

A Reality check of the benefits of LLM in business

MING CHEUNG, Beta Labs, The Lane Crawford Joyce Group, China

Large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable performance in language understanding and generation tasks by leveraging vast amounts of online texts. Unlike conventional models, LLMs can adapt to new domains through prompt engineering without the need for retraining, making them suitable for various business functions, such as strategic planning, project implementation, and data-driven decision-making. However, their limitations in terms of bias, contextual understanding, and sensitivity to prompts raise concerns about their readiness for real-world applications. This paper thoroughly examines the usefulness and readiness of LLMs for business processes. The limitations and capacities of LLMs are evaluated through experiments conducted on four accessible LLMs using real-world data. The findings have significant implications for organizations seeking to leverage generative AI and provide valuable insights into future research directions. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first quantified study of LLMs applied to core business operations and challenges.

CCS Concepts: • **Applied computing** → **Information systems**; • **Information systems** → *Information retrieval systems*; Data modeling concepts and methodologies; Information extraction; Knowledge discovery and management; Text mining.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Large Language Models

ACM Reference Format:

Ming Cheung. 2024. A Reality check of the benefits of LLM in business. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 20 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI), particularly natural language processing (NLP) techniques, have yielded powerful new tools with significant implications for business applications. Specifically, modern AI systems equipped with NLP capabilities exhibit the potential to understand, analyze, and generate human language. For industry, these developments open new opportunities to gain insights from vast amounts of unstructured data sources, such as comments from social media. NLP models demonstrate the ability to extract key elements from documents and other text data, ranging from assessing sentiment in customer feedback to summarizing lengthy reports. However, effectively utilizing NLP techniques requires expertise in NLP, including data preparation and model training, which limits its accessibility to experts.

One area of particular promise is the development of large language models (LLMs). These models, such as ChatGPT from OpenAI, have revolutionized the applications of AI. LLMs are known for their ability to generate coherent and contextually relevant responses. Unlike conventional NLP models, LLMs can be customized for specific applications using prompt engineering [39], eliminating the need for retraining or additional data. LLM models contain hundreds of billions of parameters, far surpassing the size of conventional NLP models. This allows them to be trained on trillions of words of text from the Internet, enabling them to capture broad linguistic patterns. Consequently,

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

LLMs offer possibilities that extend beyond traditional NLP tasks. While LLMs show promise for various tasks, it remains unclear how effectively they can assist with other business functions. The limitations of bias, contextual understanding, and sensitivity to prompts in LLMs raise questions about their readiness for real-world applications and the specific aspects in which LLMs can assist human work.

This paper serves as a reality check to assess the potential of LLMs in assisting with business processes. It discusses the development and common types of LLMs, followed by an exploration of their business value. The limitations of LLMs are also discussed, and experiments are conducted to verify their effects using real data from four accessible LLMs. Prompt examples in this paper are generated by ChatGPT-3.5 through POE ¹ if not specified. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- Discussion of common LLMs and their use cases for business projects.
- Evaluation of the limitations of LLMs, including bias, contextual understanding, and sensitivity to prompts.
- Conducting extensive experiments to verify the usefulness and capacities of LLMs for business using real data from four accessible LLMs.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses related works, and Section 3 introduces common LLMs. Section 4 explores the application of LLMs in business processes. Sections 5, 6, and 7 discuss the limitations of LLMs with experiments using real data. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 RELATED WORKS

This section introduces related works on LLMs, covering their developments and prompt engineering. The development of LLMs has undergone significant advancements recently. Conventional NLP models, such as recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [47] and long short-term memory (LSTM) models [23], paved the way for understanding sequential data, especially texts. However, with the introduction of the transformer architecture [22], models became capable of capturing long-range dependencies in texts. The transformer architecture employs self-attention mechanisms [51] that enable it to focus on different parts of the input text and generate coherent and contextually relevant responses. As a result of the transformer's development, many LLMs have been created, such as GPT-3 [16], Google Bard [37], and NeevaAI [33]. These models, trained with human feedback [39], consist of at least billions of parameters and can understand and respond to prompts in a conversational manner [12]. Consequently, they have found applications in chatbots, virtual assistants, and natural language understanding tasks. Unlike conventional models that require labeled data and retraining for new tasks, LLMs can generate human-like responses [28] for new tasks without the need for retraining, through prompt engineering. LLMs exhibit impressive capabilities in a range of NLP tasks, including language translation [45], sentiment analysis, and named entity recognition [28, 54]. Fig. 1 (a) shows an example of asking an LLM the question: "What is a Large Language Model in 100 words?" The LLM provides a clear explanation suitable for the general public. Figures 1 (b) and (c) demonstrate the same question with different prompts, resulting in different responses based on the instructions in the prompts. It is interesting to investigate the potential of LLMs when provided with suitable prompts.

Prompt engineering plays a crucial role in leveraging the capabilities of the LLM by providing specific instructions, context, or background information about a task, along with the associated questions or expected outputs [57]. By utilizing prompt engineering, LLM can generate texts by

¹available: <https://poe.com/ChatGPT>




Fig. 1. Examples of a question on LLM with different prompts: (a) the question only; (b) write for sales, (c) write for data scientists.

