

MLLM-Tool: A Multimodal Large Language Model For Tool Agent Learning

Chenyu Wang¹ Weixin Luo² Qianyu Chen¹ Haonan Mai¹ Jindi Guo¹
 Sixun Dong¹ Xiaohua (Michael) Xuan³ Zhengxin Li¹ Lin Ma² Shenghua Gao^{1,4,5*}
 {wangchy8, luowx, chenqy, maihn, guojd, dongsx, lizhx, gaoshh}@shanghaitech.edu.cn
 michael.xuan@unidt.com
 forest.linmagmail.com

¹ShanghaiTech University ²Meituan ³UniDT

⁴Shanghai Engineering Research Center of Intelligent Vision and Imaging

⁵Shanghai Engineering Research Center of Energy Efficient and Custom AI IC

Abstract

Recently, the astonishing performance of large language models (LLMs) in natural language comprehension and generation tasks triggered lots of exploration of using them as central controllers to build agent systems. Multiple studies focus on bridging the LLMs to external tools to extend the application scenarios. However, the current LLMs' perceiving tool-use ability is limited to a single text query, which may result in ambiguity in understanding the users' real intentions. LLMs are expected to eliminate that by perceiving the visual- or auditory-grounded instructions' information. Therefore, in this paper, we propose MLLM-Tool, a system incorporating open-source LLMs and multi-modal encoders so that the learnt LLMs can be conscious of multi-modal input instruction and then select the function-matched tool correctly. To facilitate the evaluation of the model's capability, we collect a dataset featured by consisting of multi-modal input tools from HuggingFace. Another important feature of our dataset is that our dataset also contains multiple potential choices for the same instruction due to the existence of identical functions and synonymous functions, which provides more potential solutions for the same query. The experiments reveal that our MLLM-Tool is capable of recommending appropriate tools for multi-modal instructions. Codes and data are available at <https://github.com/MLLM-Tool/MLLM-Tool>.

1. Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) [2, 20, 25, 33] have showcased remarkable success in conversational scenar-

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1. Comparisons of results outputted by tool agent with different inputs. The individual posed the same question thrice. Initially, no image was provided, causing the confusion. In the subsequent instances, images from varied scenes were uploaded, and our MLLM-Tool can correctly choose the correct tool based on the multi-modal inputs and generate distinct responses based on the differing pictorial contexts.

ios. With the promising capability of the instruction following via reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) [1, 4, 13], developers extend LLMs, e.g., ChatGPT with a Function Call feature, to the tool-use domain. This extension of LLMs' capabilities can be applied to a broad spectrum of situations, from intriguing outer tasks like restaurant reservations and online shopping to inner operations involving the retrieval and processing of infinite external knowledge. Along this direction, numerous intelligent agents [3, 7, 18, 23, 24, 31, 41, 43] have been developed, by leveraging LLMs to accomplish various tasks in human-like ways.

Although some efforts [15, 21, 23, 39] have been made to stimulate the capability to use external tools with LLMs, they are confined to purely textual inputs, leading to poten-

Method	Trainable Multimodal LLM		Num. of modality	Multi-options
	LLM	LLM		
MetaTool [12]	✗	✗	1	✗
APIBank [15]	✓	✗	1	✗
ToolBench [39]	✓	✗	1	✗
ToolLLM [23]	✓	✗	1	✗
APIBench [21]	✓	✗	1	✗
Visual ChatGPT [37]	✗	✗	2	✗
GPT4Tool [42]	✓	✗	2	✗
HuggingGPT [27]	✗	✗	4	✗
Ours	✓	✓	4	✓

Table 1. Comparison of previous works and our work. The first five are intended for tool-augmented LLMs with textual inputs, and the middle three focus on empowering the task planning of LLMs and executing multi-modal inputs with corresponding tasks’ APIs.

tial confusion and misinterpretation, especially when text is ambiguous in specifying the users’ real intentions. As illustrated in Figure 1, for the given textual prompt, “*Generate a picture conditioned on the image. A professional athlete dressed in a football uniform, throwing his arms up in a cheer.*”, LLMs struggle due to a lack of visual input and cannot specify the type of conditioned image. Recognizing this as an image generation task, they falter in recommending suitable pose- or scribble-conditioned text-to-image tools. However, when endowed with the capability to perceive visual or auditory instructions, LLMs, in this instance, can extract key “*human pose*” and “*scribble*” information from the second time and third time input images, respectively, thus resolving the ambiguity issue. Subsequently, multi-modal instruction sensing is necessary to identify the appropriate tools for different tasks.

To remedy the previous works only accepting single text instructions, in this paper, we introduce a novel system, MLLM-Tool, integrating multi-modal encoders with open-source LLMs to synthesize multi-modal information for correct external tool identification. The distinction between our work and previous works is delineated in Table 1. Compared to previous open-sourced works, our system is the first attempt to train a large multi-modal model for tool agent learning. In light of the fact that existing tool learning benchmarks [12, 15, 21, 23, 27, 37, 39, 42], do not explicitly construct text-to-any-modality pairs for alleviating text ambiguity, which cannot facilitate the training of our MLLM-Tool, in this paper, we collect a novel dataset, named ToolMMBench from the HuggingFace platform, one of the largest machine learning communities containing thousands of APIs. It is also worth noting that our ToolMMBench supports multi-options for each query, as demonstrated in Table 1. This feature is more closely related to real-life scenarios, where multiple alternatives exist to address the same challenges, albeit with varying perfor-

mance levels. Such a feature would also make our dataset suitable for other applications in future, such as the study of integrating multiple outputs from different tools to better feedback to the user.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We develop MLLM-Tool, a multi-modal tool agent system that can perceive the visual- or audio-grounded instructions’ information via incorporating multi-modal encoders and open-source large language models.
- We construct a multi-modal input benchmark for evaluating LLMs’ awareness and selection ability of the external tool usage with text-ambiguous queries. The benchmark offers content-aware multi-modal instructions and one-to-many instruction-answer pairs.
- We design some evaluation metrics and conduct experiments with extensive subset ablations on multiple popular LLMs, and by fine-tuning MLLM-Tool on ToolMMBench, we observe a promising accuracy, 88.19% of the tool selection. which demonstrates the effectiveness of our method.

2. Related Works

Multi-modal Large Language Models. LLMs have increasingly become the cornerstone of many natural language processing (NLP) applications. Subsequently, many efforts, including GPT-4V [19], LLaVA [16], BLIP-2 [14], Minigt-4 [46] developed the LLM to vision space by aligning off-the-shelf frozen pre-trained image encoders. And similar ideas are generalized to video and audio modalities, like NeXTGPT [38], and VideoLLaMA [44]. Our proposed system, MLLM-Tool, focuses on exploring tool usage awareness and selection. Our goal is to empower the LLM’s ability to be conscious of the external tools’ function and select the suitable tools, to act as a controller, instead of enhancing the ability of multi-modal understanding and reasoning.

Tool Agent. Recent advancements have witnessed a rapid emergence of systems that deploy LLMs as a central orchestrator for tool assistance. Toolformer [26] pioneers the study of bridging the LLMs with the external tools. Subsequent works have expanded the application domains of this integration to encompass health support [17], code synthesis [15, 30], web searching [28]. Gorilla [21] collected a machine learning domain dataset and introduced API retrieval to boost the performance. ToolLLM [23] focused on executing complex tasks in practical scenarios. GPT4Tools [42] and Visual ChatGPT [37] integrating visual found models after decomposing the task. On the contrary, we concentrate on completely relying on the ability of large language models to naturally process multi-modal inputs and select the appropriate APIs. And to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to explore this direction.

3. Dataset Construction

In this section, we present the process of constructing a benchmark from HuggingFace, which primarily involves three steps: collecting API datasets (Sec. 3.1), generating instruction-answer pairs (Sec. 3.2), and constructing one-to-many instruction matching (Sec. 3.3). We also introduce the statistics and distribution of the benchmark in Sec. 3.4.

3.1. API Collection

Initially, we crawled 263,945 models from the HuggingFace platform. However, the quality of these models varies significantly, for example, some models are poorly maintained, even lacking information in the model card. To ensure only those models meeting specific criteria (e.g. having a detailed model card, especially providing model description and example script) are ultimately selected, we employ a meticulous filtering process and the detailed filtering process is shown in the Appendix. Finally, we only retain 932 high-quality models.

