

HammerBench: Fine-Grained Function-Calling Evaluation in Real Mobile Device Scenarios

Jun Wang^{*,1} Jiamu Zhou^{*,1} Muning Wen² Xiaoyun Mo¹
Haoyu Zhang¹ Qiqiang Lin¹ Cheng Jin¹ Xihuai Wang²
Weinan Zhang² Qiuying Peng^{+,1} Jun Wang^{+,1}
{wangjun15,zhoujiamu,moxiaoyun,zhanghaoyu1,linqiqiang1,
jincheng,pengqiuying,wangjun7}@oppo.com
{muningwen,leoxhwang,wnzhang}@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Evaluating the capabilities of large language models (LLMs) in human-LLM interactions remains challenging due to the inherent complexity and openness of dialogue processes. This paper introduces HammerBench, a novel benchmarking framework designed to assess the function-calling ability of LLMs more effectively in such interactions. We model a wide range of real-world user scenarios on mobile devices, encompassing imperfect instructions, diverse question-answer trajectories, intent/argument shifts, and the use of external individual information through pronouns. To construct the corresponding datasets, we propose a comprehensive pipeline that involves LLM-generated data and multiple rounds of human validation, ensuring high data quality. Additionally, we decompose the conversations into function-calling snapshots, enabling a fine-grained evaluation of each turn. We evaluate several popular LLMs using HammerBench and highlight different performance aspects. Our empirical findings reveal that errors in parameter naming constitute the primary factor behind conversation failures across different data types¹.

1 Introduction

In the context of personal mobile phone assistants, many user requests necessitate a sequence of operations and interactions (Yan et al., 2024). This highlights the importance of handling multi-turn interaction cases and underscores their fundamental role in such systems. For example, in tasks such as ticket purchasing, multiple interactions are often required to collect and provide the completed context about essential arguments necessary for correct function-calling. However, evaluating dia-

logue systems remains a challenging problem (De-riu et al., 2021) as the behavior and expressions of real users can be highly diverse, indirect, and even unexpected.

Given the complexity of user behavior patterns, the evaluation of interaction quality in complex scenarios may require human participation (Zhang et al., 2023; Lai and Tan, 2019; Wang et al., 2024b; Zhang et al., 2020; Buçinca et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2023). However, considering the high costs associated with manual evaluation, significant efforts have been made to develop automatic evaluation methods for multi-turn dialogues, especially with the advent of large language models (LLMs). DialogBench (Ou et al., 2023) generates conversations for twelve tasks to assess the fine-grained capabilities of LLMs using GPT-4. Similarly, MT-Bench (Bai et al., 2024) leverages GPT-4 for dialogue evaluations. In the context of multi-turn function-calling scenarios, BFCL (Yan et al., 2024) evaluates LLMs’ capabilities in handling missing arguments, missing functions, and long contexts. NoisyToolBench (Wang et al., 2024a) introduces a learning-based approach to address hallucinations under incomplete instructions. However, certain real-world interaction scenarios remain inadequately evaluated in these benchmarks, particularly those that involve intelligent personal assistants (Apple-Inc., 2024). In these scenarios, users communicate with agents to provide the necessary parameters for a desired API (Lin et al., 2024). However, based on the analysis of logs from anonymized real users, we have identified several key aspects that require more comprehensive evaluation: 1) users may provide more or fewer responses than expected; 2) they may frequently modify their intents or arguments due to errors or other reasons during the interaction; 3) users may refer to external individual information indirectly, often using pronouns instead of directly specifying slot values.

^{*}Equal Contribution, ⁺Corresponding Author, ¹OPPO Research Institute, ²Shanghai Jiao Tong University

¹The code and datasets will be publicly available at <https://github.com/MadeAgents/HammerBench>.

To address the challenges outlined above, we introduce HammerBench, a fine-grained, multi-turn function-calling benchmark designed around three core principles: authenticity, diversity, and granularity. For authenticity, we curated our benchmark dataset based on real-world functionalities sourced from the most popular mobile apps on the OPPO App Store, in addition to queries derived from the behavioral analysis of anonymized user logs. Then, we extend the benchmark dataset using open-source models, proposing our data generation pipeline which is cost-effective and commercially accessible.

Our data generation pipeline is meticulously crafted, comprising both basic and fine-grained generation stages. By analyzing anonymized user logs, we found that 76% of user queries consist of fewer than 10 tokens, often representing incomplete or ambiguous instructions. To accommodate this, we have designed the basic generation pipeline specifically to generate such short-form data. In fine-grained generation stages, to further enhance the reliability of the generated data, we incorporate a dedicated LLM check module, inspired by the methodology outlined in Li et al., 2024. Instances that fail to pass the verification are manually corrected, while those that succeed are randomly sampled for additional inspection. After the basic datasets are generated, we randomly merge conversational turns to evaluate the diverse question-answer trajectories typical of real-world interactions. Moreover, we introduce new conversational turns to simulate shifts in intent and arguments, ensuring that the benchmark reflects the complexities of real-world dialogues. Finally, we propose an efficient and convenient method for constructing instances involving pronouns and the simulation of corresponding external individual knowledge, further enhancing the benchmark’s ability to evaluate LLM agents in a variety of realistic contexts.

As for evaluation, existing benchmarks typically assess only the overall success rate of the entire conversation. To facilitate a more granular investigation for multi-turn interactions, we classify a conversation into multiple types of snapshots and evaluate models on them separately. This approach not only provides detailed investigations but also decouples the capabilities of LLMs. For example, when asking users for missing slot values, models should be able to: 1) identify all missing parameters in the user’s query; 2) determine which of these parameters need to be asked; and 3) gener-

ate contextually appropriate questions; 4) promptly end the conversation and call APIs. However, for many lightweight models, such as those deployed on mobile devices, it is difficult to concurrently possess these capabilities. By breaking an interaction into multiple snapshots, we realize that LLMs can focus more on their function-calling capabilities, which leads to better performance. We conduct a comparative experiment and justify this insight with corresponding results.

We conduct comprehensive experiments on HammerBench, utilizing various function-calling snapshots. Our findings indicate that LLMs with enhanced generalization capabilities demonstrate superior resilience to perturbations. Besides, open-source LLMs show considerable potential for improvement when compared to GPT-4, particularly in the context of diverse question-answer trajectories and scenarios involving intent shifts. And all of them predict error in the case of imperfect instructions because of parameter name errors. Based on these results, we also deliver crucial insights for the future optimization of robust function-calling LLMs.

2 Principles of Ideal Benchmarks

Through the analysis of anonymized user logs and trials of existing benchmarks, we identify that an ideal benchmark should incorporate three essential dimensions: authenticity, diversity, and granularity.

Authenticity Queries should come from real users and reflect users’ behaviour. However, queries extracted from user logs typically follow a long-tail distribution, meaning that certain rare yet experience-affecting scenarios may be under-represented. Consequently, it may be necessary to supplement the dataset with additional instances from these sparse, long-tail scenarios to ensure a more comprehensive evaluation of such cases. Besides, the design of the API must prioritize reflecting the genuine user experience. Traditional API interfaces are typically developed with well-defined parameters tailored for developers, ensuring precise and efficient interactions. However, such developer-centric parameters often fail to provide a user-friendly experience, especially in contexts like mobile assistant interactions. To avoid the need for users to input cumbersome and non-intuitive parameter information, it is essential to consider tools abstracted from authentic API functionalities as equally legitimate in terms of their

operational capabilities. These tools facilitate a more seamless and intuitive user experience, while still preserving the integrity and reliability of the underlying API functions.

Diversity The diversity of tools, queries, and user behaviors is essential in creating a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating LLM agents’ function-calling abilities. A diverse range of tools ensures that the benchmark tests agents across various domains, including natural language processing, machine learning, and domain-specific APIs, reflecting real-world multi-tasking scenarios. Query diversity captures variations in user queries, ranging from simple requests to complex, multi-step tasks, as well as different expressions of the same intent, thereby challenging the agent’s adaptability to varying user inputs. User behavior pattern diversity involves accounting for different interaction styles, such as detailed versus vague queries, as well as how users invoke tools, either in a single turn or over multiple exchanges. This diversity enables the benchmark to assess how well the agent handles different contexts, maintains conversation flow, and adjusts to varied user expectations, providing a more robust evaluation of its function-calling capabilities.

Granularity Granularity refers to the level of detail and modularity in a benchmark’s evaluation criteria. An ideal benchmark must strike a balance between fine-grained assessments of individual tasks and the ability to combine these tasks to evaluate more complex scenarios. By decomposing tasks into atomic components, such as function calls or multi-turn interactions, granularity allows for the identification of specific strengths and weaknesses in a model’s performance. For instance, a model’s ability to execute a single function call can be distinguished from its performance in handling intricate, multi-turn interactions involving reasoning or memory. This level of detail ensures that subtle deficiencies—such as mismanagement of dependencies or errors—are captured. Moreover, a granular, composable benchmark is adaptable, enabling the integration of new evaluation dimensions and use cases as language models evolve. This approach allows for comprehensive, yet precise, assessments of function-calling abilities across varying levels of complexity.

3 Related Works

3.1 Dialogue System Evaluation

Evaluating dialogue systems presents significant challenges due to the inherent openness and diversity of conversational expressions, making rule-based evaluations difficult. Early work, such as topic-based evaluation for conversational bots (Guo et al., 2017), proposed training a topic classifier to assess dialogue quality by evaluating each sub-topic individually. With the advent of large language models (LLMs), newer approaches have focused on using LLMs as evaluators. For example, Zheng et al., 2023 highlighted the rationale behind leveraging large models for dialogue evaluation. The evaluation of multi-turn dialogues has increasingly incorporated LLMs for automatic assessment. Notably, MT-Bench (Bai et al., 2024) and MT-Eval (Kwan et al., 2024) utilize GPT-based models to evaluate dialogues. These frameworks decompose the dialogue process into fine-grained sub-tasks, evaluating each using expert-designed prompts for GPT-4. MT-Bench, for instance, assesses dimensions such as Context Memory, Anaphora Resolution, Topic Shift, and Reasoning, while MT-Eval focuses on scenario-based evaluation across four key dimensions: Recollection, Expansion, Refinement, and Follow-up. When introducing the function-calling problem into the dialogue process, it is essential to consider how the dynamics of the dialogue process impact the final function-calling outcome, rather than focusing solely on the function calling itself. This adds complexity to the evaluation process, given the intricate and nuanced nature of conversational interactions.