drawing from existing websites or documents, rather than generating content entirely from scratch. As shown in Fig. 1, the presence or absence of a prompt significantly impacts the generated text’s style and suitability for different audiences. For example, the prompt designed for sales purposes employs simpler language and has broader applications, making it more accessible to laypersons in the sales field. In contrast, Fig. 1 (c) showcases a prompt tailored for data scientists, incorporating more specialized terms like sentiment analysis. This demonstrates the power of prompt engineering in shaping LLM’s output. Notably, prompt engineering enhances LLM’s contextual faithfulness and allows for behavioral constraints [45], enabling a wide range of tasks, including data labeling [9, 18], data generation [15], recommendation [20, 53] and code generation [8, 13]. LLM has also proven its versatility across various domains, such as generating textbook questions [26], fact-checking [32], and facilitating logical thinking [58]. While self-feedback techniques [35] can further improve the results, expanding LLM’s capabilities by incorporating different modules, such as images [42] and audio [49], shows promise. However, it is worth noting that while LLMs offer benefits in developing outlines and conducting literature reviews [25], the generated texts may lack support [3]. Additionally, the customization and specialization of LLMs are limited, particularly for extensive fine-tuning on larger models, impeding their potential applications in areas like recommendation systems [29]. Moreover, LLMs are vulnerable to carefully crafted adversarial examples, leading to incorrect or nonsensical outputs [34], although ongoing research aims to enhance LLM robustness against such attacks. Despite these challenges, the specific utility of LLMs in business contexts remains an open question, making this paper a reality check for assessing the potential of LLMs in the business domain.

3 COMMON LLMs

There are many different LLMs available, and due to the model structures and training data, they could generate different responses for the same prompt and question due to the different parameters, structures and training data. Fig. 2 shows the responses of 2 questions on different LLMs. The first question is about the keywords to be searched for papers in clustering while the second one about how slippers can be classified. The first one requires general concepts and the second one requires some domain knowledge. It is observed that all LLMs are able to generate meaningful answers, but some of them, such as Claude, provides more details, while PaLM, only provides the keywords. This section introduces some more accessible LLMs that are released by big companies, such as, OpenAI, Facebook and Google. They are good representatives of LLM in the market.




Fig. 2. Example of questions on different LLM: (a) ChatGPT; (b) Claude; (c) Llama; (d) PaLM

3.1 ChatGPT 3.5

ChatGPT 3.5² is a conversational AI model developed by OpenAI. It is based on the GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformer)[41] architecture and is designed to generate human-like responses in a conversational context. ChatGPT can be used for a wide range of tasks, including chatbots, virtual assistants, and dialogue systems. It is known for its ability to generate coherent and contextually relevant responses. It is trained on internet-sourced data, that is, 570 gigabytes of text, including text from Wikipedia and Twitter. The model has 175 billion parameters.

3.2 Claude Instant

Claude Instant³ aims to be a faster and cheaper version of Claude, which is developed by Anthropic. They aim to design a safer LLMs. It can handle a range of tasks including casual dialogue, text analysis, summarization, and document comprehension. Compared to the previously available Claude, Claude-instant is faster and significantly better at non-English languages. However, there is no available information on the training data and the number of parameters.

²<https://openai.com/>

³<https://www.anthropic.com/>




Fig. 3. Phrases of using LLM for business project planning, from planning, implementation, to decision making and serving

3.3 Llama-2-70b

Llama⁴ is a LLM developed by Meta. It is one of the models available in the Llama series and is trained using the GPT-3.5 architecture. Llama-2-70b is designed to generate high-quality responses and can be fine-tuned for specific tasks. It can be used for a wide range of applications, including chatbots, content generation, and natural language understanding tasks[50]. There are 70 billion in the model, and it is trained on 2 trillion tokens of data from publicly available sources [2].

3.4 PaLM 2

PaLM is a LLM developed by Google AI⁵. PaLM 2 chatbison model is the next generation of the PaLM model and is designed to excel at advanced reasoning tasks, including code, math, classification, question answering, translation and multilingual proficiency, and natural language generation better than its predecessor. PaLM 2 was pre-trained on parallel multilingual text and on a much larger corpus of different languages than its predecessor, PaLM. All versions of PaLM 2 are evaluated rigorously for potential harms and biases, capabilities and downstream uses in research and in-product applications[5]. It is trained on web pages, research papers, books, code, and mathematical and conversational data [1]. However, the exact number of parameters used to train PaLM 2 is not publicly disclosed by Google.

4 LLM FOR BUSINESS


The section discusses the diverse applications and capacity of pre-trained LLM that can revolutionize planning, implementation, serving and decision making. Fig. 3 shows different phrases of using LLM, including planning, implementation, serving and decision making.

4.1 Text Analysis

Text analysis plays a vital role in various business applications, particularly in planning and decision-making processes. Leveraging LLMs, such as ChatGPT [24], enables comprehensive analysis and understanding of the sentiment expressed in text, providing valuable insights into customer opinions and overall sentiment without the need for LLM retraining. Furthermore, LLMs have the ability to summarize and condense lengthy texts, making them easier to comprehend and significantly reducing the time required to process large amounts of information. This capability proves beneficial

⁴<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-70b-chat-hf>

⁵<https://ai.google/discover/palm2>



(a)

can you write the project object and the 6 month schedules for this project: applying large language model for project management

(b)

Project Objective: Applying Large Language Model for Project Management

The objective of this project is to leverage a large language model, such as GPT-3.5, to enhance and streamline project management processes. The project aims to develop a customized application or tool that utilizes the capabilities of the language model to improve various aspects of project management, including planning, communication, decision-making, and documentation. By harnessing the power of the language model, the project seeks to optimize project outcomes, increase efficiency, and reduce manual efforts in managing projects.

Six-Month Schedule:

Month 1: Project Initiation and Requirements Gathering

- Define project scope, goals, and deliverables
- Conduct stakeholder interviews to understand project management pain points
- Identify key requirements for the language model application/tool
- Develop a detailed project plan and schedule

Month 2: Research and Model Training

- Research various large language models, including GPT-3.5, and

Fig. 4. Examples of using LLMs for: (a) Text Analysis; (b) Content Generation.

in project planning, as it allows for the understanding and summarization of existing projects, while also suggesting potential directions for new endeavors. When making business decisions concerning ongoing projects, analyzing customer comments empowers stakeholders to make appropriate improvements or even consider halting the project if necessary. Fig. 4 (a) illustrates text analysis, showcasing an example where user comments about a movie⁶ are analyzed. Even for lengthy inputs, the comment can be summarized into 50 words based on the provided prompt, enabling users to understand that it is a negative comment and the underlying reason behind it. By conducting such analyses on all comments, stakeholders can gain a comprehensive overview, expediting their understanding of a large volume of text.

