

From Standalone LLMs to Integrated Intelligence: A Survey of Compound AI Systems

JIAYI CHEN, JUNYI YE, and GUILING WANG, New Jersey Institute of Technology, USA

Compound AI Systems (CAIS) are an emerging paradigm that integrates large language models (LLMs) with external components, including retrievers, agents, tools, and orchestrators, to overcome the limitations of standalone models in tasks requiring memory, reasoning, real-time grounding, and multimodal understanding. These systems enable more capable and context-aware behaviors by composing multiple specialized modules into cohesive workflows. Despite growing adoption in both academia and industry, the CAIS landscape remains fragmented and lacks a unified framework for analysis, taxonomy, and evaluation. In this survey, we define the concept of CAIS, propose a multi-dimensional taxonomy based on component roles and orchestration strategies, and analyze four foundational paradigms: Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), LLM Agents, Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs), and Orchestration. We review representative systems, compare design trade-offs, and summarize evaluation methodologies across these paradigms. Finally, we identify key challenges—including scalability, interoperability, benchmarking, and coordination—and outline promising directions for future research. This survey aims to provide researchers and practitioners with a comprehensive foundation for understanding, developing, and advancing the next generation of system-level artificial intelligence.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Compound AI systems, large language models, retrieval-augmented generation, LLM agents, multimodal large language models, AI orchestration, tool-augmented model

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) based on the Transformer architecture [185] have rapidly evolved from academic prototypes to foundational infrastructure for modern artificial intelligence, supporting billion-user chat interfaces, enterprise copilots, scientific discovery tools, and automated code generation systems. Flagship LLM families from leading providers—including OpenAI’s GPT series [1], Google’s Gemini [177], and Anthropic’s Claude [27]—routinely surpass human baselines on reasoning and NLP benchmarks, and the global market for generative AI is projected to exceed \$1.3 trillion by 2032 [13].

However, the same properties that make LLMs compelling—massive pretraining on static corpora and autoregressive token prediction—also introduce structural limitations: **hallucination** (fluent but factually inaccurate output), **staleness** (inability to access post-training knowledge), and **bounded reasoning** (finite context windows that constrain multi-hop reasoning and long-horizon task decomposition). These limitations impede safe and effective deployment in dynamic, real-world environments that require recency, factual reliability, and compositional reasoning.

To overcome these barriers, the community is converging on a new systems paradigm: **Compound AI Systems (CAIS)**. We define CAIS as modular and extensible architectures that integrate LLMs with specialized external components, including high-recall retrievers, tool-using agents, symbolic planners, long-term memory modules, multimodal encoders, and orchestration frameworks, to perform complex, dynamic, and high-precision tasks. By decoupling sub-task responsibilities and intelligently routing them to appropriate modules, CAIS extends the capabilities of LLMs far beyond what any monolithic model can achieve.

Early deployments demonstrate the transformative potential of this paradigm. Retrieval-augmented assistants, such as Perplexity.ai, provide real-time answers with chain-of-thought citations [135]. GitHub Copilot-X orchestrates code reasoning, repository search, and test generation, increasing developer throughput by over 55% [133]. In radiology,

Authors’ Contact Information: Jiayi Chen, jc2693@njit.edu; Junyi Ye, jy394@njit.edu; Guiling Wang, gwang@njit.edu, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, New Jersey, USA.

multimodal pipelines coupled with rule-based triage agents have reduced report turnaround by 30% while maintaining expert-level accuracy [142]. These cases mark a shift in design philosophy: from LLMs as autonomous *soloists* to *conductors* orchestrating heterogeneous AI ensembles.

Despite growing interest, a systematic understanding of CAIS remains elusive. Recent literature has addressed isolated components of this ecosystem, including surveys on retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [48], LLM-based agents [93], multi-agent frameworks [60], and LLM-driven system optimization [97]—but these efforts remain fragmented. Some concentrate on narrow aspects such as prompt engineering [116], benchmark analysis [50], or agent communication protocols [203], without addressing the architectural interactions and trade-offs across the entire CAIS stack. None provides a holistic, system-level synthesis.

In contrast, our survey provides the first comprehensive, cross-axis systems-level synthesis of Compound AI Systems. We integrate four foundational axes—retrieval, agency, multimodal perception, and orchestration—into a cohesive framework, identify recurring design patterns, trade-offs, and failure modes, and propose an evaluation paradigm that addresses factuality, efficiency, safety, and human-centered utility.

Our analysis is structured along four axes that reflect the core dimensions of CAIS. Specifically, we make the following contributions:

- (1) **Multi-dimensional taxonomy.** We organize the CAIS landscape across four orthogonal axes—RAG, LLM Agents, MLLMs, and Orchestration—establishing a shared vocabulary for comparative study, grounded in a systematic review of over 220 papers (Section 3).
- (2) **Unified pipeline model.** We introduce a cross-axis architecture model (Figure 1) and formal notation $f(L, C, D)$ that shows how the four axes interact in a complete end-to-end CAIS pipeline, addressing the absence of a unified conceptual framework in prior surveys.
- (3) **Comparative analysis.** We provide four structured comparison tables—RAG retriever paradigms (Table 2), LLM agent reasoning frameworks (Table 3), MLLM architectures (Table 5), and orchestration frameworks (Table 7)—that distill design trade-offs and system-level implications across each axis.
- (4) **Standardization coverage.** We survey the emerging interoperability landscape—including the Model Context Protocol (MCP), Agent-to-Agent (A2A), Agent Communication Protocol (ACP), Agent Network Protocol (ANP), and Agent Spec—as a cross-cutting architectural concern, structured as a three-layer stack from tool schemas through agent communication protocols.
- (5) **Research agenda.** We synthesize open challenges in evaluation, component integration, standardization governance, and multimodal alignment, and outline promising future research directions.

The remainder of this survey is organized as follows. Section 2 positions this work against closely related surveys. Section 3 describes our systematic literature search and inclusion criteria. Section 4 formalizes the CAIS representation $f(L, C, D)$ and presents the unified cross-axis pipeline model. Sections 5–8 examine each axis in depth with comparative analysis; Section 8 additionally covers the emerging standardization landscape. Section 9 reviews evaluation methodologies, Section 10 synthesizes open research directions, and Section 11 concludes with a forward-looking agenda.

2 Related Work

A growing body of surveys addresses aspects of the Compound AI Systems landscape. Table 1 positions this survey against the most closely related prior work. We organize the discussion into three groups: CAIS-focused surveys, agent and multi-agent surveys, and evaluation-focused contributions.

2.1 CAIS-Focused Surveys

LLM-based Optimization of Compound AI Systems [97] surveys methods for optimizing compound AI pipelines in which an LLM itself acts as the optimizer, covering prompt optimization, in-context learning, and pipeline-level training. Its scope is deliberately restricted to *training-time*, *LLM-as-optimizer* approaches and explicitly excludes architecture search, topology optimization, and most multi-agent coordination strategies. It does not address RAG retriever design, multimodal integration, orchestration patterns, or system-level evaluation.

Compound AI Systems Optimization: A Survey of Methods, Challenges, and Future Directions [88] broadens the optimization scope to include both numerical and natural-language learning signals, organizing 26 representative works into a 22-cell taxonomy. However, it remains focused on the optimization slice of the CAIS design space and does not provide a general architectural synthesis, a cross-axis taxonomy, or coverage of multimodal systems, standardization, or deployment-oriented trade-offs.

Evaluating Compound AI Systems through Behaviors, Not Benchmarks [11] proposes a behavior-driven testing framework for information-seeking compound systems that generates scenario-based test specifications and selects diverse cases using submodular optimization. It is limited to retrieval-augmented conversational QA and does not cover the broader taxonomy, architectural design space, multimodal systems, or orchestration strategies.

2.2 Agent and Multi-Agent Surveys

A Review of Prominent Paradigms for LLM-Based Agents [93] surveys tool use, planning, and feedback learning as agent construction paradigms; it treats RAG instrumentally rather than as an independent axis and omits multimodal perception and orchestration frameworks.

Large Language Model Based Multi-Agents [60] covers role assignment, communication protocols, and emergent behaviors in multi-agent LLM systems; it intersects with the Orchestration axis but omits RAG, multimodal LLMs, and cross-component evaluation.

Beyond Self-Talk [203] surveys agent communication mechanisms including MCP, A2A, and ANP, complementing the standardization discussion here but not addressing RAG, multimodal systems, or heterogeneous component orchestration.

The Rise and Potential of LLM-Based Agents [198] provides a broad agent survey spanning perception, memory, planning, and action, but does not address compound architectures that integrate RAG, multimodal encoders, and orchestration as first-class dimensions.

2.3 Positioning of This Survey

The core differentiator of this survey is its **systems-level synthesis** across all four foundational axes of CAIS simultaneously. Prior surveys either focus on a single axis (RAG, agents, or evaluation) or restrict their scope to optimization methods within compound systems. None provide a unified taxonomy that integrates retrieval, agency, multimodal perception, and orchestration into a single analytical framework, nor do they address the emerging standardization

Table 1. Comparison of this survey with closely related prior work. Checkmarks indicate substantive coverage; partial coverage is noted where applicable.

Survey	Year	RAG	LLM Agents	MLLM	Orchestration	Evaluation	Standardization	Scope
Lin et al. [97]	2024	Partial	Partial	×	×	Partial	×	Optimization only
Lee et al. [88]	2025	Partial	✓	×	Partial	×	×	Optimization only
Bhagat et al. [11]	2025	Partial	×	×	×	✓	×	Info-seeking QA
Li [93]	2025	Partial	✓	×	×	Partial	×	Agent paradigms
Guo et al. [60]	2024	×	✓	×	Partial	Partial	×	Multi-agent
Yan et al. [203]	2025	×	✓	×	Partial	×	Partial	Communication
Xi et al. [198]	2025	Partial	✓	Partial	×	Partial	×	Agent systems
This survey	2026	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Full CAIS

landscape (MCP, A2A, ACP, ANP) as a cross-cutting architectural concern. This survey fills that gap by offering the first comprehensive, cross-axis treatment of Compound AI Systems from architecture through evaluation to open research challenges.

3 Survey Methodology

This section describes the systematic process used to conduct this survey, including the literature search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the rationale for the scope boundaries that define the four axes of our taxonomy.

3.1 Literature Search Strategy

We conducted a structured literature search across four major scholarly databases: the ACM Digital Library, arXiv, IEEE Xplore, and Semantic Scholar. The search was performed between December 2024 and May 2026 and targeted publications from 2020 through early 2026, a window chosen to capture the period during which LLM-augmented systems emerged as a distinct research paradigm following the introduction of GPT-3 [15] and the seminal RAG work of Lewis et al. [89].

The primary search queries used were combinations of the following terms: “*compound AI system*”, “*retrieval-augmented generation*”, “*RAG*”, “*LLM agent*”, “*tool-augmented language model*”, “*multimodal large language model*”, “*AI orchestration*”, “*multi-agent LLM*”, and “*LLM pipeline*”. Secondary searches were conducted using the reference lists of highly cited papers identified in the primary pass (snowballing). We supplemented automated searches with manual inspection of proceedings from ACL, EMNLP, NeurIPS, ICML, ICLR, CVPR, and ACM SIGKDD, as these venues have published a disproportionate share of CAIS-relevant work.

In total, we identified approximately 400 candidate papers. After applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria described below, over 220 papers were retained and are cited or discussed in this survey.

3.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

A paper was **included** if it: (1) used an LLM (at least one billion parameters, or a smaller model explicitly designed to replicate such capabilities) as a primary reasoning or generation component; (2) combined that LLM with at least one external module such as a retriever, tool, memory store, API, multimodal encoder, or orchestration framework; (3) presented novel empirical results, a new architecture, a benchmark, or a systematic comparative analysis; and (4) was publicly accessible via one of the searched databases or arXiv.

A paper was **excluded** if it focused exclusively on LLM pretraining or fine-tuning without external component integration (i.e., it refined the model itself rather than building a compound system), addressed non-Transformer or small language models without relevance to LLM-based compound architectures, was a purely theoretical contribution without empirical validation, was a duplicate or extended abstract of an already-included paper, or concerned only hardware infrastructure or low-level systems software without addressing AI component integration.

3.3 Scope Boundaries and Axis Selection

The four axes of our taxonomy—RAG, LLM Agents, Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs), and Orchestration—were selected based on two criteria: (1) they represent the dominant and most independently studied integration paradigms in the surveyed literature, and (2) together they cover the full spectrum of how LLMs are augmented with external capabilities in practice.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) was selected because grounding LLMs in external non-parametric memory is the most prevalent form of LLM augmentation, accounting for a large fraction of the surveyed literature and underpinning many downstream agent and multimodal systems.

LLM Agents were selected because autonomous decision-making and tool use—where the LLM plans, acts, and reflects in iterative loops—constitute a qualitatively distinct capability class that extends beyond passive retrieval.

Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) were selected because extending LLMs to perceive and reason over non-textual modalities (images, audio, video) introduces a distinct integration challenge involving modality-specific encoders and cross-modal alignment that is not captured by the other axes.

Orchestration was selected because the coordination of multiple LLMs and components into coherent pipelines—including topology, scheduling, memory management, and system objectives—is an independent design dimension that applies regardless of which specific components are integrated.

The following topics are explicitly *out of scope*: LLM pretraining and continuous pretraining, parameter-efficient fine-tuning (LoRA, adapters) without external component integration, pure natural language processing benchmarks, hardware-level serving infrastructure, and AI safety alignment research that does not involve compound system architectures.

How this survey relates to and is differentiated from prior work on individual CAIS axes is discussed above in the Related Work section (Section 2).

