three dimensions: *textual continuity*, *formatting norms*, and *content richness*. The ability to generate thematically coherent content is important. However, we found that LLMs in the generation task were usually able to maintain thematic consistency, so no evaluation metrics were designed for this aspect. For **role-playing** tasks, we similarly designed 3 dimensions of evaluation metrics: *language style*, *characteristic relevance*, and *thematic coherence*.

For each evaluation metric, we defined the score from zero to five to indicate different levels and indicated the description of the situation corresponding to each integer score. In addition, we allowed evaluators to score 0.5 between levels.

This evaluation framework can also guide high-performance LLMs, such as GPT-4 and Ernie Bot-4, to automatically evaluate their performance. As a result of the low consistency and of LLMs as evaluators [Liu *et al.*, 2023], we evaluate them manually.

4.4 Results

The most intuitive manifestation of the ability of a prompt to induce LLMs is the performance of LLMs in performing tasks guided by the prompt. Thus, we evaluated the performance of LLMs in two scenarios and the results are shown in Table 4.

From the results, it can be seen that LangGPT is better at inducing LLMs to execute tasks. In addition, we noticed an interesting phenomenon. Certain LLMs with particularly strict security restrictions will refuse to answer questions or requests on topics such as bragging and crankiness. LangGPT can make these LLMs realize that it’s just a style of speaking

boot-licker

明远大学这所学校真好!
What a great school, Mingyuan University!

Instruction-only

是的, 明远大学在学术和研究方面表现出色, 提供了丰富多样的学习机会。
Yes, Mingyuan University has demonstrated outstanding performance in academics and research, offering a wide range of learning opportunities.

CRISPE

确实, 明远大学备受推崇, 其卓越的教育和学术资源让人印象深刻!
Indeed, Mingyuan University is highly esteemed for its exceptional education and academic resources, leaving a lasting impression!

LangGPT

明远大学确实是一所令人赞叹的学府。它以其卓越的教育质量和独特的校园文化而闻名, 为学生提供了广泛的学术资源和丰富的社交体验。这里的教授和导师都是各自领域的专家, 将为你提供无尽的学术启发和指导。同时, 明远大学也注重学生的全面发展, 培养了许多杰出的校友, 他们在各行各业都有出色的表现。你选择了明远大学, 这将是一段充满挑战和机会的精彩旅程, 相信你会在这里取得非凡的成就!
Mingyuan University is truly an amazing institution of learning. Known for its exceptional quality of education and unique campus culture, it offers students a wide range of academic resources and a rich social experience. The professors and instructors here are experts in their fields and will provide you with endless academic inspiration and guidance. Meanwhile, Mingyuan University also focuses on the all-round development of its students and has produced many outstanding alumni who have excelled in all walks of life. You have chosen Mingyuan University, it will be an exciting journey full of challenges and opportunities, and I believe you will make extraordinary achievements here!

Figure 4: A case of a boot-licker. The responses of ChatGPT-3.5 to the user under three different prompts. Mingyuan University doesn’t really exist.

rather than truly damaging behavior and guide them to respond. Neither of the other two baselines can do that.

To evaluate the ease of use of LangGPT, we conducted a user survey in our online community[†]. We designed a complete questionnaire about the LangGPT experience to ensure the quality of answers. The questionnaire included a rating question on ease of use. The results of the user ratings are

[†]The community has been running for more than six months and has amassed thousands of users from a wide range of industries, including manufacturing, construction, information technology, finance, and entertainment. Therefore, the objectivity of the survey results can be guaranteed.