3.2 Function Calling Benchmark

Existing function-calling benchmarks are primarily categorized into single-turn and multi-turn evaluations. In single-turn benchmarks, tools such as ToolAlpaca (Tang et al., 2023), ToolLLM (Qin et al., 2023), and NexusRaven (team, 2023) adopt a human-free methodology to automatically generate datasets using the world knowledge embedded in large language models. In contrast, ToolBench (Xu et al., 2023), RestGPT (Song et al., 2023), and NESTFUL (Basu et al., 2024) build high-quality benchmarks through purely human-labeled data. Additionally, BFCL-V1 and SealTool (Wu et al., 2024) utilize the self-instruct method (Wang et al., 2023b) to construct benchmarks, while BFCL-V2 refines its dataset through the cleaning of online

Benchmark	Construction Method	Single-turn			Multi-turn			External Individual Information
		Perfect	Imperfect	Irrelevant	Intent Shifts	Diverse Q&A Trajectories	Argument Shifts	
API-Bank	Human	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
BFCL	LLM+Human	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
NoisyToolBench	Human	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
ToolSandBox	Human	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
HammerBench (Ours)	LLM+Human	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Comparison between existing benchmarks and ours. Table 2 provides detailed descriptions of Perfect, Imperfect, Irrelevant, Intent Shifts, Diverse Q&A Trajectories, Argument Shifts, and External Individual Information.

user log data. Despite these advancements, single-turn benchmarks still fall short in replicating the diversity of real-world user interactions and are insufficient for evaluating the true function-calling capabilities of models.

Multi-turn function-calling benchmarks, such as API-Bank (Li et al., 2023) and NoisyToolBench (Wang et al., 2024a), build high-quality dialogue data entirely through manual efforts. MINT (Wang et al., 2023a) primarily focuses on evaluating the use of interactive tools, including reasoning, code, and ALFWorld data, and examines the impact of utilizing external tools in question answering. BFCL-V3 and ToolSandBox (Yan et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024) provides a relatively comprehensive multi-turn function-calling evaluation system. However, its dataset still exhibits gaps when compared to interactions with real users, such as argument shifts.

In the broader context of agent evaluations, multi-turn benchmarks such as AgentBoard (Ma et al., 2024) and Agent as Judge (Zhuge et al., 2024) have introduced comprehensive evaluation systems for agent capabilities. However, these frameworks remain general in scope and do not specifically target the nuanced challenges of multi-turn function calling. Based on the limitations of existing work, which fails to address fine-grained multi-turn function-calling evaluations involving external information and argument shifts, we propose a more targeted evaluation system. Table 1 shows the comparison between these benchmarks and ours.

4 HammerBench

In this section, we introduce the design principles underlying HammerBench and outline the methodology used to generate various datasets. All datasets are constructed using open-source LLMs, including Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-GPTQ-Int4 and Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-GPTQ-Int4.

4.1 Design Principles of HammerBench

Based on the principles discussed in the previous section, we elaborate on how HammerBench incorporates these dimensions in its design and implementation.

Authenticity of Test Data: All tools within HammerBench are designed with real-world prototypes, with a particular focus on user-friendliness. The datasets reflect the most commonly used mobile application functionalities, specifically those found on the OPPO App Store. User queries are derived from the behavioral analysis of anonymized user logs, capturing a wide range of user intents, from frequent to rare long-tail scenarios encountered during daily use of mobile assistant applications.

Diversity of Evaluation Scenarios: Our benchmark incorporates a wide range of diverse evaluation scenarios designed to challenge different capabilities. These include the following four categories within the multi-turn interactive slot-filling task: 1) Imperfect instructions, where queries may lack clarity or specificity; 2) Varied question-answer trajectories, capturing different conversational paths and user expectations; 3) Intent and argument shifts, where users modify their goals or inputs throughout the conversation; and 4) User queries incorporating external individual information, such as context or background details not explicitly stated in the interaction.

Fine-Grained Evaluation: HammerBench decomposes multi-turn function calls into smaller, manageable snapshots, enabling precise evaluation of individual components. The advantage of this approach is demonstrated experimentally, as illustrated in Table 4. Specifically, we analyze intent shifts, as well as the handling of pronoun resolution, scenarios commonly observed in real-world user interactions. Targeted evaluations are conducted to assess the model’s ability to accurately process and

respond to these complex scenarios.

4.2 Data Construction and System Implementation

The construction of the dataset in HammerBench follows a systematic approach, beginning with the collection of the toolset and followed by the automatic generation, validation, and manual refinement of the dataset. The overall process refers to Figure 1.

Tool collection and API Generation : HammerBench’s toolset is collected for mobile users, focusing on functionalities commonly found in OPPO App Store applications. We begin by identifying highly downloaded apps, clustering them into 60 functional categories based on expert opinions. Descriptive prompts (see Appendix D.1) are created for each category, and APIs are generated using LLMs. Given the limitations of simple prompts, the generation process is broken into stages: generating function names, descriptions, parameters, and returns. Human oversight is incorporated at each stage to ensure usability and avoid overly complex parameters. Redundancy is minimized by ensuring distinct tool functionalities within each category.

Validation and Refinement : Each generated API is then subjected to a thorough manual review and refinement process to ensure its quality and applicability. This process results in the final selection of 1,063 APIs. This process is guided by two core principles: completeness and rationality. Completeness ensures that the APIs within each functional category adequately cover all typical usage scenarios, thereby ensuring that they represent the full range of possible interactions within that category. Rationality, on the other hand, requires that the definition, input, and output of each API are both clear and concise, avoiding unnecessary complexity while maintaining operational integrity. To facilitate the generation of function-calling instances, we apply the self-instruct method (Wang et al., 2023b) to create function-calling instances. This process yields three types of instructions: (1) perfect instructions, which correspond to complete function calls with all required parameters; (2) imperfect instructions, where one or more key arguments are missing; and (3) function-irrelevant instructions, which trigger a rejection signal when no appropriate function can be called. The refinement process ensures that each API is both functional and user-friendly, enabling accurate and efficient evaluation within the benchmark framework.

4.2.1 Multi-Turn Interactions for Imperfect Instructions

Given that 76% of the queries in user logs contain fewer than 10 tokens, we devised a methodology to generate datasets that reflect these typical query lengths. For each API, we first prompt large language models (LLMs) to identify the parameters most frequently used in daily applications, as illustrated in Figure 1. The corresponding prompt for parameter selection is provided in Appendix D.3. Subsequently, LLMs are constrained to generate instructions that incorporate these selected parameters (see Appendix D.2). If any parameters are missing or extraneous parameters are included, the model is instructed to regenerate the query until it adheres to the preset parameter list.

Through this process, we obtain imperfect instances that pass format verification. However, it is observed that hallucinations are prevalent in these instances. To mitigate this, we introduce a semantic validation step inspired by prior work (Li et al., 2024). Specifically, for each generated instance, we assess whether the function call generated by the LLM remains consistent when the instruction is presented in both zero-shot and one-shot in-context learning settings. Consistency is evaluated using two metrics: (1) Rouge-L, with a pre-defined threshold, and (2) semantic alignment, which is measured by re-evaluating the function call with the LLM. The rationale behind this semantic checking process is that instructions that are correctly processed in a zero-shot scenario are considered more reliable and less prone to hallucinations. These instances are thus re-validated, first through zero-shot and then through one-shot learning.

Once these instances are selected, they undergo manual inspection to ensure overall quality. A sampling review is conducted to further assess the integrity of the generated function calls. Ultimately, this process yields 3,240 imperfect instances, which serve as the foundation for constructing basic multi-turn function-calling scenarios, as detailed in the following sections.

4.2.2 Diverse Question-answer Trajectories

Building on the imperfect instructions outlined in the previous section, we extend these instances to create multi-turn function-calling dialogues that involve interactive slot-filling. To evaluate the model’s ability to handle varying conversational flows, we design four distinct types of question-




Figure 1: HammerBench consists of following process: toolset construction, data generation, external knowledge generation and check module, and finally obtains generated datasets. Besides, the external individual information part serves as an auxiliary module that converts the query-label pairs generated from the three stages into instances with pronouns. Blocks with GPT icons indicate the integration of LLMs, while the orange block represents the verification module. Green blocks are used to denote the various data types corresponding to each phase.

and-answer trajectories:

- **Single-Question-Single-Answer:** In this trajectory, the model queries a single argument, and the user responds with a corresponding single value. This basic structure ensures that the model can accurately elicit a single piece of information.
- **Multi-Question-Multi-Answer:** In this trajectory, the model queries a single argument, and the user responds with a corresponding single value. This basic structure ensures that the model can accurately elicit a single piece of information.
- **Single-Question-Multi-Answer:** In this scenario, the model inquires about a single argument, but the user provides answers that correspond to multiple arguments. This trajectory challenges the model’s ability to handle more nuanced user responses and manage multiple interpretations of a query.
- **Multi-Question-Single-Answer:** The model presents multiple questions, yet the user answers only one. This scenario is designed to test the model’s ability to handle incomplete information and adapt to user responses that do not follow the expected trajectory.

To construct these trajectories, we first generate single-question-single-answer instances using

the prompts provided in Appendix D.7. These instances undergo the semantic checking and human review processes discussed in Section 4.2.1. Subsequently, the remaining trajectories are derived by combining the questions and/or answers from the single-question-single-answer dataset. Specifically, we randomly merge questions posed by the model and answers provided by the user to form the different dialogue structures. This approach results in a diverse range of multi-turn interaction patterns, ultimately producing 2,310 distinct instances for evaluation.

4.2.3 Intent and Argument Shifts

In real-world interactions, users often exhibit abrupt shifts in their intentions or modify their slot values for various reasons. For instance, if a tool requires excessive parameter input, users may find the process cumbersome and opt for a different tool, or they may unexpectedly change their goal midway through the interaction. In this section, we aim to evaluate whether the model can recognize such intent shifts and appropriately respond with a rejection signal, thereby terminating the conversation.

