

# Bel Esprit: Multi-Agent Framework for Building AI Model Pipelines

Yunsu Kim   AhmedElmogtaba Abdelaziz   Thiago Castro Ferreira  
 Mohamed Al-Badrashiny   Hassan Sawaf  
 aiXplain, Inc.  
 Los Gatos, CA, USA  
 {firstname.lastname}@aixplain.com

## Abstract

As the demand for artificial intelligence (AI) grows to address complex real-world tasks, single models are often insufficient, requiring the integration of multiple models into pipelines. This paper introduces *Bel Esprit*, a conversational agent designed to construct AI model pipelines based on user-defined requirements. Bel Esprit employs a multi-agent framework where subagents collaborate to clarify requirements, build, validate, and populate pipelines with appropriate models. We demonstrate the effectiveness of this framework in generating pipelines from ambiguous user queries, using both human-curated and synthetic data. A detailed error analysis highlights ongoing challenges in pipeline construction. Bel Esprit is available for a free trial at <https://belesprit.aixplain.com><sup>1</sup>.

## 1 Introduction

AI has traditionally been applied to atomic tasks, each addressed by a single model. Over time, task coverage has expanded through multi-task learning (Ruder, 2017; Zhang and Yang, 2021) and, more recently, with generally pre-trained models exhibiting emergent capabilities (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2022a).

Even models capable of handling multiple tasks are often insufficient for complex tasks, especially those involving multiple inputs or outputs, e.g., multimodal content moderation or multilingual video dubbing (Figure 1). Such tasks can be better addressed by integrating different models, where each model handles a specific aspect of the problem. By constructing a pipeline of interconnected models, we can automate intermediate steps and facilitate seamless task transitions. This approach, known as cascading models into a pipeline, has been widely used in applications like speech trans-

**Query:** I want to dub my video clip in French, German, and Spanish




Figure 1: Query and model pipeline for multilingual video dubbing.

lation (Ney, 1999; Matusov, 2009) and voice conversion (Wu et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2020).

This paper presents *Bel Esprit*<sup>2</sup>, a conversational assistant that implements sophisticated pipeline solutions composed of diverse AI models. Here are our main contributions:

- We formally define the task of model pipeline building as a graph generation problem involving scientific reasoning.
- We design a multi-agent framework that systematically enhances pipeline quality and alignment with user intent.
- We establish a rigorous evaluation scheme for pipeline building, including a data preparation protocol and automatic metrics for performance assessment.

## 2 Task Definition

Pipeline generation is defined as a structured prediction task, where the input is a user query describing a computational task, and the output is a pipeline of AI functions designed to solve it. Each AI function may have one or more parameters, such as the language in speech recognition. The final output

<sup>1</sup>Demo video: <https://youtu.be/3KFSvrOP0bY>

<sup>2</sup>French for “beautiful mind”




Figure 2: Agentic flow of Bel Esprit.

is represented as a graph, with nodes representing inputs, outputs, and functions, and edges denoting the data flow between them. To enhance the functionality of a pipeline, we introduce three special node types:

- **Router:** Directs the input data to different subsequent nodes based on its modality.
- **Decision:** Routes data according to specific input values.
- **Script:** Executes an arbitrary task by running Python code.

Pipeline generation can be viewed as deductive reasoning where the AI functions exist as *premises* about data *entities* (Yu et al., 2023). Each premise conveys scientific knowledge from specific input types to output types. Given a user query as a new comprehensive *conclusion*, the task objective is to find a reasoning path comprising multiple premises (Saha et al., 2020; Creswell et al., 2022; Saporov and He, 2022).

### 3 Framework

In this work, we use a large language model (LLM) to process user queries and generate pipeline structures through guided prompts. Instead of producing the pipeline in a single step, the framework follows a sequential yet partially cyclic flow involving multiple subagents (Figure 2). The process begins with *Mentalist*, followed by *Builder*, which creates an initial pipeline. This pipeline is then reviewed by *Inspector*. If the review fails, it loops back to *Builder* for revisions until an error-free pipeline is generated or the maximum iteration limit is reached. Once the pipeline passes inspection, it proceeds to *Matchmaker*, completing the final pipeline. Details on the *Matchmaker* are provided in Appendix C, while the remaining components are discussed in this section.




