

semantic matching, together with a lightweight contextual bandit that re-ranks the top- K candidates using a prior based on metadata and execution feedback, enabling the system to avoid failing tools. Experiments show that RATED alone keeps fault selection below 3% and recovers at both failure rates. Under a 30% failure injection protocol, RATED reduces fault selection rate to 2.9%, compared with 86.2% for the ToolLLM API retriever, while adding only 0.172 ms latency per step over encode-only inference.

2 The EcoAgent Benchmark

We construct EcoAgent, a benchmark comprising two complementary datasets. EcoAgent complements existing tool-use datasets with metadata reliability scores for every tool and with an evaluation protocol for injected execution failures. EcoAgent-Syn supports robust training with synthetic pairs, and EcoAgent-Real supports rigorous evaluation using real-world queries. We aggregate 5,172 real-world tool definitions from four open-source AI agent platforms, namely LangChain, CrewAI, LlamaIndex, and n8n. Metadata are normalized into a shared schema with functional descriptions, names, endpoints, and authentication fields, which supports retrieval text construction and reliability scoring. To operationalize tool quality, each tool receives an automated metadata reliability score between 0 and 1 from three weighted signals, namely name-description consistency, source credibility, and documentation quality, which Section 3.3 defines. The benchmark does not rely on manual per-tool ratings. Tools with scores of at least 0.8 are marked as reliable, identifying 2,940 tools, or 56.8% of the repository. The encoder is trained only on EcoAgent-Syn, while retrieval and dynamic experiment results are validated on the EcoAgent-Real test split, with hyperparameters selected on the validation split.

We build EcoAgent-Syn with Gemma-3-1b [7]. For each tool, the model receives the tool name, functional description, and metadata as context and generates 10–20 task-oriented queries. Queries are restricted to 5–120 words, and near-duplicates with Jaccard similarity above 0.7 are removed to preserve intent diversity. Figure 2 shows the prompt template, which we also release with the dataset. To improve robustness against spurious correlations, each query is paired with hard negatives from SBERT [22] retrieval and random negatives. EcoAgent-Syn links 69,501 unique synthetic queries to 5,172 ground-truth tools, with 70,122 positive pairs and 140,244 negative pairs. For evaluation under realistic language distributions, we build EcoAgent-Real from ToolBench [21]. Because the original dataset lacks ground-truth mappings to our tool repository, we implement a semi-automated labeling pipeline. GTE-Large [12] retrieves the top-5 candidates per query, discards pairs with cosine similarity below 0.7, and Gemma-3-1b verifies the remainder, retaining only pairs with functional match scores of at least 0.85. Human experts review a stratified sample of 200 queries and agree with the LLM verifier on 94% of cases. After filtering and deduplication, EcoAgent-Real contains 6,379 unique queries and 9,946 verified query-tool pairs.

3 Methodology

3.1 Problem Setup

We formulate agent tool retrieval as sequential decision making over a shared repository. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$ denote the tool

Prompt for Query Synthesis	
[Task]	You are generating diverse user queries for an AI agent tool recommendation system.
[Inputs]	{tool_name} the tool name {tool_description} its functional description {num_queries} how many queries to write
[Requirements]	(1) Each query should be 5-120 words. (2) Vary the intent types: direct action requests, troubleshooting questions, how-to questions. (3) Use natural, conversational language. (4) DO NOT copy phrases verbatim from the tool description. (5) Make queries task-oriented and practical.
[Output]	One query per line, no numbering or bullets.

Figure 2: Prompt template that generates the EcoAgent-Syn queries.

pool, where $M=5,172$ in EcoAgent. At step t , the agent issues query q_t . The retriever returns a candidate set $\mathcal{A}_t \subset \mathcal{U}$ with $|\mathcal{A}_t| = K$, and the policy selects one tool $a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t$ for execution. The objective is to maximize the probability of successful execution. Unlike static retrieval with a fixed mapping $f(q, a) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, production agents must cope with tools that fail at runtime, where tool utility depends on semantic relevance $S_{\text{sem}}(q_t, a)$ and time-varying reliability. After execution, only the chosen tool yields binary feedback $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$, yielding partial feedback that we address with contextual bandits [1]. Figure 3 summarizes the RATED pipeline.

3.2 Semantic Perception Module

The semantic perception module implements the first stage of RATED. Given q_t , it scores all tools in $\mathcal{U}$ by S_{sem} and returns the top- K candidate set $\mathcal{A}_t$ defined in Section 3.1. The semantic encoder is based on DRAGON [13], fine-tuned on EcoAgent-Syn and frozen at deployment. New tools can be added by encoding their documentation with f_T without retraining the encoders.