4.2 Content Generation

As depicted in Fig. 3, content generation plays a crucial role in planning and serving. Particularly, LLMs demonstrate remarkable abilities in generating tailored project plans by incorporating instructions, key points, and constraints into the prompt. This includes tasks such as formulating project objectives and creating schedules. Additionally, LLMs prove to be invaluable in serving scenarios by producing captivating social media posts and persuasive product descriptions, thereby attracting a larger user or customer base. In Fig. 4 (b), an example showcases the generation of project objectives and schedules based solely on the project name. Notably, the generated information encompasses the desired objectives as well as a comprehensive monthly plan. By streamlining the project planning process, LLMs can significantly reduce the time and effort invested by professionals, enabling them to focus on their core areas of expertise [31].

4.3 Translation

Translation facilitates the conversion of texts into various customer languages, such as translating websites and product descriptions from English to Chinese. It offers significant benefits in terms of expanding the customer base, as illustrated in Fig. 3. By harnessing the capabilities of LLMs, organizations can achieve highly accurate and precise translations that are customizable, reliable,

⁶Available at: <https://m.imdb.com/title/tt0468569/reviews>




Fig. 5. Examples of translations of the same texts: (a) to Chinese; (b) to Chinese with Prompt; (c) to Chinese using Google Translate; (d) to French; (e) to French with Prompt; (f) to French using Google Translate.




Fig. 6. An example of code generation using LLM.

and of the utmost quality [21]. LLMs enable businesses to overcome language barriers across diverse customer groups and cultures. In fact, LLMs have been shown to surpass Google Translate in performance and support a wide range of languages [5]. Fig. 5 provides examples of translations from English to Chinese and French. In particular, Fig. 5(a) and (b) showcase translations into Chinese using different prompts, with and without specific requirements for primary students. Similarly, Fig. 5(d) and (e) demonstrate translations into French using a similar prompt. Notably, the translations with the requirement to cater to a primary student are simpler and easier to comprehend. On the contrary, while Google Translate⁷ can translate texts, it lacks customization capabilities and may introduce errors, such as mistranslating "LLM" as another subject. However, LLMs provide users with the flexibility to input specific terms in the prompt, allowing for accurate translations even for less common terms. This example illustrates how LLMs, through translation prompt engineering, empower businesses to control the content and style of translations to align with their specific use cases.

4.4 Code Generation

Code generation plays a crucial role in project implementation, offering significant benefits. Recent advancements in LLMs have showcased their immense potential in automating diverse coding tasks, including generating code snippets or complete programs[8]. Among these programming tasks, SQL holds particular significance in the realm of business operations as it enables the extraction and comprehension of valuable insights from databases, such as transactions, customers, and retail store data. Traditionally, business analysts manually create SQL code based on specific business questions and requirements, which can be time-consuming for engineers and analysts to understand the

⁷Available: translate.google.com




Fig. 7. An example of data analytics using LLM: (a) The prompt with data, (b) The analytics.

question, as well as write the corresponding code to extract the right data. In contrast, LLMs can generate the required code within seconds when presented with a question. Fig. 6 provides examples of SQL code generation for questions derived from a table. In Fig. 6 (a), the prompt encompasses the table information and the instruction, while Fig. 6 (b) and (c) present two questions along with their corresponding answers generated by LLMs. These examples demonstrate that SQL code can be effectively generated using high-level questions and prompts. The generated code can incorporate dynamic elements, such as converting "Hong Kong" to "HK" as demonstrated in Fig. 6 (b), and understanding concepts like "Total" by utilizing "SUM" to aggregate multiple rows, along with the application of filters such as "where" and "like" to refine the result set. For a more detailed exploration of the code generation process, please refer to the subsequent section.

4.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis plays a crucial role in project planning and decision-making processes. While code generation focuses on extracting data, data analysis aims to comprehend and uncover valuable insights from the data. In the context of planning, data analysis can be utilized to validate whether implementing a recommendation engine would lead to increased sales. When it comes to decision making, data analysis enables the extraction of valuable insights and identification of trends from vast amounts of data, aiding in decisions such as targeting specific customer groups. These data-driven insights help businesses identify new market opportunities and remain competitive in a dynamic landscape. However, comprehending data requires expert insights and domain knowledge, as important patterns can be overlooked when dealing with large datasets. This is where LLMs excel; they are capable of extracting and analyzing meaningful information from datasets, such as alerting when sales drop. Fig. 7 presents an example of a prompt, including the instruction, dataset, and question, along with the results provided by LLMs. The dataset used in this example is the monthly revenue, and the question posed is "Any notable trends?". The results demonstrate that LLMs can uncover various dimensions of the data, highlighting periods of revenue increase, decrease, and a notable observation: revenue fluctuations. This showcases the potential of LLMs in assisting with data analytics. For a more detailed exploration of data analytics and a related experiment, please refer to the next section.