Figure 3: Example conversation between Mentalist and a user. The refined query is colored in blue.

### 3.1 Mentalist

Mentalist is the agent responsible for interacting with the user and analyzing their requirements.

#### 3.1.1 Query Clarifier

User queries are often too ambiguous to build a correct solution. For example, they may lack a detailed problem description, such as how “risk” is defined in a risk management system, or omit properties of the data, like the language of the input text. *Query Clarifier*, a chat-based interface, addresses this by converting potentially ambiguous user queries into fully developed solution specifications. It identifies missing information and prompts the user in a friendly manner to fill in the gaps. Once all necessary details are gathered, the system enters a confirmation stage, summarizing the conversation into a refined query that clearly outlines the solution’s inputs, outputs, and their modalities, along with their relationships. An example conversation is shown in Figure 3.

	Name	Modality	Language
Input	Video file	Video	English
Output	Audio track 1	Audio	French
	Audio track 2	Audio	German
	Audio track 3	Audio	Spanish

Table 1: Specification example.

### 3.1.2 Specification Extractor

After the user confirms the clarified query, *Specification Extractor* extracts technical details from it in a structured format. The specification includes a short name, modality, and required parameters (e.g., language) for each input and output (Table 1). Relying solely on long natural language queries often results in errors when building a solution. In contrast, structured information offers clear guidance on which input and output nodes must be included, providing a strong foundation for constructing the intermediate flows.

If the user attaches files to clarify the task, *Mentalist* analyzes them and links them to the corresponding inputs in the specification (Appendix B).

## 3.2 Builder

After *Mentalist* finalizes the user requirements, *Builder* constructs the pipeline graph based on the initial user query, the refined query (Section 3.1.1), and the extracted specification (Section 3.1.2). *Builder* is implemented using an LLM prompted with information on data types, function identifiers, node types, and graph constraints (Appendix A). Given the complexity of this task (Section 2), a few example pipelines are included in the prompt to guide the generation process (Brown et al., 2020). *Builder*’s output can be in any structured format, such as DOT or JSON, as long as it maintains a bijective mapping to the intended graph structure.

### 3.2.1 Chain-of-Branches

Building a large graph in a single step is highly challenging. Generating token sequences in structured formats often leads to issues like hallucination and loss of consistency within the structure (Poesia et al., 2022; Beurer-Kellner et al., 2024; Tam et al., 2024). Inspired by the chain-of-thought approach (Wei et al., 2022b), we decompose the solution graph into subgraphs, focusing on distinct branches. Each branch represents a path from one or more input nodes to an output node within the




Figure 4: Example of generation using chain-of-branches. Gray dashed arrows indicate connections to previously generated nodes in existing branches. The final pipeline is in Figure 1.

graph, meaning a pipeline graph with  $N$  output nodes will have  $N$  branches. These branches can act as standalone solutions to subproblems derived from the user query. After constructing one branch, additional branches can often reuse nodes (inputs or functions) from existing branches, thereby reducing the number of nodes and edges required for each branch.

To leverage this approach, we prompt the LLM to generate one branch at a time, completing all nodes and edges for that branch before moving to the next (Figure 4). At the start of each branch, we instruct the model to generate a brief comment marked with a special symbol to clarify the subproblem it addresses, ensuring the boundaries between branches remain distinct and coherent.

## 3.3 Inspector

LLMs are particularly vulnerable to errors in scientific reasoning when dealing with lengthy contexts (Ahn et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024). Even with a clarified and detailed query, inaccuracies may still arise due to the complexity of the solution or misinterpretation of user requirements. To address these errors in LLM outputs, many previous studies have employed a critic model to assess potential inaccuracies (Ke et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024; Gou et al., 2024). Similarly, we developed *Inspector*, which analyzes the builder’s output to identify errors in both the graph structure and semantic alignment with user requirements.

