
ROMAS: A Role-Based Multi-Agent System for Database monitoring and Planning

Yi Huang^{1*}, Fangyin Cheng^{2*}, Fan Zhou¹, Jiahui Li¹,
Jian Gong¹, Hongjun Yang¹, Zhidong Fan¹, Caigao Jiang¹,
Siqiao Xue^{1†}, Faqiang Chen^{1†}

¹Ant Group, ²JD Group

{yaqing.hy, faqiang.cfq}@antgroup.com, siqiao.xsq@gmail.com

Abstract

In recent years, Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in data analytics when integrated with Multi-Agent Systems (MAS). However, these systems often struggle with complex tasks that involve diverse functional requirements and intricate data processing challenges, necessitating customized solutions that lack broad applicability. Furthermore, current MAS fail to emulate essential human-like traits such as self-planning, self-monitoring, and collaborative work in dynamic environments, leading to inefficiencies and resource wastage. To address these limitations, we propose ROMAS, a novel Role-Based Multi-Agent System designed to adapt to various scenarios while enabling low code development and one-click deployment. ROMAS has been effectively deployed in DB-GPT [Xue et al., 2023a, 2024b], a well-known project utilizing LLM-powered database analytics, showcasing its practical utility in real-world scenarios. By integrating role-based collaborative mechanisms for self-monitoring and self-planning, and leveraging existing MAS capabilities to enhance database interactions, ROMAS offers a more effective and versatile solution. Experimental evaluations of ROMAS demonstrate its superiority across multiple scenarios, highlighting its potential to advance the field of multi-agent data analytics.

1 Introduction

Multi-agent systems (MAS) have garnered significant attention for their potential to tackle complex tasks in dynamic environments through the coordinated collaboration of multiple agents. As task complexity and environmental dynamics increase, researchers have been working to enhance the capabilities of MAS by decomposing intricate tasks into simpler subtasks and improving agents' adaptive, reflective, and self-correcting abilities [Anderson et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2023a, Xue et al., 2023a, Trivedi et al., 2024]. However, despite these efforts, current MAS approaches still face several critical limitations.

In terms of structural design, traditional MAS often rely on static task allocation and predefined processes, such as Chain of Thought (CoT) [Wei et al., 2022], Self-consistent CoT (CoT-SC) [Wang et al., 2023c] and Tree of Thought (ToT) [Yao et al., 2023a]. These procedural methods suffer from low fault tolerance and lack the capability for autonomous reflection and interaction, leading to failures when deviations occur from the predetermined plan. Furthermore, task-oriented MAS, exemplified by frameworks such as MetaGPT [Hong et al., 2024] and TaskWeaver [Qiao et al., 2024], are domain-specific and fail to generalize well beyond their predefined scopes, thus limiting their

*Equal contribution

†Corresponding Author

Perspective	Module	Function	ROMAS	GA	AA	MG
Structure design	Profile	Role-based cooperation	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Scenario versatility	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Task planning	Global monitor	✓	✗	✓	✗
		Dynamic agent generation	✓	✓	✓	✗
		Plan corrected	✓	✗	✗	✗
	Memory	Message queue	✓	✓	✗	✗
		Hybrid memory	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Action	Guardrails	✓	✓	✓	✓
Self-reflection		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Scenario adaptation	-	Versatility	✓	✓	✓	✗
		Flexibility	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Robustness	✓	✗	✗	✗

Table 1: Comparison of ROMAS and traditional Autonomous MAS (GA = Generative Agent, AA = AutoAgents, MG = MetaGPT).

applicability. Interactive MAS, such as ReAct [Yao et al., 2023b], ChatCoT [Chen et al., 2023] and Voyager [Wang et al., 2023a], facilitate dynamic feedback and self-correction but struggle with high correction costs and the inability to rectify previously executed subtasks.

In terms of implementation, traditional MAS application development often relies on open-source frameworks, such as LangChain [Chase, 2022], RasaRasaHQ [2023], ChatDev [Qian et al., 2024], and AgentScope [Gao et al., 2024], which offer a range of development tools, simulated environments, and fundamental agent capabilities. Although these frameworks allow for the quick development of customized MAS systems, they are limited by their inability to handle diverse data management, provide robust built-in development components, and offer comprehensive complex problem solving toolkits, which hinders the full development potential of MAS applications.

To address the aforementioned limitations, we introduce ROMAS, a novel role-based multi-agent system deployed in DB-GPT³, featuring several key innovations.

- **Role-based collaboration.** ROMAS organizes agents into specific roles—planner, monitor, and worker. The planner creates global task lists and allocates subtasks to workers (§3.1). The monitor oversees workers, ensuring correctness and re-planning when needed (§3.2). This structure enables real-time self-supervision, enhancing flexibility and robustness.
- **Self-monitoring and self-planning.** ROMAS allows agents to evaluate their performance and adjust actions dynamically through self-monitoring and self-planning mechanisms, ensuring high adaptability to changing conditions and complex tasks.
- **Low-code development and one-click deployment.** We developed ROMAS on the DB-GPT, a multi-agent application framework that integrates efficient computing operators, rich database management components, user-friendly data analysis visualization, flexible multi-domain deployment, and the Agentic Workflow Expression Language (AWEL) for low-code streamlined development. DB-GPT provides users with an efficient, intuitive, and secure data interaction solution, facilitating development and simplifying deployment.
- **Enhanced database interactions.** ROMAS optimizes data retrieval, processing, and storage, with the help of DB-GPT’s advanced data handling capabilities. This makes ROMAS ideal for applications involving large datasets and complex analytics, ensuring efficient and effective data management.