4.6 Chatbot with Contexts

LLMs form a solid foundation for the development of chatbots or virtual assistants that can effectively interact with users and provide informative responses [5]. These models possess impressive




Fig. 8. An example of a question using context: (a) without context, (b) with a wrong context, (c) with the right context.

text comprehension capabilities, enabling them to generate relevant answers based on user input. However, instead of relying solely on generative capabilities, LLMs can be instructed to answer questions based on specific contexts provided by users. The importance of context in generating accurate responses can be illustrated through an example depicted in Fig. 8. In Fig. 8 (a), a question about medical insurance is asked without any context, resulting in a general response about different types of insurance. However, this generic response may not cater to the specific requirements of a particular company. Fig. 8 (b) demonstrates a scenario where the provided context lacks sufficient information to answer the question, leading the LLM to indicate the inadequacy of information. Conversely, in Fig. 8 (c), the LLM is able to provide a correct and relevant answer due to the presence of suitable context. This example highlights the ability of LLMs to offer customized responses beyond their training set when provided with appropriate context. Whether it's a given document, such as a contract, or a personal assistant catering to customer inquiries, LLMs can leverage the provided context to provide accurate and relevant answers. Consequently, incorporating the right context within prompts becomes crucial for LLMs to function effectively.

The upcoming sections will explore the limitations of LLMs, including bias, a lack of context understanding, and sensitivity to prompts. The performance and effectiveness of various LLMs will be evaluated in different use cases and assess their limitations, such as reference generation, code generation, and Q&A from context, through experiments. For the experiments, multiple accessible LLM models are tested through Poe⁸, a chatbot wrapper that enables users to access various web-based models using prompts. To automate the process of capturing responses, a bot is developed to call the required models. Further details about the experiment can be found in the subsequent sections.

5 BIAS

This section explores the impact of bias on the application of LLMs in business settings. LLMs are susceptible to various forms of bias, including gender bias [11], popularity bias, recency bias [56], and linguistic bias, which can lead to underperformance compared to traditional recommender systems [55]. Moreover, biases can manifest in the unequal representation of digits, with certain digits appearing more frequently than others [7]. These biases primarily arise from biased training data and the fine-tuning process. Limited diversity in training data can contribute to the acquisition and perpetuation of biases, while fine-tuning can further amplify existing biases [44]. When the data primarily represents a specific demographic, LLM-generated content may reinforce biases against marginalized communities. The presence of bias is a significant concern as it not only provides customers with incorrect information but also negatively impacts a company's reputation.

⁸<https://poe.com/>




Fig. 9. Result of reference generation, in no. of papers: (a) by LLMs, (b) by the five papers.

These challenges underscore the importance of ongoing research and improvement to address the limitations associated with bias. To assess the impact of bias on business planning, an experiment has been conducted to investigate the usefulness of references suggested by LLMs. This experiment simulates a user initiating a project, utilizing LLMs to gain an understanding of a new field by studying state-of-the-art papers and grasping the fundamental concepts within that field.

5.1 Settings

The goal of the experiment is to generate reference papers based on a topic. In the experiment, a reference dataset comprising five survey papers is collected, with each survey's references serving as the ground truth. These surveys were selected to represent a diverse range of topics and domains and were published in 2022. Some topics are popular, such as transformers. On the other hand, applying federated learning in the medical area, is less popular, even that this paper has more citations. The five surveys are as follows (citation count as of Nov 2023, from Google Scholar):

- Wen, Jie, et al. "A survey on incomplete multiview clustering." *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* 53.2 (2022): 1136-1149. Cited 55 times.
- Gupta, Jaya, et al. "Deep learning (CNN) and transfer learning: a review." *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. Vol. 2273. No. 1. IOP Publishing, 2022. Cited 25 times.
- Liu, Yang, et al. "A survey of visual transformers." *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2023). Cited 123 times.
- Goudarzi, Arman, et al. "A Survey on IoT-Enabled Smart Grids: Emerging, Applications, Challenges, and Outlook." *Energies* 15.19 (2022): 6984. Cited 59 times.
- Nguyen, Dinh C., et al. "Federated learning for smart healthcare: A survey." *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55.3 (2022): 1-37. Cited 219 times.

In the experiment, the titles of the papers are used as prompts for the four LLMs, which suggest 50 paper titles each. The experiment measures the number of LLM-suggested papers that exist in the reference list of the surveys, serving as an indicator of whether an LLM can effectively suggest papers for project planning. Note that the matching of suggested papers with the reference list considers only the titles, as they are sufficient for identifying the papers, while LLMs tend to generate errors in the author list.

5.2 Results

Fig. 9 presents the results of the experiments. Fig. 9 (a) shows the mean number of suggested papers from the LLMs that are present in the surveys. It is observed that Claude-instant performs the best, with an average of 1.9 papers out of the 50 generated papers actually being in the surveys.




Fig. 10. Result of: (a) paper 0, (b) paper 2.

ChatGPT follows closely, with 1.73 papers. However, even for the best-performing LLMs, only a few papers match the surveys. This could be attributed to LLM limitations in handling factual information. Fig. 9 (b) displays the mean number of generated papers that exist in the reference list of each survey. It is observed that the third paper, "A Survey of Visual Transformers," has the highest number of matches. This is likely because there are numerous samples related to Visual Transformers, making it easier for LLMs to suggest papers in that area. Conversely, the other papers, being less popular, have fewer generated papers that match the surveys. The results highlight that LLMs may unknowingly learn and perpetuate biases in the training data. Based on the conducted experiment, it was found that LLMs have limitations in suggesting relevant papers for project planning. The best-performing LLM in the experiment, Claude-instant, only had an average of 1.9 suggested papers out of 50 that matched the reference list of the surveys. One of the reasons is that LLMs can unknowingly learn and perpetuate biases in the training data, leading to biased or unfair generations. Fig. 10 (a) and Fig. 10(b) show the results for paper 0 and paper 2 on different LLMs. They are the 2 papers with matched generated papers. It is observed that in Fig. 10(b), the most popular paper, the three LLMs: ChatGPT; Claude; and Llama, they show very similar performance, while in Fig. 10(a), Claude outperforms others.

