XAgents: A Framework for Interpretable Rule-Based Multi-Agents Cooperation

Hailong Yang[*1,2], **Mingxian Gu**[*1], **Renhuo Zhao**[1], **Fuping Hu**[1], **Zhaohong Deng**[†1], **Yitang Chen**[2]
[1]JiangNan University
[2]DeepLang Community
{yanghailong, gumingxian, zhaorenhuo, hfping}@stu.jiangnan.edu.cn, dengzhaohong@jiangnan.edu.cn, yitangmmzk-chen@outlook.com

Abstract

Extracting implicit knowledge and logical reasoning abilities from large language models (LLMs) has consistently been a significant challenge. The advancement of multi-agent systems has further enhanced the capabilities of LLMs. Inspired by the structure of multipolar neurons (MNs), we propose the XAgents framework, an interpretable multi-agent cooperative framework based on the IF-THEN rule-based system. The IF-Parts of the rules are responsible for logical reasoning and domain membership calculation, while the THEN-Parts are comprised of domain expert agents that generate domain-specific contents. Following the calculation of the membership, XAgetns transmits the task to the disparate domain rules, which subsequently generate the various responses. These responses are analogous to the answers provided by different experts to the same question. The final response is reached at by eliminating the hallucinations and erroneous knowledge of the LLM through membership computation and semantic adversarial generation of the various domain rules. The incorporation of rule-based interpretability serves to bolster user confidence in the XAgents framework. We evaluate the efficacy of XAgents through a comparative analysis with the latest AutoAgents, in which XAgents demonstrated superior performance across three distinct datasets. We perform post-hoc interpretable studies with SHAP algorithm and case studies, proving the interpretability of XAgent in terms of input-output feature correlation and rule-based semantics.

1 Introduction

The human brain contains specific types of neurons, namely pyramidal neurons (PyMN) (Jossin and Cooper, 2011) and purkinje multipolar neurons (PuMN) (Herndon, 1963), as illustrated in Figure 1. PyMNs perform a variety of functions within the brain, including transmitting and integrating information, modulating of brain activity, and contributing learning and memory processes (Silberberg and Markram, 2007). The multi-axonal structure of PyMNs can span different regions of the brain to form long-range connections. The connections allow for more efficient and extensive information exchange between different brain regions, forming the basis for complex brain functions such as sensory processing, motor control and cognitive functions. PuMNs play a central role in cerebellar function as the multi-dendritic structure is capable of integrating inputs from multiple sources (Hirano, 2018). The dendrites receive synaptic inputs from parallel fibers in the granule cells and crawling fibers in the inferior olivary nucleus. Integration of these inputs is critical for the fine modulation of cerebellar output signals.



Figure 1. Multipolar Neuron

Inspired by the information processing of MNs, we adopt abstractions of PyMNs and PuMNs to form the structures depicted in the right part of Figure 1. These structures are characterized as Single Input Multiple Output (SIMO) and Multiple Input Single Output (MISO), respectively. It is determined that the SIMO and MISO system structures are

[*] These authors contributed equally to this work.
[†] Corresponding author.

well-suited to addressing complex problems or tasks (Larsson and Jorswieck, 2008; Zhang and Cui, 2010), including those involving reasoning with intricate information, solving problems with uncertainty, and performing generative tasks. The SIMO structure can decompose complicated tasks that span across different domains of expertise. Conversely, the MISO structure can fuse multiple sources of complex information into a well-integrated output. Based on the IF-THEN rule from formal logic system (Hoaglund, 1986) and the SIMO+MISO system structure of MNs, we carry out an IF-THEN rule-based system capable of delving deeply into information and performing logical reasoning.

In the real world, LLMs are employed to supplement humans in the resolution of intricate problems, including answering questions, facilitating user interaction, generating documents on demand. As the tasks become increasingly complex, multi-agent systems are employed to decompose the complex tasks and arrange agents with different roles to solve the various sub-tasks that comprise the workflow. Nevertheless, the existing multi-agent system continues to exhibit deficiencies in extracting LLM knowledge and formulating logical inferences (Han et al., 2024). Accordingly, we propose a multi-agent system framework, XAgents, which is based on the IF-THEN rule-based system where each rule represents an individual domain. The IF-Part of the rule is employed for logical reasoning and domain membership calculation (Civanlar and Trussell, 1986), whereas the THEN-Part is utilized for the generation of domain-specific content. In summary, the XAgents framework has the capacity of rule-based logical reasoning and comprehensive mining of LLM domain knowledge.