2 Related Work

Recent research in MAS has focused on three key areas: structure design, application development frameworks, and scenario adaptation [Wang et al., 2024a, Jiang et al., 2023, 2024]. Structure design

³<https://github.com/eosphoros-ai/DB-GPT>

Module	Component	DB-GPT	AgentScope	AutoGen	LangChain
Rich component	Multiple databases	✓	✓	✗	✗
	Data analysis	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LLM proxy	✓	✓	✓	✓
	GraphRAG	✓	✓	✗	✗
Fine-tuning	Text2SQL	✓	✗	✗	✗
	NLU	✓	✗	✗	✗
	Prompt	✓	✓	✓	✓
Coding	Workflow language	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Operator	✓	✗	✓	✓
	Private deployment	✓	✗	✓	✗
	Distribution	✓	✓	✓	✗
User interaction	Drag-and-drop workshop	✓	✓	✗	✗
	Visualization page	✓	✓	✓	✗

Table 2: Comparison of DB-GPT and traditional agent application framework.

emphasizes enhancing agent performance through modules such as profile, memory, planning, and action [Masterman et al., 2024]. Application development framework emphasis on achieving low-code development, convenient deployment, and user interaction experience. Scenario adaptability emphasis on the ability to be effectively applied across various domains. A highly adaptable framework should be able to easily accommodate different task requirements without requiring extensive adjustments.

Autonomous MAS. We compare ROMAS with traditional MAS in terms of structural design and scenario adaptation as shown in table 1, Generative Agents [Park et al., 2023] simulates social role definitions, determining each agent’s behavior, tasks, and interaction modes. The memory module records all experiences through a memory stream and retrieves the highest-priority memories based on recency, importance, and relevance. However, in task planning, Generative Agents lack a global monitor mechanism, limiting ability to engage in global reflection and dynamic correction. AutoAgents [Chen et al., 2024] adaptively generate specialized agents to build an AI team, which consists of two critical stages: drafting stage and execution stage. During the drafting stage, the planner determines the plan list and the generation of agents through discussions with the agent observer and the plan observer. In the execution stage, the action observer corrects the behavior of individual agents. Although multiple global supervisory roles are set, there is no correction of the plan list during the execution stage. Therefore, if there is an error in the plan list during the drafting stage, it cannot be corrected in the execution stage. MetaGPT [Hong et al., 2024] assigns multiple engineer agent roles to collaboratively complete the software development coding and Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) writing. However, MetaGPT lacks a global monitor and can’t adaptively generate specialized agents. This means that once the plan is set, MetaGPT has limited flexibility for adjustments or corrections during execution.

Application framework. We compare DB-GPT with traditional agent application framework as shown in table 2, AgentScope [Gao et al., 2024] is a developer-centric multi-agent platform that offers user-friendly interfaces for application demonstration and monitoring, a zero-code programming workstation, and an automatic prompt tuning mechanism. In terms of coding, it provides rich syntactic tools, built-in and customizable fault tolerance mechanisms, and an actor-based distributed framework. However, AgentScope lacks components such as Text2SQL fine-tuning [Zhou et al., 2024b] for small models and ready-made operators, making it less suitable for data analysis compared to DB-GPT. LangChain [Chase, 2022] offers a rich set of components, such as LLMs, memory, and agents, as well as structured component collections like chains to accomplish specific tasks. However, LangChain lacks a user-friendly interface and does not support private deployment. AutoGen [Wu et al., 2023a] main tasks include: (1) defining conversational agents with specific capabilities and roles; and (2) programming the interaction behaviors between agents through computation and control within a dialogue center. However, programming based on a QA scenario has limitations when it comes to handling complex tasks.




Figure 1: ROMAS framework. The blue lines represent key message exchanged between agents and DB-GPT, the orange lines signify the three distinct phases of ROMAS, and the green lines denote each agent’s internal planning and reflection processes.

3 Methodology

ROMAS is a versatile data analysis framework based on the DB-GPT. Its principles prioritize high flexibility and comprehensive functionality, without being constrained by specific scenarios, data formats, or development complexity. The agent roles in ROMAS are divided into a planner, a monitor, and multiple workers [Yong and Miikkulainen, 2009] shown in figure 1, a detailed description of the role definition is provided in the appendix A.

The ROMAS comprises three critical phases: **initialization**, **execution**, and **re-planning**, each benefiting from the powerful database capabilities of DB-GPT. During the initialization phase, the planner decomposes the requirements based on the scenario description and known database information, forming a specialized agent team and designing specific task lists for each agent [Li et al., 2024a]. The execution phase relies on multi-agent cooperation [Du et al., 2023], with workers collaborating to complete tasks according to the planner’s plan. If errors occur, the system reports key global information to the monitor, awaiting further instructions. In the re-planning phase, the monitor and planner interact closely. If the monitor’s attempts to correct the errors fail, it triggers the planner to re-plan, integrating key information to assist in the planner’s decision-making.

3.1 Initialization Phase

In this phase as illustrated in figure 2, firstly the planner automatically generate the profile prompt based on templates and user input. Next, the planner will execute the self-planning process according to the profile. During this process, it will sequentially generate two key strategies: the cooperation workflow of the agent team and the task list for each agent. Once the strategies are generated, the planner will perform self-reflection process to check the effectiveness of these strategies. Finally, an action is executed to save the initial strategies and trigger the execution phase.

Self-planning process [Huang et al., 2024]. The input set $\langle G, D, C, A, T \rangle$ is defined in the profile. and the output set is $\langle AL, TL \rangle$ which is the input of self-reflection process. Goal G specifies the planner’s task goal in detail, which involve creating the entire cooperative agent team and assigning refined task lists for each worker. Description D describes the provided scenario information, including descriptions from user and a brief table with raw database index information for task assigning. Constraint C represents the constraints that the planner must adhere to when generating the agent team and task lists. Toolkit T is a set of pre-defined toolkits provided by DB-GPT like web search tool [Microsoft, 2023]. Multiple tools can be combined to complete specific tasks in the agent’s task list. Agentset A defines the range of agent roles available for generating the agent team. worker roles are limited to tasker, retriever, extractor, and painter. Each role has a pre-defined parent class template




Figure 2: Initialization phase of ROMAS, the planner is primarily responsible for two steps: self-planning and self-reflection. In self-planning, the planner generates the agent team and arranges subtask list. In self-reflection, these strategies are validated for logical consistency.

that includes many general capabilities, which can be directly inherited and further refined based on the specific scenario.