4 Architecture of Compound AI Systems

4.1 Definition

The term *Compound AI Systems (CAIS)* first appeared in a post from Berkeley Artificial Intelligence Research (BAIR) [219]. In this post, the authors illustrate the trend where better AI performance is increasingly achieved through compound systems rather than standalone LLMs. In this survey, we provide a comprehensive definition: A CAIS is a framework that integrates LLMs, external components, and system-level designs. Its purpose is to address complex tasks that exceed the capabilities of standalone LLMs. It can be described using four dimensions: Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs), LLM Agents, and Orchestration. Pretraining, continuous pretraining, and fine-tuning without combining other components are not considered CAIS, as they refine the LLM itself rather than composing it with external components.

4.2 General Representation of Compound AI Systems

From a general perspective, CAIS can be understood as a system comprising integrated interacting components and core LLMs. Components can be external tools, models, agents, multimodal encoders, prompt engineering techniques, and self-optimization. LLMs may include general-purpose models or fine-tuned models trained for specific tasks. Both components and LLMs are essential parts of CAIS. As such, the general formulation of a compound AI system can be described as:

$$\text{Compound AI System} = f(L, C, D) \quad (1)$$

Where:

- $L = \{\text{LLM}_1, \text{LLM}_2, \dots, \text{LLM}_M\}$: The set of all LLMs in the system.
- $C = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_N\}$: The set of all components, each providing functionality f_i , output o_i , and parameters p_i .
- D : The system design that defines the architecture and interactions between L and C , including orchestration, topology, and other high-level design principles.

The function $f(L, C, D)$ abstracts the interactions of the core language models (L), the auxiliary modules that enhance or extend their functionality (C), and the overarching framework governing how they are connected and coordinated to achieve the desired outcomes (D).

4.3 Dimensions of Compound AI Systems

CAIS are organized along four axes: *RAG* (grounding LLM outputs in externally retrieved context), *MLLMs* (extending LLMs to perceive and reason over images, audio, and video via modality-specific encoders), *LLM Agents* (autonomous reasoning, planning, and tool use in iterative loops), and *Orchestration* (the structural and coordination design that integrates all components). Each axis is examined in depth in Sections 5–8.

4.4 Cross-Axis Interactions in a Complete CAIS Pipeline

While the four axes—RAG, LLM Agents, MLLMs, and Orchestration—are analyzed independently in Sections 5–8, real-world Compound AI Systems routinely combine all four within a single pipeline. This subsection illustrates how the axes interact by tracing the flow of a representative end-to-end system: a *multimodal research assistant* that accepts image-and-text queries and produces grounded, tool-augmented responses.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the MLLM component encodes the image query into token embeddings, the RAG retriever grounds the LLM in up-to-date external knowledge, the LLM Agent decomposes the task and invokes tools via a ReAct-style loop [210], and the Orchestration layer schedules all component interactions—triggering additional retrieval when needed before synthesizing the final response. The four axes co-constrain one another: MLLM design determines encoder integration, RAG design governs retriever choice, the Agent axis defines the reasoning protocol, and Orchestration specifies the coordination topology D . The remainder of this survey examines each axis in depth, beginning with RAG in Section 5.




Fig. 1. Unified CAIS pipeline showing how the four axes interact end-to-end. Row 1 (left to right): a multimodal query is encoded by the MLLM component (§7) and the resulting vector drives the RAG Retriever (§5). Row 2 (right to left): retrieved context is passed to the LLM Agent (§6), which delegates subtasks to the Orchestration layer (§8), which in turn synthesizes the final response. The dashed arc represents iterative feedback: the Orchestration layer may trigger additional retrieval or tool calls before the response is finalized.

5 Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)

5.1 Motivation and General Framework

LLMs are highly capable but exhibit several limitations, including hallucinations [69], outdated knowledge, unstable contextual understanding, and high computational costs associated with retraining or fine-tuning. RAG addresses these limitations by incorporating external documents, datasets, or search engines as non-parametric memory [89]. This approach allows RAG to enhance the performance of LLMs in a cost-efficient manner without requiring extensive retraining on massive datasets. Additionally, RAG provides mechanisms for controlling the quality of the generated responses, thereby improving their reliability and relevance. Some popular RAG libraries, such as LangChain [179], Haystack [34], and LlamaIndex [178], enable the efficient integration of retrieval with LLMs for scalable and reliable applications.

The RAG framework typically consists of two primary phases: Retrieval and Generation. In the retrieval phase, knowledge documents are segmented into smaller chunks, indexed, and represented as vectors through embedding techniques. Queries are similarly embedded, and the most relevant top- k chunks are selected based on cosine similarity. In the generation phase, these retrieved documents serve as contextual input, which is combined with the original query and processed by the LLM. The LLM then generates a response that is both accurate and contextually grounded [89].

This survey categorizes the RAG architecture into three key components: the *Retriever*, the *Generator*, and *RAG Design*. The detailed architecture is illustrated in Figure 2. As shown, the Retriever identifies and retrieves relevant documents from external databases or search engines through various methods. The Generator processes the retrieved content to produce retrieval-augmented answers, utilizing either pretrained or fine-tuned large language models (LLMs). The RAG design encompasses the overall orchestration of the system, characterized by distinct patterns or frameworks.

5.2 Retriever

The primary role of the retriever in RAG systems is to retrieve information and external knowledge. It is essential that the retriever effectively identifies and retrieves relevant context to support accurate and meaningful responses. The retriever in RAG operates along two dimensions: *Phase* and *Approach*. With regard to *Phase*, the retriever can be categorized into three phases: *Pre-Retrieval*, *Retrieval*, and *Post-Retrieval*, based on the sequence of the retrieval process.

Pre-Retrieval refers to the process of converting external knowledge into vector representations, including query preprocessing, chunking, embedding, and indexing [12, 36]. Query preprocessing improves retrieval quality through




Fig. 2. Taxonomy of Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) systems. The diagram categorizes the core components into three primary modules: Retriever, Generator, and RAG design.

techniques such as query rewriting, where a trainable rewriter modifies input queries for better retrieval [117], and docid-based retrieval, where models like DSI map document text directly to unique identifiers for efficient lookup [176].

Retrieval involves locating documents relevant to a query by measuring similarity. For example, Yu et al. [214] introduced an assertion retrieval method leveraging Jaccard similarity, while KAPING employs semantic similarity to retrieve relevant triples from knowledge graphs [5].

Post-Retrieval focuses on refining initial retrieval results through filtering, refinement, and reranking. Knowledge filtering reduces the search space by applying specific constraints [33, 189], while knowledge refinement improves coherence and usability of retrieved information [200]. Reranking reorders and reassesses retrieved results to maximize relevance [56, 87, 146].

From a functional perspective, retrievers can be classified into five types: *Sparse Retriever*, *Dense Retriever*, *Graph Retriever*, *Hybrid Retriever*, and *LLM as Retriever*. *Sparse Retriever* uses sparse representations of text (e.g., BM25) based on explicit term matching between queries and documents [71]. *Dense Retriever* leverages dense vector representations (e.g., BERT) to capture semantic similarity between queries and documents [99, 107, 205]. *Graph Retriever* utilizes graph structures (e.g., knowledge graphs) to locate relevant information by traversing nodes and edges [5, 42, 53]. *Hybrid Retriever* combines both sparse and dense retrieval approaches to leverage the strengths of explicit term matching and semantic similarity [5, 56, 111]. *LLM as Retriever* involves the use of LLMs to directly retrieve relevant knowledge based on input queries [118].

5.3 Generator

The Generator in RAG systems is essentially an LLM. It can be an original pretrained language model, such as T5 [144], FLAN [192] and LLaMA [181] (since succeeded by LLaMA 4 [127]), or a black-box pretrained language model, such as GPT-3 [15], GPT-4 [1], Gemini [177], and Claude [27]. Alternatively, the generator can also be a fine-tuned language

model specifically tailored for a particular task. For instance, BART [89] and T5 [72] are fine-tuned alongside the retriever, a process commonly referred to as co-training or dual fine-tuning, to enhance the quality and consistency of retrieval [100]. In other scenarios, the generator is fine-tuned to effectively filter retrieved results, retaining only relevant documents and discarding irrelevant ones [113, 213, 224]. Furthermore, the Generator can be trained and fine-tuned within a reinforcement learning framework to optimize performance in specific contexts [53].

5.4 RAG Design

RAG design is characterized by two key dimensions: *pattern* and *framework*. The *pattern* dimension describes how RAG systems retrieve and generate answers, encompassing iterative, recursive, and adaptive approaches. The *framework* dimension refers to the structural framework of RAG design, including co-training, prompt construction, and modularity.

Iterative is a design pattern that improves RAG systems through repeated cycles of retrieval and generation to refine outputs incrementally. For example, ITER-RETGEN [154] utilizes outputs from previous iterations to refine both retrieval and generation, effectively addressing multi-hop reasoning and complex queries [25, 77, 132, 222].

Recursive is a design pattern in which retrieval and generation are applied in a nested manner to handle complex queries by breaking them down into simpler ones. For example, IRCOT [182] combines retrieval with iterative chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive, multi-step question answering [187, 224].

Adaptive is a design pattern that dynamically adjusts retrieval or generation strategies based on context or feedback. For example, SELF-RAG [4] enables LLMs to decide dynamically when to retrieve information, generate responses, and critique their outputs via self-reflection [73, 216].

Co-training is a framework where the retriever and generator are jointly trained to enhance their collaboration. For example, RAG-end2end [161] updates all RAG components asynchronously during training, including the retriever, generator, and external knowledge base encodings.

Prompt Construction is a framework that focuses on designing and optimizing prompts to enable the generator to efficiently utilize retrieved information. For example, Ren et al. [149] present prompting strategies such as a priori judgment (evaluating a question before answering) and a posteriori judgment (assessing the correctness of an answer) to explore the impact of retrieval augmentation.

Modular is a framework in which RAG itself is designed as independent modules, allowing for flexibility, easy replacement, and integration of different components. For example, REPLUG [157] augments LLMs by incorporating external retrieval systems without altering the LLM’s internal parameters [24, 58, 218].

5.5 Comparative Analysis of RAG Retriever Approaches

The four principal retrieval paradigms—sparse, dense, graph-based, and hybrid—differ substantially in their trade-off profiles. Table 2 summarizes these differences across five dimensions that matter most for system design: retrieval latency, recall quality, scalability to large corpora, interpretability of retrieved evidence, and suitability for specialized domains.

Key trade-offs. Sparse retrievers are the most computationally efficient and fully interpretable but fail on vocabulary mismatch and cannot capture semantic similarity. Dense retrievers address this through learned embeddings at the cost of interpretability and the need for in-domain fine-tuning data. Graph-based retrieval excels when the knowledge base has explicit relational structure (e.g., knowledge graphs or code repositories) but incurs higher construction and query overhead. Hybrid retrievers combine the complementary strengths of sparse and dense approaches and consistently achieve the highest recall on benchmarks such as BEIR [180], making them the preferred choice for general-purpose

Table 2. Comparative analysis of RAG retriever paradigms across key system-design dimensions.

Retriever Type	Latency	Recall Quality	Scalability	Interpretability	Domain Specificity
Sparse (BM25, TF-IDF) [150]	Very low	Moderate (lexical match)	Very high (inverted index)	High (term weights visible)	Low (no semantic alignment)
Dense (DPR, ANCE) [75, 199]	Low-medium	High (semantic match)	High (ANN index)	Low (opaque embeddings)	High (fine-tunable)
Graph-based (GraphRAG) [42]	Medium-high	Very high (relational)	Medium (graph overhead)	Medium (edge-based)	Very high (structured KBs)
Hybrid (BM25 + Dense) [56, 112]	Medium	Highest (complementary)	High	Medium	High
LLM-as-Retriever [173]	High	Medium-high (generative)	Low (inference cost)	Low	Adapts to prompt

CAIS deployments where recall is critical. LLM-as-retriever approaches are the most flexible but carry the highest inference cost and are best suited to low-volume, high-precision scenarios where retrieval and reasoning are tightly coupled.

5.6 Limitations and Future Trends

Although RAG systems have developed rapidly with numerous innovative designs, modern RAG systems still face several limitations. For instance, seamlessly integrating retrieved information into the generation process remains a significant challenge, particularly for longer contexts or multimodal tasks [25]. Additionally, issues such as retrieval quality [30], scalability [106], and knowledge conflicts or inconsistencies [182] continue to hinder the effectiveness of modern RAG systems.

Promising directions include ready-to-use domain-specific RAG frameworks [151, 184, 202, 205], deeper multi-modal integration across text, images, and video [22, 110, 211], RAG combined with reinforcement learning for improved control [58, 117], and end-to-end LLM-as-retriever pipelines that supersede traditional retrieval-then-rank approaches [118, 176].

Having surveyed the retrieval axis of CAIS, the next section turns to the agency axis: LLM Agents that reason, plan, and take actions through iterative interaction with tools and environments.

6 LLM Agents

LLM agents have emerged as a powerful paradigm for enabling intelligent, autonomous behavior. The ecosystem of LLM agents can be broadly categorized into three interconnected layers: Application Scenario, Agent Framework, and Agent Mechanism, as illustrated in Figure 3. Together, these layers define the operational architecture and capabilities of LLM agents, guiding both their theoretical design and practical implementation.

6.1 Application Scenario

LLM agents are applied across a spectrum of real-world and simulated environments. *General-purpose agents* handle diverse tasks without domain-specific customization: Gato [148] uses a single set of weights to perform over 600 tasks across multiple modalities and embodiments, while MINEDOJO [47] trains generalist embodied agents on an internet-scale Minecraft knowledge base. *Embodied agents* are situated in physical or virtual environments: Inner Monologue [70] enables closed-loop language feedback for robotic planning without additional training, and Voyager [186] achieves open-ended lifelong learning in Minecraft using an automatic curriculum and a code-based skill library. *Miscellaneous scenarios* extend LLM agents to specialized domains, including reward function design for RL tasks (EUREKA [119]), knowledge-driven autonomous driving [194], and end-to-end scientific experiment planning [14].