3.2.1 DRAGON Dual-Encoder Architecture. DRAGON provides separate query encoder f_Q and tool encoder f_T , which suits settings where user queries and tool documentation follow different lexical patterns. For query q and tool a , we take CLS representations and L2-normalize them. The semantic relevance score is the dot product of the normalized vectors.

$$\mathbf{e}_q = \text{norm}(f_Q(q)), \quad \mathbf{e}_a = \text{norm}(f_T(a)) \quad (1)$$

$$S_{\text{sem}}(q, a) = \mathbf{e}_q^\top \mathbf{e}_a \quad (2)$$

3.2.2 Contrastive Fine-tuning on EcoAgent-Syn. Although DRAGON is effective for open-domain retrieval, agent tool descriptions use specialized API terminology. We fine-tune f_Q and f_T on EcoAgent-Syn with an in-batch InfoNCE objective [27]. For a batch of B positive pairs $\{(q_i, a_i^+)\}_{i=1}^B$, we optimize

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}} = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \log \frac{\exp(\mathbf{e}_{q_i}^\top \mathbf{e}_{a_i^+} / \tau)}{\sum_{j=1}^B \exp(\mathbf{e}_{q_i}^\top \mathbf{e}_{a_j^+} / \tau)} \quad (3)$$

where τ is a temperature hyperparameter. Hard negatives from EcoAgent-Syn construction in Section 2 are used in training. In-batch negatives provide additional contrast during optimization.




Figure 3: RATED architecture with DRAGON retrieval, bandit re-ranking, and execution feedback.

3.3 Reliability-Aware Re-ranking

The second stage re-ranks $\mathcal{A}_t$ from Section 3.2 using operational signals while the semantic encoders remain frozen. At step t , the context is the query embedding $\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{e}_{q_t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the policy selects $a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t$, and observes reward $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$ only after execution, where $y_t=1$ denotes success and $y_t=0$ denotes errors or timeouts.

Tools with little execution history are initialized from catalog metadata. We define a static prior $r_{\text{static}}(a) \in [0, 1]$ from three signals used in benchmark construction in Section 2, namely name-description consistency $r_{\text{cons}}(a)$, source credibility $w_{\text{src}}(a)$, and documentation quality $r_{\text{qual}}(a)$.

$$r_{\text{cons}}(a) = \cos(f_{\text{Enc}}(a_{\text{name}}), f_{\text{Enc}}(a_{\text{desc}})) \quad (4)$$

$$r_{\text{static}}(a) = \lambda_1 r_{\text{cons}}(a) + \lambda_2 w_{\text{src}}(a) + \lambda_3 r_{\text{qual}}(a) \quad (5)$$

where $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$. These signals implement the catalog reliability score in Section 2, and all three read catalog fields only, so no manual rating is needed. For r_{cons} , f_{Enc} is the SBERT encoder of Section 2, which embeds the tool name and its description, and we take the cosine of the two normalized vectors. For w_{src} , each platform carries a fixed weight, namely 1.0 for an official listing, 0.9 for LangChain, CrewAI, and LlamaIndex, 0.8 for n8n, and 0.6 otherwise. For r_{qual} , we standardize the description length and the tag-string length against their medians and pass $0.6 z_{\text{desc}} + 0.4 z_{\text{tag}}$ through a logistic function. The 0.8 threshold is used for benchmark statistics, while r_{static} initializes the bandit. Each arm bias is initialized as $\mathbf{b}_a \leftarrow r_{\text{static}}(a) \cdot \mathbf{x}_0$, which covers the cold-start case, where a new or rarely used tool carries no execution history and is therefore scored from its catalog metadata.

At runtime, the system must adapt to dynamic failures such as API outages. Standard LinUCB [11] weights all past observations equally and therefore adapts slowly when arm quality shifts over time. Alternatively, a global multi-armed bandit (Global MAB) [2] tracks shared or context-free arm statistics. It is cheaper to maintain but cannot model payoffs that depend on the current query context. To overcome these limitations, RATED adopts discounted LinUCB [6] with a separate linear model per tool. This choice addresses non-stationarity by down-weighting older rewards before each update, ensuring that recent failures change tool scores more

Algorithm 1 Reliability-aware adaptation via discounted LinUCB

Input: query stream $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$, frozen encoders f_Q and f_T , discount γ , exploration α , fusion weights w_1, w_2, w_3

Output: tool a_t executed at each step, with $(\mathbf{A}_a, \mathbf{b}_a)$ updated online