To build the dataset for intent shifts, we begin with instances derived from the *Single-Question-Single-Answer* trajectories. Specifically, we randomly select a user input within a dialogue and replace it with an arbitrary single-turn function call instruction pertaining to a different API, as shown




Figure 2: Examples of four types of test cases in HammerBench: 1) Diverse Q&A trajectories are generated by randomly merging user-agent interactions; 2) Intent shifts: agent should terminate the current session when users change their intent during the Q&A process; 3) Argument shifts: three cases of changing slot values during the interactions; 4) External individual information: users answer with pronouns instead of exact external information, which are frequently encountered in real-world interactions.

in Figure 2. This randomization process enables the creation of 1,098 instances that simulate sudden shifts in user intent. Additionally, we consider two types of argument shifts that challenge the model’s ability to handle evolving user input: slot overriding and repurposing of the API after a function call.

For slot overriding, users may introduce multiple values for the same parameter across a dialogue, but only the most recent value is required for the function call. This shift can be particularly challenging for models, as they must accurately recognize and apply the most up-to-date argument. To generate these instances, we modify several *Single-Question-Single-Answer* dialogues, either by inserting new turns where users explicitly request to override a previous argument or by appending an override request at the end of an existing user input. This process yields 1,462 instances involving slot overriding.

In the case of repurposing the API, users may alter certain parameters of an already executed function call while retaining the original values for others. This shift tests the model’s flexibility in reusing prior function calls while adapting to new input values. To construct these instances, we insert a new user input turn after a function call, introducing updated parameter values while pre-

serving the existing ones. In total, 1,066 instances involving repurposing are generated.

4.2.4 References to External Individual Data

In user interactions with AI assistants, it is common for users to reference information through pronouns, rather than providing specific values directly. This is particularly true when users seek to retrieve or reference external data not explicitly stated within the conversation. To evaluate models’ abilities in Anaphora Resolution, we propose a novel approach for generating datasets that incorporate references to external individual data, as depicted in the right-hand section of Figure 1. These references can be drawn from any single-turn or multi-turn function call instance, with no limitation on the method of external data acquisition, such as retrieval tools or other resources.

The dataset construction begins by selecting nine distinct information entities commonly referenced in such scenarios, including human names, company names, product identifiers, license plate numbers, ID numbers, time, location, songs and singers, and five specific applications (SMS, Email, Instant Messaging, Social Media, and Notebook). These entities serve as external sources that carry the precise values for these references. For each instance, we use LLMs to identify whether any of the argu-

Evaluation Type	Data Type	Abbr.	Description
Single-turn	Single-turn perfect instruction	Perfect	The user query that clearly gives the required parameter value
	Single-turn imperfect instruction	Imperfect	The user query that only gives few required parameter values
	Single-turn with pronouns	External	There are anaphoric pronouns that refer to external individual information in the user query
	Single-turn irrelevant	Irrelevant	There is no tool in the candidate tools list that can solve the user query.
Diverse question-answer trajectories	Single-question-single-answer	sQsA	The agent asks and the user answers with parameter values one by one.
	Multi-question-multi-answer	mQmA	The agent asks for multiple parameter values, the user also answers the corresponding value.
	Multi-question-single-answer	mQsA	The agent asks for multiple parameter values, but the user only answers one value.
	Single-question-multi-answer	sQmA	The agent only asks for one parameter value, but the user answers multiple values.
Intent and argument shifts	Intent shifts	IS	The agent should output some special tags to terminate the ongoing session when a user expresses a new intent unrelated to the current slot filling process, allowing for the subsequent handling of the new intent.
	Slots overriding	SO	The user repeatedly modifies the value of the same slot before tool execution.
	Multiple slot values	mSv	The user repeatedly modifies the value of the same slot after tool execution.
External individual information	Answering with pronouns	External	The user does not answers directly, but gives the external individual information pronoun.

Table 2: Descriptions of test data in HammerBench at different granularities.

ment values from previous instances correspond to these entities. We then reserve those instances that contain such references for further processing.

Next, for each reserved instance, one argument—corresponding to an identified entity—is selected for replacement with a pronoun. LLMs are employed to simulate a text message, which contains the argument value and links it to one of the external sources, as illustrated in the right portion of Figure 1. The instruction is then rewritten to include the pronoun referring to the external entity. This results in the creation of a new instance that reflects the reference to external individual data.

Prior to finalization, all instances undergo a semantic validation and manual inspection process similar to the previous steps. This ensures that the generated queries are both contextually accurate and free from contradictions. Through this approach, we generate 1,175 single-turn and 487 multi-turn instances that incorporate references to external individual data. All relevant prompts used in this process are detailed in Appendix D.6.

5 Benchmark Analysis

The overall structure of the datasets generated for HammerBench is summarized in Table 2. The dataset comprises four single-turn datasets, each with four distinct types, and eight multi-turn datasets, categorized into three types. A comparative analysis between HammerBench and recently released benchmarks is presented in Table 1.

Statistics: Our HammerBench dataset includes 60 functional categories, 1,063 tools, and a total of 6,531 queries, distributed across three types, as shown in Table 3. Figure 3(a) illustrates the correlation between the number of tools and the num-

ber of parameters defined in the toolset. For the parts of multi-turn test data, there are 1098 sQsA conversations generated from single-turn imperfect instructions, spanning 59 categories and 494 APIs. If we define the number of turns as the total number of questions asked by the agent, there are approximately 404 conversations with turns greater than 1. Figure 3(b) presents the distribution of conversations according to the number of turns. Because conversations can only be merged with more than one turn, there are 404 conversations in mQmA, mQsA, and sQmA. And the distribution of multi-turn dataset types is depicted in Figure 3(c).

Statistics	Perfect	Imperfect	External
# of categories	60	60	55
# of tools	1063	894	463
# of queries	2116	3240	1175

Table 3: Statistics of single-turn datasets.

Quality: The dataset quality is rigorously ensured through the LLM validation module. Initially, data that fails the LLM check is manually corrected on a case-by-case basis. Data that passes the LLM’s double-check are subject to a random sample review, with 100 instances selected for human recheck. Our quality assurance procedures have shown that the data availability rate exceeds 95%. Given that our fine-grained multi-turn dataset is constructed from single-question-single-answer multi-turn data, the quality of the underlying single-turn instances is of paramount importance. Consequently, we conducted a manual review of 1,098 multi-turn instances to ensure their compliance with the logical flow of everyday conversations.




Figure 3: Statistics: a)The number of tools corresponding to different parameter counts in our toolset; b)The number of conversations corresponding to different turn counts in sQsA; c)Various number of multi-turn data cases constructed based on the Imperfect and External in Table 3.

6 Experiment

In this section, we present a comprehensive set of experiments designed to assess the performance of large language models (LLMs) on the HammerBench. We begin by introducing the evaluation metrics and baseline models used for comparison. Next, we provide a detailed analysis of the experimental results, followed by an in-depth discussion of the error analysis.

6.1 Experimental Setups

We first conducted a comparative experiment to validate the reliability of breaking down conversations into snapshots. To eliminate the potential influence of post-training, we fine-tuned Qwen2.5-7B with two distinct training paradigms: Learning to Ask and Function Calling Snapshots. Both models were evaluated on the same 100 out-of-distribution (OOD) conversations, where human interaction and manual annotation were employed for scoring.

The **Learning to Ask** paradigm involves fine-tuning LLMs to generate appropriate questions for missing argument values directly at each turn, and subsequently output the function call after all parameter values are completed. In contrast, the **Function Calling Snapshots** paradigm fine-tunes LLMs to generate function calls at each conversational turn, while the questions themselves are generated using a rule-based approach. The results, as shown in Table 4, indicate that training on function calling snapshots yields a 16% higher success rate compared to the Learning to Ask approach. Based on these findings, we proceed to evaluate function-calling snapshots at each turn in the conversation. Three distinct types of snapshots

were chosen for this evaluation: (1) the final turn of the conversation, (2) the snapshot at the moment when the user changes slot values, and (3) every snapshot throughout the conversation.

Training Paradigm	SR
Learning to Ask	68%
Function Calling Snapshots	84%

Table 4: Comparison between Learning to Ask and Function Calling Snapshots paradigms.

6.1.1 Evaluation Metrics

To assess the performance of function-calling across various conversational snapshots, we employ several key evaluation metrics, as outlined below. These metrics, when combined, provide a comprehensive overview of the model’s performance throughout the entire conversation. Similar to the methodology used in NoisyToolBench (Wang et al., 2024a), we prompt Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-GPTQ-Int4 to determine the correctness of each snapshot prediction. The metrics are as follows:

- **Function Name Accuracy (Func Acc)** evaluates the accuracy of the predicted function names within function-calling samples.
- **Function-Irrelevant Accuracy (Irrelevant)** quantifies the proportion of function-calling samples where the model correctly identifies all irrelevant functions. A high Irrelevant score reflects the model’s ability to detect and exclude irrelevant information from the function call.

- **Parameter Names Hallucination and Missing Rate (PN_HR/MR):** In scenarios where the function names are predicted correctly, PN_HR represents the proportion of samples where the model predicted parameter names not provided in the definition, while PN_MR indicates the proportion of samples where the model fails to predict all parameter names in ground truth. These metrics help assess the accuracy and completeness of parameter name predictions.
- **Args Acc** Given that both the function name and parameter names are correct, Args Acc will be True if all parameter values are correctly filled, measuring the average accuracy of function calling across considered snapshots. Args Acc provides a detailed assessment of the model’s ability to handle both the function name and its parameters simultaneously.
- **Success Rate (SR)** measures the proportion of dialogues in which all function-calling snapshots across the entire conversation are correct. This end-to-end metric reflects the overall accuracy of the function calls within the context of the conversation.
- **Progress Rate (PR):** For multi-turn conversations, let n denote the total number of snapshots in the conversation, and k the number of snapshots that are correctly filled in from the beginning. The Progress Rate is then defined as $PR = \frac{k}{n}$, representing the proportion of correctly predicted snapshots at each stage of the conversation. This metric is designed to track the progress of function calling throughout multi-turn interactions.