Fig. 3. A structured overview of LLM agents across three dimensions: application scenarios (e.g., general-purpose, embodied), agent frameworks (single-agent and multi-agent architectures), and agent mechanisms (system orchestration, reasoning loops, and tool use).

6.2 Agent Framework

The agent framework defines how LLM agents are organized, instantiated, and deployed. This layer encompasses the majority of paradigms in multi-agent frameworks, including multi-agent collaborative frameworks, multi-agent debate frameworks, and the workflow of multi-agent systems.

6.2.1 Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework. A multi-agent collaborative framework enables multiple LLM agents to work together toward a shared objective, often leveraging role specialization, communication protocols, and coordinated planning. For example, MetaGPT [65] is a multi-agent collaborative framework for software development that integrates Standardized Operating Procedures (SOPs) into LLM-based agent workflows to improve coherence and accuracy. Moreover, AgentVerse [23] is a dynamic multi-agent collaboration framework inspired by human group problem-solving, where agents can adjust their roles, communicate, and collaborate across various tasks, including software development, consulting, and gaming. AgentVerse models the problem-solving process as a loop of four stages: expert recruitment, collaborative decision-making, action execution, and evaluation, allowing dynamic team adjustment based on feedback. Another example worth mentioning is Talebirad et al. [169], where the authors propose a graph-based multi-agent collaboration framework in which agents and plugins form nodes with defined communication channels,

allowing role-specific LLM agents to collaborate, dynamically generate new agents, provide feedback, and manage execution.

6.2.2 Multi-Agent Debate Framework. In a multi-agent debate framework, agents are intentionally assigned to argumentative roles, utilizing structured dialogue to explore divergent viewpoints, validate reasoning, or reach consensus through deliberation. For instance, Du et al. [40] propose a multi-agent debate framework in which multiple instances of language models collaboratively reason, critique, and revise their answers to enhance factuality and reasoning across various tasks. The authors design a system where several LLM agents independently generate responses, then iteratively review and revise their answers based on peer responses through multiple rounds of debate, using only prompting and without model fine-tuning. Furthermore, the Multi-Agent Debate (MAD) framework [95] involves two LLM-based agents (affirmative and negative) debating a topic iteratively with a judge LLM that decides when to stop and which response is correct, enabling exploration of diverse reasoning paths.

6.2.3 Multi-Agent Systems. Multi-agent systems encompass any architecture involving two or more autonomous agents—LLMs that interact within a shared environment to achieve individual or collective goals. *Communication strategy* defines the protocols and methods through which LLM agents exchange information, coordinate actions, and negotiate meanings within a multi-agent setting. For example, ChatEval [16] is a multi-agent debate framework that uses multiple LLMs with diverse roles to collaboratively evaluate generated text, simulating the quality and depth of human evaluation. ChatEval enables multiple LLM agents, each with a distinct role prompt (e.g., critic, scientist), to engage in structured discussion through designed communication strategies (one-by-one, simultaneous, or summarization-enhanced) before aggregating a final evaluation via majority vote or averaging.

Role playing assigns specific identities or perspectives to each agent, enabling structured interactions that reflect diverse viewpoints or specialized expertise. AutoGen [196] provides a general-purpose framework for multi-agent conversations using programmable chat patterns, while CAMEL [91] enables autonomous role-playing cooperation to generate high-quality conversational datasets.

A *shared message pool* provides a centralized hub for asynchronous agent communication. MetaGPT [65] implements this via a publish-subscribe model in which agents post and consume typed messages (e.g., Requirement, Design, Task, Code), enabling modular coordination without direct peer-to-peer dialogue.

6.3 Agent Mechanism

This layer covers the mechanisms of the LLM-driven agent: how the system is organized, how the LLM agent reasons, plans, perceives feedback from the environment, takes action, and reflects on failures. Moreover, tool use, one of the most essential features of the LLM agent, is also discussed in this layer.

6.3.1 Orchestration System. An orchestration system coordinates the components and execution flow of an LLM agent, managing memory, tools, and reasoning steps to ensure coherent and goal-directed behavior. Most LLM agent systems are *prompt-based*, which means the agent system guides the agent’s behavior and reasoning by structuring task instructions, examples, and context directly within the input prompt to the language model, without modifying its internal parameters. Inner Monologue [70], Voyager [186], and ChatEval [16] are some representative examples that leverage the prompt-based method to compose their agent systems. However, there are agent systems that apply *fine-tuning* as well. For instance, GPT4Tools [206] is a method that enables open-source language models to use

multimodal tools by generating a tool-usage instruction dataset via self-instruction from GPT-3.5 and fine-tuning with LoRA. The authors fine-tune models, such as Vicuna-13B, using LoRA for efficient parameter adaptation.

Structured memory management is an essential component of the LLM agent system. Based on different use cases, memory storage typically employs a combination of short-term memory, long-term memory, and, in some instances, episodic memory. For example, CoALA [164] is a conceptual framework inspired by cognitive science to organize and design modular, memory-augmented LLM-based agents, where it introduces a modular agent architecture with working and long-term memory (episodic, semantic, procedural). Moreover, ExpeL [226] utilizes dual memory systems, where the agent autonomously collects successful and failed task trajectories, extracts reusable natural language insights, and retrieves relevant past examples to augment its decision-making during evaluation, all without modifying LLM weights. MemFlow [18] further frames memory access as an intent-driven orchestration problem for small language model agents, routing each query to specialized memory operations with tier-aware evidence packing and grounding-based escalation.

6.3.2 Interactive Reasoning Loop. The interactive reasoning loop is the iterative process through which an LLM agent perceives input, plans actions, executes tasks, and incorporates feedback to refine decisions over time.

Planning and reasoning: ReAct [210] interleaves verbal reasoning traces with environment-changing actions via few-shot prompting, enabling dynamic replanning based on observed feedback. Tree of Thoughts [209] extends this to tree-structured search over intermediate reasoning steps, supporting backtracking and breadth/depth-first exploration.

Action is the execution step at which the agent issues a command—calling a tool, generating output, or interacting with an environment—without requiring explicit human instruction for each step.

Environment feedback: Voyager [186] refines actions through an iterative prompting loop using execution errors and self-verification; LLM-Planner [162] dynamically updates task plans based on grounded environmental state.

Self-reflection: Reflexion [158] stores verbal self-evaluations in episodic memory, allowing agents to improve across trials without weight updates. RCI [78] applies iterative critique-and-improvement across task, state, and agent grounding stages.

6.3.3 Tool Use. Tool use empowers LLM agents to go beyond language generation by interacting with external services—such as APIs, computational tools, or information sources—to perform complex tasks like data processing, real-time querying, and integration with third-party applications.

Model Context Protocol (MCP) [3] is a standardized interface proposed by Anthropic that enables language models to interact with external tools, memory, documents, and user interfaces in a structured and flexible manner. It defines how models receive context and respond with function calls or natural language, facilitating advanced agent behaviors. For example, MCP servers such as AWS KB Retrieval facilitate retrieval from the AWS Knowledge Base using Bedrock Agent Runtime. A server like Brave Search enables web and local search capabilities using Brave’s Search API. Moreover, a server like Filesystem provides secure file operations with configurable access controls.

LLM agents can invoke external services via *API Calls*, enabling access to dynamic functionalities such as data processing, computation, or third-party applications. For example, ToolLLM [138] is a framework that empowers LLMs to effectively use over 16,000 real-world APIs by combining a new dataset (ToolBench), a decision-making algorithm (DFSMT), and a trained model (ToolLaMA) to achieve robust tool-use capabilities.

Information retrieval allows agents to access relevant documents or data from structured or unstructured sources to support grounded reasoning and informed responses. For instance, Sun et al. [167] explored whether LLMs like

Table 3. Comparative analysis of LLM agent reasoning frameworks across key design dimensions.

Framework	Planning Depth	Tool Use	Error Recovery	Compute Cost	Representative Benchmark
Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [193]	Medium (linear)	None (reasoning only)	None	Low (single pass)	GSM8K [26], MATH [63]
ReAct [210]	Medium (interleaved)	Yes (action-observe loop)	Limited (via replanning)	Medium	HotpotQA [208], ALFWorld [159]
Tree of Thoughts (ToT) [209]	High (branching)	Optional	High (backtracking)	High (tree search)	Game of 24, Creative Writing
Reflexion [158]	Medium	Yes	High (verbal feedback + memory)	Medium-high	HumanEval [20], ALFWorld [159]
Self-RAG [4]	Low-medium	Yes (retrieval-gated)	Medium (critique tokens)	Medium	ASQA [163], TriviaQA [74], PopQA [121]

ChatGPT and GPT-4 can serve as effective passage re-ranking agents in information retrieval and introduced a novel permutation generation method that allows LLMs to directly output ranked passage lists.

Web search enables agents to query the internet in real-time, expanding their knowledge beyond pretraining and allowing them to answer up-to-date or domain-specific questions. For example, MIND2WEB [35] proposes MINDACT, a two-stage framework combining a small LM for webpage element ranking and a large LM for action prediction in a multiple-choice QA format, enabling the model to operate efficiently on long and noisy web pages.

6.4 Comparative Analysis of LLM Agent Reasoning Frameworks

A diverse set of reasoning frameworks has emerged for LLM agents, each making distinct design choices about how the agent plans, invokes tools, recovers from errors, and incurs computational cost. Table 3 provides a structured comparison of the five most widely adopted frameworks.

Key trade-offs. Chain-of-Thought reasoning is the lowest-cost option and effective for well-structured tasks but has no recovery mechanism and no tool access. ReAct introduces an action-observation loop that enables real-time tool use at modest additional cost, making it the most widely adopted baseline for tool-using agents. Tree of Thoughts achieves the deepest planning through explicit tree search and backtracking but incurs a multiplicative compute overhead that limits practical deployment to short horizons. Reflexion combines tool use with episodic memory and verbal self-reflection to achieve strong error recovery without weight updates, at the cost of multi-trial inference. Self-RAG integrates retrieval directly into the reasoning chain via learned critique tokens, achieving competitive factual accuracy with smaller models, but its gating mechanism requires supervised fine-tuning. For CAIS deployments, ReAct and Self-RAG represent the most practical choices, with Reflexion preferred when multi-turn error correction is critical.

Building on these frameworks, the next section examines how CAIS extend beyond text to incorporate multimodal perception through Multimodal LLMs.

7 Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs)

MLLMs extend the capabilities of LLMs beyond text-based understanding and generation to multimodal comprehension and content creation. These models are designed to process and generate information across multiple modalities, including text, images, audio, and video. By incorporating cross-modal learning, MLLMs enhance traditional LLMs, enabling them to integrate and reason across different types of data.

This section categorizes MLLMs into four aspects: architecture of MLLMs, fusion strategy inside MLLMs, MLLMs’ modality approaches, and tasks of MLLMs. From an architecture standpoint, an MLLM has four major components: Encoder, Visual Projector, Fusion Module, and Core LLM Model. Fusion strategy is another key aspect of MLLMs; different MLLMs employ various fusion strategies, broadly classified into early fusion, late fusion, cross-modal fusion, and hybrid fusion. In terms of modality, MLLMs can be further classified by their focused modality approaches: image,




Fig. 4. Overview of Multimodal Large Language Models. The diagram categorizes MLLMs by architecture, fusion strategy, modality, and tasks.

audio, video, or text-rich image. Moreover, based on different tasks and usages, MLLMs can be defined as multimodal or integrated with other techniques, such as MLLMs with Chain-of-Thought (CoT) or MLLMs with RAG.

Table 4. Representative encoder approaches for each modality in MLLMs.

Model	Modality	Architecture	Role in MLLMs
CLIP [140]	Image	Dual-encoder contrastive (ViT + text Transformer)	Zero-shot vision encoder; image-text alignment
ViT [38]	Image	Patch-based self-attention Transformer	General-purpose image feature extractor
VAE [80]	Image	Probabilistic encoder-decoder	Structured latent space for image generation
BLIP-2 [92]	Image	Q-Former bridging module	Compact visual token extraction for frozen LLMs
Whisper [141]	Audio	Seq-to-seq encoder-decoder (log-mel spectrogram)	Multilingual speech recognition and transcription
WavLM [21]	Audio	Self-supervised masked speech denoising Transformer	Universal speech encoder for audio-text alignment
Flamingo [2]	Video/Image	Perceiver Resampler + Gated Cross-Attention	Few-shot visual reasoning across frames
TimeSformer [10]	Video	Divided spatiotemporal attention Transformer	Spatiotemporal feature extraction for video QA
Donut [79]	Text-rich image	Swin Transformer encoder + BART-style decoder	OCR-free document understanding

7.1 Architecture

An MLLM comprises four main components. The **Encoder** extracts modality-specific representations: a vision encoder (e.g., CLIP-based in LLaVA [105]) converts pixel data into embeddings; an audio encoder (e.g., Whisper + BEATs in SALMONN [171]) captures temporal and spectral features; and multi-encoder systems such as GLaMM [147] combine global and region-level visual encoders for grounded dialogue. The **Visual Projector** maps encoded features into the language model’s token space—BLIP-2’s Q-Former [92] uses learnable query vectors and cross-attention to compress visual representations into a fixed-length bottleneck, while ShareGPT4V [19] demonstrates that caption quality at this alignment stage critically determines downstream performance. The **Fusion Module** merges representations across modalities into a unified context. The **Core LLM** generates outputs from the fused representation; it may be used as-is (PaLM-E [39] trains end-to-end with multimodal inputs), fine-tuned via LoRA adapters (MultiModal-GPT [57]), or kept fully frozen while only connector weights are updated (FROMAGE [83]). Some models additionally include a **Decoder** for generative outputs across modalities (e.g., Emu2 [165] produces interleaved image-and-text via a visual decoder).