- 1: $\mathbf{e}_a \leftarrow \text{norm}(f_T(a))$ for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$ {offline, reused at every step}
- 2: $\mathbf{A}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{I}_d$ and $\mathbf{b}_a \leftarrow r_{\text{static}}(a) \mathbf{x}_0$ {cold start from metadata}
- 3: **for** $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
- 4: $\mathbf{x}_t \leftarrow \text{norm}(f_Q(q_t))$
- 5: $\mathcal{A}_t \leftarrow \text{top-}K \text{ tools by } S_{\text{sem}}(q_t, a) = \mathbf{x}_t^\top \mathbf{e}_a$
- 6: **for each** $a \in \mathcal{A}_t$ **do**
- 7: $\hat{\theta}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{b}_a$
- 8: $S_{\text{bandit}} \leftarrow \hat{\theta}_a^\top \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha \sqrt{\mathbf{x}_t^\top \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t}$
- 9: $S_{\text{final}}(a) \leftarrow w_1 S_{\text{sem}} + w_2 S_{\text{bandit}} + w_3 r_{\text{static}}(a)$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: $a_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_t} S_{\text{final}}(a)$
- 12: execute a_t and observe $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$
- 13: $\mathbf{A}_{a_t} \leftarrow \gamma \mathbf{A}_{a_t} + \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^\top$ {kept diagonal, so scoring is $O(d)$ }
- 14: $\mathbf{b}_{a_t} \leftarrow \gamma \mathbf{b}_{a_t} + y_t \mathbf{x}_t$
- 15: **end for**

quickly. Each tool a maintains $\mathbf{A}_a \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\mathbf{b}_a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The reliability score combines exploitation and exploration.

$$S_{\text{bandit}}(\mathbf{x}_t, a) = \hat{\theta}_a^\top \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha \sqrt{\mathbf{x}_t^\top \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t} \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_a = \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{b}_a$. After executing a_t and observing y_t , we update with discount $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

$$\mathbf{A}_{a_t} \leftarrow \gamma \mathbf{A}_{a_t} + \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^\top \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_{a_t} \leftarrow \gamma \mathbf{b}_{a_t} + y_t \mathbf{x}_t \quad (8)$$

Discounting emphasizes recent feedback and encourages timely switches to alternatives.

3.4 Hybrid Fusion for Tool Ranking

RATED fuses semantic, bandit, and metadata signals into one score over $\mathcal{A}_t$. For query q_t and candidate $a \in \mathcal{A}_t$, we define

$$S_{\text{final}}(q_t, a) = w_1 S_{\text{sem}}(q_t, a) + w_2 S_{\text{bandit}}(\mathbf{x}_t, a) + w_3 r_{\text{static}}(a) \quad (9)$$

Table 1: Retrieval performance on EcoAgent-Syn and EcoAgent-Real.

Method	EcoAgent-Syn			EcoAgent-Real		
	MRR	Recall@1	Recall@5	MRR	Recall@1	Recall@5
TF-IDF	0.680	0.607	0.769	0.274	0.116	0.326
BM25	0.235	0.178	0.300	0.169	0.078	0.194
OpenAI Ada-002	0.790	0.736	0.857	0.670	0.430	0.750
BGE-M3	0.765	0.702	0.840	0.511	0.289	0.579
GTE-Large	0.772	0.713	0.842	0.515	0.294	0.581
E5-Large-v2	0.746	0.674	0.830	0.597	0.466	0.756
DRAGON (pretrained)	0.751	0.690	0.823	0.518	0.407	0.654
SPLADE-v3	0.754	0.689	0.834	0.626	0.491	0.789
BGE-Reranker	0.596	0.483	0.735	0.642	0.491	0.840
ToolLLM API Retriever	0.724	0.666	0.795	0.406	0.222	0.409
RATED (w/o Contrastive)	0.751	0.690	0.823	0.518	0.407	0.654
RATED (Full)	0.845	0.804	0.893	0.618	0.516	0.740

where $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$. Weights are tuned on the validation split and fixed for testing in Section 4. At each step, the system retrieves top- K tools by S_{sem} , ranks $\mathcal{A}_t$ by S_{final} , executes the highest-scoring tool, and updates bandit parameters from y_t . Algorithm 1 summarizes one step of this loop.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

All experiments run on a single NVIDIA GeForce RTX 5070 GPU (12 GB VRAM). DRAGON is fine-tuned on EcoAgent-Syn for one epoch with batch size 8, learning rate 1×10^{-5} , 1,000 warmup steps, $\tau = 0.05$, mixed precision, and maximum sequence length 256. At inference, the system retrieves top- $K=10$ tools by S_{sem} and re-ranks them with Eq. 9. The bandit uses $\alpha = 0.1$, $\gamma = 0.95$, and 2,000 warm-up pairs, with diagonal covariance updates for $O(d)$ scoring at each step. Fusion weights tuned on the EcoAgent-Real validation split are $(w_1, w_2, w_3) = (0.75, 0.15, 0.10)$. Static weights $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ in Eq. 5 are $(0.5, 0.3, 0.2)$, and biases are initialized with $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{1}/\sqrt{d}$.