### 3.3.1 Syntax

The first inspection phase assesses the integrity of the generated graph. Independent of the graph’s intended function, we can detect structural errors that violate model pipeline constraints, often related to




Figure 5: Example of syntax errors (highlighted in red).

improper node connections (see Appendix A).

Some violations can be mechanically corrected immediately upon detection. Figure 5a illustrates such a case during the generation of Branch 1 in Figure 4. The output from a function node should connect to a single output node, but here, multiple output nodes are linked to the same function output. This issue often arises when the user specifies multiple outputs in the solution. In such cases, we can resolve the error by retaining only one of the output nodes and removing the duplicates.

Figure 5b illustrates an example where no simple correction is feasible. The machine translation (MT) node requires text input, yet audio extracted from a video input is routed directly to it. Resolving this modality mismatch involves either locating an existing node in the graph that produces the necessary text output or creating a new node to perform the required transformation. Such complex corrections require assistance from the LLM to reconstruct the graph (Section 3.2).

### 3.3.2 Semantics

The second phase of inspection verifies whether the generated graph effectively fulfills the user’s specified requirements, even if it contains no syntactic errors. We employ an LLM to evaluate the semantic alignment of the graph flow with the user’s specified requirements. For each branch, the LLM is provided with a natural language summary that lists the nodes sequentially, outlining the path and context within the pipeline. The LLM then identifies the corresponding requirements in the specification (Section 3.1.2) and flags any unmatched or missing steps in the branch path.

Figure 6 shows an example where the branch passes structural checks but fails in semantic alignment. In this case, the English transcription is routed directly to a French text-to-speech (TTS) node, assuming the same text modality suffices




Figure 6: Example of semantic errors in a branch (highlighted in orange).

for synthesis; the builder overlooked the necessary translation step, resulting in a mismatch between the automatic speech recognition (ASR) output language and the intended TTS language.

## 4 Experimental Setup

To evaluate pipeline generation, we prepared query-pipeline pairs with evaluation metrics.

### 4.1 Data

**Manual creation** Given the high-level scientific nature of the task, we recruited five AI solution engineers at aiXplain, Inc. to create realistic tasks and their corresponding pipelines. To avoid redundancy, each expert’s work was shared with others, ensuring that no duplicate pipelines were produced. Each pipeline was then reviewed and, if necessary, revised by at least one other expert.

### Structured synthesis with human correction

To scale data collection, we automate the initial pipeline creation using rule-based expansion. In this approach, nodes in a pipeline graph are expanded by adding others that match the input-output specifications. Starting with one or more input nodes, we construct a tree-like structure that can branch into multiple output nodes. To manage complexity, we parameterize the number of AI function nodes and restrict each node to have a maximum of two children.

An LLM generates specifications and clear queries that enumerate the inputs and outputs. To simulate realistic user interactions, we then synthesize an initial user query by intentionally introducing ambiguity into the LLM prompt. Details for this dataset are provided in Appendix D.

### 4.2 Metrics

**Exact Match (EM)** First, we compute the proportion of cases where the generated pipeline exactly matches the reference pipeline. Two nodes are considered a match if their types are identical and, if applicable, their functions and parameters are the same. For LLM nodes, we match prompts based on cosine similarity of their sentence embed-

Framework setup	GPT-4o		Llama 3.1 405B		Llama3.1 70B	
	EM [%]	GED [%]	EM [%]	GED [%]	EM [%]	GED [%]
Builder	15.7	65.1	13.6	71.7	14.1	70.7
+ Query clarifier	25.1	44.4	21.5	52.8	19.0	54.4
+ Specification extractor	26.0	41.4	21.9	52.6	21.1	52.7
+ Chain-of-branches	25.2	40.3	21.9	52.6	19.0	53.9
+ Syntactic inspector	25.6	38.3	22.7	48.2	19.4	49.8
+ Semantic inspector	25.2	37.0	20.3	48.9	19.4	53.9

Table 2: Pipeline generation performance across framework configurations and Builder LLMs.

dings, with a threshold of 0.5. For script nodes, we consider two code snippets a match if an LLM determines they perform the same task. Edges are matched if they connect the same source and target nodes with identical parameters.