7.2 Fusion Strategy

MLLMs integrate heterogeneous modalities through four main strategies, each making different trade-offs between cross-modal interaction depth and computational cost. *Early fusion* merges raw or low-level features at the input stage before any independent unimodal processing, enabling the model to learn cross-modal dependencies from the first layer (e.g., Gemini [177]), but requires full end-to-end training. *Late fusion* preserves dedicated per-modality encoding pathways and combines outputs only at the prediction stage, offering modularity at the cost of fine-grained cross-modal correlation (e.g., Woodpecker [212]). *Cross-modal attention fusion* establishes direct modality interactions throughout the architecture via attention mechanisms or gating functions, enabling richer contextual alignment (e.g.,

Multimodal-CoT [225], BLIVA [67]). *Hybrid fusion* combines two or more of the above strategies within a single model to balance localized and holistic reasoning (e.g., KOSMOS-2 [134], GPT4RoI [223]). The detailed architectural trade-offs between these strategies are analyzed in Section 7.6.

7.3 Modality Approaches

MLLMs integrate specialized encoder backbones to handle the distinct representation challenges of each modality. Image modalities rely on contrastive or patch-based vision models (e.g., CLIP [140], ViT [38]) that project pixel data into embeddings compatible with LLM token spaces; generative image understanding additionally employs VAEs for structured latent representations [80]. Audio modalities use sequence-to-sequence or self-supervised speech encoders that convert waveforms into temporal feature embeddings aligned with text. Video extends image encoding to the temporal dimension, requiring spatiotemporal models that aggregate frame-level features into compact token sequences. Text-rich images (documents, charts) employ either OCR pipelines for text extraction or OCR-free end-to-end document encoders that jointly model visual layout and embedded text. Table 4 summarizes representative encoder approaches across modalities.

7.4 Comparative Analysis of MLLM Architectures

The rapid proliferation of Multimodal LLMs has produced architectures with substantially different design philosophies. Table 5 compares six representative models across five dimensions: the vision–language fusion strategy, supported modalities, training approach, the key benchmark on which the model was evaluated, and representative benchmark performance, providing a basis for evaluating architectural trade-offs rather than merely cataloging approaches.

Architectural trade-offs. Three fusion strategies dominate the landscape: (1) *Cross-attention injection* (Flamingo) inserts trainable cross-attention layers into a frozen LLM, preserving language model capacity at the cost of tight architectural coupling. (2) *Bridging modules* such as the Q-Former (BLIP-2, InstructBLIP) project visual features into a compact set of learned query tokens before the LLM, enabling modular training stages but potentially losing fine-grained spatial information. (3) *Linear projection connectors* (LLaVA) offer the simplest alignment and are highly efficient, but rely entirely on the richness of instruction tuning data for cross-modal alignment. Native end-to-end training (Gemini) achieves the strongest multimodal reasoning at the cost of substantially higher training resources and reduced modularity. For CAIS practitioners, the choice of fusion strategy determines not only benchmark performance but also the ease with which the vision component can be upgraded independently of the language backbone.

7.5 Tasks

MLLMs support a broad range of tasks spanning purely multimodal inference and compound applications that pair MLLMs with retrieval, reasoning, or control subsystems. Table 6 summarizes the primary task categories with representative systems.

7.6 Architectural Trade-offs in Multimodal Integration

Three trade-off dimensions govern MLLM design. **Early vs. late fusion:** early fusion merges visual and textual tokens at input time, enabling deep cross-modal interaction at the cost of full end-to-end training (e.g., Gemini [177]); late fusion processes modalities independently and merges only at the output, preserving modularity but losing fine-grained correlations. Most practical architectures use a frozen vision encoder that feeds compressed visual tokens into the LLM via a lightweight connector, balancing alignment quality with training efficiency. **Cross-attention injection vs. linear**

Table 5. Comparison of representative Multimodal LLM architectures across key design dimensions. Benchmark scores are taken from each model’s original publication and reflect the specific model version evaluated at the time of release; later versions may differ.

Model	Fusion Strategy	Modalities	Training Approach	Key Benchmark	Score (%)
Flamingo [2]	Cross-attention (frozen vision)	Image, video, text	Few-shot pretraining on image-text pairs	VQAv2 (fine-tuned)	82.0
BLIP-2 [92]	Q-Former (bridging module)	Image, text	Two-stage: Q-Former then LLM fine-tuning	VQAv2 (fine-tuned)	82.2
LLaVA [105]	Linear projection connector	Image, text	Instruction tuning on GPT-4 captions	LLaVA-Bench (COCO)	85.1
InstructBLIP [32]	Q-Former (instruction-aware)	Image, text	Instruction fine-tuning of BLIP-2	ScienceQA	90.7
GPT-4V [1]	Proprietary (cross-modal attn.)	Image, text	RLHF + instruction tuning	MMMU (val)	56.8
Gemini [177]	Native multimodal pretraining	Image, audio, video, text	End-to-end multimodal training	MMMU (Maj@32)	62.4

connectors: cross-attention injection (Flamingo [2]) enables dynamic visual attention but couples vision and language components architecturally; linear projection (LLaVA [105]) is computationally negligible and decoupled but relies entirely on instruction-tuning data for alignment; Q-Former bridging (BLIP-2 [92]) extracts a compact visual summary at the cost of a two-stage training procedure. **Instruction tuning vs. pretraining alignment:** full multimodal pretraining (Gemini, PaLM-E [39]) achieves the strongest generalization; instruction tuning (LLaVA, InstructBLIP [32]) is data-efficient but generalizes less robustly; RLHF (Fact-RLHF [168]) reduces hallucination but requires carefully designed multimodal reward models.

7.7 Limitations and Failure Modes of MLLMs

Despite significant progress, MLLMs exhibit several systematic failure modes that are particularly important for CAIS designers to understand, as these failures propagate through downstream retrieval, agent reasoning, and orchestration components.

Hallucination in visual grounding. MLLMs frequently generate plausible-sounding but factually incorrect descriptions of visual content, a phenomenon distinct from text-only hallucination because it arises from misalignment between the visual embedding and the language model’s prior. For example, models may confidently describe objects, attributes, or spatial relationships that are not present in the image. Woodpecker [212] proposes a post-hoc correction framework that identifies hallucinated visual claims and replaces them with grounded evidence, demonstrating that visual hallucination cannot be fully resolved by instruction tuning alone.

Cross-modal inconsistency. When the same query is posed in different modalities (e.g., as text vs. as a diagram), MLLMs may produce inconsistent or even contradictory answers, revealing that visual and textual representations are not truly unified in the model’s internal state. This inconsistency is particularly problematic in CAIS contexts where a multimodal query triggers retrieval and downstream reasoning: an inconsistent grounding in the MLLM propagates errors through the entire pipeline.

Evaluation fragility. Standard multimodal benchmarks (e.g., VQAv2, SEED-Bench [90], MM-Vet [215]) primarily assess closed-ended visual question answering and do not capture open-ended generation quality, temporal reasoning over video, or robustness to adversarial visual perturbations. MM-SafetyBench [109] highlights that models performing strongly on standard benchmarks can be easily jailbroken via multimodal adversarial inputs, underscoring the gap between benchmark performance and real-world robustness. For CAIS evaluation, this fragility implies that MLLM-component performance should be assessed with both standard benchmarks and adversarial/out-of-distribution test sets before integration into production pipelines.

Having examined the multimodal perception axis of CAIS, Section 8 turns to the fourth axis: the orchestration frameworks and coordination mechanisms that integrate RAG, agents, and MLLMs into coherent, production-ready pipelines.

Table 6. Representative MLLM task categories and example systems.

Task	Description	Example System
Multimodal Reasoning	Infer relationships across modalities (e.g., visual QA, commonsense)	Socratic Models [221]: zero-shot reasoning via prompted model composition
Cross-Modal Retrieval	Map queries across modalities (text↔image)	GILL [82]: frozen LLM + image encoder/decoder for retrieval & generation
Content Generation	Produce multimodal outputs (captions, image+text narratives)	Emu [166]: interleaved text-and-image autoregressive generation
Contextual Understanding	Ground language in visual context for detection/localization	ContextDET [220]: LLM outputs as prior for object detection
+ CoT Prompting	Decompose visual questions into sub-queries	DDCoT [227]: VQA model answers uncertainty-flagged sub-questions
+ RAG	Ground MLLM responses in retrieved multimodal evidence	RA-CM3 [211]: CLIP-based dense retrieval into CM3 generator
+ RL Agents	Use visual reward signals to align MLLM outputs	ESPER [217]: CLIP cosine similarity as PPO reward
+ Embodied AI	Reason over sensor data for navigation and manipulation	PaLM-E [39]: robotic sensor tokens fused with language backbone




Fig. 5. An overview of the Compound AI System orchestration layer, highlighting the relationship between its structure (e.g., hierarchical or centralized component organization), mechanism (such as input handling, task planning, and feedback loops), and objective (including privacy, low latency, and performance).

8 Orchestration

The orchestration of CAIS is inherently sophisticated, often requiring complex architectures. LLM-serving systems are designed to exceed the performance of standalone LLMs by integrating multiple layers, diverse models, or LLM-supported agents that collaborate to deliver optimal results. We categorize LLM-serving systems into three distinct layers: the structural layer, the mechanism layer, and the objective layer, as illustrated in Figure 5.

8.1 Structural Layer

The structural layer represents the architectural organization of components within a system, focusing on how tasks are distributed and coordinated. It includes two primary designs: hierarchical structure and centralized structure. This layer provides the foundational framework for the system’s operational and interaction dynamics.

8.1.1 Hierarchical Structure. In a hierarchical structure, tasks are decomposed into subtasks managed by components organized in a tree-like hierarchy with clear dependencies. Components are modular, meaning they are distinct, self-contained, and interact with others in a coordinated manner. An example is MemGPT [131], which introduces a hierarchical memory system inspired by operating systems, comprising a main context (prompt tokens within the LLM) and external memory (for recall and archival storage), to address the limitations of LLMs’ fixed context windows. The hierarchical structure has also been applied in data exploration [115], multi-agent operating systems [125], and recommendation systems [188].

8.1.2 Centralized Structure. In a centralized structure, a central manager oversees and coordinates interactions among components to ensure efficient collaboration. The central manager acts as a scheduler or coordinator, dispatching resources to the most suitable components based on the task. For example, PagedAttention [86] utilizes a centralized scheduler and distributed GPU workers, with a KV cache manager that dynamically allocates non-contiguous memory blocks for scalable LLM serving. The centralized structure has been applied to diverse domains including IoT [31] and multimodal systems [137].

8.2 Mechanism Layer

The mechanism layer defines the operational processes that govern how a system handles tasks and produces results, ensuring seamless execution and adaptability. Besides input handling and output generation, it includes *Task Planning*, which determines the steps required to achieve the desired outcome. For example, Infinite-LLM [96] integrates a distributed attention mechanism (DistAttention) with a centralized scheduler (gManager), decoupling attention computation from the main inference pipeline to enable flexible task allocation across GPU clusters.

8.2.1 Model Communication. *Model Communication* enables different AI models or components within a system to exchange information. For example, TransLLaMa [84], a simultaneous machine translation system, integrates an ASR model with a fine-tuned LLM. Tan et al. [170] propose a system involving multiple expert agents, each working with distinct abstraction spaces and combining primitive functions, structured prompting, and iterative feedback to refine outputs.

8.2.2 Tool Use. A key mechanism in CAIS is enabling LLMs to leverage external tools (e.g., APIs, search engines, databases, code executors) [139, 156, 190]. This overcomes limitations such as static knowledge [195] and a lack of computational precision, allowing LLMs to interact with real-time data and perform specialized tasks. For instance, agents like OSAgent use standardized APIs to interact with operating systems [201].

Tool use in LLM agents is generally enabled through two main approaches: training-based and prompt-based methods. *Training-based methods* involve fine-tuning models to integrate tool use capabilities. Examples include GPT-4’s structured function calling mechanism [1] and Toolformer’s self-supervised approach, which teaches the model to invoke tools such as search engines or translation services [152]. In contrast, *prompt-based methods* rely on strategic

Table 7. Comparison of CAIS orchestration frameworks across key design dimensions.

Framework	Topology	Coordination Mechanism	Tool Support	Multi-Agent	MCP-Compatible
LangChain [179]	Sequential / DAG	Chain-based prompting, callbacks	Extensive (150+ integrations)	Partial (via LangGraph)	Yes
AutoGen [196]	Multi-agent graph	Conversational agent messaging	Moderate (code, search, APIs)	Native	Partial
DSPy [77]	Pipeline (compiled)	Optimized prompt programs	Limited (retrievers, LMs)	No	No
LlamaIndex [178]	Hierarchical / DAG	Data connectors + query engine	Extensive (data sources)	Partial (via agents)	Yes
CrewAI [29]	Role-based graph	Task delegation between agents	Moderate (tools via LangChain)	Native	Partial

prompt design to guide LLM behavior. For instance, the ReAct framework interleaves reasoning with actions like tool invocation or web search via prompting, enabling complex task decomposition without additional fine-tuning [210].

A specific application is enhancing LLMs with *Web Search*. This addresses knowledge staleness and improves factuality. Models can be fine-tuned for web interaction, such as WebGPT using a text-based browser to search, navigate, and cite sources [130], or GopherCite using search to find supporting evidence for its claims [126].

8.2.3 Memory Management. *Memory Management* efficiently allocates and optimizes memory resources during tasks. For example, PagedAttention [86] implements a paging-inspired memory management system that reduces waste and improves throughput by dynamically allocating non-contiguous blocks for key-value caches.

8.2.4 Feedback Loop. *Feedback Loop* refers to a system mechanism in which outputs are cyclically returned as inputs to refine or optimize the process. For example, in Text-to-SQL systems [120], feedback loops refine SQL query generation based on execution results, improving success rates with each iteration.