Together, these metrics—Func Acc, Args Acc, PN_HR, PN_MR, SR, and PR—offer a robust framework for evaluating the performance of function calling across both individual turns and multi-turn dialogues. It is important to note that, in contrast to single-turn evaluations, the success rate in multi-turn conversations takes into account the accuracy of function calling across all conversational turns, ensuring a holistic assessment of the model’s performance in dynamic, multi-turn interactions.

6.1.2 Baselines

To evaluate the performance of the models on the HammerBench benchmark, we compare the follow-

ing baseline models: GPT-4o (Achiam et al., 2023), Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-GPTQ-Int4 (Dubey et al., 2024), Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-GPTQ-Int4 (Qwen Team, 2024), Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410 (AI, 2024), xLAM-7b-fc-r (Liu et al., 2024b) and ToolACE-8B (Liu et al., 2024a). For all models, we impose a strict requirement on the output format in the prompt, as detailed in Appendix C.

6.2 Overall Evaluation and Analysis

In this section, we present the experimental results of open-source and closed-source LLMs evaluated within our proposed system, as shown in Table (5, 10, 11). As anticipated, we observe a general decline in performance for most models as more noise is introduced into the input, except for GPT-4o, whose degradation remains minimal. Besides, All models demonstrate high **Func Acc**, suggesting that the task of function name selection is relatively straightforward for LLMs. The primary challenge lies in the slot filling task, which proves more susceptible to errors in multi-turn function-calling conversations, particularly when accounting for complex user behaviors. Several key observations emerge from the evaluation:

Imperfect Instructions and Parameter Name Hallucinations: As illustrated in Table 9, the **PN_HR** in the first snapshot is significantly higher than in the last snapshot for all LLMs, with the **PN_HR** being positively correlated with the rate of parameter name hallucinations. Furthermore, when all parameter names are predicted correctly, the end-to-end function call is typically accurate as well, i.e. $PN_{HR} + PN_{MR} + ArgsAcc \approx 100\%$, emphasizing the importance of precise initial instruction. We can see similar observations from Table 10.

Fluctuations in Conversation Success Rate Across Diverse Q&A Trajectories: As shown in Table 7, different conversation trajectories introduce varying degrees of disturbance to the overall success rate of function calling. Consistent with expectations, we find that the progress rate tends to be higher when slot values are provided more rapidly within the conversation (e.g. mQmA and sQmA), highlighting the impact of the timing and flow of user input on function-calling accuracy.

Generalization and Handling of Intent/Argument Shifts: The ability of a model to handle shifts in user intent and arguments is crucial for multi-turn function calling. As indicated

Model	Overall		Single-turn (Args Acc)				Multi-turn (Args Acc)			
	Args Acc	Irrelevant	Perfect	Imperfect	External	Irrelevant	Diverse Q&A	Argument shifts	External	Intent shifts
GPT-4o	61.11%	81.34%	82.80%	62.75%	63.15%	80.16%	53.00%	52.15%	52.81%	82.51%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	<u>59.69%</u>	<u>68.81%</u>	77.74%	46.70%	61.70%	69.96%	59.97%	56.23%	55.77%	67.67%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	56.83%	35.55%	77.93%	53.06%	59.32%	27.29%	50.34%	51.62%	48.73%	43.81%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	53.28%	52.45%	73.35%	38.27%	52.17%	44.43%	54.99%	51.68%	49.22%	60.47%
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	50.99%	29.64%	74.57%	44.69%	56.85%	10.01%	44.59%	43.08%	42.18%	49.27%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	34.73%	6.59%	78.78%	12.50%	53.02%	11.45%	20.59%	23.06%	20.42%	1.73%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	37.43%	23.93%	77.84%	15.71%	50.89%	42.03%	27.05%	25.25%	27.81%	5.83%
ToolACE-8B	25.73%	12.73%	80.10%	3.55%	51.15%	24.37%	5.41%	7.40%	6.76%	1.09%

Table 5: HammerBench leaderboard

Model	PR/Func Acc										IS	
	sQsA	mQmA	mQsA	sQmA	w/o SO	w/ SO	w/o mSv	w/ mSv	w/o External	w/ External		Overall
GPT-4o	<u>60.92%</u>	65.40%	59.42%	65.05%	65.88%	64.82%	67.78%	54.28%	76.47%	68.73%	64.88%	82.51%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	61.87%	67.10%	56.74%	66.96%	60.95%	55.63%	<u>60.68%</u>	51.58%	<u>67.02%</u>	58.05%	<u>60.66%</u>	43.81%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	49.25%	<u>65.60%</u>	51.88%	<u>65.58%</u>	57.06%	<u>56.16%</u>	60.25%	<u>53.55%</u>	64.57%	<u>59.51%</u>	58.34%	<u>67.67%</u>
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	49.91%	57.24%	47.07%	57.18%	52.31%	47.69%	53.06%	44.33%	61.02%	49.40%	51.92%	49.27%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	46.12%	56.74%	43.36%	55.96%	51.26%	46.55%	53.38%	42.74%	60.61%	52.29%	50.90%	60.47%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	17.67%	20.42%	12.67%	20.19%	20.20%	18.71%	21.21%	16.14%	24.35%	19.88%	19.14%	1.73%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	12.69%	15.64%	9.38%	15.46%	15.14%	13.22%	15.97%	11.95%	23.21%	19.40%	15.20%	5.83%
ToolACE-8B	0.53%	0.98%	0.53%	0.98%	0.27%	0.24%	0.17%	0.13%	0.25%	0.25%	0.43%	1.09%

Table 6: The evaluation (PR/Func Acc) on HammerBench for all snapshots in different data types. It is a snippet from Table 11. The Overall column is the average of PR/Func Acc. The IS represents the success rate of LLM terminating correctly when encountering intent shifts. The SR and Args Acc results are in Table 12 and Table 13.

in Table 7, only GPT-4o demonstrates robust performance in this area, with most open-source LLMs (e.g., xLAM-7b-fc-r, ToolACE-8B, and Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410) struggling to accommodate such shifts. However, models from the Llama and Qwen series perform reasonably well, demonstrating some degree of generalization to intent and argument shifts. Moreover, as shown in Table 8, models with stronger generalization abilities, such as GPT-4o, exhibit the smallest change in **Args Acc**, indicating that these models can better understand and adapt to shifts in argument semantics.

Impact of External Individual Information on Function Calling Capability: As evidenced in Table 8, nearly all LLMs are significantly affected by external individual information, such as personalized user data or context. This highlights the vulnerability of LLMs to external factors, which can substantially interfere with their function-calling

accuracy, further complicating the task of ensuring reliable performance in dynamic, real-world settings.

Additional experimental results can be found in Appendix E.

6.3 Fine-Grained Evaluation and Error Analyses

Diverse Q&A Trajectories: As evidenced in the dataset of diverse Q&A trajectories (Table 7), multi-turn interactions can lead open-source LLMs to hallucinate additional parameters, particularly when handling multi-question-single-answer (mQsA). It frequently results in parameter mispredictions, as detailed in Appendix B.2. However, GPT-4o shows resilience to this issue, with a minimal decrease in Progress Rate (PR), which only drops by 1.5%. In contrast, GPT-4o exhibits an increased tendency to reject tool selection, yielding an IS score of 82.51% and a relatively lower function name ac-

Model	PR/Func Acc (w/o w/ Δ)											
	mQmA		mQsA		sQmA		SO		mSv		External	
GPT-4o	60.92%	+4.481%	60.92%	-1.501%	60.92%	+4.127%	65.88%	-1.056%	67.78%	-13.50%	76.47%	-7.733%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	61.87%	+5.234%	61.87%	-5.127%	61.87%	+5.088%	60.95%	-5.325%	60.68%	-9.095%	67.02%	-8.967%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	49.25%	+16.34%	49.25%	+2.628%	49.25%	+16.32%	57.06%	-0.899%	60.25%	-6.699%	64.57%	-5.054%
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	49.91%	+7.324%	49.91%	-2.836%	49.91%	+7.273%	52.31%	-4.616%	53.06%	-8.733%	61.02%	-11.61%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	46.12%	+10.62%	46.12%	-2.755%	46.12%	+9.848%	51.26%	-4.713%	53.38%	-10.64%	60.61%	-8.321%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	17.67%	+2.747%	17.67%	-4.996%	17.67%	+2.522%	20.20%	-1.488%	21.21%	-5.067%	24.35%	-4.475%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	0.531%	+0.443%	0.531%	+0.000%	0.531%	+0.443%	0.273%	-0.030%	0.170%	-0.035%	0.246%	-0.000%
ToolACE-8B	12.69%	+2.950%	12.69%	-3.319%	12.69%	+2.765%	15.14%	-1.919%	15.97%	-4.027%	23.21%	-3.804%

Table 7: Multi-turn fine-grained evaluation across different data types for all snapshots. Each cell consists of two items: the absolute value of the baseline sQsA dataset and the change (Δ) in the metric after encountering the corresponding situations. So that we can more clearly observe the impacts of these situations.

Model	w/o w/ (Δ)											
	SO						External					
	PN_HR		PN_MR		PR/Func Acc		PN_HR		PN_MR		PR/Func Acc	
GPT-4o	12.76%	+1.478%	7.553%	-2.753%	74.94%	-3.676%	7.469%	+3.044%	5.542%	+10.34%	80.95%	-20.77%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	19.77%	+7.795%	1.838%	-0.838%	70.03%	-11.71%	14.85%	+8.607%	1.980%	+1.001%	74.88%	-20.71%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	16.04%	+0.776%	13.22%	-2.270%	64.90%	-3.323%	12.16%	+4.017%	12.83%	+4.690%	68.71%	-13.27%
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	23.00%	+7.060%	5.871%	-2.818%	65.47%	-12.11%	18.04%	+8.445%	4.990%	+8.829%	71.10%	-27.71%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	21.53%	+7.524%	8.706%	-5.650%	62.85%	-13.78%	15.42%	+13.25%	7.943%	+1.146%	67.99%	-24.25%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	30.73%	+10.40%	5.672%	-3.863%	56.75%	-12.12%	24.40%	+7.930%	6.547%	+10.81%	60.57%	-23.76%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	65.73%	+4.250%	0.124%	-0.124%	29.99%	-8.535%	57.96%	-4.310%	0.318%	+5.713%	36.29%	-8.252%
ToolACE-8B	46.61%	+13.34%	1.068%	-0.610%	47.67%	-20.34%	41.16%	+12.40%	0.375%	+1.879%	51.84%	-19.04%

Table 8: Evaluations for snapshots at the moment of slot overriding (SO) and answering with pronouns (External). Each cell in the table includes two items: the baseline absolute metrics under the sQsA dataset, and the changes (Δ) in metrics after considering SO/External.