Since node and edge numbering may differ between the generated and reference pipelines, determining an exact match (EM) requires solving the graph isomorphism problem. We adapt the VF2 algorithm (Cordella et al., 2004) to account for our problem in this process.

**Graph Edit Distance (GED)** In our initial study, we found that many non-matching pipelines differ only slightly, typically by a single node or edge. Assigning a full penalty to such cases is too severe, as EM fails to capture incremental improvements. Therefore, we adopt a more fine-grained metric—graph edit distance (GED)—to quantify the deviation between the generated and reference graphs by counting the number of edit operations required to make them identical. These operations include insertion, deletion, or substitution of nodes or edges, with equal weight of 1.0 assigned to each for simplicity. We apply the same matching conditions for nodes and edges as used in EM.

We use NetworkX<sup>3</sup>’s implementation of the depth-first GED algorithm (Abu-Aisheh et al., 2015). Given the potential computational cost for large pipelines, we limit the running time for each pipeline pair to 60 seconds.<sup>4</sup>

### 4.3 Models

Mentalist’s query clarifier (Section 3.1.1) and Builder (Section 3.2) utilize GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024), while the rest of the framework, including data synthesis and evaluation, relies on the Llama 3.1 70B model (Dubey et al., 2024) when LLM as-

sistance is required. Prompt similarity is computed using the all-MiniLM-L6-v2 model of Sentence Transformers (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019).

## 5 Results

Table 2 shows the pipeline generation performance across various framework configurations. Starting with a baseline pipeline builder, we incrementally incorporate components from Mentalist, Builder, and Inspector, achieving +9.5% EM and -28.1% GED overall. For the Builder, the high-end proprietary model (GPT-4o) outperforms open-source alternatives, with performance declining as model size decreases. Smaller models like Llama 3.1 8B and Solar 10.7B (Kim et al., 2024) yielded unacceptable performances, with EM rates below 3%.

Each component’s contribution is evident in GED improvements for GPT-4o but less consistent for weaker models. Appendix E shows an example of the incremental contribution of the components in pipeline generation. EM fails to capture these nuanced improvements. As a side note, semantic inspection occasionally confuses weaker Builders, leading to unnecessary graph repetitions and sporadic performance drops.

**Ambiguity of query** As shown above, ambiguity in user queries is inevitable in user-facing applications and is a primary factor contributing to poor pipeline generation performance. To quantify its impact, we used the GPT-4o model to rate the ambiguity of queries in our dataset in three levels: unambiguous, ambiguous, and very ambiguous. Pipelines in our dataset were then categorized by these levels, and performance metrics were computed for each group, as shown in Figure 7. The results demonstrate that pipeline generation becomes increasingly challenging with higher ambiguity. The Mentalist subagent significantly improves performance in such cases by clarifying

<sup>3</sup><https://networkx.org/>

<sup>4</sup>We used Macbook Pro 2023 (with Apple M2 Pro) machine for evaluation.






Figure 7: Performance over different levels of query ambiguity.




Figure 8: Performance over increasing pipeline size.

missing information in queries and concretizing input and output requirements.

**Pipeline size** To analyze the complexity of the pipeline generation problem, we measure performance as a function of reference pipeline size, shown in Figure 8. As expected, larger pipelines—such as simultaneous processing of the same input across multiple paths—are more challenging to construct. However, the chain-of-branches technique proves to be effective in handling these cases by breaking the graph into manageable subgraphs.

## 6 Edit Analysis

This section analyzes errors in generated pipelines using GED, highlighting discrepancies from reference pipelines. Figure 9 shows error distributions in our framework with GPT-4o and the Builder (Table 2, last row). Most errors stem from node substitutions, often due to parameter mismatches or incorrect node types (Figure 10).