Agent list AL is a list of agents with a predefined call order, structured like a tree [Yao et al., 2023a]. tasker serves as the control center for each entire process including main process, planning and managing the workflow of each agent. Following steps are executed in sequence in the tasker: 1. call extractor: the extractor is responsible for extracting the required data from the raw data and storing it categorically for future needs. This step enhances efficiency and reduces redundant work. 2. call retriever: the retriever is responsible for recalling and assembling the metadata needed to complete the task from the stored data. This ensures that all necessary information is prepared and ready. 3. call painter (not necessary): the painter is responsible for handling complex data analysis and chart generation. It uses the data extracted and assembled in the previous steps to produce detailed analytical reports and intuitive charts, helping users better understand and interpret the data. Task list TL is a comprehensive series of tasks for each agent need to complete, with each task being derived from the robust DB-GPT resource library which encompasses a wide array of tools, including data extraction, data analysis, and more, designed to support a variety of complex operations and workflows.

Self-reflection process [Li et al., 2024c]. The planner primarily addresses two main aspects [Chen et al., 2024]: A. verifying the rationality of the agent team workflow. The following aspects are primarily checked: 1. compliance, ensuring that the agent team adheres to the specifications defined in the constraints. 2. scenario compatibility, verifying that the agent team is compatible with the scenario information defined in the description. 3. system-individual coupling, assessing whether

each agent can adapt to the entire team and determining if there is a need to add or remove any agents. B. verifying the rationality of each agent’s task list. The following aspects are primarily checked: 1. task interdependency: ensuring that tasks are combined in a logical manner to accomplish specific tasks. 2. input and output parameter logic: verifying that the input and output parameters of each task are logically consistent and that the task can be executed successfully to complete its assigned responsibilities.

Memory mechanism [Zhang et al., 2024]. ROMAS leverages a memory mechanism based on DB-GPT to facilitate communication and feedback between agents. However, due to the varying recency, importance, and relevance of different messages, as well as the limited prompt length processing capability of LLM, it is impractical to cover all messages in a single pass. To address this, ROMAS employs an effective memory categorization strategy, including sensory memory, short-term memory, and hybrid memory, ensuring efficient management and utilization of diverse types of information. Details of the memory mechanism implementation are in the appendix B.

3.2 Execution Phase




Figure 3: Execution phase of ROMAS, workers execute tasks based on the strategies formulated by the planner, monitor classifies errors and decides to either fix them directly or report to the planner for re-planning.

In this phase as illustrated in figure 3, When encountering errors, workers firstly attempt to self-correct using the self-reflection mechanism. If the error persists after retries, workers must report the global state to the monitor and await corrective instructions. Upon receiving the urgent information from workers, the monitor firstly classifies the errors. Errors can be classified into two types depending on nature: task list pipeline errors or agent team generation errors. For task list pipeline errors, which typically indicate a problem at a specific process node and regarded as relatively simple orchestration issues, the monitor can directly identify the fault and propose appropriate corrective instructions to the workers. For agent team generation errors, which typically indicates that there exists fundamental system issues in the planning process conducted by the planner. In this case, the monitor needs to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the overall information, formulate a set of improvement recommendations, and trigger the planner to restart the planning process in hopes of finding a better solution.

Error alert. When workers encounter a problem, they report the global state to the monitor. Due to the prompt length window limitation [Vaswani et al., 2023], the monitor only processes key information. Therefore, we require that workers encountering errors report detailed information related to both

the individual and the system, including logs, error messages, history records, and the self-reflection process. In contrast, workers that are operating normally only need to report their individual result data and system-related context information, such as operation results, history records, and logs. When a worker fails, it will broadcast an error message to all workers, all workers will then pause their tasks and report their current status to the monitor.

Error tree search strategy [Browne et al., 2012]. Based on empirical data, we have hierarchically organized the potential errors in the MAS into a tree structure, as shown in the appendix D. We classify errors into two major categories: pipeline errors and logical errors. Pipeline errors typically involve anomalies in the processing flow, while logical errors are related to defects in algorithm design. When the monitor collects error information, it organizes key information and performs similarity searches using this predefined error tree to pinpoint specific issues, starting from the root node and proceeding layer by layer until it identifies the specific leaf node.

Instruction and recommendation generation. After identifying the error type, the monitor plans the next steps based on the collected information from both the planner and the workers. (1). Agent team generation errors: The monitor retrieves the planner’s planning and reflection record from short-term memory in this current round. It also consolidates alert information provided by the workers, with a particular focus on error-related data. Based on this information, the monitor extracts key global insights and formulates recommendations, which are then transferred to the planner for replanning. (2). Task pipeline error, the monitor will assess whether the input and output results of each task and their upstream and downstream relationships meet the objectives according to the current strategy of the planner. It will then issue adjustment instructions to correct any discrepancies without triggering the planner to perform re-planning.

3.3 Re-planning Phase




Figure 4: Re-planning phase of ROMAS, planner receives global critical information and modification recommendation from the monitor to generate a new strategy for the current round.