For each model, we document the model card and extract the key information, including the domain, `api_name`, `api_call`, `parameters`, `coarse_functionality`, `fine_functionality`, `example codes`, and `descriptions`. Further, to prevent an overabundance of APIs with identical functionalities leading to excessive options for subsequent instruction matching (e.g., in the imaging realm, where two APIs might differ only in their network architectures but are identical in terms of the datasets they were trained on and their functionalities), we adopt a strategy based on the API’s download statistics. For any single functionality category, we retain a maximum of five of the most downloaded APIs.

It is worth noticing that the function classification rules formulated by the HuggingFace platform are coarse-grained and not suitable for direct use by our work for some reasons. In particular, some models lack assigned categories or are incorrectly classified, or they contain multiple tasks but only one of them is labeled. Additionally, the platform employs overly coarse, resulting in a loss of fine-grained distinctions. For example, the task of *Audio Classification*, can be subdivided into *Event Recognition*, *Command Recognition*, *Spoken Language Identification*, *Speaker Verification*, etc. We then propose a new hierarchical function categorization system and rearrange the filtered model. We list all the tasks our system supports in Table 2, and for the sub-tasks we divide under these tasks, we provide more detailed information in the Appendix.

Given our API collection may not cover all tasks, users in real-world scenarios might encounter situations without a suitable API. Thus, we also introduce the “*Unknown*” option to address this issue.

Audio Classification	Audio-to-Text	Audio-to-Audio
Voice Activity Detection	Video Classification	Video-to-Text
Depth Estimation	Image Classification	Image Segmentation
Image-to-Image	Visual Question Answering	Image-to-Text
Zero-Shot Image Classification	Multimodal-to-Image	Object Detection
Feature Extraction	Fill-Mask	Text Generation
Text Generation	Text Classification	Question Answering
Sentence Similarity	Summarization	Text-to-Image
Text-to-Speech	Text-to-Video	Text-to-Text
Translation	Zero-Shot Classification	

Table 2. The 29 coarse-grained tasks our system supports.

3.2. Instruction-Answer Pairs Generation

To curate the instruction-answer pairs, we leverage GPT-4 to understand the functionalities of these API calls and then generate 20 queries for each API call. Detailed prompts are provided in the Appendix.


After meticulously filtering and refining through manual review, 10 well-crafted queries will be finally selected to be associated with each API call. A significant highlight of our approach is its capability to disambiguate text prompts by learning the characteristics of other modalities when handling multi-modal inputs. We elaborate on five text ambiguity cases that need to be checked:

Data models used are from different domains: It is imperative to acknowledge the inherent disparities across data domains, either auditory or visual. Owing to these pronounced differences between domains, a unified treatment could result in significant biases in outcomes. Models need to judiciously select APIs contingent on the particular data domain at hand, instead of using a unified treatment, ignoring the bias across different domains. For instance, in image segmentation tasks, it is vital to select distinct APIs tailored for specific scenarios like indoor decorations, portraits’ fashion apparel, or medical related according to the given image.

Distribution and granularity of categories in different datasets: Within the same domain, we need to consider the covered categories and category granularity variations. Especially when doing image classification tasks, specific strategies vary for common, specialized, or rare categories.

Image Quality: The most evident instance revolves around image quality, which can be compromised by multiple factors including fog, rain, low resolution, and motion blur. When confronted with vague commands such as “*I want to enhance the image quality*”, analyzing the reason for the low imaging quality of the input image, and then selecting the appropriate API call for quality enhancement becomes necessary.

Input Conditions of different models: In some cases, the format of the input image can also assist in resolving text ambiguity issues. For example, ControlNet [45] posits multiple conditions for image generation. Faced with an instruction like “*Based on the provided image, generate a*



(a) The distribution of sub-testing sets divided by API option number and ambiguity types respectively. (b) The distribution of each ambiguity type in the whole dataset. (c) The distribution of each ambiguity type in the testing set.

Figure 2. Dataset statistic visualization.




Figure 3. The word cloud calculated based on the frequency of task name occurrence.

photo of a chef in the kitchen,” and given inputs such as a pose image or a normal map, the model must leverage the unique features distinguishing between the two types of images. This discernment facilitates the selection of the appropriate API to achieve the desired output.

Others: There are some individual cases unique to individual modality, for instance, linguistic variations in the audio realm. Within the speech recognition task, when presented with an instruction like “In my language class, we listened to a story. I managed to record it; can you tell me its content?”, the absence of explicitly provided language information necessitates the model to first ascertain the spoken language. Only then can it aptly select the correspond-

ing API for accurate content extraction and interpretation.

For convenience, the following defaults to five ambiguity situations, referred to as **Domains, Categories, Quality, Conditions and Others**.

Subsequently, nuanced manual intervention is warranted to search for prompt-matching inputs, especially in scenarios involving multi-modalities, sourced either from relevant datasets or online searches. Take the image classification task for example, one might say, “I have a photo of marine life taken during my scuba diving trip. Can you identify its category?”, it becomes crucial to provide a marine creature image input to match the context of the prompt “marine life” and “scuba diving trip”, and the corresponding image path would be saved.

We collect a total of multi-modal instruction-answer pairs, including 3798 image inputs, 103 video inputs, and 726 audio inputs, totaling 72 videos, 3777 images, and 590 audio files.

3.3. Instruction Matching

In contrast to prior works, our dataset stands out with a unique feature: it encompasses numerous API calls that perform identical or similar functions. This results in a scenario where a single instruction could be associated with several API calls within our dataset, each potentially suitable for addressing it. In step two, we approach from a singular API function perspective to construct one-to-one matched instruction-answer pairs, now necessitating integration of results from the classification system established in the first step. For APIs with identical functionalities, we can match their queries immediately. However, for groups

of APIs with similar functionalities, it’s essential to determine whether a query aligns with a strict or broad functional description of each API. For instance, the request, “*Can you help me generate an image of a ‘golden-haired magical princess’ in the Disney style?*” In this scenario, the emphasis on the “*Disney style*” narrows down the choice of APIs to those pre-trained on Disney-themed images. Conversely, a more general instruction like, “*I’m organizing a role-playing event and need a reference image. Can you generate an image of a ‘masked mysterious hero’ for me?*” leaves room for multiple APIs to be potential solutions, given its lack of specificity. This process yielded a dataset where each instruction corresponds to one or, in some cases, multiple relevant API calls.

3.4. Dataset Statistics

In alignment with HuggingFace’s task-specific API distributions, ToolMMBench exhibits a similar long-tailed distribution, with text-related APIs being the most abundant and video-related ones the least. ToolMMBench consists of 27 coarse-grained task categories inheriting from HuggingFace, from which we expands to 29 tasks to form the first level of our classification system, and then extending to our predefined fine-grained tasks. The overall distribution graph of our support tasks can be observed in Figure 3, where the larger the font size, the higher the frequency of occurrence. We also tally the instances of each ambiguity type in Figure 2b, amassing a total of 2533 ambiguity pairs. Predominantly, these are concentrated within conditional cases involving image inputs, comprising 1530 pairs, since our dataset covers 11 distinct condition types of ControlNet [45], and their various combinations, achieving a considerable quantity.

We divide our dataset into training and testing sets in an 8:2 ratio. Since our task currently focuses on a closed set of APIs, our test set cannot include any APIs that haven’t been encountered in the training set. Therefore, we approach this from the perspective of queries generated by each API. Given the presence of one-to-many query scenarios in our dataset, we implement a strategy in the training set to address these cases. Specifically, we split each one-to-many query into W distinct inputs, where W represents the number of APIs that support the given query. This approach ensures that each potential API response is individually represented, allowing the model to learn the diverse range of suitable responses for a single query. In contrast to the training sampling strategy, for the one-to-many query scenarios in our dataset, each query appears only once in the test set. Finally, the training set comprises 44,533 instructions, containing 9,245 different instructions, and the testing set totaled 2,397 instructions. The detailed distribution is illustrated in Table 3.

Particularly for the testing set, we depict in Figure 2a

Settings	Text	Audio	Image	Video
Training Set (w/ split)	31,280	2,944	10,085	224
Training Set (w/o split)	5,563	562	3,938	82
Testing Set	1,452	164	760	21

Table 3. Distribution of training set and testing set. Note that, in the training set, one-to-many scenarios are split into multiple one-to-one instructions, so the first line represents for the number of queries after splitting while the second line calculates the distinct query number of four single modality. The last line is the distribution of the whole testing set.

and Figure 2c the distribution of API quantities across each testing subset. These subsets are constructed based on three distinct partitioning criteria: ambiguity types, API option number, and modality.