8.3 Comparative Analysis of Orchestration Frameworks

A growing ecosystem of orchestration frameworks has emerged to simplify the construction and deployment of CAIS. These frameworks vary substantially in their architectural topology, coordination mechanism, tool support, and compatibility with emerging interoperability standards. Table 7 provides a structured comparison of five widely used frameworks.

Key trade-offs. LangChain and LlamaIndex offer the broadest tool ecosystems and MCP compatibility, making them well-suited for general-purpose CAIS that require integration with diverse data sources and APIs. Their sequential/DAG topology is flexible but can become difficult to debug in complex pipelines. AutoGen and CrewAI are optimized for multi-agent coordination with native conversational or role-based messaging, but their tool ecosystems are narrower and MCP support is partial. DSPy takes a fundamentally different approach by compiling pipeline programs into optimized prompt sequences, trading runtime flexibility for reproducibility and systematic optimization—an advantage for research settings but limiting for production systems that require dynamic tool invocation. For CAIS practitioners, the choice of framework should be guided by: (1) whether multi-agent coordination is required, (2) the breadth of external tool integrations needed, and (3) whether standardized interoperability (MCP) is a deployment requirement.

8.4 Objective Layer

The objective layer governs the essential priorities of CAIS design: **Privacy and Security**—SECGPT [197] uses isolated execution environments and hub-and-spoke models to protect against untrustworthy third-party apps, while Evertz et al. [45] simulate attack scenarios to measure sensitive data leakage when LLMs interact with integrated tools; **Bias**—Sharma et al. [155] study how LLM-powered conversational search influences selective exposure and opinion

polarization; **Low Latency**—LLM-Slice [102] reduces transmission latency by dedicating wireless network slices for LLM task resource allocation; and **Cost-efficiency**—PALIMPZEST [103] compiles high-level task declarations into optimized execution plans that balance cost, runtime, and output quality.

8.5 Standardization and Interoperability Protocols

A persistent challenge in Compound AI Systems is *interoperability*: enabling heterogeneous LLMs, tools, retrievers, and agents to communicate reliably across framework and vendor boundaries. As CAIS pipelines grow in complexity, ad-hoc point-to-point integrations become increasingly brittle and difficult to maintain. This subsection surveys the emerging standardization landscape, organized as a three-layer stack.

8.5.1 Schema Layer: Structured Tool Interfaces. The lowest layer of interoperability standardizes how tools are *described* to an LLM. OpenAI’s function-calling specification (2023) introduced the now-prevalent convention of expressing tools as JSON-schema-described operations with typed arguments and return values. In 2024, OpenAI’s Structured Outputs extension tightened this interface by enforcing strict JSON-schema adherence, reducing parsing failures in production systems. These schema conventions have become a de facto standard: most major LLM providers and orchestration frameworks now accept function-call specifications in a compatible format. However, schema standardization addresses only the description layer—it does not govern how tools are discovered, authenticated, or invoked across runtime boundaries.

8.5.2 Tool-Access Protocol Layer: Model Context Protocol. The *Model Context Protocol* (MCP) [3, 129], introduced by Anthropic in November 2024, defines a universal open interface between AI systems (hosts and clients) and external tool servers. MCP adopts a host/client/server role model over JSON-RPC 2.0 and standardizes four core abstractions: *resources* (data exposed by the server), *prompts* (server-provided prompt templates), *tools* (callable functions), and *sampling* (server-initiated LLM requests). This design separates the AI application from the tool implementation, enabling a single MCP server (e.g., a database connector, a web search service) to be consumed by any MCP-compatible host without bespoke integration code.

Adoption and ecosystem growth. Empirical studies of the MCP ecosystem show rapid adoption across both open-source and enterprise deployments [59, 61]. MCP is now natively supported by LangChain, LlamaIndex, and several cloud AI platforms, making it the most widely integrated tool-access protocol in the CAIS ecosystem. Mastouri et al. [123] demonstrate that existing REST APIs described in OpenAPI can be automatically compiled into MCP-compatible servers, allowing organizations to reuse their existing API infrastructure. Fei et al. [49] extend MCP with active tool discovery, enabling agents to retrieve relevant tools from large tool registries rather than consuming static schemas dumped into the context window.

Security limitations. Despite its adoption, MCP introduces a standardized attack surface alongside its standardized interface. Radosevich and Halloran [143] demonstrate that MCP-enabled agents can be exploited to exfiltrate sensitive data, execute unauthorized actions, and bypass application-level safeguards. Hou et al. [66] provide a lifecycle-based threat model showing that vulnerabilities arise at server registration, capability negotiation, and tool execution stages, including privilege-separation and trust issues at ecosystem scale. These findings indicate that standardization of the interface layer does not automatically confer security: governance, authentication, and sandboxing must be co-designed with the protocol.

8.5.3 *Agent Interoperability Layer: Cross-Framework and Cross-Agent Protocols.* The highest layer of the standardization stack addresses interoperability not between an LLM and a single tool, but between *whole agents, workflows, and ecosystems* running across organizational and runtime boundaries. Ehtesham et al. [43] survey four competing proposals operating at this layer:

Agent-to-Agent (A2A), proposed by Google, enables structured communication between autonomous agents via a message-passing protocol that supports task delegation, capability advertisement, and result reporting.

Agent Communication Protocol (ACP), developed by IBM, focuses on standardizing the message envelope and interaction semantics for multi-agent workflows within enterprise environments.

Agent Network Protocol (ANP) targets an “agentic web” vision in which agents discover one another via decentralized identity mechanisms and collaborate across open network boundaries [207].

Agent Spec (Open Agent Specification) [8] proposes a framework-agnostic declarative representation for agents and workflows, with demonstrated portability across LangGraph, CrewAI, AutoGen, and other runtimes.

These proposals differ in scope: A2A and ACP target runtime message-passing; ANP targets open network discovery; Agent Spec targets static workflow portability. No single proposal currently addresses all interoperability tiers simultaneously.

8.5.4 *The Convergence-by-Layering Thesis.* A key insight from the 2024–2025 standardization literature is that interoperability in CAIS is converging not through a single universal standard, but through *translation and layering*: OpenAPI-to-MCP compilers, protocol-agnostic tool registries, and shared agent representations allow older API standards, vendor schema conventions, and new agent protocols to coexist via adapters and intermediate representations [43, 123]. For CAIS designers, this implies that near-term interoperability is achievable by adopting MCP for tool access, Agent Spec representations for workflow portability, and schema-level compatibility for LLM function calling, while the higher-level cross-agent protocol landscape continues to consolidate.

The following section reviews the benchmarks and evaluation metrics used to assess CAIS across all four axes surveyed in Sections 5–8.

9 Benchmarks and Evaluation Metrics

The rapid growth and advancement of CAIS have led to the development of numerous evaluation benchmarks and datasets. Because CAIS can have different objectives and structures, their respective evaluation benchmarks are diverse. This section introduces the key tasks, datasets, and quantitative metrics used for evaluating CAIS across the domains of RAG, Multimodal LLMs, LLM Agents, and Orchestration, as detailed in Table 8.

RAG evaluation targets both retrieval quality (MRR, nDCG) and generation factuality (EM, F1, ROUGE, BLEU), with key benchmarks including HotpotQA [208] for multi-hop reasoning, BEIR [180] for cross-domain retrieval generalization, and Ragas [44] for end-to-end pipeline evaluation. **LLM agent evaluation** assesses role fidelity (Role-Consistency Score), reasoning quality (Reasoning Trace Accuracy), and tool-use efficiency (Tool Call Accuracy, Token Efficiency) in dynamic environments requiring planning, action, and self-correction. **MLLM evaluation** spans visual QA, chart and document understanding, and safety alignment, combining standard NLP metrics with specialized benchmarks such as MM-SafetyBench [109] for adversarial robustness. **Orchestration evaluation** measures infrastructure performance (throughput, latency), system coordination (task completion time, cache hit rate), and alignment with fairness objectives across the structural, mechanism, and objective layers. Full benchmark and dataset listings for all four dimensions

Table 8. Summary of evaluation dimensions, benchmarks, and metrics for Compound AI Systems.

Dimension	Task	Datasets/Benchmarks	Evaluation Metrics
RAG	Open-domain QA	Natural Questions [85], TriviaQA [74], WebQuestions [9], RealTimeQA [76]	Accuracy, F1 Score, EM
	Passage Retrieval	MS MARCO [6], BEIR [180], TREC-DL [28]	MRR, nDCG, Precision, Recall, F1 Score
	Knowledge QA	OpenBookQA [128], PopQA [121], TruthfulQA [98]	Accuracy, F1 Score, EM
	Multi-hop QA	HotpotQA [208], 2WikiMultihopQA [64], MuSiQue [183], StrategyQA [54]	EM, F1 Score, Accuracy
	Extractive QA	SQuAD [145], DROP [41]	EM, F1 Score, Precision, Recall
	Summarization / Long-form Eval.	WikiAsp [62], Multi-News [46], NarrativeQA [81], UniEval [228]	ROUGE, BLEU, F1 Score
	RAG Pipeline Evaluation	Ragas [44], KILT [136]	Faithfulness, Context Precision, Context Recall, EM, F1 Score
Multimodal LLM	Reasoning & Commonsense QA	MM-Vet [215], ALLaVA [17], SEED-Bench [90]	Accuracy, F1 Score, EM, Perplexity
	Chart & Document Understanding	ChartQA [122], MMC-Benchmark [104], DocVQA [124], TextVQA [160]	Accuracy, F1 Score, BLEU, ROUGE
	Safety & Alignment	MM-SafetyBench [109]	Accuracy, F1 Score, Custom Safety Metrics
	Multimodal Evaluation	MME [51], MultiBench [94]	Accuracy, F1 Score, MRR, Perplexity, BLEU, ROUGE
Orchestration of CAIS	Structural Layer	BigDataBench [52], AIBench Training [172]	Throughput, Latency Overhead, Bandwidth Utilization
	Mechanism Layer	AISBench [37], WebArena [229], Long Range Arena [175], ZeroSCROLLS [153]	Mean Task Completion Time, Avg. API Response Time, Cache Hit Rate
	Objective Layer	AI Fairness 360 [7]	Fairness-specific metrics
LLM Agents	Role-Playing	RoleLLM [191], AgentBench [108], AgentBoard [114]	Role-Consistency Score, Self-Correction Rate
	Interactive Reasoning	AgentQuest [55], InfiAgent-DABench [68], CriticBench [101]	Reasoning Trace Accuracy, Generalization Score
	Tool Use	ML-Bench [174], Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard [204]	Tool Call Accuracy, Token Efficiency

are provided in Table 8. Persistent gaps—particularly the lack of unified system-level metrics and robust multimodal benchmarks—motivate the challenges and open directions discussed in the following section.

10 Challenges, Limitations, and Opportunities

10.1 Challenges and Limitations

Compound AI Systems represent a significant advancement in the capabilities of LLM-based architectures, yet they are not without challenges and limitations. As this field matures, it is crucial to understand the key obstacles that hinder its scalability, efficiency, and safety, while also identifying the most promising future directions.

10.1.1 System Complexity and Scalability. Compound AI Systems often involve the integration of multiple components—retrievers, agents, multimodal encoders, memory modules, and orchestration mechanisms. This architectural complexity introduces engineering overhead, increasing the difficulty of deployment, debugging, and system optimization. Moreover, the added complexity can lead to performance bottlenecks and increased inference latency, particularly when coordinating multiple LLMs and tools in real-time.

10.1.2 Evaluation and Benchmarking. Evaluating Compound AI Systems is inherently difficult due to the diversity of their components and the dynamic nature of their outputs. Traditional NLP benchmarks do not adequately capture the interactive or multimodal capabilities of such systems. There is a lack of unified evaluation frameworks that consider system-level performance metrics, such as latency, robustness, and resource usage, alongside task-specific accuracy.

10.1.3 Tool and Component Integration. Despite advances in tool-use and agent-based planning, seamless integration between LLMs and external components remains a challenge. Issues such as API misalignment, inconsistent data formats, limited error handling, and brittle tool chaining cause failures in real-world applications. Moreover, many tools and retrievers were not originally designed for interaction with LLMs, leading to interoperability and reliability issues.

10.1.4 Standardization and Ecosystem Fragmentation. The rapid growth of the CAIS ecosystem has produced a fragmented landscape of incompatible frameworks, tool schemas, and agent protocols. While emerging standards such as the Model Context Protocol (MCP) [3] and Agent Spec [8] address parts of this problem (as discussed in Section 8.5), no single standard currently covers the full interoperability stack from tool schemas through agent communication to cross-framework workflow portability. Security governance of standardized interfaces is also under-developed: studies have demonstrated that MCP’s open extensibility introduces privilege-separation vulnerabilities at ecosystem scale [66, 143]. Developing governance models, authentication mechanisms, and sandboxing standards that co-evolve with protocol design is a critical open challenge for the field.

10.1.5 Multimodal Alignment and Evaluation. Despite rapid progress in MLLMs, cross-modal consistency and evaluation robustness remain unsolved. As shown in Section 7.7, MLLMs exhibit visual hallucination, cross-modal inconsistency, and fragility to adversarial visual inputs that are not captured by standard benchmarks. Developing evaluation frameworks that assess multimodal CAIS components under realistic, out-of-distribution, and adversarial conditions is an important open problem.

10.2 Opportunities

The challenges above delineate the most fertile frontiers for the next generation of CAIS.

10.2.1 Unified and Modular Architectures. Designing CAIS with clean interfaces between retrievers, agents, encoders, and orchestration layers—so components can be swapped without cascading side effects—is a key priority. Standardized protocols (MCP, A2A; Section 8.5) are early steps, but interoperability benchmarks and certified adapter libraries are still needed.