In this phase as illustrated in figure 4, the main responsibility is on the planner. The planner receives global critical information and modification recommendation from the monitor, and combines them with its own historical strategies and experience information from the previous round to generate a new strategy for the current round. To ensure the effectiveness of the new strategy and avoid resource wastage during the execution stage when validating its effectiveness, we introduce a strategy called gap narrow. The gap narrow strategy aims to correct the errors from the previous round at the minimum cost and align the inconsistencies between the current round’s strategy and the previous round’s strategy through minimal modifications. This strategy not only enhances the system’s efficiency but also ensures the consistency and continuity of the strategies, thereby optimizing the overall performance. The algorithm at this stage is shown in the algorithm 1.

Gap narrow rule [Li et al., 2024b]. After generating the new strategy, we first use LLM to conduct a detailed comparison between the new and old strategies, analyzing and identifying their specific differences. Next, we establish a set of prior rules aimed at minimizing modifications to the old strategy. Then, we integrate comprehensive data from the monitor to perform a thorough reflection and correction on each difference point. This process not only ensures that each difference point effectively corrects the errors from the old strategy’s execution but also aims to achieve the best possible solution with the minimum modification cost [Zhang et al., 2020].

4 Experiments

Datasets. We conducted our experience based on following 2 dataset, empirical evidence has consistently demonstrated that ROMAS exhibits excellent performance in both general-knowledge and domain-specific scenarios.

- FAMMA [Xue et al., 2024a]. We focus on the financial data analysis scenario, a critical application area for generative language models [Xue et al., 2023c, Wu et al., 2023b], to evaluate the capabilities of ROMAS. FAMMA is an open-source benchmark for financial multilingual multimodal [Yin et al., 2024] question answering (QA) [Kapoor et al., 2024]. To adapt to the task requirements, we processed the original dataset by selecting 100 cases that include both text and table images in the input and have standard options in the output, and converted these table images into tabular format.
- HotpotQA [Yang et al., 2018]. To demonstrate reasoning capabilities in general scenarios, we selected 100 samples from HotpotQA. This dataset is renowned for its multi-hop reasoning questions and diverse question types, which encourage models to perform cross-document information integration and complex reasoning, thereby comprehensively evaluating and enhancing system performance in complex reasoning tasks.

Evaluation metrics. We select success rate, LLM evaluation [Wang et al., 2023b], and Human evaluation as metrics. Besides using success rate to evaluate whether the system outputs standard answers, we also adopt CoT to guide the agent in outputting its reasoning process along with standard options. LLM evaluation and Human evaluation are used to assess the accuracy, coherence, completeness, and logic of the descriptions [Wang et al., 2023b]. As shown in the appendixC, both LLM and human evaluation are scored based on a standard scale of 10 points per dimension, with a total of 100 points. The human score is independently evaluated by multiple financial analysis experts according to a unified standard, with reasons for the scores recorded and the final score averaged. By combining these three metrics, we can comprehensively assess the performance of ROMAS and validate its effectiveness.

Setup. We developed ROMAS based on GPT-4 [OpenAI et al., 2024], configuring the temperature to 0 to ensure the consistency of the model’s outputs. For each agent, the maximum retry count for self-reflection and self-planning was set to 2, mitigating the risk of failure in a single invocation of the LLM. The maximum retry count for the re-planning process was set to 3 to prevent exceeding context threshold.

Analysis I: Comparison with other LLM and MAS. As shown in table 3, we categorize the comparative objects into three groups: LLMs, single-agent with task planning capabilities, and the current advanced MAS. In the LLMs group, we selected Qwen2-72B [Yang et al., 2024], Llama2-70B [Touvron et al., 2023], and GPT-4, combining with single prompt technique as the baselines for experiments. The result indicates that GPT-4 performs the best, likely due to its extensive training with large-scale data and network parameters. In the single-agent group, we selected traditional decision-making models with task planning capabilities, including CoT, ToT, and ReAct. The result shows that ReAct significantly improves the baseline accuracy of LLMs. This improvement is likely because the thought-act-observation [Yao et al., 2023b] process in ReAct enables a more reflective and reasonable task planning process. In the MAS group, we compare the pioneering generative agent, which introduces reflective thinking mechanisms in the MAS domain, and AutoAgent, which also features role-based supervision. The result demonstrates that ROMAS outperforms the others. The advantage over the generative agent could be attributed to the introduction of the monitor mechanism, which offers error correction opportunities. ROMAS surpasses AutoAgent possibly because its task planning error correction occurs during the execution phase when real problems arise, rather than during the drafting phase as a prediction. Furthermore, ROMAS’s on-the-spot error correction

mechanism for pipeline errors significantly enhanced the efficiency of error correction in the MAS. Simultaneously, experimental results show that performance on the HotpotQA dataset surpasses that on FAMMA, particularly within the MAS grouping. This could be attributed to the LLM’s proficiency in handling general knowledge, as well as ROMAS can flexibly adjust strategies in the dynamical situation based on self-monitoring and self-planning process, which helps in handling the uncertainties and changes that may arise during multi-hop reasoning.

Grouping	Model	<i>SR</i>	<i>LLMEval</i>	<i>HumanEval</i>
		F / H(%)	F / H(0-100)	F / H(0-100)
LLM baseline	LLAMA2-70B	29.13 / 31.53	42.14 / 44.12	33.12 / 35.97
	QWEN2-72B	35.65 / 37.83	46.97 / 45.02	41.51 / 42.56
	GPT-4	42.85 / 45.36	48.72 / 47.20	47.19 / 48.85
LLM w/ task planning	CoT (GPT-4)	46.44 / 51.27	51.36 / 54.77	50.24 / 49.05
	ToT (GPT-4)	51.61 / 56.18	56.98 / 61.04	54.79 / 52.61
	ReAct (GPT-4)	56.80 / 61.44	57.82 / 63.29	60.26 / 62.07
State-of-art MAS	Generative Agent	61.20 / 67.08	64.31 / 69.37	62.03 / 66.07
	AutoAgents	73.45 / 78.99	70.55 / 73.08	68.07 / 71.11
	ROMAS	81.68 / 85.24	78.30 / 83.64	75.08 / 77.98

Table 3: Performance of ROMAS on FAMMA benchmark comparing with other LLM and MAS (F = FAMMA, H = HotpotQA).