4. MLLM-Tool

We introduce MLLM-Tool, a method that leverages the LLM performing the role of multi-modality tool agent. The architecture of this network is depicted in Figure 4. Considering the diversity of our data, which includes images, videos, and audios, we incorporate ImageBind [9] as our primary multimodal encoder. ImageBind [9] is designed to create a unified embedding space that integrates six distinct modalities, utilizing the advancements in large-scale vision-language models.

For the large language model component of MLLM-Tool, we select a range of leading LLMs, including Vicuna [5], Llama [33], Llama2 [34], and Llama2-Chat [34]. These models are chosen for their exemplary performance in various areas, such as inference capabilities, knowledge retention, and comprehension skills. Consequently, our system is equipped with the proficiency to interpret multimodal input instructions effectively.

In our dataset, there are four types of modality-combination input: *Text*, *Text+Image*, *Text+Video*, and *Text+Audio*. The output from the LLM includes textual responses that provide tool recommendations along with their respective model card information. For the multimodal inputs in the *Image*, *Video*, or *Audio* modalities, we first utilize ImageBind [9] encoders with fixed weights for feature extraction. These features are then aligned with the LLM’s feature space through a linear projection layer. To optimize our model while minimizing the number of learnable parameters, we implement Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [11] to fine-tune an open-source LLM.

Currently, the system’s output only includes the API Name in the format $\{api_name: [Recommended\ API]\}$. Our future endeavors aim to expand this output to include API parameters, code execution results, and elements of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) Prompting [35]. Additionally, the current version of our system is designed for single-turn dia-




Figure 4. **Our network architecture.** The network could process four distinct types of input, each uniquely color-coded. These inputs, irrespective of their modality, are first encoded using modality-specific frozen encoders. Subsequently, they are passed through a trainable projection layer, aligning them within a unified language feature space. The fine-tuned Large Language Models (LLMs), augmented with Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), then process a combination of the prompt and the projected embeddings, enabling the accurate predicting of corresponding API name.

logues, with the intention to extend its capabilities to multi-turn conversations in subsequent developments.

5. Evaluation Metrics

Since no prior work addresses user prompt ambiguity from the perspective of constructing text-to-any-modality pairs, there are no established metrics for measuring performance. In this paper, we propose evaluation metrics tailored to the dataset’s unique attributes, ambiguity types, multiple options, and diverse modality inputs to effectively measure performance disparities.

- **Ambiguity types:** In light of the five distinct ambiguity scenarios delineated above, we construct corresponding testing subsets. These facilitate the evaluation of the model’s capability to leverage multimodal information under varying types of ambiguity, providing a nuanced understanding of its performance.
- **Multiple options:** Since our model has the capacity to support multiple options, we divide the instruction set into two subsets, solved only by one single API versus those allowing for multiple API options, and we expect to examine the performance gaps within two subsets.
- **Individual modality:** For each modality, we partition subsets to evaluate model performance with fixed modality combinations, ensuring a comprehensive assessment

across varying input configurations.

The testing set is divided into several subsets based on the three attributes. For a subset S , supposing containing n instructions $\{x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots x_n\}$, where each instruction x_i matches an API list y_i , which consists of a list of M suitable APIs $[A_i^1, A_i^2, A_i^3, \dots, A_i^M]$. Thus, the collection of API lists corresponding to this instruction subset combined to a set Y , $\{y_1, y_2, y_3 \dots y_n\}$. With these symbols defined, assuming the subset S yields an API set $\{z_1, z_2, z_3 \dots z_n\}$, output from our model, we can represent the accuracy of each mentioned subset using the following formula:

$$\text{Acc} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{z_i \in y_i} / n \quad (1)$$

The above formula also applies to the accuracy calculation for the entire testing set. Besides that, the hallucination rate is used as a metric to evaluate the performance of each testing subset and the overall testing set. For the calculation of the hallucination rate, we first assume the corpus C , containing all APIs. Hallucination refers to the phenomenon where the model outputs APIs are not present in the corpus C , essentially fabrications of the model. Taking the above subset S as an example, the calculation of the hallucination

rate can be expressed with a formula:

$$\text{Hallu} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{z_i \notin C} / n \quad (2)$$

Besides that, unlike simple one-to-one mapping relationships, using single-instance accuracy is insufficient for evaluating the system’s comprehension of the relationships of APIs, especially in one-to-many mapping relationships. Hence, we propose utilizing recall, allowing the system to perform repeated inferences. By examining the proportion of ground truth encompassed by the collective results of multiple inference results, marked as R_i^j , where i is the i^{th} instruction in the testing set and j represents for the j^{th} inference. The corresponding metric calculation is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(f_c(\text{Set}(R_i^1, R_i^2 \dots R_i^K | R_i^j \in y_i, j \in [1, K]))}{f_c(y_i)}$$

where K is the number of inference, f_c is the counting function.

Additionally, to assess whether the system’s output is intuitive and whether the output format meets user needs, we introduce a metric named **format accuracy**. Specifically, we aim for the output to be presented in JSON format, with clearly delineated key-value pairs. In this paper, the format should be $\{api_name: [Recommended\ API]\}$. Any alterations to this format, including missing symbols or changing the order of placement, are all considered as formatting errors. This structure is designed to facilitate user navigation, allowing for easy selection of desired sections.

6. Experiments

In this section, we conduct experiments on our collected dataset, evaluating the performance of our system MLLM-Tool. We start by introducing the experiment setup in Sec. 6.1 and data processing in Sec. 6.2. In Sec. 6.3, we assess MLLM-Tool’s ability on our benchmark, followed by results analysis in Sec. 6.4. And we conduct qualitative experiment and visualize the result in Sec. 6.5.

6.1. Experiment Setup

We list the setup, including some hyperparameters used to train our model in Table 4. The setup follows [29] and adjusts based on our computation resources ($4 \times$ A40 40G GPUs). Especially, given the larger parameter size of the 13B model, to enhance experimental performance, we increase the epoch to 10.

6.2. Data processing

For multimodal inputs, we adopt ImageBind’s [9] data processing approach. For video, we evenly split into five

Configuration	7B-model	13B-model
Optimizer	AdamW	AdamW
Optimizer Momentum	$\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$	$\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$
Peak learning rate	5e-4	5e-4
Weight decay	0.001	0.001
Warmup steps	10	10
Batch size	64	32
Micro-batch size	4	1
Gradient accumulation steps	4	8
Maximum target length	512	512
ImageBind Checkpoint	ImageBind-Huge	ImageBind-Huge
Epochs	5	10
LoRA attention dimension (r)	32	32
LoRA scaling alpha (α)	32	32
LoRA drop out	0.1	0.1

Table 4. 7B and 13B model training configuration.

clips and randomly sample 2 frames from each clip to cover the full length, similar to other Vision Transformer (ViT) [6]-based works [8, 32] with video input. For audio, we sample each input audio at 16KHz. Subsequently, we capture a log mel spectrogram featuring 128 frequency bins, following [10]. Then, the spectrogram can be seen as a 2D image. In this way, we can use ViT for these three multi-modal encoders. A modality-specific linear projection head is added to each modality’s encoder to align the feature into a uniform 1024-sized dimension.

Model	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Format Acc \uparrow
Vicuna-7B (3epochs)	77.35	4.13	100.00
Llama-7B (3epochs)	76.64	2.80	100.00
Llama2-7B (3epochs)	76.39	5.13	100.00
Llama2-Chat-7B (3epochs)	76.18	4.92	100.00
Vicuna-7B (5epochs)	83.15	1.63	100.00
Llama-7B (5epochs)	84.48	0.58	100.00
Llama2-7B (5epochs)	80.68	1.96	100.00
Llama2-Chat-7B (5epochs)	83.60	1.34	100.00
Vicuna-13B (3epochs)	74.34	3.63	100.00
Llama-13B (3epochs)	75.18	3.21	100.00
Llama2-13B (3epochs)	64.71	3.38	100.00
Llama2-Chat-13B (3epochs)	77.51	3.38	100.00
Vicuna-13B (5epochs)	80.85	1.63	100.00
Llama-13B (5epochs)	81.44	2.00	100.00
Llama2-13B (5epochs)	67.58	1.34	100.00
Llama2-Chat-13B (5epochs)	81.35	1.42	100.00
Vicuna-13B (10epochs)	88.19	0.17	100.00
Llama-13B (10epochs)	<u>87.86</u>	<u>0.17</u>	100.00
Llama2-13B (10epochs)	81.81	<u>0.17</u>	100.00
Llama2-Chat-13B (10epochs)	87.78	0.08	100.00

Table 5. **Experimental results of MLLM-Tool.** We present the performance of eight large language models with different configurations, and we report the performance at different epochs of training to reflect the changing trend.