In this paper, we present three contributions to the field of multi-agent system. First, we propose XAgents, a multi-agent framework based on the IF-THEN rule-based system. Furthermore, we validate the performance of XAgents on knowledge-based and inference-based datasets. Lastly, we analyze the interpretability of XAgents.

2 Related Works

LLM-based Agent. The initial research on agent systems focused on the analysis of single-agent systems, which contains distant reasoning mechanisms. The most notable works are Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), which demonstrated the capacity of LLMs to devise their own thought processes for problem-solving. Subsequent research has been conducted in several areas, including least-to-most prompting for solving complex tasks (Zhou et al., 2023), zero-sample CoT (Kojima et al., 2022), self-consistent reasoning mechanisms (Wang et al., 2023a), and iterative self-refine by feedback (Madaan et al., 2023). As the research progresses, the agent systems evolve from a simple structure to a complex structure. Auto-GPT (Yang et al., 2023) represents an early example of a single-agent complex system that employs a LLM-based autonomous agent to accomplish tasks through the utilization of a range of tools. However, Auto-GPT is only capable of functioning independently and can't facilitate processing complex tasks. One method of enhancing the task-solving capability of agent systems is to create distinct roles based on LLMs, and facilitate their coordination of actions to achieve the common objective. CAMEL (Li et al., 2023) is the early chat-based multi-agent framework that guide agents to finish complex tasks through inception prompting and role-playing. MetaGPT (Hong et al., 2023) is also a multi-agent framework that creates and assigns different roles to multiplex agents based on LLMs, which collaborate to solve complex tasks in the process of collaborative software development. Recent research has investigated the potential of LLMs to adaptively generate roles instead of having static presets for the agents. SPP (Wang et al., 2023b) is a mechanism that adaptively generates multiple personas based a common LLM to enhance the abilities of processing complex tasks in multi-turn self-collaboration. AutoAgents (Chen et al., 2024) draws a connection between tasks and roles by dynamically generating multiple agents based on the task content and design an executable solution from a planner agent, achieving the task through the collaborative efforts of multiple specified agents. Concurrently, the framework incorporates observer roles with the objective of reflecting and enhancing the specified plans and the responses of the agents.

Rule-based System. Rule-based systems automate problem-solving know-how and provide means for that capture and refines human expertise (Hayes-Roth, 1985; Davis and King, 1984). Rule-based systems have been further developed in the field of mixture of expert (MoE) systems (Grosan et al., 2011; Yuksel et al., 2012) in several application areas, including classification, generation, recognition, and logical reasoning etc. The study of rule-based systems' interpretability has been a very crucial direction in the field of artificial intelligence. Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) aims to address the problem of black-box models. Wang et al. proposed Bayesian Rule Set (BRS) based on Bayesian theory and proved its interpretability (Wang et al., 2017). Liu et al. investigated the interpretable representations of rule-based networks showing that rule-based models help to discover deep knowledge (Liu et al., 2017). SHAP (Van den Broeck et al., 2022) is a game theory-based approach that aims to provide global explanations of the predictions of any machine learning model. RuleXAI (Macha et al., 2022) is an interpretability study of rule-based models based on the SHAP algorithm, in which the authors demonstrate that the rule-based and tree-based models used for classification, regression and survival analysis tasks are explicable .

3 Interpretable Rule-Based Multi-Agents Cooperative Framework: XAgents

XAgents is a multi-agent framework based on domain rules, comprising two principal phases: task planning and task execution. In the planning phase, the planner agent (PA) is responsible for organizing a workflow appropriate for the input task. This step involves the generation of a task execution graph (TEG) that represents the sequence of tasks to be performed. Additionally, the PA assigns specific roles to the agents within the nodes of the graph designated to have special responsibilities. In the TEG, the complex task is initially decomposed into a series of discrete, relatively simple subtasks. Finally, the outputs of these sub-tasks are integrated to generate the final result.