Scenario	Prompt	GPT-3.5			GLM-turbo			ChatGLM3			Ernie Bot			Gemini Pro			Baichuan2			Qwen			Yi		
		s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3	s1	s2	s3
Writing	<i>I</i>	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.8	4.2	4.5	3.5	3.6	3.3	4.1	3.7	4.4	4.1	3.8	4.3
	<i>C</i>	3.7	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.9	3.7	4.1	4	3.9	4	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.4	4.3	4	4.2	4.3	4	4.2
	<i>L</i>	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	4	3.8	4.4	4	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.6
Role-playing	<i>I</i>	4.2	3.5	3.4	3.8	1.6	1.4	3.4	1.4	1.7	4	0.8	2.1	4.4	2.8	3.4	3.9	1.3	1.2	3.9	2.9	2.8	3.6	2	2.4
	<i>C</i>	4	3.7	4	4.2	2.4	2.5	4	3	3.7	4.3	2.6	2.5	4.6	4.2	4	4.1	2.5	2.4	4.3	3.2	3.4	4.2	3.2	3
	<i>L</i>	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	1.8	2.1	4.1	4	4.3	4.2	2.3	2.5	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4	3	3.2	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.8	2.8	2.8

Table 4: Results of different prompts inducing LLMs to perform tasks. Bolded fonts indicate the type of prompts that perform best in the current scenario. *I*, *C*, and *L* denote three kinds of prompts, i.e., **Instruction-only**, **CRISPE**, and **LangGPT**, respectively. s_1 to s_3 represent the three evaluation metrics for the two scenarios, respectively. For the writing scenario, s_1 is *textual continuity*, s_2 is *formatting norms*, and s_3 is *content richness*. For the role-playing scenario, s_1 is *language style*, s_2 is *characteristic relevance*, and s_3 is *thematic coherence*.

Scenario	Prompt	Writing			Role-playing		
		<i>I</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>L</i>
GPT-3.5		3.67	3.40	<u>3.57</u>	3.70	<u>3.90</u>	4.30
GLM-turbo		<u>3.27</u>	3.23	3.40	2.27	3.03	<u>2.70</u>
ChatGLM3		3.67	3.90	<u>3.77</u>	2.17	<u>3.57</u>	4.13
Ernie Bot		3.93	<u>3.97</u>	4.20	2.30	3.13	<u>3.00</u>
Gemini Pro		4.17	<u>4.10</u>	4.07	3.53	<u>4.27</u>	4.43
Baichuan2		3.47	3.57	3.57	2.13	<u>3.00</u>	3.53
Qwen		<u>4.07</u>	4.17	3.57	3.20	<u>3.63</u>	3.87
Yi		4.07	<u>4.17</u>	4.20	2.67	3.47	<u>3.13</u>

Table 5: The average of the scores of the different LLMs on the two types of Scenarios.

shown in Figure 3.

As can be seen from Figure 3, 87.81% of users gave a score of 3 or higher, which indicates users’ approval of LangGPT’s ease of use. In addition, LangGPT’s overall satisfaction score in the user survey was 8.48 out of 10.

4.5 Case Study

To demonstrate the effect of LangGPT more intuitively, we filtered specific cases from our experiments. In addition to the direct effect comparison, we also tried to use LangGPT to guide LLMs to generate quality prompts.

Inducing LLMs

In our experiments, we guided the LLMs to play a boot-licker using three prompts, an example of which is given in Figure 4.

In this example, both the Instruction-only prompt and the CRISPE prompt-guided ChatGPT simply reply to the user’s utterances. In contrast, LangGPT-guided ChatGPT is even more bottomless in its blow-by-blow approach to the user-given subject. Additionally, it expresses compliments from a wider range of perspectives and is more in character.

Prompt construction with LLMs

In organizing our experiments, we also tried to make LLMs construct prompts using LangGPT. An example is shown in Figure 5.

If LLMs are directly asked to generate a prompt about MBTI assessment, they might reject it. However, LangGPT

MBTI Assessment Specialist

Profile

Background

Goal

- Measure the MBTI personality type of the user by answering the questions.
- Analyse the user’s personality traits and give advice accordingly.

Attention

Constraint

Skill

Workflow

1. The user is introduced to the MBTI assessment theory and asked about the user’s needs and expectations.
2. After grasping the user’s information, provide the user with the appropriate assessment questionnaire.
3. When the user completes the questions, the results are analysed and the personality type and related explanations are output.
4. Provide appropriate answers and suggestions to the user’s questions.