Analysis II: Ablation study. As shown in table 4, a comparison of ROMAS performance with and without the corresponding components validates the effectiveness of each component.

On FAMMA. The result indicates that the absence of the monitor mechanism leads to the most significant decline in ROMAS success rate, underscoring its critical role. Secondly, the self-reflection module also has a considerable impact on the system, although its influence is less than that of the monitor mechanism. The reason for this may be that the self-reflection process can only accomplish independent reflection by the agent itself, based solely on predefined conditions and its own data. In contrast, the information from the monitor mechanism is derived from a global perspective, enabling it to improve the performance of individual agents by considering the overall system state, making the correction process more reliable. The memory mechanism also has a substantial impact on the overall performance of ROMAS, as memory serves as a crucial basis for agents to process information in each round. Without classified storage and prioritization of memory, the task planning capability of agents would significantly decrease. The gap narrow rule has the least impact on ROMAS, indicating that the success rate in the re-planning process after an initial correction is high, thus requiring minimal alignment operations.

Notably, on the HotpotQA, the self-reflection and memory mechanisms have the most significant impact. This disparity may be attributed to the differing inferential demands of the two datasets. The complex questions in FAMMA require precise monitoring mechanisms and self-reflection to avoid errors, whereas HotpotQA’s multi-hop reasoning characteristic necessitates a system with stronger memory capacity to maintain consistency and integrity across multiple steps, as well as self-reflection to correct biases in the reasoning process.

Model	<i>SR</i>	<i>LLMEval</i>	<i>HumanEval</i>
	F / H (% Δ vs.romas)	F / H (0-100)	F / H (0-100)
ROMAS w/o gap narrow rule	76.69 (\downarrow 4.99) / 79.17 (\downarrow 6.07)	72.76 / 70.61	70.85 / 69.29
ROMAS w/o memory mechanism	68.63 (\downarrow 13.05) / 64.83 (\downarrow 20.41)	65.63 / 68.37	62.50 / 68.45
ROMAS w/o self-reflection	62.37 (\downarrow 19.31) / 59.92 (\downarrow 25.32)	54.73 / 45.18	52.13 / 41.20
ROMAS w/o monitor mechanism	59.02 (\downarrow 22.66) / 71.79 (\downarrow 13.45)	42.31 / 53.20	40.02 / 50.18
ROMAS	81.68 / 85.24	78.30 / 83.64	75.08 / 77.98

Table 4: The ablation study of ROMAS (F = FAMMA, H = HotpotQA).

Analysis III: DB-GPT effectiveness demonstration. As shown in table 4, we validate the effectiveness of developing the ROMAS system using the DB-GPT framework through comparative

experiments. We also implemente the ROMAS system using two leading application frameworks, LangChain and AgentScope, and select code volume, average QA time, and task success rate as the evaluation metrics [Feng et al., 2020]. The result indicates that the DB-GPT framework significantly reduces the amount of code required for development. This is primarily due to the robust open-source community of DB-GPT, which has contributed numerous functions and operators that support one-click invocation, greatly simplifying the development process of agent applications. Moreover, DB-GPT’s extensive set of database operation tools and components further enhances the success rate of task execution and execution efficiency.

Application framework	<i>SR</i> (%)	<i>CodeVolume</i> (number of rows)	<i>AverageQATime</i> (second)
LangChain	68.59	2500	22.08
AgentScope	74.1	1800	19.97
ROMAS	81.68	1500	12.23

Table 5: Comparison of ROMAS implementation using DB-GPT, LangChain, and AgentScope.

Analysis IV: Argument on diversity and functionality. As shown in figure5, the six subtask categories predominantly center on DocumentQA [documentqa, 2023] and IndicatorQA, underscoring their importance in building a qa system and substantial influence on overall system performance. Additionally, for domain-specific dataset FAMMA, the higher task complexity, various data, and complex reasoning necessitate more specialized subtasks, frequent self-reflection and replanning. Consequently, the average frequency of self-reflection and replanning is higher, and the number of generated workers is also greater.




Figure 5: Figure 1 shows the average proportions of different subtask types in the FAMMA and HotpotQA. Figure 2 presents the average number of workers generated, the average self-reflection frequency per agent, and the average replanning frequency of the planner. Figure 3 displays the average proportions of instructions and recommendations given by the monitor.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented ROMAS, a role-based multi-agent system designed for database monitoring and planning, leveraging DB-GPT for enhanced self-monitoring, self-planning, and collaborative interaction. By addressing the limitations of current multi-agent systems, ROMAS enables efficient and versatile deployment in complex scenarios. Through evaluations on the FAMMA dataset, we demonstrated the system’s effectiveness, highlighting its potential to streamline analytical tasks and support future advancements in intelligent multi-agent systems.

Appendices

A Role Introduction

The planner aims to decompose user requests and scenario information into clear, well-defined subtasks, generates the entire specialized agent team [Chen et al., 2024], and assigns a task list for each agent.

The monitor is responsible for overseeing the entire system, ensuring global smooth operation through continuous interaction with workers and the planner. If an error occurs during execution, the monitor analyzes global information to categorize this error as either task list pipeline error or agent team generation error. Depending on the type of error, monitor decides whether to correct the error itself or to report it to the planner for replanning.

To align with the typical processes of data acquiring, data cleaning, data processing, and data analysing [Maharana et al., 2022] in a data analysis scenario, we have categorized workers into the following roles:

Tasker, as the primary manager for subtasks, aims to complete subtasks by flexibly planning the collaboration between extractors, retrievers, and painters. One system can abstract different types of taskers based on various subtasks, such as indicator tasker, document QA tasker, GraphRAG tasker [Peng et al., 2024], and summary tasker.