Figure 2. Structure of XAgents

As illustrated in Figure 2, the Task Node represents the initial node T at the commencement of the TEG, followed by the sub-task nodes connected to it. The sub-tasks $[T_1, \ldots, T_N]$ constitute the primary component of the TEG, and the final result is attained by integrating the responses of all the sub-tasks through the fusion node F, as showed in Eq. (1). The TEG is an unweighted directed acyclic graph, tailored to each intricate task.

$$G = (V, E) = PA(x) \tag{1}$$

Where x is the complex task, G is the task execution graph, PA is the planer agent processing unit for initializing all the agents of the whole task workflow which is to build TEG, $V = \{T, T_1, \ldots, T_N, F\}$ is the node set of the TEG, E is the edges set of the TEG, $E = \{T \to T_1, T \to T_2, \ldots, T_N \to F\}$. The effective completion of sub-tasks is crucial to the success of the XAgents execution phase. The fulfillment of each sub-task node requires the involvement of multiple agents, including a Inference Expert Agent (IEA), a Domain Analyst Agent (DAA), Domain Expert Agents (DEAs), and a Fusion Expert Agent (FEA), as illustrated in the Sub-Task Node part of Figure 2. These agents are integrated into an IF-THEN rule-based system. In the planning phase, the planner agent does not generate detailed domain rules or set

up the relevant DEAs. Instead, it delegates the task of generating specific domain rules to the DAA in the execution phase, following domain analysis, as shown in Eq. (2). Consequently, during the execution phase, each sub-task node is dynamic, as are the domain rules associated with it, as shown in Eq. (3). FEA fuses the domain responses from DEAs with different domain-specific knowledge in the THEN-Parts of Domain rules, as shown in Eq. (4).

$$Rules = [Rule^1, Rule^2, \ldots, Rule^K] = DAA(T_i) \quad (2)$$

$$R_{rules} = [R_{rule1}, \ldots, R_{ruleK}] = IEA(Rules, T_i, \mathcal{P}_i) \quad (3)$$

$$R_{sub} = FEA_{rules}(R_{rules}) \quad (4)$$

where $DAA(.)$ is the domain analyst agent processing unit, $IEA(.)$ is the inference expert agent processing unit, $FEA_{rules}(.)$ is the fusion expert agent processing unit for rules, T_i is the ith sub-task, $Rules$ are the rules generated by the DAA, $\mathcal{P}_i$ is the input to the i-th sub-task node and the response of the previous node, R_{sub} is the output of the i-th sub-task, $Rules = [Rule^1, Rule^2, \ldots, Rule^K]$, K is the number of the domain rules in the sub-task, and $Rules$ is the rule set of the rule-based system in the sub-task node, which generalized form is shown in Eq. (5), $k = 1,2, \ldots K$.

IF x is of the k-th domain, THEN $y = DEA(x)$ (5)

At the end of the execution phase, the fusion expert agent fuses the outputs of the previous sub-task nodes to output the final result.

$$R_{final} = FEA_{sub}(F, \mathcal{P}_f) \quad (6)$$

Where FEA_{sub} is the fusion expert agent processing unit for the sub-tasks, $\mathcal{P}_f$ is the input to the fusion node, $\mathcal{P}_f = [R_{sub1}, R_{sub2}, \ldots, R_{subM}]$, M is the number of the sub-tasks for fusion, and R_{final} is the final result of the whole task.



Figure 3. Task Execution Graph

Domain Rule-based Logical Reasoning. The rule-based system is located at each sub-task node, generated dynamically and adaptively based on specific task domains. Each rule comprises two distinct parts: IF-Part and THEN-Part. The IF-Part is concerned with calculating the membership of the sub-task with each rule, while the THEN-Part contains a DEA able to cope with the domain-specific tasks. The domain membership calculation in XAgents is carried out by semantic reasoning from the DAA instead of mathematical computation. As a result, the results are discrete semantic terms (High, Sub-High, Low etc.) instead of continuous values. Each rule processes tasks from distinct specific domains and provide expert responses from its own individual domain. The logical reasoning based on rules is built from the semantic reasoning of the IF-Parts, which determine the membership of the task according to the domain rules. The THEN-Part contains a DEA that is able to process domain-specific tasks and generate domain-specific responses. The rule-based logical reasoning system is capable of resolving the ambiguity and uncertainty inherent in the task, thereby generating crisp and precise results.