Model	Func Acc	First Snapshot			Last Snapshot		
		PN_HR	PN_MR	Args Acc/Func Acc	PN_HR	PN_MR	Args Acc/Func Acc
		GPT-4o	75.41%	18.12%	2.17%	78.74%	11.11%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	86.07%	26.14%	2.33%	70.48%	18.41%	1.90%	<u>70.90%</u>
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	80.33%	<u>21.09%</u>	1.13%	<u>74.60%</u>	<u>13.95%</u>	10.54%	<u>68.93%</u>
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	<u>88.80%</u>	34.15%	1.54%	63.38%	21.54%	5.44%	65.95%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	<u>77.32%</u>	30.15%	2.12%	67.02%	18.37%	7.30%	66.31%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	62.75%	72.42%	1.60%	25.69%	26.56%	5.08%	60.38%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	89.53%	79.76%	<u>0.61%</u>	19.02%	41.00%	<u>0.81%</u>	52.29%
ToolACE-8B	54.83%	99.14%	0.00%	0.66%	56.31%	0.17%	37.38%

Table 9: Evaluations on the first and last snapshots.

curacy (Func Acc) of 75.41%. Notably, 66.7% of the error instances involve the model responding with ‘Sorry, no tool is suitable for your request.’ Despite the comparable success rates between GPT-4o and other open-source 70B models as shown in Table 11, GPT-4o outperforms these models when success rate is calculated based on correct function selection (SR/Func Acc), demonstrating its superior capability in choosing the appropriate function.

Slot Overriding: A common challenge arises when users modify the value of the same slot multiple times before the function execution. In these cases, LLMs sometimes fail to accurately follow user instructions. For example, when a user initially provides a date like June 1st, only to later change it to July 8th, the LLM may still retain the June 1st value, thereby failing to update the slot correctly. Additionally, LLMs often struggle to handle situations where two similar parameter definitions are present, such as when updating train orders, where two different train numbers are required. This issue is particularly evident in the examples provided in Appendix B.4. These cases illustrate that LLMs are prone to disturbances when a slot involves multiple values. As shown in Table 8, open-source LLMs are generally slow to detect and adjust to slot overriding. Only GPT-4o, with its more robust generalization abilities, is able to perform this task more effectively.

Multiple Slot Values: When users repeatedly modify the value of the same slot after a tool has been executed, LLMs may succeed in updating the modified slot but tend to lose track of other parameter values. This behavior is observed even in GPT-4o, though to a lesser extent. The underlying issue might arise from LLMs perceiving the tool call as completed once executed, leading them to disregard previously provided information. It is also possible that such patterns are underrepresented in the training data of existing LLMs, making it challenging for them to handle these scenarios effectively. This difficulty is particularly prevalent in the experiments illustrated in Table 9, where slot values are inconsistently managed across multiple turns.

External Individual Information: User queries containing external individual information often present significant noise, affecting the accuracy of slot filling. As demonstrated in Appendix B.3, when users provide indirect references to parameter values, such as through pronouns or external context, rather than directly supplying the values, the accuracy of slot filling deteriorates substantially. This issue is compounded by an increase in the PN_MR as shown in Table 8, where critical arguments are missed due to the external interference.

Imperfect Instructions: Despite the emphasis placed on correct instruction formatting in the

prompt (Appendix C), imperfect or ambiguous user instructions continue to lead to parameter hallucinations. In these cases, LLMs tend to fill in missing arguments based on their internal model of the world rather than the actual user input, as detailed in Appendix B.1. Since snapshots are often imperfect, these inaccuracies significantly impact multi-turn success rates, further highlighting the challenges posed by incomplete or unclear user input. As a result, the overall effectiveness of function-calling tasks is diminished when the instructions provided to the model are less than ideal.

7 Conclusion and Future Works

This paper introduces HammerBench, a fine-grained evaluation benchmark designed for multi-turn function calling, which encompasses the assessment of imperfect instructions, diverse question-answer trajectories, intent shifts, argument shifts, and user queries with external individual information in the context of multi-turn interactive slot filling tasks. These aspects are aligned with more realistic user scenarios. We break down the multi-turn slot-filling interaction into distinct function-calling snapshots, enabling the evaluation of each conversational turn. Additionally, we introduce random merging of conversation trajectories from basic dialogues to assess the randomness of question-answer trajectories. Furthermore, we propose a method to generate data with external individual information in a cost-effective and efficient manner, which allows for the evaluation of a model’s capability to resolve pronouns and anaphora related to external individual information.

Our experiments demonstrate that, as noisy information increases in the data, the model’s performance deteriorates. HammerBench effectively reflects the capabilities of large language models (LLMs) in scenarios closer to real-world applications, providing valuable insights for optimizing the multi-turn function-calling abilities of LLMs. Additionally, by integrating data generation methods from multiple dimensions, this benchmark supports the evaluation of multi-turn interactions in more complex scenarios. Due to certain constraints, further exploration of this aspect is left as future work.

References

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman,

Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

Mistral. AI. 2024. Introducing the world’s best edge models. Website. <https://mistral.ai/news/ministraux/>.

Apple-Inc. 2024. *Wwdc 2024*.

Ge Bai, Jie Liu, Xingyuan Bu, Yancheng He, Jiaheng Liu, Zhanhui Zhou, Zhuoran Lin, Wenbo Su, Tiezheng Ge, Bo Zheng, et al. 2024. Mt-bench-101: A fine-grained benchmark for evaluating large language models in multi-turn dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, page 7421–7454.

Kinjal Basu, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Kelsey Bradford, Maxwell Crouse, Kiran Kate, Sadhana Kumaravel, Saurabh Goyal, Asim Munawar, Yara Rizk, Xin Wang, Luis Lastras, and Pavan Kapanipathi. 2024. Nestful: A benchmark for evaluating llms on nested sequences of api calls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.03797*.

Zana Bućinca, Maja Barbara Malaya, and Krzysztof Z Gajos. 2021. To trust or to think: cognitive forcing functions can reduce overreliance on ai in ai-assisted decision-making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW1):1–21.

Jan Deriu, Alvaro Rodrigo, Arantxa Otegi, Guillermo Echevoyen, Sophie Rosset, Eneko Agirre, and Mark Cieliebak. 2021. Survey on evaluation methods for dialogue systems. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 54:755–810.

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 preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.

Fenfei Guo, Angeliki Metallinou, Chandra Khatri, Anirudh Raju, Anu Venkatesh, and Ashwin Ram. 2017. Topic-based evaluation for conversational bots. *NIPS 2017 Conversational AI workshop*.

Wai-Chung Kwan, Xingshan Zeng, Yuxin Jiang, Yufei Wang, Liangyou Li, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Kam-Fai Wong. 2024. *Mt-eval: A multi-turn capabilities evaluation benchmark for large language models*.

Vivian Lai and Chenhao Tan. 2019. On human predictions with explanations and predictions of machine learning models: A case study on deception detection. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 29–38.

Minghao Li, Yingxiu Zhao, Bowen Yu, Feifan Song, Hangyu Li, Haiyang Yu, Zhoujun Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023. Api-bank: A comprehensive benchmark for tool-augmented llms. In *Proceedings*

- of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 3102–3116.
- Yunshui Li, Binyuan Hui, Xiaobo Xia, Jiayi Yang, Min Yang, Lei Zhang, Shuzheng Si, Junhao Liu, Tongliang Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024. One-shot learning as instruction data prospector for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4586–4601.
- Qiqiang Lin, Muning Wen, Qiuying Peng, Guanyu Nie, Junwei Liao, Jun Wang, Xiaoyun Mo, Jiamu Zhou, Cheng Cheng, Yin Zhao, et al. 2024. Hammer: Robust function-calling for on-device language models via function masking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04587*.
- Weiwen Liu, Xu Huang, Xingshan Zeng, Xinlong Hao, Shuai Yu, Dexun Li, Shuai Wang, Weinan Gan, Zhengying Liu, Yuanqing Yu, et al. 2024a. Toolace: Winning the points of llm function calling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00920*.
- Zuxin Liu, Thai Quoc Hoang, Jianguo Zhang, Ming Zhu, Tian Lan, Shirley Kokane, Juntao Tan, Weiran Yao, Zhiwei Liu, Yihao Feng, et al. 2024b. Apigen: Automated pipeline for generating verifiable and diverse function-calling datasets. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Jiarui Lu, Thomas Holleis, Yizhe Zhang, Bernhard Aumayer, Feng Nan, Felix Bai, Shuang Ma, Shen Ma, Mengyu Li, Guoli Yin, et al. 2024. Toolsandbox: A stateful, conversational, interactive evaluation benchmark for llm tool use capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04682*.
- Yuxuan Lu, Bingsheng Yao, Shao Zhang, Yun Wang, Peng Zhang, Tun Lu, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Dakuo Wang. 2023. Human still wins over llm: An empirical study of active learning on domain-specific annotation tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09825*.
- Chang Ma, Junlei Zhang, Zhihao Zhu, Cheng Yang, Yujia Yang, Yaohui Jin, Zhenzhong Lan, Lingpeng Kong, and Junxian He. 2024. Agentboard: An analytical evaluation board of multi-turn llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13178*.
- Jiao Ou, Junda Lu, Che Liu, Yihong Tang, Fuzheng Zhang, Di Zhang, and Kun Gai. 2023. Dialogbench: Evaluating llms as human-like dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01677*.
- Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, et al. 2023. Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2307.
- Qwen Team. 2024. **Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models**.
- Yifan Song, Weimin Xiong, Dawei Zhu, Wenhao Wu, Han Qian, Mingbo Song, Hailiang Huang, Cheng Li, Ke Wang, Rong Yao, Ye Tian, and Sujian Li. 2023. Restgpt: Connecting large language models with real-world restful apis. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2306.
- Qiaoyu Tang, Ziliang Deng, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Qiao Liang, and Le Sun. 2023. Toolalpaca: Generalized tool learning for language models with 3000 simulated cases. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2306.
- Nexusflow.ai team. 2023. **Nexusraven: Surpassing the state-of-the-art in open-source function calling llms**.
- Wenxuan Wang, Juluan Shi, Chaozheng Wang, Cheryl Lee, Youliang Yuan, Jen-tse Huang, and Michael R Lyu. 2024a. Learning to ask: When llms meet unclear instruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00557*.
- Xihuai Wang, Shao Zhang, Wenhao Zhang, Wentao Dong, Jingxiao Chen, Ying Wen, and Weinan Zhang. 2024b. Zsc-eval: An evaluation toolkit and benchmark for multi-agent zero-shot coordination. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Xingyao Wang, Zihan Wang, Jiateng Liu, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. 2023a. Mint: Evaluating llms in multi-turn interaction with tools and language feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10691*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khoshdel, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023b. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508.
- Mengsong Wu, Tong Zhu, Han Han, Chuanyuan Tan, Xiang Zhang, and Wenliang Chen. 2024. Sealtools: Self-instruct tool learning dataset for agent tuning and detailed benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08355*.
- Qiantong Xu, Fenglu Hong, Bo Li, Changran Hu, Zhengyu Chen, and Jian Zhang. 2023. On the tool manipulation capability of open-source large language models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2305.
- Fanjia Yan, Huanzhi Mao, Charlie Cheng-Jie Ji, Tianjun Zhang, Shishir G. Patil, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2024. Berkeley function calling leaderboard. https://gorilla.cs.berkeley.edu/blogs/8_berkeley_function_calling_leaderboard.html.
- Shao Zhang, Hui Xu, Yuting Jia, Ying Wen, Dakuo Wang, Luoyi Fu, Xinbing Wang, and Chenghu Zhou. 2023. Geodeepshovel: A platform for building scientific database from geoscience literature with ai assistance. *Geoscience Data Journal*, 10(4):519–537.