10.2.2 End-to-End Trainable Compound Pipelines. Current CAIS are assembled from independently pretrained modules with no joint training objective; end-to-end differentiable or RL-based training of retriever–generator–agent pipelines [88, 97] is a promising direction. Key open challenges are credit assignment across heterogeneous components and fine-tuning strategies that avoid catastrophic forgetting.

10.2.3 Multimodal Grounding and Evaluation. Advances in cross-modal alignment for video, audio, and 3D inputs will expand the task scope of CAIS. Future benchmarks should probe compositional reasoning, temporal consistency, and adversarial robustness—going beyond aggregate accuracy.

10.2.4 Self-Adaptive and Meta-Agent Orchestration. Static workflow graphs are brittle in open-ended environments; self-adaptive orchestration that monitors performance, reconfigures components, and allocates resources dynamically is an important frontier. Meta-agent architectures—where a high-level planner supervises specialist sub-agents—offer a path toward more robust and explainable CAIS.

10.2.5 Human-AI Collaboration and Interpretability. In high-stakes domains (medicine, law, finance), explaining compound reasoning chains—tracing outputs back through orchestration, retrieval, and tool calls—is essential. Interactive explanation interfaces, uncertainty quantification, and controllable planning mechanisms for domain-expert oversight are open research opportunities.

10.2.6 Sustainable and Efficient Deployment. The multi-component nature of CAIS amplifies inference cost; speculative retrieval, cached reasoning, and adaptive computation (early-exit agents) are promising directions for reducing this overhead. Efficiency benchmarks measuring system-level throughput and cost per task—rather than per-component metrics—would accelerate progress.

11 Conclusion

This survey has presented a systematic, systems-level synthesis of Compound AI Systems (CAIS)—the emerging paradigm in which large language models are augmented with external components to overcome the inherent limitations of standalone models. Drawing on a structured search of over 220 papers published between 2020 and early 2026, we have organized the CAIS landscape along four foundational axes: Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), LLM Agents, Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs), and Orchestration.

Key contributions. For each axis, we have provided both descriptive coverage of representative systems and comparative analysis of design trade-offs through dedicated comparison tables (Tables 2–7). We introduced a unified cross-axis pipeline model (Figure 1) and formal instantiation in terms of $f(L, C, D)$ that shows how the four axes co-constrain one another in a complete CAIS. We surveyed the emerging standardization landscape—MCP, A2A, ACP, ANP, and Agent Spec—and argued that interoperability is currently converging through translation and layering rather than a single universal standard. We also deepened the comparative treatment of MLLM architectures and identified three systematic failure modes—visual hallucination, cross-modal inconsistency, and evaluation fragility—that are particularly consequential for CAIS integration.

Open challenges. Despite this progress, significant challenges remain. System complexity and debugging difficulty grow super-linearly with the number of integrated components. Evaluation frameworks lag behind system capabilities, particularly for interactive, multimodal, and long-horizon tasks. Standardization and security governance of tool-access and agent communication protocols are still immature. Cross-modal alignment in MLLMs also remains an unsolved problem at the intersection of representation learning and evaluation methodology.

Looking forward. We anticipate that the most impactful near-term advances in CAIS will come from three directions: (1) unified, modular architectures that allow components to be upgraded or replaced without retraining adjacent modules; (2) end-to-end trainable pipelines in which retrievers, agents, and generators are jointly optimized; and (3) principled governance frameworks for standardized interoperability that address both portability and security. As CAIS continue

to expand into real-world, multimodal, and interactive environments, the systems-level perspective developed in this survey—synthesizing retrieval, agency, perception, and orchestration into a coherent analytical framework—will be essential for designing, evaluating, and advancing the next generation of intelligent applications.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. 2022. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 23716–23736.
- [3] Anthropic. 2024. Introducing the Model Context Protocol. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/model-context-protocol>. Accessed: 2025-03-29.
- [4] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511* (2023).
- [5] Jinheon Baek, Alham Fikri Aji, and Amir Saffari. 2023. Knowledge-augmented language model prompting for zero-shot knowledge graph question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04136* (2023).
- [6] Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, et al. 2016. Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09268* (2016).
- [7] Rachel KE Bellamy, Kuntal Dey, Michael Hind, Samuel C Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Kalapriya Kannan, Pranay Lohia, Jacquelyn Martino, Sameep Mehta, Aleksandra Mojsilović, et al. 2019. AI Fairness 360: An extensible toolkit for detecting and mitigating algorithmic bias. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 63, 4/5 (2019), 4–1.
- [8] Yassine Benajiba, Cesare Bernardis, Vladislav Blinov, Paul Cayet, Hassan Chafi, Abderrahim Fathan, Louis Faucon, Damien Hilloulin, Sungpack Hong, Ingo Kossyk, et al. 2025. Open Agent Specification (Agent Spec) Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.04173* (2025).
- [9] Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. 2013. Semantic parsing on freebase from question-answer pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. 1533–1544.
- [10] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. 2021. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding?. In *ICML*, Vol. 2. 4.
- [11] Pranav Bhagat, K N Ajay Shastry, Pranoy Panda, and Chaitanya Devaguptapu. 2025. Evaluating Compound AI Systems through Behaviors, Not Benchmarks. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*. 24193–24222. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.findings-emnlp.1314>
- [12] Multimodal Blog. 2024. *How to Chunk Documents for Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)*. https://www.multimodal.dev/post/how-to-chunk-documents-for-rag?utm_source-chatgpt.com Accessed: 2024-12-14.
- [13] Bloomberg Intelligence. 2023. Generative AI to Become a \$1.3 Trillion Market by 2032, Research Finds. <https://www.bloomberg.com/company/press/generative-ai-to-become-a-1-3-trillion-market-by-2032-research-finds/>. Accessed: 2025-05-30.
- [14] Daniil A Boiko, Robert MacKnight, and Gabe Gomes. 2023. Emergent autonomous scientific research capabilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05332* (2023).
- [15] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [16] Chi-Min Chan, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jianxuan Yu, Wei Xue, Shanghang Zhang, Jie Fu, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2023. Chateval: Towards better llm-based evaluators through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07201* (2023).
- [17] Guiming Hardy Chen, Shunian Chen, Ruifei Zhang, Junying Chen, Xiangbo Wu, Zhiyi Zhang, Zhihong Chen, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang. 2024. Allava: Harnessing gpt4v-synthesized data for lite vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11684* (2024).
- [18] Jiayi Chen, Yingcong Li, and Guiling Wang. 2026. MemFlow: Intent-Driven Memory Orchestration for Small Language Model Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.03312* (2026).
- [19] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. 2025. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 370–387.
- [20] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).
- [21] Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Jinyu Li, Naoyuki Kanda, Takuya Yoshioka, Xiong Xiao, et al. 2022. Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 16, 6 (2022), 1505–1518.
- [22] Wenhui Chen, Hexiang Hu, Chitwan Saharia, and William W Cohen. 2022. Re-imagin: Retrieval-augmented text-to-image generator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14491* (2022).
- [23] Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jingwei Zuo, Cheng Yang, Chenfei Yuan, Chen Qian, Chi-Min Chan, Yujia Qin, Yaxi Lu, Ruobing Xie, et al. 2023. Agentverse: Facilitating multi-agent collaboration and exploring emergent behaviors in agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10848* 2, 4 (2023), 6.

- [24] Xiang Chen, Lei Li, Ningyu Zhang, Xiaozhuan Liang, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, Luo Si, and Huajun Chen. 2022. Decoupling knowledge from memorization: Retrieval-augmented prompt learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 23908–23922.
- [25] Xin Cheng, Di Luo, Xiuying Chen, Lema Liu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2024. Lift yourself up: Retrieval-augmented text generation with self-memory. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [26] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168* (2021).
- [27] Wikipedia contributors. 2024. Claude (language model). [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude_\(language_model\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude_(language_model)). Accessed: 2024-12-24.
- [28] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, Ellen M Voorhees, and Ian Soboroff. 2021. TREC deep learning track: Reusable test collections in the large data regime. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 2369–2375.
- [29] CrewAI. 2024. CrewAI: Framework for Orchestrating Role-Playing, Autonomous AI Agents. <https://github.com/crewAIinc/crewAI>. Accessed: 2025-05-30.
- [30] Florin Cuconasu, Giovanni Trappolini, Federico Siciliano, Simone Filice, Cesare Campagnano, Yoelle Maarek, Nicola Tonello, and Fabrizio Silvestri. 2024. The Power of Noise: Redefining Retrieval for RAG Systems. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. ACM, 719–729. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657834>
- [31] Hongwei Cui, Yuyang Du, Qun Yang, Yulin Shao, and Soung Chang Liew. 2024. Llmind: Orchestrating ai and iot with llm for complex task execution. *IEEE Communications Magazine* (2024).
- [32] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Hua Tong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale N Fung, and Steven Hoi. 2024. InstructBLIP: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [33] Zhuyun Dai, Vincent Y Zhao, Ji Ma, Yi Luan, Jianmo Ni, Jing Lu, Anton Bakalov, Kelvin Guu, Keith B Hall, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. Promptgator: Few-shot dense retrieval from 8 examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11755* (2022).
- [34] deepset.ai Team. 2024. Haystack GitHub Repository. <https://github.com/deepset-ai/haystack>. Accessed: 2024-12-24.
- [35] Xiang Deng, Yu Gu, Boyuan Zheng, Shijie Chen, Sam Stevens, Boshi Wang, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. 2023. Mind2web: Towards a generalist agent for the web. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 28091–28114.
- [36] DataStax Documentation. 2024. *Introduction to Indexing in Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)*. https://docs.datastax.com/en/ragstack/intro-to-rag/indexing.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com Accessed: 2024-12-14.
- [37] Jian Dong, Wei Bao, Xiaoqi Cao, Yang Xu, Yuze Yang, Binbin Li, Qi Zhang, and Heng Ye. 2025. AISBench: an performance benchmark for AI server systems. *The Journal of Supercomputing* 81, 2 (2025), 1–24.
- [38] Alexey Dosovitskiy. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020).
- [39] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. 2023. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378* (2023).
- [40] Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. 2023. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [41] Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. DROP: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00161* (2019).
- [42] Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, and Jonathan Larson. 2024. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130* (2024).
- [43] Abul Ehtesham, Aditi Singh, Gaurav Kumar Gupta, and Saket Kumar. 2025. A Survey of Agent Interoperability Protocols: Model Context Protocol (MCP), Agent Communication Protocol (ACP), Agent-to-Agent (A2A), and Agent Network Protocol (ANP). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02279* (2025).
- [44] Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2024. Ragas: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*. 150–158.
- [45] Jonathan Evertz, Merlin Chlosta, Lea Schönherr, and Thorsten Eisenhofer. 2024. Whispers in the Machine: Confidentiality in LLM-integrated Systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06922* (2024).
- [46] Alexander R Fabbri, Irene Li, Tianwei She, Suyi Li, and Dragomir R Radev. 2019. Multi-news: A large-scale multi-document summarization dataset and abstractive hierarchical model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01749* (2019).
- [47] Linxi Fan, Guanzhi Wang, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Yuncong Yang, Haoyi Zhu, Andrew Tang, De-An Huang, Yuke Zhu, and Anima Anandkumar. 2022. Minedojo: Building open-ended embodied agents with internet-scale knowledge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 18343–18362.
- [48] Wenqi Fan, Yujuan Ding, Liangbo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. 2024. A survey on rag meeting llms: Towards retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 6491–6501.
- [49] Xiang Fei, Xiawu Zheng, and Hao Feng. 2025. MCP-Zero: Active Tool Discovery for Autonomous LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01056* (2025).
- [50] Mohamed Amine Ferrag, Norbert Tihanyi, and Merouane Debbah. 2025. From LLM Reasoning to Autonomous AI Agents: A Comprehensive Review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19678* (2025).