Multi-View Knowledge Enhance. In the XAgents, each DEA in the THEN-Part represents a view from a specific knowledge domain. Therefore, the rule-based system is a multi-view system with distinct pieces of domain knowledge. When processing a task, the system employs the multi-view mechanism to obtain the responses from multiplex domain expert views. These individual responses are then combined by a FEA to deliver a final response of superior quality. The rule-based system facilitates the generation and enhancement of knowledge through the multi-view mechanism, while simultaneously mitigating the potential for illusions and ambiguities that may arise in LLMs.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets and Experiment Setting

Task1.Trivia Creative Writing (Wang et al., 2023b)**.** The task tests LLMs' ability to retrieve and integrate diverse information from their internal knowledge. In this task, a model must craft a coherent story around a given topic while incorporating answers to N trivia questions. We evaluate the models with N set to 5 and 10, where a higher N requires more extensive domain knowledge. Our benchmark includes 100 instances for each N, totaling 1,000 trivia questions.

Task2. Logic Grid Puzzle. The task is from the Bigbench dataset (Srivastava et al., 2023), which comprises 200 instances. Each instance describes a logic puzzle involving 2 to 5 houses, each occupied by a person with specific characteristics, such as playing the piano. The goal is to answer questions about house numbers based on given clues, requiring multi-step reasoning and the selection of relevant information. For evaluation, we measure the accuracy of the predicted house numbers by comparing them to the ground truth targets provided by the dataset.

Task3. Codenames Collaborative (Wang et al., 2023b).The task is an extension of the Codenames task from the BigBench. Codenames Collaborative is a collaborative

task that examines a model's knowledge, reasoning, and theory of mind abilities by assigning two player roles: the Spymaster and the Guesser. The Spymaster's role is to provide a hint word related to the target words, excluding some other distractor words, while the Guesser's role is to identify the target words based on the given hint and the full list of words.

Evaluation Metrics. Drawing on the approach of (Wang et al., 2023b), we adopt an automatic metric to identify factual errors and measure a model's capacity to integrate diverse domain knowledge. We conduct string matching with the veridical target answers for each question on the generated output. The generalized form is shown as Eq. (7).

$$Score = \frac{A_{correct}}{N_q} \quad (7)$$

Where N_q is the number of questions, $A_{correct}$ is the number of correct answer mentions, $Score$ is the metrics score for the tasks.

Comparative Methods. We compare our approach with methods for single-agents, including Standard-Prompting, CoT and Self-Refine and methods for multi-agents, including SPP and AutoAgents.

LLMs. The default LLM for Agents is GPT4 (gpt-4). We adopt two other LLMs, GPT3.5 (gpt-3.5-turbo) and LLAMA3.1 (llama3.1-70b), to further investigate the hidden patterns between our method and LLMs with different parameter scales and cognitive abilities.

We choose 20 domains for rules generation. Each rule involves only one individual domain. The specific domain names, the corresponding temperature value of the LLMs and the frequency of occurrence in the experiments are showed in Part 1 of the *Supplementary Materials*. We present the details of all the agents' prompting in XAgents in Part 2 of the *Supplementary Materials*.

4.2 Performance Analysis

Table 1. Trivia Creative Writing based on GPT4

Methods	**N (# trivia questions) = 5**		**N (# trivia questions) = 10**	
	Score (%)	**Δ (v.s Standard %)**	**Score (%)**	**Δ (v.s Standard %)**
Standard	74.6	0.0%	77.0	0.0%
COT	67.1	-10.0%	68.5	-11.1%
Self-Refine	73.9	-0.9%	76.9	-0.1%
SPP	79.9	+7.1%	84.7	+10.0%
AutoAgents	82.0	+9.9%	85.3	+10.8%
XAgents	**84.4**	**+13.1%**	**88.1**	**+14.4%**

Δ indicates the differences compared with Standard

Table 2. Logic Grid Puzzle based on GPT4

Methods	**Score (%)**	**Δ (v.s Standard %)**
Standard	57.7	0.0%
COT	65.8	+14.0%
Self-Refine	60.0	+4.0%
SPP	68.3	+18.4%
AutoAgents	71.8	+24.4%
XAgents	**75.0**	**+30.0%**

Table3.Codenames Collaborative based on GPT4

Methods	**Score (%)**	**Δ (v.s Standard %)**
Standard	75.4	0.0%
COT	72.7	-3.6%
Self-Refine	75.3	-0.1%
SPP	79.0	+4.8%
AutoAgents	81.4	+7.9%
XAgents	**83.5**	**+10.7%**

When N is equal to 5 in Table 1, the score of XAgents is 2.4 points higher than that of state-of-the-art AutoAgents, and 10.7% higher than that of Standard. When N is 10, the XAgents score is 2.7 points higher than the AutoAgents score and 14.4% higher than the Standard score. Given that Trivia Creative Writing is a dataset that focuses on the knowledge task, XAgents is more effective than the other methods at mining the knowledge and hidden patterns of LLMs. XAgents generates a multi-expert view through the application of multi-domain rules and the provision of disparate responses from experts operating within different domains enables the elucidation of intricate knowledge.