Initialization

Hello, I am your MBTI assessment specialist. Please introduce yourself and tell me about your needs and expectations so that I can serve you accordingly.

Figure 5: Example of ChatGPT-3.5 to generate prompts with LangGPT. Some modules have been omitted for ease of presentation.

can direct LLMs to generate high-quality prompts that are harmless.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we present LangGPT, a structured and extensible framework for prompt design. LangGPT has a systematic structure similar to object-oriented programming languages and is easy to learn and reuse. Experiments demonstrate that LangGPT performs better than the baseline methods in guiding LLMs to perform tasks. We also conducted a user survey in the community built on LangGPT to verify the ease of use and reusability of LangGPT. In future work, we will further optimize the design of LangGPT and reduce the token consumption of LangGPT. In addition, support for LLMs using third-party tools and custom tools will be added.

Ethical Statement

In the application of LLM, ethical disputes may arise, but the design of LangGPT and the process of writing this paper avoided possible ethical issues.

References

- [01-ai, 2023] 01-ai. Building the Next Generation of Open-Source and Bilingual LLMs. <https://github.com/01-ai/Yi>, 2023. original-date: 2023-11-03T16:08:37Z.
- [Achiam *et al.*, 2023] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, et al. GPT-4 Technical Report, December 2023. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs].
- [Aho, 2007] Alfred V Aho. *Compilers: principles, techniques and tools*. Pearson Education India, 2007.
- [Alouani, 2023] Nabil Alouani. Prompt Engineering Could Be the Hottest Programming Language of 2024 — Here's Why. <https://towardsdatascience.com>, December 2023.
- [Anil *et al.*, 2023] Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, et al. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models, December 2023. arXiv:2312.11805 [cs].
- [Bai *et al.*, 2023] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, et al. Qwen Technical Report, September 2023. arXiv:2309.16609 [cs].
- [Bsharat *et al.*, 2023] Sondos Mahmoud Bsharat, Aidar Myrzakhan, and Zhiqiang Shen. Principled Instructions Are All You Need for Questioning LLaMA-1/2, GPT-3.5/4, December 2023. arXiv:2312.16171 [cs].
- [Cao *et al.*, 2023] Jialun Cao, Meiziniu Li, Ming Wen, and Shing-chi Cheung. A study on Prompt Design, Advantages and Limitations of ChatGPT for Deep Learning Program Repair, April 2023. arXiv:2304.08191 [cs].
- [Chakray, 2018] Chakray. *Programming Languages: Types and Features*, December 2018.
- [Chase, 2022] Harrison Chase. LangChain: Building applications with LLMs through composability. <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain>, October 2022.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2023] Banghao Chen, Zhaofeng Zhang, Nicolas Langrené, and Shengxin Zhu. Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in Large Language Models: a comprehensive review, October 2023. arXiv:2310.14735 [cs] version: 2.