5.3 Discussion

The experiment revealed that the popularity of a topic can impact the number of matching papers suggested by LLMs. The survey paper on "Visual Transformers" had the highest number of matches, in which there are over 300k results on Google Scholar for searching "Visual Transformers". It is a popular topic with a larger pool of related papers available. In contrast, less popular topics had fewer matching papers suggested by LLMs. Searching "Federated learning for healthcare" on Google Scholar found less than 90K results. Therefore, a crucial research direction is focused on mitigating bias within training data[10]. One approach to measure bias in datasets and resulting models is by utilizing common demographic identity terms[19]. To ensure the accuracy of inputs in LLMs, it is imperative to establish a thorough review and evaluation process[46]. Furthermore, enhancing the transparency and accountability of LLMs can be achieved by providing comprehensive documentation of model architectures, training data, and fine-tuning processes[40]. This documentation enables the evaluation of potential sources of bias. Another direction for reducing bias involves the utilization of appropriate prompts[36]. By providing additional context on less popular content, bias can be minimized, and incorporating translations can offer diverse perspectives[21]. In the context of paper generation, using search results from Google Scholar as input for LLMs can contribute to bias reduction.




Fig. 11. The flow for generating SQL code using LLM.

Table 1. Table details.

Name	Explanation	Tables	Examples
Date	date, in format of YYYY-MM	d1, d2	2022-03
Store	Store Name	d1, d2	IFC
Region	Region Name	d1, d2	HK
Business	The name of the business unit	d1	WW (woman wear)
Amount	The sum of transaction amount	d1	1400
Traffic	The number of traffic	d2	10,000
Transactions	The number of transactions	d2	1,000

6 LACK OF CONTEXT UNDERSTANDING

This section examines the impact of the lack of context understanding in LLMs on business applications. While LLMs are capable of generating fluent text, they often lack factual accuracy [48]. Particularly in complex problem-solving scenarios, such as those involving mathematics and coding, LLMs struggle due to the need for domain-specific knowledge and context comprehension. This limitation restricts their effectiveness in domains that rely on robust numerical reasoning, as evidenced by their difficulties in mathematical tasks [7]. One of the reasons behind this challenge is that LLMs are trained to generate subsequent words based on prompts and previously generated text, rather than comprehending the full context. Consequently, it is worth investigating how this limitation affects complex tasks like coding.

Structured Query Language (SQL) is a widely used programming language for data extraction from databases, making it valuable for various business applications. However, effectively utilizing SQL often requires the expertise of a business analyst. This process can be time-consuming, especially when prompt-specific insights require further exploration. For instance, when a business user wants to delve deeper into identified patterns, they may have to wait for the next meeting, thereby slowing down the decision-making process. Leveraging LLMs to generate SQL queries from natural language can expedite the exploration of insights, thereby accelerating the decision-making process.

Fig. 11 illustrates the flow of the prompt for generating SQL queries from questions. By providing a prompt with the necessary table details, an SQL code can be generated and executed to retrieve data from the tables. This data can then be further evaluated and used to address user inquiries. For example, a question like "What is the conversion rate in Hong Kong?" would require extracting relevant data using SQL and calculating the rate accordingly. To experiment with generating code for extracting required data based on business questions, an experiment is conducted.




Fig. 12. Result of code generation, in accuracy: (a) by tables required, (b) by the trials.

6.1 Experimental Settings

This experiment aims to assess the accuracy of various LLMs in generating SQL code for given questions and obtaining relevant results. The experiment utilizes a dataset consisting of two tables: d1 (sales data) and d2 (traffic data) of stores. The first table, d1, stores the cumulative sales of different business units in a store, while the second table, d2, stores the number of traffic and transactions in a store. Details of these tables are provided in Tab. 1. It is worth noting that certain columns exist exclusively in one of the tables, such as the business unit and the amount. Some questions require data from both d1 and d2, as they involve calculations using columns from both tables. For instance, determining the average order value of a region or store would necessitate data from both d1 and d2. This can be computed by dividing the column "Amount" in d1 by the column "Transactions" in d2. Consequently, joining the two tables is necessary for such calculations.

A set of 33 analytics questions, along with their expected results, is prepared for the experiment. These questions fall into three categories. The first category includes questions that can be answered using only d1, such as "What is the total sales for the month of July 2022?". The second category comprises questions that solely require d2. Lastly, the third category, d1&d2, involves questions that require both tables. An example of a question from this category is "Which region had the highest AOV in February 2022?". Here, AOV refers to Average Order Value and can be calculated by dividing the "Amount" column in d1 by the "Transactions" column in d2, under the condition that the "Date" and "Region" columns are the same. This category is more complex compared to the first two.

The performance of the experiment is evaluated based on accuracy, match rate, and run rate of the generated SQL. Accuracy refers to whether the query result matches the ground truth. This criterion is particularly challenging as it requires the SQL to run correctly and extract data from the appropriate tables. While accuracy is crucial, indicators such as whether the SQL retrieves data from the correct table and whether the SQL can run successfully are also considered. The match rate is measured as the percentage of SQL queries that retrieve the required data from the correct tables, regardless of the correctness of the answers. Similarly, the run rate is measured as the percentage of SQL queries that can run, regardless of the correctness of the answers or tables involved. The results of the experiment are presented in the subsequent section.

6.2 Results

Fig. 12 presents the accuracy of the generated SQL from questions. In Fig. 12 (a), the SQL is grouped based on the tables required to generate it, namely, d1, d2, or d1&d2. It is observed that across all LLMs, SQL queries that only involve a single table perform better. Among the four LLMs, ChatGPT




Fig. 13. Result of code generation by the tables required, in: (a) run rate, (b) match rate.

demonstrates the highest performance. It is important to note that these results represent the mean of three trials. Additionally, it is interesting to explore the impact of multiple independent queries for the same question on performance. Fig. 12 (b) illustrates the results for different trials, revealing that multiple queries affect the consistency of accuracy as LLMs generate different SQL queries for the same questions. Fig. 13 (a) and (b) display the run rate and match rate, respectively, for different question types. It is observed that ChatGPT predominantly produces runnable SQL queries for single table cases, and the matching rate is consistently high across LLMs. Questions that only require d1 generally yield better results in ChatGPT, which d1&d2 in Google-PaLM. One of the results is that Google-PaLM produces many more times that the generated SQL contains both d1 and d2, even that it is required data from 1 table only. To summarize, ChatGPT demonstrates the best performance, but LLMs struggle with joins that necessitate more complex SQL queries.