The results of Logic Grid Puzzle, the dataset of the reasoning tasks, showed in Table 2. XAgents outperforms all compared methods. XAgents scores 3.2 points higher than AutoAgents, 6.7 points higher than SPP, and 15.0 points higher than Self-Refine. Since the logical reasoning system of XAgent is based on the highly logical IF-THEN rule-based reasoning, it is more capable of applying logical processing skills on reasoning tasks compared to other methods.

The Codenames Collaborative dataset in Table 3 incorporates both logic and knowledge tasks, thus demanding enhanced logical reasoning and knowledge mining capabilities. XAgents demonstrated a superior performance compared to the other comparative methods on this dataset. It exhibited a 1.9-point advantage over AutoAgents and a 4.5-point advantage over SPP, which suggests that XAgents possesses a

distinct proficiency in logical reasoning and knowledge mining.

The comparative analysis in Part 3 of the *Supplementary Materials* presents various methods in terms of their framework features and prompting mechanisms. The experimental result based on GPT3.5 and Llama3.1 are in Part 4 of the *Supplementary Materials*. These results demonstrate that XAgents also exhibits superior performance compared to other methods. Furthermore, the task processing examples presented in Part 5 of the *Supplementary Materials* demonstrate the high effectiveness of XAgents in real-world scenarios.

In summary, XAgents outperforms the comparative methods in both logical reasoning and knowledge mining. This is achieved via the combination of Domain Rule-based reasoning mechanism and domain expert agents.

4.3 Interpretability Analysis



Figure 4. SHAP Value of XAgents based on Domain Rules.

SHAP values provide a consistent and fair way of evaluating the interpretability of model predictions. We randomly oversampling the Trivia Creative Writing's questions, and every {2,4,6,8,10} questions make up a new task sample. There are 30000 sample points in the Figure 4. The range of SHAP value is [-1.0, 1.0], while Domain Membership is from the following set: {High=1.0, Sub-High=0.8, Medium=0.6, Mid-Low=0.4, Lower=0.2, Low=0.0}.

We used the task's domain membership as input features to calculate the SHAP value. As shown in Figure 4, blue sample points indicate low membership and their SHAP value is 0.0, while red sample points indicate high membership and their SHAP values are mainly concentrated in [0.0,1.0]. When the rule domain membership is low, the input features have no effect on the model predictions; when the membership is high, and the features impact on the model predictions. The input task-domain membership features of XAgents are strongly correlated with the model predictions, and most of the domain features with high membership show positive correlation with the model predictions. The sub-task processing module of XAgents exhibits the remarkable interpretability.



Figure 5. Sub-Task Processing of XAgents based on Domain Rules

In order to further analyze the interpretability of XAgents, we semantically analyzed a specific sub-task processing on the Trivia Creative Writing. First, the question of the sub-task was analyzed by DAA and found to be highly related to the Entertainment-and-Media domain, to a medium degree to the Arts-and-Design and History domains, as shown in the Figure 5. DAA then generates three corresponding IF-THEN domain rules, namely Rule1, Rule2 and Rule3 in the Figure. The sub-task is processed by the three rules in three different domains and then fused by FEA to obtain the final answer.

Semantically Interpretability. In the example shown in Figure 5, after the DAA analysis, it determines that the sub-task is highly correlated with the Entertainment-and-Media domain, and less correlated with the Arts-and-Design and History domains, consistent with the judgements of the human experts. After processing these three rules, the DEAs generates the answers from three expert perspectives. According to the analysis, the answers of Rule1 and Rule3 are semantically highly consistent, and the fused answer is also consistent with the real target. The correlation between Rule2 and the sub-task is medium, and therefore the output with conflicting semantics has a minimal impact on the final result. This reasoning process conforms to the human prior knowledge and demonstrates the semantically interpretability that XAgents offers in the process of domain rule-based reasoning.