Node insertions occur when the builder fails to address all query requirements, often in large pipelines. Node deletions typically result from redundant function repetitions in separate paths (Figure 14b). Both edits are also required when a




Figure 9: Distribution of edits required to align generated pipelines with reference pipelines.




Figure 10: Breakdown of causes for node substitution errors.

misplaced node must be relocated to another path in the graph, which in turn needs corresponding edge insertions and deletions. These errors are generally less significant compared to node substitutions.

Edge errors often involve missing connections, usually when a function requires multiple inputs (Figure 14c). While the Inspector can detect these issues readily, resolving them remains challenging as it requires comprehensive semantic understanding of the graph and query to locate the correct node supplying the missing data.

## 7 Conclusion

This paper introduces a novel task of generating AI solution pipelines from user queries and proposes Bel Esprit, a multi-agent framework, consisting of Mentalist, Builder, and Inspector, which incrementally improve pipeline quality through query clarification, stepwise construction, and validation.

Future work includes employing retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) with a pool of valid pipelines, incorporating user feedback for pipeline editing, and extending the framework to generate autonomous agents beyond static pipelines.

## Limitations

Although the Mentalist (Section 3.1) enhances performance in ambiguous scenarios, the system still struggles with highly ambiguous queries, especially when critical input or output requirements are missing.

Pipeline building (Section 3.2) and matchmaking (Appendix C) are restricted to a predefined pool of AI functions. Expanding this pool and incorporating their parameter details increases the prompt length, leading to higher computational costs. Generic nodes (Appendix C.1) address this partially but are currently limited to text-to-text functions.

The Inspector (Section 3.3) does not verify the generated code for script nodes (Appendix C.2), requiring custom test cases tailored to each script, which is not yet automated.

## References

- Zeina Abu-Aisheh, Romain Raveaux, Jean-Yves Ramel, and Patrick Martineau. 2015. An exact graph edit distance algorithm for solving pattern recognition problems. In *4th International Conference on Pattern Recognition Applications and Methods 2015*.
- Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 225–237.
- Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Martin Vechev. 2024. Guiding llms the right way: Fast, non-invasive constrained generation. In *The 41th International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901.
- Luigi P Cordella, Pasquale Foggia, Carlo Sansone, and Mario Vento. 2004. A (sub) graph isomorphism algorithm for matching large graphs. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 26(10):1367–1372.
- Antonia Creswell, Murray Shanahan, and Irina Higgins. 2022. Selection-inference: Exploiting large language models for interpretable logical reasoning. In *The 11th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2024. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. In *The 12th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Wen-Chin Huang, Tomoki Hayashi, Shinji Watanabe, and Tomoki Toda. 2020. The sequence-to-sequence baseline for the voice conversion challenge 2020: Cascading asr and tts. In *Joint Workshop for the Blizzard Challenge and Voice Conversion Challenge 2020*, pages 160–164.
- Pei Ke, Bosi Wen, Zhuoer Feng, Xiao Liu, Xuanyu Lei, Jiale Cheng, Shengyuan Wang, Aohan Zeng, Yuxiao Dong, Hongning Wang, et al. 2023. Critiquellm: Scaling llm-as-critic for effective and explainable evaluation of large language model generation. *arXiv:2311.18702*.
- Sanghoon Kim, Dahyun Kim, Chanjun Park, Wonsung Lee, Wonho Song, Yunsu Kim, Hyeonwoo Kim, Yungi Kim, Hyeonju Lee, Jihoo Kim, Changbae Ahn, Seonghoon Yang, Sukyung Lee, Hyunbyung Park, Gyoungjin Gim, Mikyoung Cha, Hwalsuk Lee, and Sunghun Kim. 2024. SOLAR 10.7B: Scaling large language models with simple yet effective depth up-scaling. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, pages 23–35, Mexico City, Mexico.
- Yubo Ma, Zhibin Gou, Junheng Hao, Ruochen Xu, Shuohang Wang, Liangming Pan, Yujiu Yang, Yixin Cao, Aixin Sun, Hany Awadalla, et al. 2024. Sciagent: Tool-augmented language models for scientific reasoning. *arXiv:2402.11451*.
- Evgeny Matusov. 2009. *Combining Natural Language Processing Systems to Improve Machine Translation of Speech*. Ph.D. thesis, RWTH Aachen University.
- Hermann Ney. 1999. Speech translation: Coupling of recognition and translation. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Proceedings (ICASSP)*, volume 1, pages 517–520.
- OpenAI. 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv:2410.21276*.
- Gabriel Poesia, Alex Polozov, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Gustavo Soares, Christopher Meek, and Sumit Gulwani. 2022. Synchronesh: Reliable code generation