Extractor, as a data processing assistant, aims to achieve information extraction and index storage from structured and unstructured raw data. Its functions include PDF document loading, data preprocessing, document block segmentation, document tree construction, table extraction and merging, and the storage of text and table data.

Retriever, as a data acquiring helper, aims to retrieve the necessary data from the most suitable database to support taskers. Its functions include sql generation, sql execution, python execution, composite index calculation.

Painter, as a data analysing helper, aims to draw relevant charts based on the provided data, making it easier for users to intuitively understand the analysis results.

B Memory Mechanism of ROMAS

Sensory memory [Wang et al., 2024a] is similar to human transient memory and primarily used for recording and capturing real-time sensory information interacted with environment such as one-time and repetitive actions of agents. Some important parts in Sensory memory is transferred to Short-term memory over time.

Short-term memory [Wang et al., 2024a] stores recent important information with limited capacity and duration. This type of memory temporarily holds information that requires quick access and processing, such as the agent’s current self-planning and self-reflection results, agent current situations, context information, temporary strategy. Some important parts in short-term memory is transferred to long-term memory over time.

Long-term memory [Wang et al., 2024a] stores the knowledge and patterns learned by the agent from past experiences, which are used to guide future decisions and actions. In ROMAS, long-term memory commonly stores agent’s vital erroneous information and summaries of historical decisions.

Hybrid memory [Wang et al., 2024a] explicitly combines the advantage of short-term and long-term memories, leveraging immediate data for short-term tasks while utilizing accumulated knowledge for long-term strategy and learning. In ROMAS, hybrid memory is commonly used to generate the current round strategy based on the previous round’s strategy and the current round’s state, such as in the replanning phase, the planner combines its historical strategy in long-term memory with the global state in monitor’s short-term memory to generate this round’s new strategy.




Figure 6: We divided the evaluation criteria into 10 dimensions based on common standards for large models.

C Dimension of LLM and Human Evaluation

D Error tree search




Figure 7: Error tree search, we classified common errors in MAS into two categories based on empirical data: pipeline and logic and constructed an error tree as reference for monitor’s error classification, enabling precise error cause identification by DFS [Tarjan, 1972].

E Re-planning phase algorithm

F Ongoing and Future Works

We are actively exploring several extensions to enhance the capability and versatility of our system, particularly in addressing more complex dialogue and analytical tasks. Our key areas of focus include:

- Empowering computational agents. Users increasingly expect systems not only to perform analyses but also to deliver advanced computational capabilities, such as generating predictive insights [Jin et al., 2023, Xue et al., 2024c] and facilitating decision-making based on historical data [Xue et al., 2022a, Pan et al., 2023, Zhou et al., 2024a]. Developing these functionalities will significantly enhance the system’s utility in real-world applications, such as recommendation systems [Chu et al., 2023, Wang et al., 2024b] and traffic control [Xue et al., 2022b].

Algorithm 1 Re-planning phase

Require: global state from monitor G , recommendation from monitor R , user query Q , old strategy S_{old} , scenario prompt P

- 1: generate a new strategy, $S_{new} \leftarrow \text{LLM}(G, R, Q, S_{old}, P)$.
- 2: compute differences D between S_{new} and S_{old} , $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\} \leftarrow \text{LLM}(S_{new}, S_{old})$.
- 3: establish prerequisites $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ aimed at minimizing modifications.
- 4: **for** each difference $d_i \in D$ **do**
- 5: **for** each rule $r_j \in R$ **do**
- 6: **if** d_i does not follow r_j **then**
- 7: regenerate d_i based on $\{G, R, Q, S_{old}, P\}$
- 8: **break**
- 9: **else**
- 10: reflect on whether d_i has improved S_{old} based on G and R
- 11: **if** not improved **then**
- 12: regenerate differences D based on $\{G, R, Q, S_{old}, P\}$
- 13: **break**
- 14: **end if**
- 15: **end if**
- 16: **end for**
- 17: **end for**
- 18: ensure each corrected difference integrates properly to form the optimized strategy S_{opt}
- 19: **return** optimized strategy S_{opt}

- Adopting advanced model training methodologies. Beyond pre-training, the integration of advanced techniques such as continual learning, including continual pre-training [Jiang et al., 2023, 2024], and prompt learning [Wang et al., 2022, Xue et al., 2023b], offers opportunities to improve the system’s adaptability and performance. Leveraging these methods will drive advancements in the development of systems for computational use and foster further innovation in the research community.

References

- Peter Anderson, Angel Chang, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Saurabh Gupta, Vladlen Koltun, Jana Kosecka, Jitendra Malik, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Manolis Savva, et al. On evaluation of embodied navigation agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06757*, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.06757>.
- Cameron B. Browne, Edward Powley, Daniel Whitehouse, Simon M. Lucas, Peter I. Cowling, Philipp Rohlfshagen, Stephen Tavener, Diego Perez, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Simon Colton. A survey of monte carlo tree search methods. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games*, 4(1):1–43, 2012. doi: 10.1109/TCIAIG.2012.2186810.
- Harrison Chase. LangChain, 2022. URL <https://github.com/hwchase17/langchain>.
- Guangyao Chen, Siwei Dong, Yu Shu, Ge Zhang, Jaward Sesay, Börje F. Karlsson, Jie Fu, and Yemin Shi. Autoagents: A framework for automatic agent generation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17288>.
- Zhipeng Chen, Kun Zhou, Beichen Zhang, Zheng Gong, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Chatcot: Tool-augmented chain-of-thought reasoning on chat-based large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14323>.
- Zhixuan Chu, Hongyan Hao, Xin Ouyang, Simeng Wang, Yan Wang, Yue Shen, Jinjie Gu, Qing Cui, Longfei Li, Siqiao Xue, et al. Leveraging large language models for pre-trained recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10837*, 2023.
- documentqa. documentqa. see <https://huggingface.co/tasks/document-question-answering>, 2023.