Semantic Adversarial Generation. In Figure 5, Rule2's answer semantically conflicts with the other answers, and the main disagreement is the movie name. From the semantic analysis, both Rule1 and Rule3 support that the name is "Guess Who's coming to Dinner" (1967) while Rule2 supports that it was "The Lion in Winter" (1968). XAgents solves the problem of semantic conflict and fuses the domain rules' answers into a consistent final result by two mechanisms. Initially, we implement a voting mechanism that assigns trust degrees based on the votes of distant semantics. The higher votes lead to a higher trust degree, while the fewer votes result in a lower trust degree. Subsequently, by considering the domain membership, we evaluate the trust degree of semantics, awarding a high trust degree to those semantics which are generated by the domain rule with high membership and a low trust degree to those with low membership. By utilizing the two mechanisms, XAgents remove the semantic pieces of information with low trust degree. Furthermore, our analysis demonstrates that XAgents is capable of solving semantic adversarial problems and generating results that are highly trustworthy. This is evidenced by the additional cases presented in Part 6 of the *Supplementary Materials*.

5 Discussion

XAgents vs MoE. MoE is a machine learning model architecture that combines multiple specialized models (experts) to handle different parts of a task (Masoudnia and Ebrahimpour, 2014). The essential elements of MoE model are the experts, the gating network, and the combined outputs (Yuksel et al., 2012). The gating network determines which experts are to be used for each input. In the context of XAgents, the primary roles of a rule-based system are that of a domain expert, domain analyst and fusion expert. MoE and the rule-based XAgents exhibit notable similarities in the terms of system structure. However, the XAgents framework incorporates a rule-based reasoning process, which facilitates the elimination of errors and ambiguous information. XAgents does not necessitate the provision of training resources or datasets, with the requisite knowledge derived from LLMs. Furthermore, XAgents allows for the incorporation of expert knowledge and experience through rule-based embedding, which capability is not available with MoE.

XAgents vs Ensemble Learning. Ensemble learning (EL) (Dietterich, 2000) is an approach to accomplish tasks such as classification by constructing multiple weak learners and combining them into one strong learner. It can be demonstrated that EL methods can significantly enhance prediction performance in comparison to an individual learner. The rule-based system of XAgents integrates domain expert agents, which are analogous to pre-trained strong learners of EL. However, XAgents is unable to learn knowledge in the same way as EL, due to the fact that it can't update the domain knowledge of the pre-trained LLMs. Instead, the agents are capable of thinking and reasoning in order to gain more useful knowledge. In contrast, EL has no rule-based reasoning ability and is therefore unable to solve problems by further drawing on the leaners' intrinsic knowledge and hidden patterns.

Conclusions

Inspired by the structure of multipolar neurons, we designed XAgents, a multi-agent framework based on rule-based systems. We conducted the experiments on three datasets and analyzed the performance of XAgents. The results demonstrates that XAgents outperforms the state-of-the-art AutoAgents. For a task, XAgents generates the responses from different domain experts and fuses these responses to obtain a final result of high quality. In terms of interpretability, we investigated the rule-based interpretability of XAgents using the SHAP algorithm, proving that XAgents exhibits global interpretability. We also study the intrinsic rule-based interpretability of XAgents through the case study at the semantic level. XAgents creatively uses the two mechanisms to solve the adversarial problems between various rules to suppress the hallucinations of LLMs. Though XAgents has an excellent performance, there are areas for improvement. Firstly, XAgents do not support multi-modal data processing. Secondly, the structure of the task execution graph generated by the planner is static and cannot be dynamically adjusted. Future works will focus on making to support multi-modal tasks and expand its application scope.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the National key R & D plan under Grant (2022YFE0112400), the NSFC un-der Grant 62176105. The authors are grateful for re-sources from the Artificial Intelligence and Pattern Recognition Technology Research and Development Cen-ter of Jiangnan University. Prof. Zhaohong Deng is the corresponding author of the paper.

References

Guangyao Chen, Siwei Dong, Yu Shu, Ge Zhang, Jaward Sesay, Börje F. Karlsson, Jie Fu, and Yemin Shi. 2024. AutoAgents: A Framework for Automatic Agent Generation. arXiv:2309.17288 [cs].