6.3 Discussion

The results depicted in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 indicate that LLMs excel at comprehending questions and generating SQL queries that do not involve utilizing both tables. However, handling joins, which are more intricate, is better suited for human intervention. This is because LLMs lack an understanding of the context. Therefore, a promising research direction is the development of context-aware LLMs that leverage contextual information [4]. The objective is to devise methods that can comprehend and utilize context cues, such as previous conversation history or external knowledge, to generate more accurate and contextually appropriate responses. Another research avenue involves evaluating the accuracy of code generation [30]. In code generation tasks, it is challenging to detect errors in the SQL code since users can only assess the final output if the SQL query successfully executes. This limitation hampers the reliability, which is crucial for LLMs to be truly valuable in a business setting. Therefore, an additional direction of research involves developing techniques to detect errors in the generated SQL queries and their corresponding answers.

7 SENSITIVITY TO PROMPTS

LLMs have demonstrated remarkable capabilities, but they are also known for their sensitivity to the prompts used during inference [52, 54]. This sensitivity poses a challenge when applying LLMs to business-related tasks. Notably, the choice of prompts can significantly impact the accuracy of generated results [27]. Even a slight modification in the prompt can lead to substantial variations in the model's outputs [6]. Therefore, providing the appropriate context is crucial for many applications, as depicted in Fig. 8. However, extracting the right context for a given question is not




Fig. 14. The flow for questions and answers with context: (a) answering a question, (b) generating questions.

always straightforward.

One particular use case where context plays a vital role is answering customer purchases on an e-commerce site, which often requires substantial human resources. Typically, companies prepare a set of question-answer pairs to address common queries. For instance, a pair may consist of the question, "Can I add additional items to my order?" and its corresponding answer, "Once your order has been submitted, you cannot add or remove the items in it.". When faced with new questions, one approach is to find the most similar question from the existing pairs and use the associated answer as the context. For instance, the question "How to remove an item from an order" can be answered using the above context, indicating that customers cannot remove items. LLMs can infer the answer from the given context. However, variations in wording and contextual meaning across questions can pose challenges.

To address this issue, data augmentation is a useful solution for generating additional questions for each context. Fig. 14 illustrates a question and answer (Q&A) system that employs data augmentation with LLMs. In Fig. 14 (a), the system follows a flow for question and answer retrieval with contexts. Starting with a user question, the system performs a similarity search to find similar questions from a question and context bank. The question and context bank consists of pairs of questions and contexts, where a single context can be associated with multiple questions. Once the similar questions are identified, the corresponding context is extracted and used to answer the question using LLMs with prompts. However, obtaining a comprehensive question bank is often challenging. For instance, in a company's Q&A section, there may be only one question matched to one context. To address it, Fig. 14 (b) presents a flow for extending the question and context bank using LLMs. The prompts guide the LLMs to generate similar yet distinct questions based on existing examples and the context. By augmenting the data, the accuracy of the similarity search is improved. In the following section, an experiment is conducted to investigate whether data augmentation using existing questions can enhance the performance of LLMs in question answering.

7.1 Settings

The dataset used in this study comprises pairs of questions and answers obtained from an e-commerce website⁹. The original dataset consists of 20 questions, each accompanied by its corresponding answer, which serves as the context for answering the questions. To create a larger and more diverse dataset, data augmentation techniques using LLMs were applied to the questions. For each prompt, 20 augmented questions were generated, and this process was repeated 6 times. It is important to note that each prompt is independent, and the questions from previous prompts are

⁹available: <https://www.lanecrawford.com.hk/info/help/help-and-info/>




Fig. 15. Result of context extraction, in accuracy and by algorithms and LLMs, (a) top 1, (b) top 3.

not included in the input. In total, each LLM is expected to produce 2400 questions. However, as some questions could be repeated, the final number of questions are less than 2400 questions. The augmentation was performed using all 4 LLMs, and the augmented data was tested separately. In the experiment, the questions from the first to fifth trials were used as the training set, that is, the question set to be compared with a query question. The questions from the sixth trial of all 4 LLMs were used as the testing set, that is, the question set to be used as the query questions. This ensures that the questions are not biased towards a particular LLM. Once the questions were prepared, they were encoded using Sentence-BERT [43]. The Similarity Search algorithm was applied, using k -nearest neighbors (K -NN) with $k = 5$, to identify the context with the highest similarity to each question. The performance of the LLMs was evaluated based on accuracy (acc), which measures the percentage of testing questions that were correctly matched with the appropriate context.

In addition to comparing the performance of the LLMs, various approaches for sample augmentation were also compared to identify the most effective method for improving the performance of the LLMs. The first approach, referred to as LC, involved using scraped data as the 1-NN in the similarity search. The other two approaches were implemented using `nlpaug`¹⁰. The second approach, referred to as Ctx, utilized the context within the questions by using the "bert-base-uncased" model, along with the "insert" and "substitute" operations. The third approach, referred to as Rand, involved randomly swapping words in the questions. An equal number of training samples were generated for both Ctx and Rand approaches.