Shao Zhang, Jianing Yu, Xuhai Xu, Changchang Yin, Yuxuan Lu, Bingsheng Yao, Melanie Tory, Lace M Padilla, Jeffrey Caterino, Ping Zhang, et al. 2024. Rethinking human-ai collaboration in complex medical decision making: A case study in sepsis diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–18.

Yunfeng Zhang, Q Vera Liao, and Rachel KE Bellamy. 2020. Effect of confidence and explanation on accuracy and trust calibration in ai-assisted decision making. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 295–305.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46595–46623.

Mingchen Zhuge, Changsheng Zhao, Dylan Ashley, Wenyi Wang, Dmitrii Khizbullin, Yunyang Xiong, Zechun Liu, Ernie Chang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Yuandong Tian, et al. 2024. Agent-as-a-judge: Evaluate agents with agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10934*.

A Examples of Dataset

A.1 Single-turn

normal user query

User: Please help me send the traffic violation record of Yue B6789X in Guangzhou yesterday to Manager Zhang by email.

Agent: {"name": "shareViolationDetail", "arguments": {"city": "Guangzhou", "media": "email", "name": "Manager Zhang", "plate_number": "Yue B6789X", "time": "yesterday"}}

missing arguments user query

User: Share the traffic violation information in Guangzhou.

Agent: {"name": "shareViolationDetail", "arguments": {"city": "Guangzhou", "media": "", "name": "", "plate_number": "", "time": ""}}

user query with external individual information

User: I found the license plate number mentioned in my notepad and would like to share the traffic violation information I encountered in Guangzhou yesterday with Manager Zhang via email. Is that okay?

EK: At 3pm today, I saw a car with license plate number Yue B6789X in the parking lot. The owner seemed to have forgotten to turn off the lights, and the lights were on until the evening. I am worried about violating traffic rules. If you know the owner, please remind him.

Agent: {"name": "shareViolationDetail", "arguments": {"city": "Guangzhou", "media": "email", "name": "Manager Zhang", "plate_number": "Yue B6789X", "time": "yesterday"}}

A.2 Multi Turn

conversation with external individual information

User: Share the violation information.

Agent: Which city did the violation occur in?

User: The violation occurred in Guangzhou.

Agent: Please provide a way to share.

User: Share the link via email.

Agent: Please provide the recipients of the shared content.

User: The recipient was Manager Zhang.

Agent: Please provide the license plate number.

User: The license plate number mentioned in the notebook

EK: At 3pm today, I saw a car with license plate number Yue B6789X in the parking lot. The owner seemed to have forgotten to turn off the lights, and the lights were on until the evening. I am worried about violating traffic rules. If you know the owner, please remind him.

Agent: When is the order opening time?

User: It was yesterday.

Agent: {"name": "shareViolationDetail", "arguments": {"city": "Guangzhou", "media": "email", "name": "Manager Zhang", "plate_number": "Yue B6789X", "time": "yesterday"}}

B Examples of Model Output Errors

B.1 Imperfect instruction

Parameter hallucination

User: Help me find a mail.

Agent: {"name": "searchMail", "arguments": {"keyword": "mail", "max_results": "10"}}

The user did not provide any parameter information, but the slots were filled in by LLMs.

B.2 Diverse Q&A trajectories

Parameter hallucination

User: See how much airline points I have.

Agent: What's your rider's name Provide the rider's ID number.

User: The passenger's name is Li Si.

Agent: {"name": "getFlightAirlinePoints", "arguments": {"name": "Li Si", "passenger_id": "123456789"}}

Due to aske ID number, although the user did not answer, LLMs also mistakenly filled in this parameter slot.

B.3 External Individual Information

Redundant Information

User: Share my taxi ride.

Agent: What time is the order

User: The time mentioned in the QQ message sent to me by Xiao Ming<EK>:Yesterday evening at 8pm, we had a virtual meeting to discuss next week's work schedule. Everyone put forward a lot of good suggestions and felt that the meeting was efficient. Hopefully our team can continue to maintain this positive attitude!

Agent: {"name": "shareTaxiOrder", "arguments": {"time": "yesterday evening at 8pm", "media": "QQ"}}

The user only mentioned that the time is in the QQ, but did not mention that the media is QQ.

B.4 Argument shifts

arguments overriding

User: Is there any way to change the train ticket standby order I applied for previously?

Agent: What number of trips did you book

User: The number I booked is G123. I'm sorry, Booked trips is D789.

Agent: {"name": "updateTrainWaitlistOrder", "arguments": {"train_number": "D789", "after_number": "G123"}}

The two train numbers provided by the user are both from before updating.

multiple slot values

User: Find me a way. How do I get there?

Agent: Please provide your departure location name or address If using your current location please confirm directly

User: People's Square

Agent: Please provide your destination name or address

User: Shanghai Hongqiao International Airport

Agent: {"name": "vehicleNavigationRoute", "arguments": {"departure": "People's Square", "destination": "Shanghai Hongqiao International Airport"}}

User: I also want to see that Name or address of the destination is Bondi Beach

Agent: {"name": "vehicleNavigationRoute", "arguments": {"destination": "Bondi Beach"}}

When another destination is given again, the original departure parameter is lost.

C Prompts of Function Calling

format prompt

You have access to the following functions.

<tools>

To call a function, please respond with JSON for a function call. Respond in the format “{“name”: function name, “parameters”: dictionary of argument name and its value}.”

Attention! For time parameters, please fill in the format as described in the user request, and do not automatically convert the format! For example:

user: Set an alarm for 8 a.m. tomorrow

assistant : {"name": "UtilityTools.AlarmClock.addAlarm", "arguments": {"time": "8 a.m. tomorrow"}}

Note! Please do not hallucinate parameters. If some parameters are not mentioned in the

```

user request, please directly output an empty string ” For example:
user:Check my traffic violation record to see what happened.
assistant:““json{"name": "Navigation.TrafficViolations.viewViolationDetail", "argu-
ments":{"plate_number": "", "city": "", "time": ""} }““
Never ask to the user for missing parameters!Output tool call!
## If all the above tools are not suitable, you must output: Sorry, no tool is suitable for your request.

Let’s start!

```

D Prompts of Dataset Construction

D.1 Tool Generation

Generating Tools

```

# System
You are a tool builder! Your task is to generate realistic and versatile toolkits that will be used by
Large Language Models (LLMs) to enhance their ability to solve real-world tasks. You must generate
toolkits that are useful, cohesive, complete, and diverse. You should focus on generating toolkits that
are commonly used by average users.
### Core requirements
1. Realism requirement: Ensure that the generated toolkit has a realistic design and can be seamlessly
integrated with LLMs for practical real-world applications. Specifically, the toolkit should either have
a tangible prototype that has been deployed in the real world, such as those developed using existing
APIs (such as Weibo or NetEase Mail), or demonstrate strong potential for future development and
accessibility through APIs (such as industrial automation toolkits).
2. Diversity requirement: Ensure that the generated toolkit is diverse, meeting a wide range of domains,
types, functions, and use cases.
3. Compatibility requirement: Ensure that the generated toolkit is compatible with the textual interfaces
of LLMs. In particular, LLMs can only interact with the toolkit through textual and programmatic
APIs. Therefore, the tool API should mainly accept and return text as input and output. Therefore,
the toolkit’s API should mainly accept and return text as input and output. In cases where the input
or output involves alternative types such as files, images, videos, or audio, these should be interfaced
through data paths or URLs, rather than raw data.
4. Cohesion requirement: Ensure that the generated toolkit is a cohesive collection of related tools
designed to facilitate the completion of a specific core target task. It should contain a variety of tool
APIs that serve different purposes within the scope of the intended functionality. For example, the
NetEase Mailbox toolkit may include tools for sending, searching, reading, and deleting emails.
5. Completeness requirement: Ensure that the toolkit is functionally complete and self-contained. Each
toolkit should contain comprehensive tool APIs that are sufficient to complete its core target tasks
without relying on any external tools or resources. In particular, if a toolkit involves operating data
resources (such as tasks in the Trello toolkit), the tool APIs should generally support relevant CRUD
(create, read, update, delete) operations on these resources, or similar operations. In addition, these tool
APIs should generally operate using unique identifiers of the data source. You should not assume that
such unique identifiers will be provided by the user. Instead, there should be a tool API (e.g., a search
tool API) in the toolkit for retrieving unique identifiers. A typical design of a complete toolkit is as
follows:
- A search tool for retrieving unique identifiers (and possibly primary content) of data resources, such as
by keyword search.
- A read tool that takes a unique identifier as a parameter and returns the detailed data resource.
- An update tool that takes a unique identifier and the updated data resource as parameters and updates
the data resource, returning the unique identifier of the updated data resource.
- A delete tool that takes a unique identifier as a parameter and deletes the data resource, returning the
success status of the deletion.