- Yali Du, Joel Z. Leibo, Usman Islam, Richard Willis, and Peter Sunehag. A review of cooperation in multi-agent learning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.05162>.
- Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, and Ming Zhou. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08155>.
- Dawei Gao, Zitao Li, Xuchen Pan, Weirui Kuang, Zhijian Ma, Bingchen Qian, Fei Wei, Wenhao Zhang, Yuexiang Xie, Daoyuan Chen, Liuyi Yao, Hongyi Peng, Zeyu Zhang, Lin Zhu, Chen Cheng, Hongzhu Shi, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Jingren Zhou. Agentscope: A flexible yet robust multi-agent platform, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14034>.
- Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. MetaGPT: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VtmBAGCN7o>.
- Xu Huang, Weiwen Liu, Xiaolong Chen, Xingmei Wang, Hao Wang, Defu Lian, Yasheng Wang, Ruiming Tang, and Enhong Chen. Understanding the planning of llm agents: A survey, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.02716>.
- Gangwei Jiang, Caigao Jiang, Siqiao Xue, James Y. Zhang, Jun Zhou, Defu Lian, and Ying Wei. Towards anytime fine-tuning: Continually pre-trained language models with hypernetwork prompt. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.13024>.
- Gangwei Jiang, Caigao Jiang, Zhaoyi Li, Siqiao Xue, Jun Zhou, Linqi Song, Defu Lian, and Ying Wei. Interpretable catastrophic forgetting of large language model fine-tuning via instruction vector. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12227>, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12227>.
- Ming Jin, Qingsong Wen, Yuxuan Liang, Chaoli Zhang, Siqiao Xue, Xue Wang, James Zhang, Yi Wang, Haifeng Chen, Xiaoli Li, Shirui Pan, Vincent S. Tseng, Yu Zheng, Lei Chen, and Hui Xiong. Large models for time series and spatio-temporal data: A survey and outlook, 2023.
- Sayash Kapoor, Benedikt Stroebl, Zachary S. Siegel, Nitya Nadgir, and Arvind Narayanan. Ai agents that matter, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01502>.
- Ao Li, Yuexiang Xie, Songze Li, Fugee Tsung, Bolin Ding, and Yaliang Li. Agent-oriented planning in multi-agent systems, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.02189>.
- Jiahui Li, Hanlin Zhang, Fengda Zhang, Tai-Wei Chang, Kun Kuang, Long Chen, and Jun Zhou. Optimizing language models with fair and stable reward composition in reinforcement learning. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10122–10140, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024b. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.565. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.565>.
- Yuanchun Li, Hao Wen, Weijun Wang, Xiangyu Li, Yizhen Yuan, Guohong Liu, Jiacheng Liu, Wenxing Xu, Xiang Wang, Yi Sun, Rui Kong, Yile Wang, Hanfei Geng, Jian Luan, Xuefeng Jin, Zilong Ye, Guanqing Xiong, Fan Zhang, Xiang Li, Mengwei Xu, Zhijun Li, Peng Li, Yang Liu, Ya-Qin Zhang, and Yunxin Liu. Personal llm agents: Insights and survey about the capability, efficiency and security, 2024c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.05459>.
- Kiran Maharana, Surajit Mondal, and Bhushankumar Nemade. A review: Data pre-processing and data augmentation techniques. *Global Transitions Proceedings*, 3(1):91–99, 2022. ISSN 2666-285X. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gltp.2022.04.020>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666285X22000565>. International Conference on Intelligent Engineering Approach(ICIEA-2022).
- Tula Masterman, Sandi Besen, Mason Sawtell, and Alex Chao. The landscape of emerging ai agent architectures for reasoning, planning, and tool calling: A survey, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.11584>.

Microsoft. bing. see <https://www.microsoft.com/zh-cn/bing/search-app-desktop?rtc=1>, 2023.

OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorný, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>.

Chen Pan, Fan Zhou, Xuanwei Hu, Xinxin Zhu, Wenxin Ning, Zi Zhuang, Siqiao Xue, James Zhang, and Yunhua Hu. Deep optimal timing strategies for time series. In *ICDM*, 2023.

Joon Sung Park, Joseph C. O’Brien, Carrie J. Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03442>.

Boci Peng, Yun Zhu, Yongchao Liu, Xiaohe Bo, Haizhou Shi, Chuntao Hong, Yan Zhang, and Siliang Tang. Graph retrieval-augmented generation: A survey, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.08921>.

- Chen Qian, Wei Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Nuo Chen, Yufan Dang, Jiahao Li, Cheng Yang, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Xin Cong, Juyuan Xu, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Chatdev: Communicative agents for software development, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.07924>.
- Bo Qiao, Liqun Li, Xu Zhang, Shilin He, Yu Kang, Chaoyun Zhang, Fangkai Yang, Hang Dong, Jue Zhang, Lu Wang, Minghua Ma, Pu Zhao, Si Qin, Xiaoting Qin, Chao Du, Yong Xu, Qingwei Lin, Saravan Rajmohan, and Dongmei Zhang. Taskweaver: A code-first agent framework, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17541>.
- RasaHQ. Rasa. <https://github.com/RasaHQ/rasa>, 2023.
- Robert Tarjan. Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1(2): 146–160, 1972. doi: 10.1137/0201010. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0201010>.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>.
- Harsh Trivedi, Tushar Khot, Mareike Hartmann, Ruskin Manku, Vinty Dong, Edward Li, Shashank Gupta, Ashish Sabharwal, and Niranjan Balasubramanian. Appworld: A controllable world of apps and people for benchmarking interactive coding agents. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.18901>.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>.
- Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlkar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.16291>.
- Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Wayne Xin Zhao, Zhewei Wei, and Jirong Wen. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6), March 2024a. ISSN 2095-2236. doi: 10.1007/s11704-024-40231-1. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11704-024-40231-1>.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Liang Chen, Zefan Cai, Dawei Zhu, Binghuai Lin, Yunbo Cao, Qi Liu, Tianyu Liu, and Zhifang Sui. Large language models are not fair evaluators, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17926>.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models, 2023c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11171>.
- Yan Wang, Zhixuan Chu, Xin Ouyang, Simeng Wang, Hongyan Hao, Yue Shen, Jinjie Gu, Siqiao Xue, James Y Zhang, Qing Cui, Longfei Li, Jun Zhou, and Sheng Li. Llmrg: Improving recommendations through large language model reasoning graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2024b. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/29887>.