Model	Domains		Categories		Quality		Conditions		Others		With ambiguity		Without ambiguity	
	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow
Vicuna-7B (3epochs)	60.92	0.00	64.71	3.92	<u>97.06</u>	0.00	87.86	0.00	97.92	0.00	82.74	0.38	74.89	3.49
Llama-7B (3epochs)	54.02	1.15	66.67	0.00	47.06	0.00	87.54	0.00	100.00	0.00	78.61	0.19	76.98	5.26
Llama2-7B (3epochs)	58.62	0.00	64.71	0.00	61.76	0.00	87.86	0.32	97.92	0.00	80.11	0.19	73.50	4.02
Llama2-Chat-7B (3epochs)	66.67	0.00	74.51	0.00	79.41	0.00	88.50	0.00	100.00	0.00	84.05	0.00	73.93	6.33
Vicuna-7B (5epochs)	83.91	2.30	72.55	0.00	100.00	0.00	94.25	0.00	100.00	0.00	91.37	0.94	80.79	1.98
Llama-7B (5epochs)	75.86	0.00	66.67	0.00	73.53	0.00	95.21	0.00	100.00	0.00	88.37	0.00	83.37	0.75
Llama2-7B (5epochs)	66.67	0.00	66.67	0.00	94.12	0.00	92.97	0.00	100.00	0.00	86.87	0.00	78.92	2.52
Llama2-Chat-7B (5epochs)	87.36	0.00	74.51	0.00	<u>97.06</u>	0.00	95.85	0.00	100.00	0.00	92.87	0.00	80.95	1.72
Vicuna-13B (3epochs)	56.32	0.00	64.71	0.00	82.35	0.00	88.82	0.00	100.00	0.00	81.80	0.00	73.28	4.13
Llama-13B (3epochs)	24.14	0.00	66.67	0.00	44.12	11.76	89.46	0.00	100.00	0.00	74.67	0.75	74.25	4.45
Llama2-13B (3epochs)	59.77	0.00	76.47	0.00	58.82	0.00	90.10	0.00	97.92	0.00	82.55	0.00	76.07	4.35
Llama2-Chat-13B (3epochs)	39.08	0.00	68.63	0.00	38.24	0.00	26.20	1.60	97.92	0.00	39.59	0.94	71.89	4.08
Vicuna-13B (5epochs)	82.76	0.00	68.63	7.84	<u>97.06</u>	0.00	93.61	0.32	100.00	0.00	90.24	0.94	78.92	2.31
Llama-13B (5epochs)	48.28	0.00	62.75	0.00	100.00	0.00	88.50	0.96	100.00	0.00	81.24	0.56	80.74	1.93
Llama2-13B (5epochs)	74.71	0.00	60.78	0.00	91.18	0.00	88.82	0.00	100.00	0.00	84.99	0.00	80.31	1.82
Llama2-Chat-13B (5epochs)	33.33	0.00	58.82	0.00	41.18	0.00	31.63	0.00	87.50	0.00	40.15	0.00	75.43	1.72
Vicuna-13B (10epochs)	88.51	0.00	66.67	0.00	<u>97.06</u>	0.00	97.76	0.00	100.00	0.00	93.43	0.00	86.70	0.21
Llama-13B (10epochs)	<u>89.66</u>	0.00	<u>76.47</u>	0.00	100.00	0.00	97.12	0.00	100.00	0.00	<u>94.37</u>	0.00	<u>86.00</u>	0.21
Llama2-13B (10epochs)	64.37	0.00	60.78	0.00	73.53	0.00	73.48	0.32	100.00	0.00	73.17	0.19	84.28	0.16
Llama2-Chat-13B (10epochs)	90.80	0.00	78.43	0.00	<u>97.06</u>	0.00	<u>97.44</u>	0.00	100.00	0.00	94.75	0.00	85.78	0.11

Table 6. The performance on testing subsets divided by ambiguity type.

6.3. Experimental Results

We finetune four open-source LLMs, Llama, Llama2, Llama2-Chat, and Vicuna, each with 7B and 13B two variants, on the instruction-solution data pairs. As illustrated in Table 5, we report the format accuracy, the accuracy, and the hallucination rate, which are defined in Table 5 in detail. Due to the limitation of computing resources, the experiment results for recall metric, we focused on the two models, Llama2-7B and Llama2-Chat-7B, and set the inference times K 10. The results are shown in Table 7.

Model	Recall \uparrow
Llama2-7B (3 epochs)	55.85
Llama2-7B (5 epochs)	62.13
Llama2-Chat-7B (3 epochs)	55.23
Llama2-Chat-7B (5 epochs)	<u>61.47</u>

Table 7. The recall performance of two 7B models.

We can derive some findings from the results:

1. For the 7B models, Llama-7B performs the best performance both on accuracy and hallucination rate, with 84.48% and 0.58% respectively when trained with 5 epochs. As we increase the training epochs, we can observe that there is a consistent improvement in both accuracy (+ 6.34%) and the reduction of hallucination rates (- 2.87%) averagely compared to that with 3 epochs. As for 13B models, when training for 5 epochs, the performance is not as good as the corresponding 7B model. But if increasing to 10 epochs, we can observe a substantial improvement, and Vicuna-13B achieves 88.19% accuracy. Meanwhile, all the

13B models’ hallucination rate drop to within 0.17% at 10 epochs.

2. The format maintains a hundred percent accuracy across all models, demonstrating LLMs have a high understanding of structural rules, which is crucial for tasks that demand strict formatting.

3. The hallucination rate generally remains low, especially when increasing the number of epochs, which we speculate is due to the relative simplicity of our dataset. Since most of our data provides a clear context and our extracted description does not involve complex language structures so that the model is more likely to produce responses within the whole corpus.

4. While recall gradually increases with the number of epochs, the overall recall values remain modest. We hypothesize this is due to an abundance of selectable APIs for some queries. Despite limiting identical function APIs, in cases like image classification, common object labels appearing across multiple datasets can accumulate suitable APIs, potentially exceeding ten options. Therefore, even with ten inference times, it’s impossible to cover all possibilities.

Overall, the results affirm that our system MLLM-Tool effectively brings out the tool-use potential in LLMs and enhances the LLMs to deal with multi-modal instruction inputs.

6.4. Results Analysis

To verify the effectiveness of our system when encountering different complex cases, we conduct experiments on all types of testing subsets defined by three previously established criteria in Sec. 5, assessing the impact of different

Model	Video		Audio		Image		Text	
	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow
Vicuna-7B (3epochs)	76.19	4.76	88.41	3.05	79.87	1.18	73.62	3.58
Llama-7B (3epochs)	<u>85.71</u>	0.00	<u>92.68</u>	0.00	75.66	1.18	76.38	6.20
Llama2-7B (3epochs)	80.95	0.00	89.63	0.61	76.97	1.05	72.18	4.61
Llama2-Chat-7B (3epochs)	76.19	0.00	87.20	0.00	79.87	0.66	73.00	7.78
Vicuna-7B (5epochs)	71.43	0.00	93.29	0.00	88.95	0.53	79.13	2.41
Llama-7B (5epochs)	76.19	0.00	89.02	0.00	87.24	0.26	82.64	0.83
Llama2-7B (5epochs)	80.95	0.00	93.29	0.00	83.82	0.39	77.62	3.03
Llama2-Chat-7B (5epochs)	80.95	0.00	92.07	0.00	86.45	1.84	81.20	1.24
Vicuna-13B (3epochs)	<u>85.71</u>	0.00	89.63	1.83	76.71	1.84	72.59	4.13
Llama-13B (3epochs)	80.95	0.00	92.07	0.00	72.50	1.45	73.21	5.23
Llama2-13B (3epochs)	76.19	0.00	89.63	0.00	78.16	1.32	75.83	4.89
Llama2-Chat-13B (3epochs)	<u>85.71</u>	0.00	90.24	0.00	44.61	1.32	72.04	4.89
Vicuna-13B (5epochs)	80.95	0.00	89.63	0.00	86.18	1.97	78.03	2.27
Llama-13B (5epochs)	76.19	0.00	90.85	0.00	79.87	0.92	80.30	2.20
Llama2-13B (5epochs)	71.43	0.00	92.07	0.00	82.11	0.13	79.89	2.27
Llama2-Chat-13B (5epochs)	76.19	0.00	85.37	0.00	44.21	0.53	77.69	1.93
Vicuna-13B (10epochs)	76.19	0.00	92.07	0.00	<u>90.66</u>	0.13	86.64	0.21
Llama-13B (10epochs)	71.43	0.00	92.07	0.00	92.76	0.00	85.06	0.28
Llama2-13B (10epochs)	<u>85.71</u>	0.00	89.02	0.00	71.84	0.13	86.16	0.21
Llama2-Chat-13B (10epochs)	80.95	0.00	89.63	0.00	90.53	0.00	<u>86.23</u>	0.14

Table 8. The performance on testing subsets divided by input modality.

characteristics of data on our model’s performance and accuracy. All the 7B models are trained in 5 epochs and 13B models are trained in 10 epochs by default for a fair comparison.