M. Reha Civanlar and H. Joel Trussell. 1986. Constructing membership functions using statistical data. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 18(1):1–13.

Randall Davis and Jonathan J. King. 1984. The origin of rule-based systems in AI. *Rule-based expert systems: The MYCIN experiments of the Stanford Heuristic Programming Project*.

Thomas G. Dietterich. 2000. Ensemble Methods in Machine Learning. In *Multiple Classifier Systems*, pages 1–15, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.

Crina Grosan, Ajith Abraham, Crina Grosan, and Ajith Abraham. 2011. Rule-based expert systems. *Intelligent systems: A modern approach*:149–185.

Shanshan Han, Qifan Zhang, Yuhang Yao, Weizhao Jin, Zhaozhuo Xu, and Chaoyang He. 2024. LLM Multi-Agent Systems: Challenges and Open Problems. arXiv:2402.03578 [cs].

Frederick Hayes-Roth. 1985. Rule-based systems. *Communications of the ACM*, 28(9):921–932.

Robert M. Herndon. 1963. THE FINE STRUCTURE OF THE PURKINJE CELL. *Journal of Cell Biology*, 18(1):167–180.

Tomoo Hirano. 2018. Purkinje Neurons: Development, Morphology, and Function. *The Cerebellum*, 17(6):699–700.

John Hoaglund. 1986. The Logic of "If-Then" Propositions. *Informal Logic*, 8(3).

Sirui Hong, Xiawu Zheng, Jonathan Chen, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, and Chenglin Wu. 2023. MetaGPT: Meta Programming for Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework. arXiv:2308.00352 [cs].

Yves Jossin and Jonathan A. Cooper. 2011. Reelin, Rap1 and N-cadherin orient the migration of multipolar neurons in the developing neocortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, 14(6):697–703.

Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang (Shane) Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large Language Models are Zero-

Shot Reasoners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22199–22213.

Erik G. Larsson and Eduard A. Jorswieck. 2008. Competition Versus Cooperation on the MISO Interference Channel. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 26(7):1059–1069.

Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. CAMEL: Communicative Agents for "Mind" Exploration of Large Language Model Society. arXiv:2303.17760 [cs].

Han Liu, Alexander Gegov, and Mihaela Cocea. 2017. Rule Based Networks: An Efficient and Interpretable Representation of Computational Models. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Soft Computing Research*, 7(2):111–123.

Dawid Macha, Michał Kozielski, Łukasz Wróbel, and Marek Sikora. 2022. RuleXAI—A package for rule-based explanations of machine learning model. *SoftwareX*, 20:101209.

Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegreffe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. 2023. SELF-REFINE: Iterative Refinement with Self-Feedback.

Saeed Masoudnia and Reza Ebrahimpour. 2014. Mixture of experts: a literature survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 42:275–293.

Gilad Silberberg and Henry Markram. 2007. Disynaptic Inhibition between Neocortical Pyramidal Cells Mediated by Martinotti Cells. *Neuron*, 53(5):735–746.

Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, et al. 2023. Beyond the Imitation Game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.

Guy Van den Broeck, Anton Lykov, Maximilian Schleich, and Dan Suciu. 2022. On the tractability of SHAP explanations. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 74:851–886.

Tong Wang, Cynthia Rudin, Finale Doshi-Velez, Yimin Liu, Erica Klampfl, and Perry MacNeille. 2017. A bayesian framework for learning rule sets for interpretable classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(70):1–37.

Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023a. Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models. arXiv:2203.11171 [cs].

Zhenhailong Wang, Shaoguang Mao, Wenshan Wu, Tao Ge, Furu Wei, and Heng Ji. 2023b. Unleashing Cognitive Synergy in Large Language Models: A Task-Solving Agent through Multi-Persona Self-Collaboration. arXiv:2307.05300 [cs].

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.

Hui Yang, Sifu Yue, and Yunzhong He. 2023. Auto-GPT for Online Decision Making: Benchmarks and Additional Opinions. arXiv:2306.02224 [cs].

Seniha Esen Yuksel, Joseph N. Wilson, and Paul D. Gader. 2012. Twenty years of mixture of experts. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 23(8):1177–1193.

Rui Zhang and Shuguang Cui. 2010. Cooperative Interference Management With MISO Beamforming. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 58(10):5450–5458.

Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, and Ed Chi. 2023. Least-to-Most Prompting Enables Complex Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv:2205.10625 [cs].