- Zifeng Wang, Zizhao Zhang, Chen-Yu Lee, Han Zhang, Ruoxi Sun, Xiaoqi Ren, Guolong Su, Vincent Perot, Jennifer Dy, and Tomas Pfister. Learning to prompt for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 139–149, 2022.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903.pdf>.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Ryen W White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.08155>.
- Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhajan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17564>.
- Siqiao Xue, Chao Qu, Xiaoming Shi, Cong Liao, Shiyi Zhu, Xiaoyu Tan, Lintao Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shijun Wang, Yun Hu, Lei Lei, Yangfei Zheng, Jianguo Li, and James Zhang. A meta reinforcement learning approach for predictive autoscaling in the cloud. In *KDD '22: The 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, August 14 - 18, 2022*, pages 4290–4299. ACM, 2022a. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3534678.3539063>.
- Siqiao Xue, Xiaoming Shi, Y James Zhang, and Hongyuan Mei. Hypro: A hybridly normalized probabilistic model for long-horizon prediction of event sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.01753>.
- Siqiao Xue, Caigao Jiang, Wenhui Shi, Fangyin Cheng, Keting Chen, Hongjun Yang, Zhiping Zhang, Jianshan He, Hongyang Zhang, Ganglin Wei, Wang Zhao, Fan Zhou, Danrui Qi, Hong Yi, Shaodong Liu, and Faqiang Chen. Db-gpt: Empowering database interactions with private large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17449*, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.17449>.
- Siqiao Xue, Yan Wang, Zhixuan Chu, Xiaoming Shi, Caigao Jiang, Hongyan Hao, Gangwei Jiang, Xiaoyun Feng, James Zhang, and Jun Zhou. Prompt-augmented temporal point process for streaming event sequence. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.04993>.
- Siqiao Xue, Fan Zhou, Yi Xu, Ming Jin, Qingsong Wen, Hongyan Hao, Qingyang Dai, Caigao Jiang, Hongyu Zhao, Shuo Xie, Jianshan He, James Zhang, and Hongyuan Mei. Weaverbird: Empowering financial decision-making with large language model, knowledge base, and search engine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05361*, 2023c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.05361>.
- Siqiao Xue, Tingting Chen, Fan Zhou, Qingyang Dai, Zhixuan Chu, and Hongyuan Mei. Famma: A benchmark for financial domain multilingual multimodal question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04526*, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.04526>.
- Siqiao Xue, Danrui Qi, Caigao Jiang, Wenhui Shi, Fangyin Cheng, Keting Chen, Hongjun Yang, Zhiping Zhang, Jianshan He, Hongyang Zhang, Ganglin Wei, Wang Zhao, Fan Zhou, Hong Yi, Shaodong Liu, Hongjun Yang, and Faqiang Chen. Demonstration of db-gpt: Next generation data interaction system empowered by large language models. In *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.10209>.
- Siqiao Xue, Xiaoming Shi, Zhixuan Chu, Yan Wang, Hongyan Hao, Fan Zhou, Caigao Jiang, Chen Pan, James Y. Zhang, Qingsong Wen, Jun Zhou, and Hongyuan Mei. Easytpp: Towards open benchmarking temporal point processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.08097>.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang,

- Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10671>.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2018. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1259.pdf>.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10601>.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.03629>.
- Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models. *National Science Review*, page nwae403, 11 2024. ISSN 2095-5138. doi: 10.1093/nsr/nwae403. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwae403>.
- Chern Han Yong and Risto Miikkulainen. Coevolution of role-based cooperation in multiagent systems. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*, 1(3):170–186, 2009. doi: 10.1109/TAMD.2009.2037732.
- Hengjie Zhang, Sihai Zhao, Gang Kou, Cong-Cong Li, Yucheng Dong, and Francisco Herrera. An overview on feedback mechanisms with minimum adjustment or cost in consensus reaching in group decision making: Research paradigms and challenges. *Information Fusion*, 60:65–79, 2020. ISSN 1566-2535. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2020.03.001>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S156625351930781X>.
- Zeyu Zhang, Xiaohe Bo, Chen Ma, Rui Li, Xu Chen, Quanyu Dai, Jieming Zhu, Zhenhua Dong, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on the memory mechanism of large language model based agents, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.13501>.
- Fan Zhou, Chen Pan, Lintao Ma, Yu Liu, Siqiao Xue, James Zhang, Jun Zhou, Hongyuan Mei, Weitao Lin, Zi Zhuang, Wenxin Ning, and Yunhua Hu. Gmp-ar: Granularity message passing and adaptive reconciliation for temporal hierarchy forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2024a. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/28795>.
- Fan Zhou, Siqiao Xue, Danrui Qi, Wenhui Shi, Wang Zhao, Ganglin Wei, Hongyang Zhang, Caigai Jiang, Gangwei Jiang, Zhixuan Chu, and Faqiang Chen. Db-gpt-hub: Towards open benchmarking text-to-sql empowered by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11434*, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11434>.