Ambiguity types. In Table 6, we provide the results for five types of ambiguity, and the comparison between non-ambiguity and ambiguity cases. We find that the ambiguity types I (Domains) and II (Categories) perform worst in ambiguity handling. In contrast, other categories excel, especially type V (Language) achieves 100% accuracy when trained 5 epochs for 7B or 10 epochs for 13B models. Intuitively, the exceptional performance of type III (Quality) and type IV (Conditions) may stem from significant visual differences and clear classification boundaries. In contrast, for type I and type II, particularly the latter, the challenges arise due to varying granularity in datasets. The model must not only understand the multimodal input content but also discern the most appropriate classification granularity for the task at hand, complicating the choice of API. For the overall performance, we find that performance without ambiguity surprisingly falls short compared to that with ambiguity. It indirectly highlights that text descriptions cannot substitute for multimodal information, even when the language is exceptionally detailed. This underscores the necessity for LLMs to process the capability to perceive visual- and auditory- instructions, demonstrating the significance of our work.

Model	one-to-one		one-to-many	
	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow	Acc \uparrow	Hallu \downarrow
Vicuna-7B (3epochs)	51.75	6.71	86.62	1.23
Llama-7B (3epochs)	56.12	6.85	85.86	3.04
Llama2-7B (3epochs)	47.67	6.56	85.91	1.81
Llama2-Chat-7B (3epochs)	57.29	6.56	83.75	4.27
Vicuna-7B (5epochs)	66.03	3.35	90.01	0.94
Llama-7B (5epochs)	69.24	1.31	90.59	0.29
Llama2-7B (5epochs)	63.12	3.64	87.73	1.29
Llama2-Chat-7B (5epochs)	70.99	2.33	88.66	0.94
Vicuna-13B (3epochs)	47.96	7.14	86.09	1.64
Llama-13B (3epochs)	47.23	5.69	85.21	2.81
Llama2-13B (3epochs)	51.90	8.16	87.78	1.46
Llama2-Chat-13B (3epochs)	41.84	7.00	73.87	1.93
Vicuna-13B (5epochs)	61.95	4.52	89.25	0.99
Llama-13B (5epochs)	61.81	3.35	88.49	0.94
Llama2-13B (5epochs)	62.97	3.06	88.72	0.76
Llama2-Chat-13B (5epochs)	50.58	3.35	74.40	0.53
Vicuna-13B (10epochs)	77.26	0.58	92.58	0.00
Llama-13B (10epochs)	<u>76.68</u>	0.58	<u>92.34</u>	0.00
Llama2-13B (10epochs)	69.24	0.44	86.85	0.06
Llama2-Chat-13B (10epochs)	76.38	0.29	<u>92.34</u>	0.00

Table 9. The performance on testing subsets divided by API option number.

Multiple options. We divide the testing set into two to distinguish whether prompts can be linked to multiple



Figure 5. Qualitative example of MLLM-Tool on text ambiguity case. MLLM-Tool firstly receives the text instruction and perceives information from the input image to determine the corresponding task, select the appropriate API that meets the requirements from the API corpus, and then call the API to execute, and finally get the quality-improved image. Zoom in for the best view.

API options (one-to-one or one-to-many), and the corresponding performances are shown in Table 9. Surprisingly, we discover that one-to-one performance does not surpass, and is significantly behind, the scenario with one-to-many cases, lagging by an average of 21.90% across four 7B models at 5 epochs and 16.14% across four 13B models at 10 epochs. Besides, in terms of the rate of hallucinations, the one-to-one demonstrates a relatively higher incidence. Our analysis suggests that one-to-one pairs may lead to overfitting, where the model becomes overly tuned to specific pairs, hindering its ability to generalize to slightly different queries or contexts. The higher rate of hallucinations also verifies the above speculation.

Individual modality. We further investigate the model’s perception and understanding of instructions with the specific sole modality and report the results in Table 8. Notably, the audio modality stands out, achieving an impressive performance among all models, reaching as high as 93.29% on both the Llama2-Chat-7B and Vicuna-7B model. On the other hand, we notice that pure text-based performance is not particularly satisfactory, falling short in both accuracy and hallucination rate. As for the video modal, it has a greater performance variance than other modals. Interestingly, We find that as the number of epochs increased, the performance of Vicuna-7B drops significantly. A similar situation also occurs on the several other models. We speculate that this may be related to the complexity and scarcity of video data. Since our video task mostly involves video understanding, but with the epochs increasing, the model might start to emphasize the detailed information, which can impact the performance when extending to new unseen data.

6.5. Visualization

We visualize qualitative result of MLLM-Tool, to verify its effectiveness. As shown in Figure 5, our system is asked to improve the quality of the input image without explaining the reason for the poor image quality, and MLLM-Tool is capable of perceiving the multi-modal information and choosing the correct API by combining the instruction and visual information, which proves that our MLLM-Tool can effectively accomplish the users’ needs.

7. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce how to empower the tool-augmented LLMs with perceiving visual- or audio-grounded instructions’ information. We collect a benchmark, ToolMMBench, from the HuggingFace Platform, which covers 932 high-quality machine learning related APIs. The finetuning of this dataset on various popular LLMs has yielded promising results, demonstrating that MLLM-Tool can accurately recommend appropriate tools for multi-modal instructions.

MLLM-Tool: A Multimodal Large Language Model For Tool Agent Learning

Supplementary Material

In this supplementary material, we list i) dataset details, including selection criteria, prompt templates, data distribution; ii) our proposed categorization system.

8. Dataset Details

In this section, we elaborate on the details of dataset construction and the distribution of training and testing data. Specifically, Figure 8.1 visualizes the entire dataset construction process, while Sec. 8.2 - Sec. 8.4 detail each step, including API selection criteria, API functional boundaries criteria, and prompt construction. Sec. 8.5 visualizes some data distributions of the training set and testing set. We emphasize that the collection and processing of this dataset involved over 2000 person-hours, ensuring its reliability for advanced computer vision research and applications by meticulous attention to detail.




Figure 6. The process of dataset construction. It mainly consists of three stages. The first step is collection and preprocessing, including crawling the original API from HuggingFace, filtering and re-categorizing the API according to tasks. The second step is the generation of instruction-answer pairs, including using GPT-4 to generate instructions based on API functions, determining whether there is text ambiguity in the user prompts, and searching for content-matching input for multi-modal. The third step is to construct a potential one-to-many instruction-answer pair based on the relationship between API functions.




Figure 7. Five types of ambiguity cases needed to be checked during the instruction-answer pair generation step.

8.1. Visualization of Dataset Construction Process

We show the whole process of collecting our dataset in Figure 6. The difficulty in collecting the benchmark is reflected in three aspects. (1) Task Classification: We restructure a hierarchical task classification system. This advancement rectifies the overly coarse-grained categorizations observed in the HuggingFace platform, ensuring that each API is endowed with a specific and unambiguous task label. (2) Annotation of Multimodal Input Instructions: Should an instruction reveal cues from modalities other than text, a precise coherence between the divulged information in the instruction and the content of the non-textual modality is paramount. In cases where no such cues are disclosed, we deem it essential to investigate the presence of five potential cases that are caused by textual ambiguity. And we show the visualization of five ambiguity types in Figure 7. Such scrutiny lays the groundwork for subsequent experiments aimed at validating whether information from other modalities aids large language models in making appropriate tool selections; (3) Instruction Matching: To identify all APIs meeting an instruction’s functional requirements, we must categorize APIs based on identical and similar functionalities respectively during collection. When pairing in-

structions for groups of APIs with analogous functions, it becomes crucial to discern whether a provided instruction strictly satisfies each API’s functional description. This determination will influence the number of APIs that can aptly respond as the correct answer to a given instruction.