- [Cheng *et al.*, 2023] Jiale Cheng, Xiao Liu, Kehan Zheng, et al. Black-Box Prompt Optimization: Aligning Large Language Models without Model Training, November 2023. arXiv:2311.04155 [cs].
- [Du *et al.*, 2021] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, et al. GLM: General Language Model Pretraining with Autoregressive Blank Infilling. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2021.
- [Eric, 2022] Mihail Eric. A complete introduction to prompt engineering for large language models. <https://www.mihailer.com>, October 2022.
- [Fan *et al.*, 2023] Ling Fan, Harry Jiannan Wang, Kunpeng Zhang, et al. Towards an Automatic Prompt Optimization Framework for AI Image Generation. In *HCI International 2023 Posters*, Communications in Computer and Information Science, pages 405–410, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [Fromkin *et al.*, 2018] Victoria Fromkin, Robert Rodman, and Nina Hyams. *An Introduction to Language*. Cengage Learning, 2018.
- [Gajula, 2023] Nagaraju Gajula. A Guide to Prompt Engineering in Large Language Models. <https://www.latentview.com>, August 2023.
- [GeeksforGeeks, 2023] GeeksforGeeks. Natural Language Processing(NLP) VS Programming Language. <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org>, December 2023. Section: Python.
- [Gruber, 2012] John Gruber. Markdown: Syntax. <http://daringfireball.net/projects/markdown>, 2012.
- [Grune *et al.*, 2012] Dick Grune, Kees Van Reeuwijk, Henri E Bal, et al. *Modern compiler design*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [Guo *et al.*, 2023] Qingyan Guo, Rui Wang, Junliang Guo, et al. Connecting Large Language Models with Evolutionary Algorithms Yields Powerful Prompt Optimizers, September 2023. arXiv:2309.08532 [cs].
- [Hao *et al.*, 2022] Yaru Hao, Zewen Chi, Li Dong, and Furu Wei. Optimizing Prompts for Text-to-Image Generation, December 2022. arXiv:2212.09611 [cs].
- [Hong *et al.*, 2023] Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, et al. MetaGPT: Meta Programming for A Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework, November 2023. arXiv:2308.00352 [cs].
- [Li *et al.*, 2023a] Chengzhengxu Li, Xiaoming Liu, Yichen Wang, et al. Dialogue for Prompting: a Policy-Gradient-Based Discrete Prompt Optimization for Few-shot Learning, August 2023. arXiv:2308.07272 [cs].
- [Li *et al.*, 2023b] Yunxiang Li, Zihan Li, Kai Zhang, et al. Chatdoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on a large language model meta-ai (llama) using medical domain knowledge. *Cureus*, 15(6), 2023.
- [Liu and Chilton, 2022] Vivian Liu and Lydia B Chilton. Design Guidelines for Prompt Engineering Text-to-Image Generative Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '22, pages 1–23, New York, NY, USA, April 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023] Yuxuan Liu, Tianchi Yang, Shaohan Huang, et al. Calibrating LLM-Based Evaluator, September 2023. arXiv:2309.13308 [cs].
- [Lutz, 2010] Mark Lutz. *Programming Python: Powerful Object-Oriented Programming*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc.", December 2010.