- [51] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, et al. 2023. MME: A Comprehensive Evaluation Benchmark for Multimodal Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13394* (2023).
- [52] Wanling Gao, Jianfeng Zhan, Lei Wang, Chunjie Luo, Daoyi Zheng, Xu Wen, Rui Ren, Chen Zheng, Xiwen He, Hainan Ye, et al. 2018. Bigdatabench: A scalable and unified big data and ai benchmark suite. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08254* (2018).
- [53] Manas Gaur, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vijay Srinivasan, and Hongxia Jin. 2022. Iseqq: Information seeking question generation using dynamic meta-information retrieval and knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 10672–10680.
- [54] Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 346–361.
- [55] Luca Gioacchini, Giuseppe Siracusano, Davide Sanvito, Kiril Gashteovski, David Friede, Roberto Bifulco, and Carolin Lawrence. 2024. Agentquest: A modular benchmark framework to measure progress and improve llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06411* (2024).
- [56] Michael Glass, Gaetano Rossiello, Md Faisal Mahub Chowdhury, Ankita Rajaram Naik, Pengshan Cai, and Alfio Gliozzo. 2022. Re2G: Retrieve, rerank, generate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.06300* (2022).
- [57] Tao Gong, Chengqi Lyu, Shilong Zhang, Yudong Wang, Miao Zheng, Qian Zhao, Kuikun Liu, Wenwei Zhang, Ping Luo, and Kai Chen. 2023. Multimodal-gpt: A vision and language model for dialogue with humans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04790* (2023).
- [58] Anirudh Goyal, Abram Friesen, Andrea Banino, Theophane Weber, Nan Rosemary Ke, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Arthur Guez, Mehdi Mirza, Peter C Humphreys, Ksenia Konyushova, et al. 2022. Retrieval-augmented reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 7740–7765.
- [59] Hechuan Guo, Yongle Hao, Yue Zhang, Minghui Xu, Peizhuo Lv, Jiezhong Chen, and Xiuzhen Cheng. 2025. A Measurement Study of Model Context Protocol Ecosystem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25292* (2025).
- [60] Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. 2024. Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01680* (2024).
- [61] Mohammed Mehedi Hasan, Hao Li, Emad Fallahzadeh, Gopi Krishnan Rajbahadur, Bram Adams, and Ahmed E. Hassan. 2025. Model Context Protocol (MCP) at First Glance: Studying the Security and Maintainability of MCP Servers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13538* (2025).
- [62] Hiroaki Hayashi, Prashant Budania, Peng Wang, Chris Ackerson, Raj Neervannan, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Wikiasp: A dataset for multi-domain aspect-based summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 211–225.
- [63] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874* (2021).
- [64] Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2020. Constructing a multi-hop qa dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.01060* (2020).
- [65] Sirui Hong, Xiawu Zheng, Jonathan Chen, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, et al. 2023. Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352* 3, 4 (2023), 6.
- [66] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Shengao Wang, and Haoyu Wang. 2025. Model Context Protocol (MCP): Landscape, Security Threats, and Future Research Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23278* (2025).
- [67] Wenbo Hu, Yifan Xu, Yi Li, Weiyue Li, Zeyuan Chen, and Zhuowen Tu. 2024. Bliva: A simple multimodal llm for better handling of text-rich visual questions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 2256–2264.
- [68] Xueyu Hu, Ziyu Zhao, Shuang Wei, Ziwei Chai, Qianli Ma, Guoyin Wang, Xuwu Wang, Jing Su, Jingjing Xu, Ming Zhu, et al. 2024. Infiagent-dabench: Evaluating agents on data analysis tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05507* (2024).
- [69] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* (2023).
- [70] Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Jacky Liang, Pete Florence, Andy Zeng, Jonathan Tompson, Igor Mordatch, Yevgen Chebotar, et al. 2022. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608* (2022).
- [71] Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. 2020. Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01282* (2020).
- [72] Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. 2023. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 251 (2023), 1–43.
- [73] Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06983* (2023).
- [74] Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03551* (2017).
- [75] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 6769–6781.
- [76] Jungo Kasai, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Akari Asai, Xinyan Yu, Dragomir Radev, Noah A Smith, Yejin Choi, Kentaro Inui, et al. 2023. Realtime qa: What’s the answer right now? *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2023), 49025–49043.

- [77] Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Xiang Lisa Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. Demonstrate-search-predict: Composing retrieval and language models for knowledge-intensive nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14024* (2022).
- [78] Geunwoo Kim, Pierre Baldi, and Stephen McAleer. 2023. Language models can solve computer tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 39648–39677.
- [79] Geewook Kim, Teakgyu Hong, Moonbin Yim, JeongYeon Nam, Jinyoung Park, Jinyeong Yim, Wonseok Hwang, Sangdoon Yun, Dongyoon Han, and Seunghyun Park. 2022. Ocr-free document understanding transformer. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 498–517.
- [80] Diederik P Kingma, Max Welling, et al. 2019. An introduction to variational autoencoders. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 12, 4 (2019), 307–392.
- [81] Tomáš Kočiský, Jonathan Schwarz, Phil Blunsom, Chris Dyer, Karl Moritz Hermann, Gábor Melis, and Edward Grefenstette. 2018. The narrativeqa reading comprehension challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6 (2018), 317–328.
- [82] Jing Yu Koh, Daniel Fried, and Russ R Salakhutdinov. 2024. Generating images with multimodal language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [83] Jing Yu Koh, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Daniel Fried. 2023. Grounding language models to images for multimodal inputs and outputs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 17283–17300.
- [84] Roman Koshkin, Katsuhito Sudoh, and Satoshi Nakamura. 2024. Transllama: Llm-based simultaneous translation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04636* (2024).
- [85] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 453–466.
- [86] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 611–626.
- [87] Angeliki Lazaridou, Elena Gribovskaya, Wojciech Stokowiec, and Nikolai Grigorev. 2022. Internet-augmented language models through few-shot prompting for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05115* (2022).
- [88] Yu-Ang Lee, Guan-Ting Yi, Mei-Yi Liu, Jui-Chao Lu, Guan-Bo Yang, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2025. Compound AI Systems Optimization: A Survey of Methods, Challenges, and Future Directions. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 28760–28775. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.1463>
- [89] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Kuttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.
- [90] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. 2023. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16125* (2023).
- [91] Guohao Li, Hasan Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 51991–52008.
- [92] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 19730–19742.
- [93] Xinzhe Li. 2025. A Review of Prominent Paradigms for LLM-Based Agents: Tool Use, Planning (Including RAG), and Feedback Learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. 9760–9779.
- [94] Paul Pu Liang, Yiwei Lyu, Xiang Fan, Zetian Wu, Yun Cheng, Jason Wu, Leslie Chen, Peter Wu, Michelle A Lee, Yuke Zhu, et al. 2021. Multibench: Multiscale benchmarks for multimodal representation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2021, DB1 (2021), 1.
- [95] Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujia Yang, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023. Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19118* (2023).
- [96] Bin Lin, Chen Zhang, Tao Peng, Hanyu Zhao, Wencong Xiao, Minmin Sun, Anmin Liu, Zhipeng Zhang, Lanbo Li, Xiafei Qiu, et al. 2024. Infinite-llm: Efficient llm service for long context with distattention and distributed kvcache. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02669* (2024).
- [97] Matthieu Lin, Jenny Sheng, Andrew Zhao, Shenzi Wang, Yang Yue, Yiran Wu, Huan Liu, Jun Liu, Gao Huang, and Yong-Jin Liu. 2024. LLM-based Optimization of Compound AI Systems: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16392* (2024).
- [98] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2021. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07958* (2021).
- [99] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Akari Asai, Minghan Li, Barlas Oguz, Jimmy Lin, Yashar Mehdad, Wen-tau Yih, and Xilun Chen. 2023. How to train your dragon: Diverse augmentation towards generalizable dense retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07452* (2023).
- [100] Xi Victoria Lin, Xilun Chen, Mingda Chen, Weijia Shi, Maria Lomeli, Rich James, Pedro Rodriguez, Jacob Kahn, Gergely Szilvasy, Mike Lewis, et al. 2023. Ra-dit: Retrieval-augmented dual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01352* (2023).
- [101] Zicheng Lin, Zhibin Gou, Tian Liang, Ruilin Luo, Haowei Liu, and Yujia Yang. 2024. Criticbench: Benchmarking llms for critique-correct reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14809* (2024).
- [102] Boyi Liu, Jingwen Tong, and Jun Zhang. 2024. Llm-slice: Dedicated wireless network slicing for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*. 853–854.

- [103] Chunwei Liu, Matthew Russo, Michael Cafarella, Lei Cao, Peter Baille Chen, Zui Chen, Michael Franklin, Tim Kraska, Samuel Madden, and Gerardo Vitagliano. 2024. A Declarative System for Optimizing AI Workloads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14696* (2024).
- [104] Fuxiao Liu, Xiaoyang Wang, Wenlin Yao, Jianshu Chen, Kaiqiang Song, Sangwoo Cho, Yaser Yacoob, and Dong Yu. 2023. Mmc: Advancing multimodal chart understanding with large-scale instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10774* (2023).
- [105] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2024).
- [106] Junyi Liu, Liangzhi Li, Tong Xiang, Bowen Wang, and Yiming Qian. 2023. Tera-llm: Token compression retrieval augmented large language model for inference cost reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15556* (2023).
- [107] Xiao Liu, Hanyu Lai, Hao Yu, Yifan Xu, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. WebGLM: Towards an efficient web-enhanced question answering system with human preferences. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4549–4560.
- [108] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, et al. 2023. Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03688* (2023).
- [109] Xin Liu, Yichen Zhu, Jindong Gu, Yunshi Lan, Chao Yang, and Yu Qiao. 2024. Mm-safetybench: A benchmark for safety evaluation of multimodal large language models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 386–403.
- [110] Alexander Long, Wei Yin, Thalaisyasingam Ajanthan, Vu Nguyen, Pulak Purkait, Ravi Garg, Alan Blair, Chunhua Shen, and Anton van den Hengel. 2022. Retrieval Augmented Classification for Long-Tail Visual Recognition. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 6949–6959. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.00683>
- [111] Shuai Lu, Nan Duan, Hojae Han, Daya Guo, Seung-won Hwang, and Alexey Svyatkovskiy. 2022. Reacc: A retrieval-augmented code completion framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07722* (2022).
- [112] Yi Luan, Jacob Eisenstein, Kristina Toutanova, and Michael Collins. 2021. Sparse, Dense, and Attentional Representations for Text Retrieval. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 329–345.
- [113] Hongyin Luo, Yung-Sung Chuang, Yuan Gong, Tianhua Zhang, Yoon Kim, Xixin Wu, Danny Fox, Helen Meng, and James Glass. 2023. Sail: Search-augmented instruction learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15225* (2023).
- [114] Chang Ma, Junlei Zhang, Zhihao Zhu, Cheng Yang, Yujiu Yang, Yaohui Jin, Zhenzhong Lan, Lingpeng Kong, and Junxian He. 2024. Agentboard: An analytical evaluation board of multi-turn llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13178* (2024).
- [115] Pingchuan Ma, Rui Ding, Shuai Wang, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2023. InsightPilot: An LLM-empowered automated data exploration system. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. 346–352.
- [116] Ruotian Ma, Xiaolei Wang, Xin Zhou, Jian Li, Nan Du, Tao Gui, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. Are large language models good prompt optimizers? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02101* (2024).
- [117] Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. Query rewriting for retrieval-augmented large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14283* (2023).
- [118] Xueguang Ma, Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, and Jimmy Lin. 2024. Fine-tuning llama for multi-stage text retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2421–2425.
- [119] Yecheng Jason Ma, William Liang, Guanzhi Wang, De-An Huang, Osbert Bastani, Dinesh Jayaraman, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. Eureka: Human-level reward design via coding large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12931* (2023).
- [120] Karime Maamari and Amine Mhedhbi. 2024. End-to-end Text-to-SQL Generation within an Analytics Insight Engine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12104* (2024).
- [121] Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10511* (2022).
- [122] Ahmed Masry, Do Xuan Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. 2022. Chartqa: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10244* (2022).
- [123] Meriem Mastouri, Emna Ksontini, and Wael Kessentini. 2025. Making REST APIs Agent-Ready: From OpenAPI to Model Context Protocol Servers for Tool-Augmented LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.16044* (2025).
- [124] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and CV Jawahar. 2021. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*. 2200–2209.
- [125] Kai Mei, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Ruosong Ye, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2024. Llm agent operating system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16971* (2024).
- [126] Jacob Menick, Maja Trebacz, Vladimir Mikulik, John Aslanides, Francis Song, Martin Chadwick, Mia Glaese, Susannah Young, Lucy Campbell-Gillingham, Geoffrey Irving, and Nat McAleese. 2022. Teaching language models to support answers with verified quotes. *arXiv:2203.11147* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11147>
- [127] Meta AI. 2025. The Llama 4 Herd: The Beginning of a New Era of Natively Multimodal AI Innovation. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-4-multimodal-intelligence>. Accessed: April 2026.
- [128] Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02789* (2018).
- [129] Model Context Protocol. 2024. Specification, version 2024-11-05. <https://spec.modelcontextprotocol.io>. Official MCP specification.

- [130] Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, Xu Jiang, Karl Cobbe, Tyna Eloundou, Gretchen Krueger, Kevin Button, Matthew Knight, Benjamin Chess, and John Schulman. 2022. WebGPT: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv:2112.09332* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.09332>
- [131] Charles Packer, Sarah Wooders, Kevin Lin, Vivian Fang, Shishir G Patil, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E Gonzalez. 2023. Memgpt: Towards llms as operating systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08560* (2023).
- [132] Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, Qiuyuan Huang, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2023. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12813* (2023).
- [133] Sida Peng, Eirini Kalliamvakou, Peter Cihon, and Mert Demirel. 2023. The impact of ai on developer productivity: Evidence from github copilot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06590* (2023).
- [134] Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. 2023. Kosmos-2: Grounding multimodal large language models to the world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14824* (2023).
- [135] Perplexity AI. 2025. Perplexity AI. <https://www.perplexity.ai/>. Accessed: 2025-05-30.
- [136] Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vladimir Karpukhin, Jean Maillard, et al. 2020. KILT: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02252* (2020).
- [137] Jie Qin, Jie Wu, Weifeng Chen, Yuxi Ren, Huixia Li, Hefeng Wu, Xuefeng Xiao, Rui Wang, and Shilei Wen. 2024. Diffusiongpt: LLM-driven text-to-image generation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10061* (2024).
- [138] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, et al. 2023. Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16789* (2023).
- [139] Changle Qu, Sunhao Dai, Xiaochi Wei, Hengyi Cai, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, Jun Xu, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024. Tool Learning with Large Language Models: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17935* (2024).
- [140] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
- [141] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. 2023. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 28492–28518.
- [142] RADLogics. 2021. Use of AI to Analyze Chest CT Shortens Turnaround Times in Russia. <https://www.auntminnieeurope.com/imaging-informatics/artificial-intelligence/article/15655440/use-of-ai-to-analyze-chest-ct-shortens-turnaround-times-in-russia>. Accessed: 2025-05-30.
- [143] Brandon Radosevich and John Halloran. 2025. MCP Safety Audit: LLMs with the Model Context Protocol Allow Major Security Exploits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03767* (2025).
- [144] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research* 21, 140 (2020), 1–67.
- [145] Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250* (2016).
- [146] Ori Ram, Yoav Levine, Itay Dalmedigos, Dor Muhlga, Amnon Shashua, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Yoav Shoham. 2023. In-context retrieval-augmented language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 1316–1331.
- [147] Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Sahal Shaji, Abdelrahman Shaker, Salman Khan, Hisham Cholakkal, Rao M Anwer, Eric Xing, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad S Khan. 2024. Glamm: Pixel grounding large multimodal model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 13009–13018.
- [148] Scott Reed, Konrad Zolna, Emilio Parisotto, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Alexander Novikov, Gabriel Barth-Maron, Mai Gimenez, Yury Sulsky, Jackie Kay, Jost Tobias Springenberg, et al. 2022. A generalist agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.06175* (2022).
- [149] Ruiyang Ren, Yuhao Wang, Yingqi Qu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Liu, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, Ji-Rong Wen, and Haifeng Wang. 2023. Investigating the factual knowledge boundary of large language models with retrieval augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11019* (2023).
- [150] Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 3, 4 (2009), 333–389.
- [151] Jaromir Savelka, Kevin D Ashley, Morgan A Gray, Hannes Westermann, and Huihui Xu. 2023. Explaining legal concepts with augmented large language models (gpt-4). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09525* (2023).
- [152] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2024. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [153] Uri Shaham, Maor Ivgi, Avia Efrat, Jonathan Berant, and Omer Levy. 2023. ZeroSCROLLS: A zero-shot benchmark for long text understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14196* (2023).
- [154] Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. Enhancing retrieval-augmented large language models with iterative retrieval-generation synergy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15294* (2023).
- [155] Nikhil Sharma, Q Vera Liao, and Ziang Xiao. 2024. Generative Echo Chamber? Effect of LLM-Powered Search Systems on Diverse Information Seeking. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–17.
- [156] Zhuocheng Shen. 2024. Llm with tools: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18807* (2024).