8.2. Filtering Rules

After crawling APIs from HuggingFace, due to varying quality among these models, we implement stringent selection criteria for APIs. The specific filtering rules for this selection process are outlined as follows:

Low-Quality Model Card A significant number of APIs either lack model cards or contain overly simplistic ones, providing little helpful information. Additionally, some APIs have ceased maintenance or have been integrated into other APIs. Even multiple APIs share a single model card. These APIs pose challenges in organizing API documentation and require manual consultation of additional sources like papers and GitHub. While enriching the number of APIs, this approach introduces inaccuracies. Finally, we opted to remove such APIs from our dataset uniformly.

NSFW Content Risk For ethical and safety considerations, we remove APIs, particularly some of the text-to-image type, which pose risks of generating NSFW (Not Safe For Work) content. Such content is deemed inappropriate for all age groups and could compromise the dataset’s applicability in diverse settings.

License Restrictions We exclude models with restrictive licensing terms. An example is the Llama2 [34] model, which requires a formal application and approval process to download and use its model weights.

Identical APIs Numerous models on HuggingFace share identical structures and datasets, merely differing in implementation by various contributors. To avoid redundancy, we selectively retain only the most downloaded version of each such model, ensuring the dataset is more streamlined. For APIs with different model architectures but trained on the same dataset and having the same functions, as we mentioned in the main text, we select the top five APIs based on download statistics.

8.3. API Function Boundaries

Multi-task APIs Our dataset includes multi-task APIs like various large language models (Bloom [36], Baichuan2 [40], Falcon [22]), capable of numerous NLP tasks, some of which even fall outside HuggingFace’s classification system. For simplicity, we focus specifically on their text generation capabilities, aligning with HuggingFace’s functional categorization of such APIs. Additionally, we modify the descriptions of these APIs in our dataset to ensure a match between the functionalities reflected by the provided queries and those described in the API descriptions.

API Function Differentiation After identifying the specific subdomain of each API, we detail our approach for discerning whether APIs within the same subdomain possess identical or similar functions. For plain text input APIs, we can assess APIs based on the language and context of the datasets they utilize. For example, in sentiment analysis tasks, we discern various contexts by relying on the distinct domains of data sources, such as financial, legal, social media, and reviews, enabling us to classify nuanced functional differences among similar-function APIs. Similarly, for multimodal inputs, especially images, we refine API function categorization by analyzing dataset contexts. For instance, in Visual Question Answering tasks, datasets feature a range of images such as Diagrams, Charts, Documents, Infographics, and other general images, enabling nuanced API segmentation. The above examples provide merely a subset of our API classification rules. Due to the complex and case-by-case nature of the analysis, the complete set of rules is not listed here.

One-to-many Situation Identification Originating from each API’s functional description, our approach, driven by GPT-4, generates corresponding instructions that adhere strictly to the API’s functional boundaries. Hence, consideration is primarily given to other APIs with the same function in one-to-many scenarios.

8.4. Prompt Construction

Below, we list the detailed prompts used for generating instructions. The prompts fed to GPT-4 are composed of (1)the API call’s relevant information, including its name, a concise functional description, and training datasets if mentioned in the model card, (2)some sample instructions, and (3)additional requirements. The sample instructions are leveraged to foster format standardization and enhance the quality of GPT-4’s outputs. So we invite some expert annotators to craft some high-quality instructions in advance and then randomly choose two each time as exemplary inputs to GPT-4. We design two sets of prompt templates in our dataset, mindful of prompt ambiguity cases. For APIs with multimodal inputs susceptible to prompt ambiguity, we strive to balance the final selection of ten instructions, maintaining a 1:1 ratio between unambiguous and ambiguous instructions; the corresponding prompt template is shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9 respectively. We emphasize that ambiguity pairs in queries are those pairs with identical textual inputs but varied multimodal inputs.

8.5. Visualization of Data Distributions

In our work, we collect 932 APIs and one “Unknown” category, featuring 651 APIs with pure text inputs, 191 APIs incorporating image inputs, 80 incorporating audio inputs, and 10 incorporating video inputs. Given the long-tail distribution of API quantities for various tasks on Hugging-

User: You are an NLP task expert. Given an API, you need to generate 20 different user queries that utilize the API function, adhering to the following input and output format for each query:

Input:

API Name: This is the name of the API Function.

Description: This is a detailed description of the model.

Prohibit Words: These are words that are prohibited from appearing in the output.

Output:

Query1: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query2: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query3: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query4: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query5: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

...

Query20: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Below are some examples:

Example 1:

Input:

API Name: microsoft/codereviewer

Description: CodeReviewer is a model pre-trained with code change and code review data to support code review tasks.

Prohibit Words: "API, tools, model"

Output:

Query1: I've made some changes to my Python code. Can you review this snippet for me? `def addNums(a, b):
return a + b`

Query2: I'm not very confident in my Java coding skills. Could you check this piece for potential issues? `public int
divide(int x, int y) { return x / y; }`

Query3: I'm trying to refactor this C# method. Does it look okay? `public void PrintName(string name) {
Console.WriteLine(name); }`

Query4: I wrote this SQL query, and I'm unsure if it's optimized. Can you review it? `SELECT * FROM users
WHERE age ≥ 25;`

Query5: Here's a piece of JavaScript function I came up with. Any suggestions for improvement? `function
greet(name) { return 'Hello ' + name; }`

Query6: I've been learning Ruby recently. Would appreciate your thoughts on this code segment: `def multiply(x,
y) x * y end`

Query7: I'm not sure if this CSS is correct. Can you review it? `h1 { color: blue; font-size: 30px; }`

Query8: I just started with Swift. Here's a function I wrote. Could you review it for best practices? `func
displayMessage(message: String) { print(message) }`

Query9: My colleague wrote this PHP function, but it seems off. Can you review it for me? `function subtract(x,y)
{ return x-y; }`

...

Query20: I'm learning Kotlin and wrote this simple method. Mind taking a look? `fun sum(a: Int, b: Int): Int = a + b`

Example 2:

Input:

API Name: Salesforce/blip-vqa-base

To be continued

Continued

Description: This model is a base-sized ViT-based BLIP trained on the visual question answering task VQA2.0 dataset. The model's input is an image and a text question, and the model's output is a text answer.

Prohibit Words: "API, tools, model, VQA2.0"

Output:

Query1: I recently visited a new city and took some photographs. Based on this particular image, can you tell me what is the weather conditions like?

Query2: I was at a photo exhibition and took this picture. Could you provide information about was this taken in a Latin American country judging from the dress?

Query3: I was at the park and saw a dog playing. By analyzing this photo, can you tell if the frisbee it is using is hard or soft?

Query4: My cousin went to a new food joint and ordered their specialty hot dog. By looking at this picture, can you determine if the hot dog is larger than a normal one?

Query5: I attended a family gathering and took a group photo. By analyzing the photograph, how many kids can you see in the picture?

Query6: Looking at this captivating portrait, I noticed an object in the individual's hand. It seems to be a sweet treat. What is this person holding?

Query7: I was at the beach and took a photo of a man skiing. By examining the image, can you tell if the wave is chasing him?

Query8: I visited the local train station and captured an image of a passing train. Can you identify what color the train is from the picture?

Query9: This cityscape presents an old-fashioned vehicle that stands out amidst the modern structures. I'd like to know more about this vehicle. Could you tell me its model and color?"

...

Query20: Given the serene backdrop of sailboats and a calm sea, can you tell me how many boats are there?

Note that:

1. When crafting queries, avoid including the API's name;
2. Ensure that the queries are varied and diverse;
3. When processing an input, any words listed in the Prohibited Words must be strictly excluded from the response.

Now, let's start.