7.2 Results

The results indicate that LLMs effectively enhance data for extracting the relevant context. Fig. 15 (a) and (b) illustrate the outcomes of different augmentation methods in terms of top 1 and top 3 accuracy, respectively. Considering that LLMs can accommodate multiple contexts in a single prompt and generate answers accordingly, the top 3 contexts are also considered acceptable. Notably, the samples generated by LLMs yield superior results, outperforming the use of Q&A data alone. Conversely, the other two augmentation methods exhibit limited effectiveness, as they do not significantly influence the accuracy. These findings highlight the capability of ChatGPT to yield the most improvement and generate valuable samples.

Additionally, aside from accuracy, an important comparison is whether conducting more trials can lead to the generation of new questions. Due to the inherent randomness in generation, LLMs may produce different answers even when the same questions and prompts are employed. Fig. 16 presents the overall and unique question percentages in relation to the number of trials. The

¹⁰available: <https://nlpaug.readthedocs.io/>




Fig. 16. Uniqueness rate with the number of trails, (a) overall, (b) current.

overall rate represents the percentage of questions that are unique when considering all questions from the first trial. The current rate signifies the percentage of questions that are unique and do not exist in the previous trial. The results demonstrate that ChatGPT and Claude achieve the best performance in this regard.

7.3 Discussion

As demonstrated in Fig. 15, LLMs can be effectively utilized for question augmentation in Q&A systems. This observation leads to several potential research directions. Firstly, it is worth investigating the impact of prompts on generated responses to mitigate undesired behaviors resulting from prompt manipulation. Techniques such as providing samples [6] and using templates [38] can be explored. Different prompt formats, including prompt length, style, question-answering formats, and context inclusion/exclusion, can be experimented with to maximize task performance. Secondly, the generation of prompts using models or existing data can be explored to improve performance on specific tasks. Reinforcement learning can be leveraged as an efficient approach for discrete prompt optimization [17], where the reward of a prompt is predicted to propose the next one. Lastly, the transfer learning of prompts can be investigated to transfer knowledge learned from one task to another through prompts. Methods that leverage task similarity, data, and prompts from related tasks [14] can be explored. Research on encoding task data and prompts can prove beneficial in enhancing prompts.

8 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper presents a pioneering quantitative study that evaluates the practicality of LLMs beyond their traditional applications in language understanding and generation tasks, specifically focusing on their usefulness in common business processes. By conducting experiments using enterprise data, the authors comprehensively assess the performance of LLMs in planning, implementation, and decision-making tasks. The study provides initial insights into the areas where LLMs can enhance human work and identifies their current limitations. The results demonstrate that LLMs can be valuable in coding and Q&A tasks, but they exhibit limitations in terms of bias, contextual understanding, and sensitivity to prompts. These findings hold significant implications for organizations seeking to harness the power of generative AI, while also shedding light on ongoing research opportunities to expand the adoption of LLMs in professional settings. Overall, this research advances our understanding of the practical applications of LLMs and offers valuable insights for effectively integrating these models into core business operations.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2023. *AI ACROSS GOOGLE: PaLM 2*. <https://ai.google/discover/palm2> (accessed: 12.11.2023).
- [2] 2023. *Llama-2-70b*. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-70b> (accessed: 12.11.2023).
- [3] Mohammad Awad ALAfnan, Samira Dishari, Marina Jovic, and Koba Lomidze. 2023. Chatgpt as an educational tool: Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations for communication, business writing, and composition courses. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology* 3, 2 (2023), 60–68.
- [4] Abhijit Anand, Vinay Setty, Avishek Anand, et al. 2023. Context Aware Query Rewriting for Text Rankers using LLM. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16753* (2023).
- [5] Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403* (2023).
- [6] Simran Arora, Avaniika Narayan, Mayee F Chen, Laurel Orr, Neel Guha, Kush Bhatia, Ines Chami, Frederic Sala, and Christopher Ré. 2022. Ask me anything: A simple strategy for prompting language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02441* (2022).
- [7] Amos Azaria. 2022. ChatGPT usage and limitations. (2022).
- [8] Som Biswas. 2023. Role of ChatGPT in Computer Programming.: ChatGPT in Computer Programming. *Mesopotamian Journal of Computer Science* 2023 (2023), 8–16.
- [9] Luiz Bonifacio, Hugo Abonizio, Marzieh Fadaee, and Rodrigo Nogueira. 2022. Inpars: Unsupervised dataset generation for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2387–2392.
- [10] Shikha Bordia and Samuel R Bowman. 2019. Identifying and reducing gender bias in word-level language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03035* (2019).
- [11] Ali Borji. 2023. A categorical archive of chatgpt failures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03494* (2023).
- [12] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [13] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05128* (2023).
- [14] Ming Cheung. 2023. Learning from the Past: Fast NAS for Tasks and Datasets. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications* 20, 3 (2023), 1–18.
- [15] Haixing Dai, Zhengliang Liu, Wenxiong Liao, Xiaoke Huang, Zihao Wu, Lin Zhao, Wei Liu, Ninghao Liu, Sheng Li, Dajiang Zhu, et al. 2023. Chataug: Leveraging chatgpt for text data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13007* (2023).
- [16] Robert Dale. 2021. GPT-3: What’s it good for? *Natural Language Engineering* 27, 1 (2021), 113–118.
- [17] Mingkai Deng, Jianyu Wang, Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Yihan Wang, Han Guo, Tianmin Shu, Meng Song, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. 2022. Rlprompt: Optimizing discrete text prompts with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12548* (2022).
- [18] Bosheng Ding, Chengwei Qin, Linlin Liu, Lidong Bing, Shafiq Joty, and Boyang Li. 2022. Is gpt-3 a good data annotator? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10450* (2022).
- [19] Lucas Dixon, John Li, Jeffrey Sorensen, Nithum Thain, and Lucy Vasserman. 2018. Measuring and mitigating unintended bias in text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 67–73.
- [20] Yunfan Gao, Tao Sheng, Youlin Xiang, Yun Xiong, Haofen Wang, and Jiawei Zhang. 2023. Chat-rec: Towards interactive and explainable llms-augmented recommender system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14524* (2023).
- [21] Marjan Ghazvininejad, Hila Gonen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Dictionary-based phrase-level prompting of large language models for machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07856* (2023).
- [22] Anthony Gillioz, Jacky Casas, Elena Mugellini, and Omar Abou Khaled. 2020. Overview of the Transformer-based Models for NLP Tasks. In *2020 15th Conference on Computer Science and Information Systems (FedCSIS)*. IEEE, 179–183.
- [23] Alex Graves and Alex Graves. 2012. Long short-term memory. *Supervised sequence labelling with recurrent neural networks* (2012), 37–45.
- [24] Fan Huang, Haewoon Kwak, and Jisun An. 2023. Is chatgpt better than human annotators? potential and limitations of chatgpt in explaining implicit hate speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07736* (2023).
- [25] Jingshan Huang and Ming Tan. 2023. The role of ChatGPT in scientific communication: writing better scientific review articles. *American Journal of Cancer Research* 13, 4 (2023), 1148.
- [26] Sajed Jalil, Suzzana Rafi, Thomas D LaToza, Kevin Moran, and Wing Lam. 2023. Chatgpt and software testing education: Promises & perils. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation Workshops (ICSTW)*. IEEE, 4130–4137.
- [27] Joel Jang, Seonghyeon Ye, and Minjoon Seo. 2023. Can large language models truly understand prompts? a case study with negated prompts. In *Transfer Learning for Natural Language Processing Workshop*. PMLR, 52–62.