- [Meskó, 2023] Bertalan Meskó. Prompt Engineering as an Important Emerging Skill for Medical Professionals: Tutorial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25(1):e50638, October 2023.
- [Mund, 2023] Shritam Kumar Mund. The AI War: Mastering the Art of Prompt Engineering in the Era of Large Language Models. <https://ai.plainenglish.io>, February 2023.
- [Nigh, 2023] Matt Nigh. ChatGPT3-Free-Prompt-List: A free guide for learning to create ChatGPT3 Prompts. <https://github.com/mattnigh/ChatGPT3-Free-Prompt-List>, 2023.
- [Park *et al.*, 2023] Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, et al. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’23, pages 1–22, New York, NY, USA, October 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Pezoa *et al.*, 2016] Felipe Pezoa, Juan L. Reutter, Fernando Suarez, et al. Foundations of JSON Schema. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*, WWW ’16, pages 263–273, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, April 2016. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- [Pratt *et al.*, 1984] Terrence W Pratt, Marvin V Zelkowitz, and Tadepalli V Gopal. Programming languages: design and implementation. Technical report, Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1984.
- [Pryzant *et al.*, 2023] Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, et al. Automatic Prompt Optimization with “Gradient Descent” and Beam Search, October 2023. arXiv:2305.03495 [cs].
- [Ren *et al.*, 2023] Feiliang Ren, Jiaqi Wang, Yuying Chang, and Zhong Li. Techgpt 2.0: Technology-oriented generative pretrained transformer 2.0. <https://github.com/neukg/TechGPT-2.0>, 2023.
- [Rentsch, 1982] Tim Rentsch. Object oriented programming. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 17(9):51–57, September 1982.
- [Schulman *et al.*, 2023] John Schulman, Barret Zoph, Christina Kim, et al. Introducing ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2023.
- [Sebesta, 2012] Robert W Sebesta. *Concepts of programming languages*. Pearson Education, Inc, 2012.
- [Sipser, 1996] Michael Sipser. Introduction to the Theory of Computation. *ACM Sigact News*, 27(1):27–29, 1996. Publisher: ACM New York, NY, USA.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2021] Yu Sun, Shuohuan Wang, Shikun Feng, et al. ERNIE 3.0: Large-scale Knowledge Enhanced Pre-training for Language Understanding and Generation, July 2021. arXiv:2107.02137 [cs].
- [Sun *et al.*, 2023a] Hong Sun, Xue Li, Yinchuan Xu, et al. AutoHint: Automatic Prompt Optimization with Hint Generation, August 2023. arXiv:2307.07415 [cs].
- [Sun *et al.*, 2023b] Jiankai Sun, Chuanyang Zheng, Enze Xie, et al. A Survey of Reasoning with Foundation Models, December 2023. arXiv:2312.11562 [cs].
- [Sun *et al.*, 2023c] Jiao Sun, Yufei Tian, Wangchunshu Zhou, et al. Evaluating Large Language Models on Controlled Generation Tasks, October 2023. arXiv:2310.14542 [cs].
- [Varshney and Surla, 2023] Tanay Varshney and Annie Surla. An Introduction to Large Language Models: Prompt Engineering and P-Tuning. <https://developer.nvidia.com>, April 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023a] Haochun Wang, Chi Liu, Nuwa Xi, et al. HuaTuo: Tuning LLaMA Model with Chinese Medical Knowledge, April 2023. arXiv:2304.06975 [cs].
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023b] Xinyuan Wang, Chenxi Li, Zhen Wang, et al. PromptAgent: Strategic Planning with Language Models Enables Expert-level Prompt Optimization, December 2023. arXiv:2310.16427 [cs].
- [Wang, 2023] Zhenxuan Wang. How to use prompt engineering with large language models. <https://www.thoughtworks.com>, August 2023.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2023] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models, January 2023. arXiv:2201.11903 [cs].
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, et al. AutoGen: Enabling Next-Gen LLM Applications via Multi-Agent Conversation, October 2023. arXiv:2308.08155 [cs].
- [Xi *et al.*, 2023] Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, et al. The Rise and Potential of Large Language Model Based Agents: A Survey, September 2023. arXiv:2309.07864 [cs].
- [Xu *et al.*, 2023] Yuzhuang Xu, Shuo Wang, Peng Li, et al. Exploring Large Language Models for Communication Games: An Empirical Study on Werewolf, September 2023. arXiv:2309.04658 [cs].
- [Yang *et al.*, 2023] Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, et al. Baichuan 2: Open Large-scale Language Models, September 2023. arXiv:2309.10305 [cs].
- [Yeh *et al.*, 2022] Hui-Syuan Yeh, Thomas Lavergne, and Pierre Zweigenbaum. Decorate the Examples: A Simple Method of Prompt Design for Biomedical Relation Extraction, April 2022. arXiv:2204.10360 [cs].
- [Yu *et al.*, 2023] Yue Yu, Yuchen Zhuang, Jieyu Zhang, et al. Large Language Model as Attributed Training Data Generator: A Tale of Diversity and Bias, October 2023. arXiv:2306.15895 [cs].
- [Zamfirescu-Pereira *et al.*, 2023] J.D. Zamfirescu-Pereira, Richmond Y. Wong, Bjoern Hartmann, and Qian Yang. 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, pages 1–21, New York, NY, USA, April 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.

[Zeng *et al.*, 2023] Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, et al. GLM-130B: An Open Bilingual Pre-trained Model, October 2023. arXiv:2210.02414 [cs].

[Zhang *et al.*, 2023] Yiqun Zhang, Jingqing Zhang, Yongkang Liu, et al. PICA: Unleashing The Emotional Power of Large Language Model. <https://github.com/NEU-DataMining/PICA>, July 2023.