```

- A create tool that takes a data resource as a parameter and creates a new data resource, returning the unique identifier of the created data resource.

Additional Requests

1. Unique target user requirement: Ensure that the toolkit is designed for a specific target user group and that all tools will be used by the same target user group. The designated user group can vary - individual users, enterprise users, developers, etc. For example, in the case of an e-commerce toolkit, all tools should target either individual users or enterprise users, but not both.

2. Compactness requirement: Ensure that the toolkit API is compact, meaning that if tools have similar interfaces and functionality, they should be unified into one tool. For example, tools for searching for different types of items should be unified into one tool API with a parameter for specifying the type of items to search for.

3. Search limit requirement: For toolkits that involve searching the tool API to retrieve data resources, ensure that there is a parameter for specifying the maximum number of results returned by the search tool API. This parameter can be optional, and the default value is specified in the tool description.

4. Avoid unnecessary authentication requirements: In most cases, toolkits are designed for personal use by a single user, and it is reasonable to assume that the user has completed authentication before using the toolkit. In this case, ensure that all tools do not require login, authentication, or personal ID. For example, all tools in a personal banking toolkit should not require a login or a 'user_id' parameter for the tool. This also means that "unauthorized evaluation" should not be considered a potential risk for the toolkit.

5. Avoid unnecessary ID requirements: Ensure that the tool does not introduce unnecessary unique identifiers. Unique identifiers are only necessary when multiple data resource instances of the same type need to be distinguished and operated on by the unique identifier. For example, for an online shopping toolkit, an 'order_id' needs to be introduced because there are usually multiple orders in a user account, and it is necessary for operations on orders such as retrieval, read or cancel. However, unique identifiers are unnecessary when the data source is singular, eliminating the need for distinction. For example, for an online shopping toolkit, a 'cart_id' for a user's shopping cart or a 'profile_id' for the user's own profile are redundant because a user account usually contains only one of each.

6. Stored data access requirements: For cases where some tools in the toolkit require specific user details such as address or payment method, and it is reasonable to assume that the user has previously provided this information to the toolkit, there must be a tool API that can access the stored data. For example, in a toolkit for food delivery or e-commerce, there should be a tool API for accessing a user's saved addresses and payment methods.

7. Operation Status Indication Requirement: For tool APIs that involve operations such as creating, updating, or deleting data resources, it is critical to include the operation status (e.g., a Boolean value of "success") as part of the return value. Other return values should also align with the operation status. For example, if a tool returns a unique identifier for a created data resource, it should return null or an empty string if the operation failed.

8. File/Media Management Requirement: Toolkits that involve file or media resources (such as the Twitter toolkit that requires media attachments) need to carefully distinguish between local and remote file management. Remote files located on a remote server should be identified and managed by their remote file path or unique identifier. Whereas local files located on the user's system should be identified and managed by local file paths. Different tools may require remote or local files as input parameters or return values, depending on the specific use case. For example, for the Twitter toolkit, a tool for posting a tweet should require the local path of the media file to be posted, while a tool for retrieving tweets should return the remote file identifier of the media file in the tweet. Additionally, there should be a tool for downloading remote media files to the local system.

Output Format

Toolkit specifications should be in a valid JSON list separated by "'json' and '". Each item in the list

should contain the following fields:

‘tool’: The name of the tool, which should be in "CamelCase" format.

‘name’: The Chinese name of the tool, which should express the function of the tool as concisely as possible.

‘description’: The summary of the tool, which should be a clear and concise description of the purpose and function of the tool without any ambiguity. It must be in Chinese.

‘parameters’: The parameter list of the tool, each parameter should contain the fields including ‘name’, ‘type’ and ‘description’, ‘required’ (whether the parameter is required). ‘description’ must be in Chinese.

‘returns’: The return list of the tool, each return should contain ‘name’, ‘type’ and ‘description’.

Please note:

1. For tool ‘parameters’ and ‘returns’, ‘name’ should not contain spaces and should be in "snake_case" format.

2. For tool ‘parameters’ and ‘returns’, ‘type’ should be a valid JSON type, i.e. one of ["string", "integer", "number", "boolean", "array", "object", "null"].

3. For tool ‘parameters’ and ‘returns’, ‘description’ should be a clear and concise description of the parameter or return, without any ambiguity. If the parameter or return is subject to some specific format or value constraints, these constraints should be explicitly specified in ‘description’.

4. If a tool ‘parameters’ or ‘returns’ is an object, the exact fields of the object should be explicitly specified in ‘description’.

Format example

You should output the toolkit as a JSON object, strictly following the structure shown in the following example tool spec:

*WARNING! ** You need to check your JSON format carefully!!! Output the detailed toolkit spec as:

```
““json
```

```
<Output toolkit spec follows [format description]>
```

```
““
```

Try to generate tools that users might use in their daily lives.

Do not output the same string repeatedly!!!

Make sure to meet the above format requirements, especially do not lose "parameters"

Question: You need to generate tools for the following toolkits related to map navigation: Reference message: Turn on navigation sound, turn off navigation sound, change navigation sound, query real-time bus, view my footprints, find charging piles, add common addresses, view common addresses, delete common addresses, add favorite places, view favorite places, delete favorite places, add favorite routes, view favorite routes, delete common routes

D.2 Query Generation

Generating Single-turn Queries

You are now a mobile phone user. Your task is to fill in the corresponding parameters according to the actual scenario based on the provided description and parameters, and then generate a user request based on the filled parameters.

Please make sure that the generated user requests are different from each other. You can feel free to use different sentence styles, such as instructions or requests, and change the degree of detail as needed.

Related requirements:

1. Use as few questions and polite tones as possible;

2. Natural questions similar to human conversations need to be more humane and colloquial, and in line with people’s daily life

3. The parameters in the generated user request should be as reasonable as possible. For example, if it involves image parameters, the user request needs to have representative information like test.jpg

4. Fill in parameters carefully, output the corresponding JSON format and wrap it with “json...”

5. Information such as test.jpg contained in parameters also needs to be included in the user request!!

6. All parameters must be filled in all given parameters!! Do not miss any one!

7. The user request needs to be wrapped with <user0>...<user1>. Your task is to generate natural and colloquial user requests, make sure to clearly mention the tool name {name_for_human} in the request, and avoid using stiff or direct imperative tones. For example, do not generate requests like 'Dianping, show me my group purchases', but use more humane and daily conversation expressions, such as 'Help me see the group purchases on Dianping'. Please generate a user request that meets the specifications according to this requirement.

8. You can generate parameters first, and then generate user requests based on the generated parameters.

9. The text descriptions in parameters must be in Chinese!

10. For time parameters, please use Chinese text! And the expressions before and after must be consistent!

11. When no parameter definition is given, please generate a statement that does not contain any parameters! Output Format:

1. Parameters: “json parameter dictionary”. <user0>[user request]<user1>

2. Parameters: “json parameter dictionary”. <user0>[user request]<user1>

... Here are two examples for your reference:

description: Modify alarm time, ring mode, weekday settings, custom settings
parameters:

Must include parameters:
Output:

1. Parameters:“json{ }”. <user0>I want to modify the alarm time<user1>

description: Modify the alarm time, ring mode, weekday settings, custom settings
parameters:[{"name": "clock_time","type": "string","description": "Alarm time","required": false}, {"name": "target_time","type": "string","description": "Modified target time","required": true}]
Must include parameters: clock_time, target_time Output:

1. Parameters:“json{ "clock_time": "8 o'clock","target_time": "15 o'clock" }”. <user0>Change the alarm at 8 o'clock to 15 o'clock in the afternoon<user1> The description of the tool and the corresponding parameters are as follows:
description:{description}
parameters:{parameters}
Must include parameters:{param_list} Please refer to the example and generate {num} [user requests] and [parameter dictionaries] that conform to the output format according to the above requirements and tool conditions.

D.3 Parameters Selection

_____Selecting parameters_____

Please select the specified number of parameters that best suit your daily habits based on the tool description and corresponding parameter definitions. ## Selection Principles:

1. Simulate daily user usage scenarios and give priority to parameters that are more commonly used in daily life ## Output Format:

1. Output your thoughts first, then output the parameter name you selected, and wrap it with “...”

2. Use commas to separate parameter names ## For examples:

Tool description: Create a new alarm
Parameter definition:
["name": "clock_time_name", "type": "string", "description": "Alarm name, empty by

```
default", "required": false, "name": "clock_time", "type": "string", "description":
"Alarm time", "required": true, "name": "kwargs", "type": "array", "description":
"Ring mode, weekday settings, custom settings", "required": false]
```

Output 2 parameters: clock_time, clock_time_name

Start now! Tool description: {tool_desc}

Parameter definition: {parameters}

Output {num} parameters:

D.4 LLM Check Prompt

LLM Check Prompt

System

You are an expert who can accurately judge the information matching relationship between texts, and you have a keen insight into the information matching between two structured texts.

Task Description

1. Given a query, model_output and the label of the corresponding tool call, your task is to determine whether the model_output and label both express the same semantic meaning and are derived from the information found in the query. output your judgment True/False

2. If model_output and label have different number of parameters, such as {'A':1,'B':2} and {'A':1}, output False

3. model_output and label do not have to be exactly the same. As long as they express the same meaning and can solve query needs, only True is output.