Input:

API Name: [API Name]

Description: [API Description]

Prohibit Words: [Some words]

Figure 8. **Example of the unambiguous prompt template:** This template applies to pure text inputs and a part of multimodal input scenarios where textual inputs reveal multimodal information. In practical usage, the template's masked sections should be populated with the respective API's name, description, and words prohibited in the instructions.

Face, coupled with our selection criteria, the APIs we ultimately choose exhibit a similar long-tail distribution across both modality and task level. In future work, we aim to enrich our collection with more APIs, particularly those with video inputs, and optimize the distribution across different tasks for more uniformity.

9. Categorization System

We illustrate our proposed categorization system in Table 10. The system is two-level hierarchical. The coarse level task setting mainly refers to the classification of HuggingFace, while the fine-grained subtask is based on the different task descriptions.

User: You are an NLP task expert. Given an API, you need to generate 20 different user queries that utilize the API function, adhering to the following input and output format for each query:

Input:

API Name: This is the name of the API Function.

Description: This is a detailed description of the model.

Prohibit Words: These are words that are prohibited from appearing in the output.

Output:

Query1: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query2: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query3: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query4: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Query5: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

...

Query20: This is an instruction that can utilize the API function.

Below are some examples:

Example 1:

Input:

API Name: timm/resnet101.a1h_in1k

Description: A 101 layers ResNet-B image classification model trained on ImageNet-1k.

Prohibit Words: "API, tools, model, ImageNet"

Output:

Query1: I'd value your input on this image's classification.

Query2: There's an image in my possession, and I'm seeking a label for it.

Query3: I need help in determining the label for this image. Can you help?

Query4: Can you provide a label perspective for this image?

Query5: How would you manage the categorization of this particular visual?

Query6: There's an intriguing image that I've come across, and I'm curious about its category.

Query7: How would you classify this picture?

Query8: I'd be grateful for your view on this image's category.

Query9: I'm searching for a label for this visual. Can you assist?

...

Query20: What category seems plausible for this visual, in your view?

Example 2:

Input:

API Name: llyasviel/control_v11f1p_sd15_depth

Description: This model is intended for control diffusion models by adding extra conditions. Trained with depth estimation, the condition image is an image with depth information, usually represented as a grayscale image, and the output is a new image.

Prohibit Words: "API, tools, model, depth, controlnet"

Output:

Query1: Use my image to depict a family picnic in a sunlit park with children playing.

Query2: Can you reimagine my image as a soccer match in progress, with players and fans cheering?

Query3: Create an adventure scene with pirates and treasure islands using my image.

Query4: Can you make my image into a heartwarming scene of a mother duck leading her ducklings through a pond?

To be continued

Continued

Query5: Craft a depiction of a magician performing tricks in front of an amazed audience from my image.

Query6: Could you reshape this photograph into a bustling train station with intricate ironwork and arches?

Query7: Transform this snapshot into a charming cottage nestled among rolling hills and wildflowers.

Query8: I'm curious about how this picture would be reimagined as a bustling harbor with ships, cranes, and cargo containers.

Query9: Use my image to depict a family picnic in a sunlit park with children playing.

...

Query20: I'd love to see this image as a gardener carefully pruning roses in a blooming garden.

Note that:

1. When crafting queries, avoid including the API's name;
2. Ensure that the queries are varied and diverse;
3. When processing an input, any words listed in the Prohibited Words must be strictly excluded from the response;
4. The queries should not convey or imply multimodal information.

Now, let's start.

Input:

API Name: [API Name]

Description: [API Description]

Prohibit Words: [Some words]

Figure 9. **Example of the ambiguous prompt template:** This template applies to other multimodal input scenarios where textual inputs do not reveal multimodal information. In practical usage, the template's masked sections should be populated with the respective API's name, description, and words prohibited in the instructions.

Task	Subtask	Api Names
Audio Classification	Event Recognition	MIT/ast-finetuned-audioset-10-10-0.4593
	Command Recognition	MIT/ast-finetuned-speech-commands-v2
	Spoken Language Identification	TalTechNLP/voxlangua107-epaca-tdnn
	Speaker Verification	anton-1/wav2vec2-base-superb-sv
	Emotion Recognition	audeering/wav2vec2-large-robust-12-ft-emotion-msp-dim
	Gender Recognition	m3hrdadfi/hubert-base-persian-speech-gender-recognition
Audio-to-Audio	Keyword Spotting	superb/hubert-base-superb-ks
	Single-Channel Speech Enhancement	JorisCos/ConvTasNet_Libri1Mix_enhsingle_16k
	Speech-to-Speech Translation	facebook/xm_transformer_unity_en-hk
	Voice Conversion	microsoft/speecht5_vc
	Seperate Clean	mpariente/DPRNNTasNet-ks2.WHAM_sepclean
Feature Extraction	Audio Source Separation	speechbrain/sepformer-libri3mix
	Pop-to-Piano	sweetcocoa/pop2piano
Audio-to-Text	Automatic Speech Recognition	LeBenchmark/wav2vec2-FR-7K-large
Voice Activity Detection	Automatic Speech Recognition	Harveenchadha/vakyansh-wav2vec2-hindi-him-4200
	Speaker Segmentation	philschmid/pyannotate-segmentation
Depth Estimation	Speaker Diarization	philschmid/pyannotate-speaker-diarization-endpoint
	Depth Estimation	Intel/dpt-hybrid-midas
Image Classification	General Image Classification	facebook/convnextv2-tiny-1k-224
	Specific Type Image Classification	Neto71/sea_mammals
	Style Classifier	playrobin/furniture-styles
Image Segmentation	Text Guided Image Segmentation	CIDAS/clipseg-rd64-refined
	Semantic Segmentation	apple/deeplabv3-mobilevit-small
	Panoptic Segmentation	facebook/detr-resnet-50-panoptic
	Instance Segmentation	facebook/mask2former-swin-small-coco-instance
	Zero-shot Segmentation	facebook/sam-vit-huge
Image-to-Image	Image Super-Resolution	caidas/swin2SR-classical-sr-x2-64
	Image Variations	lambdalabs/sd-image-variations-diffusers
	2D-to-3D	openai/shap-e-img2img
	Image Deblurring	google/maxim-s3-deblurring-gopro
	Image Dehazing	google/maxim-s2-dehazing-sots-outdoor
Feaure Extraction	Image Deraining	google/maxim-s2-deraining-rain13k
	Image Feature Extraction	BridgeTower/bridgetower-base
Object Detection	Object Detection	SenseTime/deformable-detr
	Table Detection	TahaDouaji/detr-doc-table-detection
	Text-conditioned Object Detection	google/owlvit-base-patch32
Visual Question Answering	Visual Question Answering	Salesforce/blip-vqa-base
	Chart Question Answering	google/matcha-chartqa
	Diagram Question Answering	google/pix2struct-ai2d-base
	Document Question Answering	google/pix2struct-docvqa-base
	Infographics Question Answering	google/pix2struct-infographics-vqa-large

Task	Subtask	Api Names
Image-to-Text	Conditional Image Caption	Salesforce/blip2-flan-t5-xl
	Optical Character Recognition	alibaba-damo/mgp-str-base
	Image Caption	bipin/image-caption-generator
	Document Parsing	naver-clova-ix/donut-base-finetuned-cord-v2
	Tag Generation	SmilingWolf/wd-v1-4-convnextv2-tagger-v2
	Chart-to-Table	google/deplot
Zero-Shot Image Classification	Zero-Shot Image Classification	laion/CLIP-ViT-B-16-laion2B-s34B-b88K
Multimodal-to-Image	Face-Detection-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	CrucibleAI/ControlNetMediaPipeFace
	Prompt-guided Cartoonization	instruction-tuning-sd/cartoonizer
	Brightness-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	ioclab/control.v1p_sd15_brightness
	Prompt-guided Pixel-to-Pixel Image Editing	llyasviel/control.v11e_sd15_ip2p
	Shuffle-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11e_sd15_shuffle
	Tiled-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11f1e_sd15_tile
	Depth-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11f1p_sd15_depth
	Canny-Edges-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_canny
	Line-Art-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_lineart
	MLSD-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_mlsd
	Normal-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_normalbae
	Openpose-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_openpose
	Scribble-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_scribble
Segment-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_seg	
HED-Boundary-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15_softedge	
Anime-Line-Art-Conditioned Prompt-guided Image Generation	llyasviel/control.v11p_sd15s2_lineart_anime	
	Prompt-guided Image Variations	stabilityai/stable-diffusion-2-1-unclip
Text Classification	Sentiment Analysis	DTAI-KULeuven/robbert-v2-dutch-sentiment
	Emotion Analysis	MilaNLProc/feel-it-italian-emotion
	Offensive Language Detection	Hate-speech-CNERG/bert-base-uncased-hatexplain
	Topic Classification	MaartenGr/BERTopic_Wikipedia
	Toxicity Analysis	OpenAssistant/reward-model-deberta-v3-large-v2
	Sensitive Text Detection	apanc/russian-inappropriate-messages
	Irony Detection	cardiffnlp/twitter-roberta-base-irony
	Bias Detection	cffi/bert-base-styleclassification-subjective-neutral
Feature Extraction	Text Feature Extraction	facebook/bart-large
Fill-Mask	Fill-Mask	CLTL/MedRoBERTa.nl
Text Generation	Text Generation	EleutherAI/gpt-j-6b
	Prompt Generation	FredZhang7/anime-anything-promptgen-v2
	Code Generation	NumbersStation/nsql-350M
	Specific Text Genre Generation	uer/gpt2-chinese-poem