- from pre-trained language models. In *The 11th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sebastian Ruder. 2017. An overview of multi-task learning in deep neural networks. *arXiv:1706.05098*.
- Swarnadeep Saha, Sayan Ghosh, Shashank Srivastava, and Mohit Bansal. 2020. Prover: Proof generation for interpretable reasoning over rules. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 122–136.
- Abulhair Saparov and He He. 2022. Language models are greedy reasoners: A systematic formal analysis of chain-of-thought. In *The 11th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhi Rui Tam, Cheng-Kuang Wu, Yi-Lin Tsai, Chieh-Yen Lin, Hung-yi Lee, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2024. Let me speak freely? a study on the impact of format restrictions on performance of large language models. *arXiv:2408.02442*.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022a. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35.
- Yichiao Wu, Patrick Lumban Tobing, Tomoki Hayashi, Kazuhiro Kobayashi, and Tomoki Toda. 2018. The nu non-parallel voice conversion system for the voice conversion challenge 2018. In *The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop (Odyssey 2018)*, pages 211–218.
- Wenda Xu, Daniel Deutsch, Mara Finkelstein, Juraj Juraska, Biao Zhang, Zhongtao Liu, William Yang Wang, Lei Li, and Markus Freitag. 2024. Llmrefine: Pinpointing and refining large language models via fine-grained actionable feedback. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 1429–1445.
- Fei Yu, Hongbo Zhang, and Benyou Wang. 2023. Natural language reasoning, a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14725*.
- Yu Zhang and Qiang Yang. 2021. A survey on multi-task learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)*, 34(12):5586–5609.

## A Graph Constraints

Below you can find the list of constraints to be a valid graph for a model pipeline.

### Input nodes

- An input node should have no previous nodes
- An input node should have only one output parameter

### Output nodes

- An output node should have no next nodes
- There should be no multiple output nodes with the same incoming link

### Router nodes

- A router node should have a single input node as its predecessor
- A router node should have two or more output parameters, each of which has a different modality
- A router node should not be connected with another router node

### Function nodes

- A function name should exist in the predefined list of functions
- Parameters of a function node should exist in the predefined list of parameters
- A function node should have all its required input parameters

### General Node I/O

- An input parameter should have only one incoming link
- An output parameter should have at least one outgoing link if it is not an output node


### Connectivity

- Every node should be reachable from an input node

### Edges

- An edge should connect existing parameters
- The connected parameters should have the same modality





	Name	Attachment
Input	Input speech	<a href="#">@star.wav</a>
	Reference voice	<a href="#">@moon.wav</a>
Output	Converted speech	N/A

Figure 11: Attachment matching example.

## B Attachment Matcher

In our pilot study, we found that many users begin their interaction with Bel Esprit by attaching a file they want to work with, for example, stating, “I want to work with this text file to extract all named entities and identify any grammatical errors.” Once a solution is generated, users often want to know which input node in the pipeline graph corresponds to the attached file. While matching is straightforward when there is only a single input node, it becomes more challenging when there are multiple input nodes, especially when some share the same modality.

In such cases, semantic analysis of the conversation is necessary to determine the specific characteristics of each input. Files may also be attached mid-conversation, with contextual clues before and after the attachment providing critical information for accurate matching. *Attachment Matcher* detects these associations and assigns each attached file to the appropriate input node. Note that file names themselves are not passed to the builder, as they may not be directly relevant to the solution.