- [157] Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12652* (2023).
- [158] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2023. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 8634–8652.
- [159] Mohit Shridhar, Xingdi Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Yonatan Bisk, Adam Trischler, and Matthew Hausknecht. 2020. ALFWorld: Aligning text and embodied environments for interactive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03768* (2020).
- [160] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. 2019. Towards vqa models that can read. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 8317–8326.
- [161] Shamane Siriwardhana, Rivindu Weerasekera, Elliott Wen, Tharindu Kaluarachchi, Rajib Rana, and Suranga Nanayakkara. 2023. Improving the domain adaptation of retrieval augmented generation (RAG) models for open domain question answering. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 1–17.
- [162] Chan Hee Song, Jiaman Wu, Clayton Washington, Brian M Sadler, Wei-Lun Chao, and Yu Su. 2023. Llm-planner: Few-shot grounded planning for embodied agents with large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2998–3009.
- [163] Ivan Stelmakh, Yi Luan, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. ASQA: Factoid questions meet long-form answers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06092* (2022).
- [164] Theodore Summers, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Thomas Griffiths. 2023. Cognitive architectures for language agents. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023).
- [165] Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiyang Yu, Yuezhe Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. 2024. Generative multimodal models are in-context learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 14398–14409.
- [166] Quan Sun, Qiyang Yu, Yufeng Cui, Fan Zhang, Xiaosong Zhang, Yuezhe Wang, Hongcheng Gao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. 2023. Generative pretraining in multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05222* (2023).
- [167] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is ChatGPT good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09542* (2023).
- [168] Zhiqing Sun, Sheng Shen, Shengcao Cao, Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yikang Shen, Chuang Gan, Liang-Yan Gui, Yu-Xiong Wang, Yiming Yang, et al. 2023. Aligning large multimodal models with factually augmented rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14525* (2023).
- [169] Yashar Talebirad and Amirhossein Nadiri. 2023. Multi-agent collaboration: Harnessing the power of intelligent llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03314* (2023).
- [170] John Chong Min Tan and Mehul Motani. 2023. Large language model (llm) as a system of multiple expert agents: An approach to solve the abstraction and reasoning corpus (arc) challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05146* (2023).
- [171] Changli Tang, Wenyi Yu, Guangzhi Sun, Xianzhao Chen, Tian Tan, Wei Li, Lu Lu, Zejun Ma, and Chao Zhang. 2023. Salmonn: Towards generic hearing abilities for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13289* (2023).
- [172] Fei Tang, Wanling Gao, Jianfeng Zhan, Chuanxin Lan, Xu Wen, Lei Wang, Chunjie Luo, Zheng Cao, Xingwang Xiong, Zihan Jiang, et al. 2021. AIBench training: Balanced industry-standard AI training benchmarking. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. IEEE, 24–35.
- [173] Jiabin Tang, Yuhao Yang, Wei Wei, Lei Shi, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Dawei Deng, and Bing Yin. 2023. LLMs as Knowledge Graph-Driven Retrievers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11512* (2023).
- [174] Xiangru Tang, Yuliang Liu, Zefan Cai, Yanjun Shao, Junjie Lu, Yichi Zhang, Zexuan Deng, Helan Hu, Kaikai An, Ruijun Huang, et al. 2023. ML-Bench: Evaluating Large Language Models and Agents for Machine Learning Tasks on Repository-Level Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09835* (2023).
- [175] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Samira Abnar, Yikang Shen, Dara Bahri, Philip Pham, Jinfeng Rao, Liu Yang, Sebastian Ruder, and Donald Metzler. 2020. Long range arena: A benchmark for efficient transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04006* (2020).
- [176] Yi Tay, Vinh Tran, Mostafa Dehghani, Jianmo Ni, Dara Bahri, Harsh Mehta, Zhen Qin, Kai Hui, Zhe Zhao, Jai Gupta, et al. 2022. Transformer memory as a differentiable search index. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 21831–21843.
- [177] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805* (2023).
- [178] Llama Team. 2024. LlamaIndex GitHub Repository. https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index. Accessed: 2024-12-24.
- [179] LangChain AI Team. 2024. LangChain GitHub Repository. <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain>. Accessed: 2024-12-24.
- [180] Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Beir: A heterogenous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08663* (2021).
- [181] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutvi Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [182] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2022. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive multi-step questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10509* (2022).
- [183] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2022. ♣ MuSiQue: Multihop Questions via Single-hop Question Composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), 539–554.

- [184] YunDa Tsai, Mingjie Liu, and Haoxing Ren. 2024. RTLFixer: Automatically Fixing RTL Syntax Errors with Large Language Model. In *Proceedings of the 61st ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*. 1–6.
- [185] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [186] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291* (2023).
- [187] Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, and Wenhui Chen. 2023. Augmenting black-box llms with medical textbooks for clinical question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02233* (2023).
- [188] Yuhao Wang, Yichao Wang, Zichuan Fu, Xiangyang Li, Wanyu Wang, Yuyang Ye, Xiangyu Zhao, Huifeng Guo, and Ruiming Tang. 2024. Llm4msr: An llm-enhanced paradigm for multi-scenario recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 2472–2481.
- [189] Zhiruo Wang, Jun Araki, Zhengbao Jiang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Learning to filter context for retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08377* (2023).
- [190] Zhiruo Wang, Zhoujun Cheng, Hao Zhu, Daniel Fried, and Graham Neubig. 2024. What are tools anyway? a survey from the language model perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15452* (2024).
- [191] Zekun Moore Wang, Zhongyuan Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhan Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Jian Yang, et al. 2023. Rolellm: Benchmarking, eliciting, and enhancing role-playing abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00746* (2023).
- [192] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652* (2021).
- [193] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, 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 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [194] Licheng Wen, Daocheng Fu, Xin Li, Xinyu Cai, Tao Ma, Pinlong Cai, Min Dou, Botian Shi, Liang He, and Yu Qiao. 2023. Dilu: A knowledge-driven approach to autonomous driving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16292* (2023).
- [195] Zhihua Wen, Zhiliang Tian, Zexin Jian, Zhen Huang, Pei Ke, Yifu Gao, Minlie Huang, and Dongsheng Li. 2024. Perception of Knowledge Boundary for Large Language Models through Semi-open-ended Question Answering. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Li9YTHoltP>
- [196] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, et al. 2023. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155* (2023).
- [197] Yuhao Wu, Franziska Roesner, Tadayoshi Kohno, Ning Zhang, and Umar Iqbal. 2024. SecGPT: An execution isolation architecture for llm-based systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04960* (2024).
- [198] Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, et al. 2025. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: a survey. *Science China Information Sciences* 68 (2025), 121101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11432-024-4222-0>
- [199] Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. 2020. Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive estimation for dense text retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00808* (2020).
- [200] Fangyuan Xu, Weijia Shi, and Eunsol Choi. 2023. Recomp: Improving retrieval-augmented lms with compression and selective augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04408* (2023).
- [201] Jiaming Xu, Kaibin Guo, Wuxuan Gong, and Runyu Shi. 2024. OSAgent: Copiloting Operating System with LLM-based Agent. In *2024 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 1–9.
- [202] Qiantong Xu, Fenglu Hong, Bo Li, Changran Hu, Zhengyu Chen, and Jian Zhang. 2023. On the tool manipulation capability of open-source large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16504* (2023).
- [203] Bingyu Yan, Xiaoming Zhang, Litian Zhang, Lian Zhang, Ziyi Zhou, Dezhuang Miao, and Chaozhuo Li. 2025. Beyond self-talk: A communication-centric survey of llm-based multi-agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14321* (2025).
- [204] Fanjia Yan, Huanzhi Mao, Charlie Cheng-Jie Ji, Tianjun Zhang, Shishir G. Patil, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2024. Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard. https://gorilla.cs.berkeley.edu/blogs/8_berkeley_function_calling_leaderboard.html.
- [205] Kaiyu Yang, Aidan Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan J Prenger, and Animashree Anandkumar. 2024. Leandajo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [206] Rui Yang, Lin Song, Yanwei Li, Sijie Zhao, Yixiao Ge, Xiu Li, and Ying Shan. 2023. Gpt4tools: Teaching large language model to use tools via self-instruction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 71995–72007.
- [207] Yingxuan Yang, Huacan Chai, Yuanyi Song, Siyuan Qi, Muning Wen, Ning Li, Junwei Liao, Haoyi Hu, Jianghao Lin, Gaowei Chang, et al. 2025. A Survey of AI Agent Protocols. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.16736* (2025).
- [208] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600* (2018).
- [209] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2023), 11809–11822.

- [210] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [211] Michihiro Yasunaga, Armen Aghajanyan, Weijia Shi, Rich James, Jure Leskovec, Percy Liang, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2022. Retrieval-augmented multimodal language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12561* (2022).
- [212] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Tong Xu, Hao Wang, Dianbo Sui, Yunhang Shen, Ke Li, Xing Sun, and Enhong Chen. 2024. Woodpecker: Hallucination correction for multimodal large language models. *Science China Information Sciences* 67, 12 (2024), 220105.
- [213] Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. Making retrieval-augmented language models robust to irrelevant context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01558* (2023).
- [214] Hao Yu, Yiling Lou, Ke Sun, Dezhi Ran, Tao Xie, Dan Hao, Ying Li, Ge Li, and Qianxiang Wang. 2022. Automated assertion generation via information retrieval and its integration with deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 163–174.
- [215] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02490* (2023).
- [216] Wenhao Yu, Hongming Zhang, Xiaoman Pan, Kaixin Ma, Hongwei Wang, and Dong Yu. 2023. Chain-of-note: Enhancing robustness in retrieval-augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09210* (2023).
- [217] Youngjae Yu, Jiwan Chung, Heeseung Yun, Jack Hessel, JaeSung Park, Ximing Lu, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Rowan Zellers, Roman Le Bras, Gunhee Kim, et al. 2022. Multimodal knowledge alignment with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12630* (2022).
- [218] Zichun Yu, Chenyan Xiong, Shi Yu, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2023. Augmentation-adapted retriever improves generalization of language models as generic plug-in. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17331* (2023).
- [219] Matei Zaharia, Omar Khattab, Lingjiao Chen, Jared, Heather Miller, Chris Potts, James Zou, Micha, Jonathan Frankle, Naveen Rao, and Ali Ghodsi. 2024. The Shift from Models to Compound AI Systems. <https://bair.berkeley.edu/blog/2024/02/18/compo>.
- [220] Yuhang Zang, Wei Li, Jun Han, Kaiyang Zhou, and Chen Change Loy. 2024. Contextual object detection with multimodal large language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision* (2024), 1–19.
- [221] Andy Zeng, Maria Attarian, Brian Ichter, Krzysztof Choromanski, Adrian Wong, Stefan Welker, Federico Tombari, Aavek Purohit, Michael Ryoo, Vikas Sindhwani, et al. 2022. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598* (2022).
- [222] Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. Repocoder: Repository-level code completion through iterative retrieval and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12570* (2023).
- [223] Shilong Zhang, Peize Sun, Shoufa Chen, Min Xiao, Wenqi Shao, Wenwei Zhang, Yu Liu, Kai Chen, and Ping Luo. 2023. Gpt4roi: Instruction tuning large language model on region-of-interest. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03601* (2023).
- [224] Tianjun Zhang, Shishir G Patil, Naman Jain, Sheng Shen, Matei Zaharia, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E Gonzalez. 2024. Raft: Adapting language model to domain specific rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10131* (2024).
- [225] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, Hai Zhao, George Karypis, and Alex Smola. 2023. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00923* (2023).
- [226] Andrew Zhao, Daniel Huang, Quentin Xu, Matthieu Lin, Yong-Jin Liu, and Gao Huang. 2024. Expel: Llm agents are experiential learners. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 19632–19642.
- [227] Ge Zheng, Bin Yang, Jiajin Tang, Hong-Yu Zhou, and Sibe Yang. 2023. Ddcot: Duty-distinct chain-of-thought prompting for multimodal reasoning in language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 5168–5191.
- [228] Ming Zhong, Yang Liu, Da Yin, Yuning Mao, Yizhu Jiao, Pengfei Liu, Chenguang Zhu, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. 2022. Towards a unified multi-dimensional evaluator for text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07197* (2022).
- [229] Shuyan Zhou, Frank F Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, et al. 2023. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13854* (2023).