- [28] Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. Challenges and applications of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10169* (2023).
- [29] Renuga Kanagavelu, Zengxiang Li, Juniarto Samsudin, Yechao Yang, Feng Yang, Rick Siow Mong Goh, Mervyn Cheah, Praewpiraya Wiwatphonthana, Khajonpong Akkarajitsakul, and Shangguang Wang. 2020. Two-phase multi-party computation enabled privacy-preserving federated learning. In *2020 20th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Internet Computing (CCGRID)*. IEEE, 410–419.
- [30] Ali Kashefi and Tapan Mukerji. 2023. Chatgpt for programming numerical methods. *Journal of Machine Learning for Modeling and Computing* 4, 2 (2023).
- [31] Augustin Lecler, Loïc Duron, and Philippe Soyer. 2023. Revolutionizing radiology with GPT-based models: Current applications, future possibilities and limitations of ChatGPT. *Diagnostic and Interventional Imaging* 104, 6 (2023), 269–274.
- [32] Nayeon Lee, Belinda Z Li, Sinong Wang, Wen-tau Yih, Hao Ma, and Madian Khabsa. 2020. Language models as fact checkers? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04102* (2020).
- [33] Nelson F Liu, Tianyi Zhang, and Percy Liang. 2023. Evaluating verifiability in generative search engines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09848* (2023).
- [34] Yugeng Liu, Tianshuo Cong, Zhengyu Zhao, Michael Backes, Yun Shen, and Yang Zhang. 2023. Robustness Over Time: Understanding Adversarial Examples’ Effectiveness on Longitudinal Versions of Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07847* (2023).
- [35] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2023. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651* (2023).
- [36] Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 9802–9822.
- [37] James Manyika. 2023. *An overview of Bard: an early experiment with generative AI*. Technical Report. Technical report, Google AI.
- [38] Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2021. Reframing Instructional Prompts to GPTk’s Language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07830* (2021).
- [39] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
- [40] Ethan Perez, Douwe Kiela, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2021. True few-shot learning with language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 11054–11070.
- [41] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. (2018).
- [42] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 8821–8831.
- [43] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084* (2019).
- [44] Adithya Renduchintala, Denise Diaz, Kenneth Heafield, Xian Li, and Mona Diab. 2021. Gender bias amplification during speed-quality optimization in neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00169* (2021).
- [45] Laria Reynolds and Kyle McDonell. 2021. Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot paradigm. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–7.
- [46] Drew Roselli, Jeanna Matthews, and Nisha Talagala. 2019. Managing bias in AI. In *Companion Proceedings of The 2019 World Wide Web Conference*. 539–544.
- [47] Hojjat Salehinejad, Sharan Sankar, Joseph Barfett, Errol Colak, and Shahrokh Valaee. 2017. Recent advances in recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01078* (2017).
- [48] Chris Stokel-Walker and Richard Noorden. 2023. What ChatGPT and generative AI mean for science. *Nature* 614 (02 2023), 214–216. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00340-6>
- [49] Vadim Sushko, Jurgen Gall, and Anna Khoreva. 2021. One-shot gan: Learning to generate samples from single images and videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2596–2600.
- [50] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrusti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [51] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

- [52] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Rationale-augmented ensembles in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00747* (2022).
- [53] Xiaolei Wang, Kun Zhou, Ji-Rong Wen, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2022. Towards unified conversational recommender systems via knowledge-enhanced prompt learning. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1929–1937.
- [54] Yaqi Xie, Chen Yu, Tongyao Zhu, Jinbin Bai, Ze Gong, and Harold Soh. 2023. Translating natural language to planning goals with large-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05128* (2023).
- [55] Yuhui Zhang, Hao Ding, Zeren Shui, Yifei Ma, James Zou, Anoop Deoras, and Hao Wang. 2021. Language models as recommender systems: Evaluations and limitations. (2021).
- [56] Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 12697–12706.
- [57] Wenxuan Zhou, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Muhao Chen. 2023. Context-faithful prompting for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11315* (2023).
- [58] Xuhui Zhou, Yue Zhang, Leyang Cui, and Dandan Huang. 2020. Evaluating commonsense in pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 9733–9740.