Task	Subtask	Api Names
Text Generation	Text Generation	EleutherAI/gpt-j-6b
	Prompt Generation	FredZhang7/anime-anything-promptgen-v2
	Code Generation	NumbersStation/nsql-350M
	Specific Text Genre Generation	uer/gpt2-chinese-poem
Question Answering	Extractive Question Answering	CATIE-AQ/QAmentbert
	Open Domain Question Answering	facebook/dpr-ctx_encoder-single-nq-base
Sentence Similarity	Sentence Similarity	intfloat/e5-small-v2
Summarization	Summarization	IDEA-CCNL/Randeng-Pegasus-523M-Summary-Chinese
	Title Generation	JulesBelveze/t5-small-headline-generator
	Keyword Generation	Voicelab/vlt5-base-keywords
Text-to-Image	Text to General Style Image	runwayml/stable-diffusion-v1-5
	Text to RGBD Image	Intel/ldm3d
	Text to Specific Style Image	nitrosocke/spider-verse-diffusion
	Text to 3D Image	openai/shap-e
	Text to Spectrogram Image	riffusion/riffusion-model-v1
Text-to-Speech	Text-to-Speech	Voicemod/fastspeech2-en-male1
Text-to-Video	Text-to-Video	damo-vilab/text-to-video-ms-1.7b
Text-to-Text	General Text Generation	1-800-BAD-CODE/xlm-roberta_punctuation_fullstop_truecase
	Sentence Correction	KES/T5-KES
	Generative Question Answering	MaRiOrOsSi/t5-base-finetuned-question-answering
	Question Generation	allenai/t5-small-squad2-question-generation
	Paraphraser	cointegrated/rut5-base-paraphraser
	Recipe Generation	flax-community/t5-recipe-generation
	Question Answering Generation	google/t5-small-ssm-nq
	Text Revision	grammarly/coedit-large
	Relation Extraction	ibm/knowgl-large
	Code Review	microsoft/codereviewer
	Commonsense Reasoning	mrm8488/t5-base-finetuned-common_gen
	Span Sentiment Extraction	mrm8488/t5-base-finetuned-span-sentiment-extraction
	Distractor	potsawee/t5-large-generation-race-Distractor
	Detoxification	s-nlp/bart-base-detox
Symbolic Music Generation	sander-wood/text-to-music	
Translation	Translation	Babelscape/mrebel-large
Zero-Shot Classification	Zero-Shot Classification	MoritzLaurer/DeBERTa-v3-base-mnli-fever-anli
Video Classification	Human action recognition video classification	MCG-NJU/videomae-base-finetuned-kinetics
Video-to-Text	Video Question Answering	kpyu/video-blip-flan-t5-xl-ego4d
	Video caption	Neleac/timesformer-gpt2-video-captioning
Feature Extraction	Video Feature Extraction	deepmind/multimodal-perceiver

Table 10. Our proposed categorization system. The first and second columns are the two levels of the categories for each task. The third column provides an example of the candidate models.

References

- [1] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862](#), 2022.
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. [Advances in neural information processing systems](#), 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [3] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrmann, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4, 2023.
- [4] Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, Jérémy Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomasz Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, et al. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15217](#), 2023.
- [5] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>, 2023.
- [6] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929](#), 2020.
- [7] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling, 2022.
- [8] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Yanghao Li, Kaiming He, et al. Masked autoencoders as spatiotemporal learners. [Advances in neural information processing systems](#), 35:35946–35958, 2022.
- [9] Rohit Girdhar, Alaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all. In [Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition](#), pages 15180–15190, 2023.
- [10] Yuan Gong, Yu-An Chung, and James Glass. Ast: Audio spectrogram transformer. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01778](#), 2021.
- [11] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685](#), 2021.
- [12] Yue Huang, Jiawen Shi, Yuan Li, Chenrui Fan, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Yixin Liu, Pan Zhou, Yao Wan, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, et al. Metatool benchmark: Deciding whether to use tools and which to use. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03128](#), 2023.
- [13] Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Kellie Lu, Thomas Mesnard, Colton Bishop, Victor Carbune, and Abhinav Rastogi. Rlaif: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00267](#), 2023.
- [14] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597](#), 2023.
- [15] Minghao Li, Feifan Song, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Zhoujun Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Api-bank: A benchmark for tool-augmented llms. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08244](#), 2023.
- [16] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485](#), 2023.
- [17] Zilin Ma, Yiyang Mei, and Zhaoyuan Su. Understanding the benefits and challenges of using large language model-based conversational agents for mental well-being support. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15810](#), 2023.
- [18] Y Nakajima. Task-driven autonomous agent utilizing gpt-4, pinecone, and langchain for diverse applications. See <https://yoheinakajima.com/task-driven-autonomous-agent-utilizing-gpt-4-pinecone-and-langchain-for-diverse-applications> (accessed 18 April 2023), 2023.
- [19] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV_System_Card.pdf, 2023.
- [20] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. [Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems](#), 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [21] Shishir G Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E Gonzalez. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive apis. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15334](#), 2023.
- [22] Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116](#), 2023.
- [23] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, et al. Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16789](#), 2023.
- [24] Jingqing Ruan, Yihong Chen, Bin Zhang, Zhiwei Xu, Tianpeng Bao, Guoqing Du, Shiwei Shi, Hangyu Mao, Xingyu Zeng, and Rui Zhao. Tptu: Task planning and tool usage of large language model-based ai agents. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03427](#), 2023.
- [25] Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné,

- Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100](#), 2022.
- [26] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04761](#), 2023.
- [27] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in huggingface. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17580](#), 2023.
- [28] Yifan Song, Weimin Xiong, Dawei Zhu, Cheng Li, Ke Wang, Ye Tian, and Sujian Li. Restgpt: Connecting large language models with real-world applications via restful apis. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06624](#), 2023.
- [29] Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Huayang Li, Jialu Xu, Yan Wang, and Deng Cai. Pandagpt: One model to instruction-follow them all. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16355](#), 2023.
- [30] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08128](#), 2023.
- [31] Qiaoyu Tang, Ziliang Deng, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Qiao Liang, and Le Sun. Toolalpaca: Generalized tool learning for language models with 3000 simulated cases. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05301](#), 2023.
- [32] Zhan Tong, Yibing Song, Jue Wang, and Limin Wang. Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:10078–10093, 2022.
- [33] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971](#), 2023.
- [34] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288](#), 2023.
- [35] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [36] BigScience Workshop, Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, et al. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100](#), 2022.
- [37] Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671](#), 2023.
- [38] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-gpt: Any-to-any multimodal llm. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05519](#), 2023.
- [39] Qiantong Xu, Fenglu Hong, Bo Li, Changran Hu, Zhengyu Chen, and Jian Zhang. On the tool manipulation capability of open-source large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16504](#), 2023.
- [40] Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305](#), 2023.
- [41] Hui Yang, Sifu Yue, and Yunzhong He. Auto-gpt for online decision making: Benchmarks and additional opinions, 2023.
- [42] Rui Yang, Lin Song, Yanwei Li, Sijie Zhao, Yixiao Ge, Xiu Li, and Ying Shan. Gpt4tools: Teaching large language model to use tools via self-instruction. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18752](#), 2023.
- [43] Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model, 2023.
- [44] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858](#), 2023.
- [45] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3836–3847, 2023.
- [46] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592](#), 2023.