## C Matchmaker

The pipeline graph generated by the builder specifies only the data flow logic of the solution, without assigning specific models to each function node. Model selection is treated as a detail independent of the core solution structure. For instance, a dubbing solution could employ an ASR model from

**Query:** I want to understand English news clips more easily




Figure 12: Example pipeline using a generic node.

**Query:** If I give you a summary, extend it to a long article; if it’s an article, then summarize it.




Figure 13: Example pipeline with a script node.

Google or Microsoft for transcription; while this choice might influence performance, it does not alter the primary solution logic.

Users may express specific preferences for model selection, such as favoring the latest models available on a platform or selecting models with expertise in specialized domains, e.g., legal or medical fields. *Matchmaker* gathers any additional information not utilized in the graph-building phase to identify the models that best align with these preferences. When no specific model criteria are provided, Matchmaker defaults to a predefined model choice.

In cases where a node requires a task for which no suitable model exists in the current pool—often due to a complex, novel task in the user query or gaps in the platform’s model library—Matchmaker ensures no nodes are left unresolved by employing the following fallback strategies to address these gaps.

### C.1 Generic Nodes

Recent LLMs can perform generic tasks beyond their specific training when given a clear prompt. When certain AI functions are unavailable, we insert a custom LLM node for text-to-text tasks, with the prompt derived from the relevant part of the user query. This approach is useful for tasks like paraphrasing, domain mixing, or creative writing, where specialized models are scarce.

### C.2 Script Generator

Some nodes are designated not for AI tasks but for simpler functions, such as counting words or extracting text from a PDF. General LLMs are not suited for these tasks, as a basic script with the right libraries is sufficient.

To automate this process, we use an LLM to generate scripts for these unpopulated nodes. We begin by providing a script template that defines the input/output and their modalities, allowing the LLM to complete the method part based on the task description.

## D Query-Pipeline Dataset

**Pipeline types** We define five pipeline types to balance diversity and simplicity during synthesis by excluding overly complex connections:

- **Sequential:** A single input linearly flows through a chain of nodes, where each node uses the output of the previous one.
- **Single-branching:** A single input branches into multiple independent paths, each ending in an output node.
- **Sequence-branching:** A single input is processed by a linear sequence of nodes first and then branches into multiple paths.
- **Merging:** Distinct branches from separate inputs merge and continue processing.
- **Router:** Distributes a single input via a router node to specialized paths based on modality.


**Review process** Pipeline synthesis involves randomness, occasionally producing nonsensical results. To address this, an LLM first assigns binary labels to filter such pipelines based on their descriptions. Retained pipelines then undergo a second review by one of the authors of this paper to ensure their integrity and applicability to real-world business contexts. Notably, the search-based generation ensures logical correctness, eliminating the need for human reviewers to validate graph structures.

**Statistics** We synthesized around 100 pipelines for each of the five types. After review, we curated a dataset of 441 pipelines, comprising 82 real and 359 synthetic examples.

## E Qualitative Example


Figure 14 illustrates an example of incremental improvements in pipeline generation. The initial user query is ambiguous, as it does not specify the input language. The plain Builder assumes English as the input language and generates a pipeline accordingly. Mentalist refines the query to explicitly indicate that the input language is unknown, resulting in a pipeline that first performs language

**Query:** I want to translate my speech into French and German




(a) Builder (plain)


**Refined Query:** The requested solution takes speech in an unknown language as input and converts it to French text. The input language will be detected automatically.



(b) Mentalist + Builder (plain)



(c) Mentalist + Builder (chain-of-branches)



(d) Mentalist + Builder (chain-of-branches) + Inspector

Figure 14: Examples of generated pipelines across framework configurations.

identification and passes the detected language to the ASR function.

However, this version redundantly includes separate ASR nodes for French and German outputs. The chain-of-branches technique resolves this redundancy by generating one path at a time, enabling the reuse of the ASR node. Despite this improvement, the MT nodes lack source language parameters. The final configuration, which incorporates Inspector, identifies this issue and adds edges from the language identifier to the MT nodes, producing a complete and correct pipeline.