4. If model_output is the same as label, or only a slight difference between them in terms of singular and plural, output True! such as {} and {}, {"departure": "office"} and {"departure": "Offices"}, you need output True

Output Format

1. Following Task Description, Only output True/False, Never answer more text! For examples:

1. Different characters but same semantics, output True:

query: Add a note of the address of Starbucks Zhongguancun store on the map, and write "frequently visited writing place"

label: {"address": "Starbucks Zhongguancun store", "remake": "often come to write"}

model_output: {"address": "Starbucks Zhongguancun store", "remake": "frequently visited writing place"}

Output: True

2. model_output contains parameters that are not in label, output False:

query: How many times have you ridden this year?

label: {}

model_output: {"time": "this year"}

answer: False

3. The model_output is missing the parameters of label, output False:

query: I want to know which five-star hotels are there in Nanshan District, Shenzhen

label: {"destination": "Nanshan District, Shenzhen", "checkin_date": "", "checkout_date": "", "price_range": "", "kwargs": "five-star hotel"}

model_output: {"destination": "Nanshan District, Shenzhen", "checkin_date": "", "checkout_date": "", "kwargs": "five-star hotel"}

answer: False

4. Time hallucination occurs, output False:

query: Make an appointment to test drive Xiaomi su7 at 10 am this Saturday

label: {"test_drive_time": "This Saturday at 10 am", "name": "", "phone": "", "kwargs": ""}

model_output: {"test_drive_time": "2023-04-20 10:00", "name": "", "phone": "", "kwargs": ""} answer: False

5. The time format is different, but it expresses the same time, output True:
query: Make an appointment to test drive Xiaomi su7 at 10 am this Saturday
label: {"test_drive_time": "This Saturday at 10 am", "name": "", "phone": "", "kwargs": ""}
model_output: {"test_drive_time": "This Saturday at 10:00", "name": "", "phone": "", "kwargs": ""}
answer: True

6. All are empty characters, output True:

query: Open TikTok
label: {}
model_output: {}
answer: True
Start now!

query: {query}
label: {label}
model_output: {model_output}
answer:

D.5 Irrelevant tools selection

Irrelevant tools selection

Given a query and the corresponding tool description and parameter definition, please judge whether the tool can complete the query.

Output Format:

Only outputs boolean strings: True/False

Start now!

query: {query}
tool: {tool}
answer:

D.6 Generation with external individual information

classify entity

Please determine whether a parameter is in the entity category

Output Format:

Please select which entity it belongs to. The selected entity category is enclosed in "..."

entity : {entities}

Parameter name and description: {param_desc}

Output:

pronoun generation

Please rewrite the following content into a sentence in the form of adjective + noun that is more in line with daily habits and has more specific information.

For example:

Input: The time mentioned in the message received from SMS

Requirement: Cannot contain specific time

Output: The time mentioned in the text message sent to me by Tom

Start now! Output only the rewritten 1 sentence!

Input: {entity} mentioned in the message received from {Tool_} Requirement: Cannot contain specific {entity} Output:

external individual information simulation

Please simulate a message in {app} as required

Related requirements

The content must involve entity;

The content should be as detailed as possible, and no referential content such as that or this should appear. The message should contain a clear {entity}: {param_value} The content must not contain the following: {param_forbid} ## Output format

Only output simulated messages, do not ask or output other content!

Simulated message:

rewrite query

Please generate the corresponding user query according to the label and the corresponding tool function description

Related requirements

1. Try to be consistent with the language of daily conversation interaction, smooth and concise

Output format:

Only output the query, do not include other information

Tool description: {desc}

label: {label}

query:

D.7 Multi-turn Prompt

Question prompt

You are a function call agent, currently processing the {description} function call task, but the parameters {miss_args_desc} are missing. Please ask the user for the missing parameter values

Requirements

- Do not include the existing parameters: {args_desc}
- Be brief and concise, do not add additional explanations
- Ask only about the missing parameters
- Ask multiple missing parameters together, do not use special symbols to separate, such as colons, newlines, etc.
- Just ask questions, do not tell the user how to answer

E Other Experiment Result

The experiment result of single-turn dataset is shown in Table 10. As for single-turn dataset with missing arguments, PN_HR is much larger than other single-turn dataset. It reveals that user query with missing arguments can easily lead to parameter hallucinations. And the single-turn dataset with external individual information has the lower end-to-end Args Acc. Other multi-turn results are in Table (12, 13).

Data type	Model	Func Acc	PN_FP	PN_FN	Args Acc/Func Acc	Args Acc	Irrelevant
ST_Perfect	GPT-4o	90.17%	0.21%	2.97%	91.83%	82.80%	79.28%
	Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-INT4	90.93%	6.81%	2.23%	85.70%	77.93%	26.54%
	Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	90.36%	1.67%	2.29%	86.03%	77.74%	72.71%
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	86.34%	5.52%	3.28%	86.37%	74.57%	12.02%
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	88.99%	4.89%	2.38%	82.42%	73.35%	42.90%
	Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	88.00%	0.48%	1.76%	89.52%	78.78%	12.49%
	xLAM-7b-fc-r	84.31%	0.39%	1.12%	92.33%	77.84%	43.85%
	ToolACE-8B	90.26%	0.68%	0.42%	88.74%	80.10%	20.53%
ST_Imperfect	GPT-4o	79.32%	18.25%	2.27%	79.11%	62.75%	85.28%
	Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-INT4	85.4%	36.09%	1.58%	62.11%	53.06%	36.77%
	Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	68.30%	27.79%	2.33%	68.37%	46.70%	73.93%
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	88.12%	47.73%	1.64%	50.71%	44.69%	11.63%
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	66.42%	38.71%	2.87%	57.62%	38.27%	50.56%
	Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	57.07%	75.77%	5.88%	21.90%	12.50%	8.91%
	xLAM-7b-fc-r	88.1%	81.37%	0.87%	17.83%	15.71%	47.53%
	ToolACE-8B	56.54%	92.90%	7.62%	6.28%	3.55%	21.27%
ST_External	GPT-4o	86.81%	6.18%	10.11%	72.75%	63.15%	75.91%
	Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-INT4	85.19%	9.24%	6.95%	69.63%	59.32%	18.55%
	Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	92.68%	7.07%	8.91%	66.57%	61.70%	63.23%
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	89.28%	9.67%	9.32%	63.68%	56.85%	6.38%
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	89.62%	10.92%	6.93%	58.21%	52.17%	39.83%
	Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	90.81%	15.37%	3.54%	58.39%	53.02%	12.94%
	xLAM-7b-fc-r	88.51%	15.77%	3.74%	57.50%	50.89%	34.72%
	ToolACE-8B	91.23%	19.12%	0.46%	56.07%	51.15%	31.32%
Overall	GPT-4o	85.43%	8.21%	5.12%	81.23%	69.57%	80.16%
	Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-INT4	87.18%	17.38%	3.59%	72.48%	63.44%	27.29%
	Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	83.78%	12.18%	4.51%	73.66%	62.05%	69.96%
	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	87.91%	20.97%	4.75%	66.92%	58.70%	10.01%
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	81.68%	18.17%	4.06%	66.09%	54.60%	44.43%
	Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	78.63%	30.54%	3.73%	56.60%	48.10%	11.45%
	xLAM-7b-fc-r	86.98%	32.51%	1.91%	55.88%	48.15%	42.03%
	ToolACE-8B	79.34%	37.57%	2.83%	50.36%	44.93%	24.37%

Table 10: Experiment result for single-turn dataset.

Model	SR/Func Acc										Overall	IS
	sQsA	mQmA	mQsA	sQmA	w/o SO	w/ SO	w/o mSv	w/ mSv	w/o External	w/ External		
GPT-4o	48.61%	56.24%	49.31%	55.29%	55.40%	54.19%	57.99%	22.02%	67.99%	52.20%	51.93%	82.51%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	47.49%	54.70%	41.12%	54.27%	50.54%	40.82%	51.79%	30.14%	58.13%	40.62%	46.96%	43.81%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	29.47%	56.47%	37.20%	55.70%	42.90%	42.25%	48.31%	35.51%	52.61%	42.81%	44.32%	67.67%
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	36.13%	46.49%	31.93%	46.77%	42.38%	34.28%	44.56%	23.33%	51.37%	28.66%	38.59%	49.27%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	29.93%	46.10%	29.72%	45.27%	39.14%	30.70%	42.83%	18.01%	49.45%	33.15%	36.43%	60.47%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	12.66%	14.86%	5.88%	14.86%	16.02%	13.36%	17.41%	4.63%	19.99%	10.41%	13.01%	1.73%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	8.99%	12.49%	4.09%	12.26%	12.44%	9.17%	13.62%	3.14%	19.45%	11.99%	10.76%	5.83%
ToolACE-8B	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.09%

Table 12: Overall evaluation (SR) on HammerBench for different data types.

Model	Args Acc/Func Acc										Overall	IS
	sQsA	mQmA	mQsA	sQmA	w/o SO	w/ SO	w/o mSv	w/ mSv	w/o External	w/ External		
GPT-4o	75.74%	74.28%	71.98%	73.59%	75.18%	73.56%	74.91%	63.34%	83.50%	71.49%	73.76%	82.51%
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-Int4	73.39%	72.69%	67.89%	71.90%	70.93%	66.29%	70.10%	64.23%	77.76%	65.69%	70.09%	43.81%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-Int4	63.09%	71.64%	65.68%	70.35%	65.29%	64.93%	66.45%	64.49%	70.00%	62.34%	66.43%	67.67%
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	63.35%	63.38%	59.40%	62.79%	63.22%	58.96%	63.12%	56.79%	71.62%	55.32%	61.79%	49.27%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	61.33%	62.98%	57.00%	62.77%	61.81%	56.82%	62.33%	54.90%	70.05%	56.62%	60.66%	60.47%
Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410	41.85%	38.77%	31.23%	38.39%	41.01%	38.40%	40.93%	36.09%	47.71%	34.74%	38.91%	1.73%
xLAM-7b-fc-r	33.33%	31.15%	23.55%	31.00%	34.09%	27.32%	34.34%	29.09%	42.39%	30.83%	31.71%	5.83%
ToolACE-8B	10.42%	13.82%	8.67%	13.60%	13.56%	12.40%	14.59%	15.29%	17.50%	12.22%	13.21%	1.09%

Table 13: Overall evaluation (Args Acc) on HammerBench for different data types.