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

Offline retrieval is measured with MRR, Recall@1, and Recall@5 on the EcoAgent-Real test split. EcoAgent-Syn uses the same metrics for in-domain comparison. Dynamic reliability is evaluated over $T=10,000$ sequential selections. At step t , the policy selects a_t for query q_t with ground truth a_t^* . The indicator $\text{Status}(a, t) \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes whether tool a is available under simulated failure injection. To simulate a persistent outage, the simulator ranks the N distinct ground-truth tools of the evaluation stream by frequency, skips the top 10%, and marks the next ρN tools as failing, where ρ is the failure rate. The failing set is fixed before the run, and its tools stay unavailable from failure onset to the end. Metrics are averaged over the window after failure onset $\mathcal{T}_{\text{post}} = \{2,001, \dots, 5,000\}$, which contains $T_{\text{post}}=3,000$ steps.

$$\text{Post-Fail SR} = \frac{1}{T_{\text{post}}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{post}}} \mathbb{I}(a_t = a_t^*) \cdot \text{Status}(a_t, t), \quad (10)$$

$$\text{FSR} = \frac{1}{T_{\text{post}}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{post}}} \mathbb{I}(\text{Status}(a_t, t) = 0), \quad (11)$$

Table 2: Dynamic reliability evaluation under injected tool failures.

Method	Failure Rate 20%			Failure Rate 30%		
	Post-Fail SR (%) ↑	FSR (%) ↓	AS ↓	Post-Fail SR (%) ↑	FSR (%) ↓	AS ↓
BM25	18.8	20.0	<i>Failed</i>	10.2	30.0	<i>Failed</i>
ToolLLM API Retriever	17.4	79.6	<i>Failed</i>	10.5	86.2	<i>Failed</i>
OpenAI Ada-002	19.4	80.4	<i>Failed</i>	11.1	88.8	<i>Failed</i>
DRAGON (pretrained)	78.1	18.1	<i>Failed</i>	75.7	21.2	<i>Failed</i>
SPLADE-v3	16.0	7.7	<i>Failed</i>	15.8	9.1	<i>Failed</i>
BGE-Reranker	83.2	17.5	<i>Failed</i>	81.0	20.5	<i>Failed</i>
Health Check Blacklist	82.6	1.4	2,620	80.2	1.9	<i>Failed</i>
Retry ($k=3$)	84.8	16.4	70	82.9	19.1	<i>Failed</i>
ToolRL-like Batch GRPO	80.3	5.4	2,620	79.5	6.1	1
RATED (w/o Feedback)	81.1	16.5	<i>Failed</i>	78.7	19.4	<i>Failed</i>
RATED (w/ Global MAB)	78.1	10.1	3,852	74.3	13.2	2,718
RATED (Full)	83.4	2.5	1,603	82.1	2.9	0

where FSR is the fault selection rate. Adaptation steps (AS) measure recovery speed using

$$t_{\text{adapt}} = \min\{t : \text{SR}_{\text{window}}(t) \geq \theta \times \text{SR}_{\text{peak}}\}, \quad (12)$$

computed from failure onset with a sliding window of $W=200$ steps, peak success rate before failure SR_{peak} , and $\theta=0.9$ at 20% failure rate or $\theta=0.8$ at 30%. Static rankers without online feedback never reach the recovery target and are marked *Failed*.

4.3 Baselines

Retrieval baselines include lexical matchers TF-IDF [26] and BM25 [23], dense encoders OpenAI Ada-002 [18], BGE-M3 [3], GTE-Large [12], and E5-Large-v2 [28], and neural IR models DRAGON [13], which is not fine-tuned on EcoAgent-Syn, and SPLADE-v3 [9]. We also include a BGE-Reranker-v2-m3 [3] cross-encoder that re-ranks DRAGON top-50 candidates, and the ToolLLM API retriever [21]. For dynamic evaluation, two reactive baselines share the DRAGON ranker: Health Check Blacklist permanently excludes any tool after one failed execution, and Retry ($k=3$) tries up to three candidates within one step and keeps no memory across steps. A batch GRPO proxy similar to ToolRL [25] updates weights periodically rather than online. RATED uses DRAGON fine-tuned on EcoAgent-Syn as the backbone and is evaluated as RATED (Full), RATED (w/o Contrastive), RATED (w/o Feedback), and RATED (w/ Global MAB).

4.4 Main Results

Table 1 reports offline retrieval on EcoAgent-Syn and the held-out EcoAgent-Real test split. RATED (Full) ranks first on Syn across all metrics, and RATED (w/o Contrastive) matches pretrained DRAGON on both benchmarks, which isolates the gain from contrastive fine-tuning. On EcoAgent-Real, RATED (Full) improves MRR by 52.2% over the ToolLLM API retriever but stays below Ada-002 and SPLADE-v3. High offline ranking accuracy on real queries therefore does not guarantee robust tool selection when tools fail at runtime.

Table 2 reports Post-Fail SR, FSR, and adaptation steps under 20% and 30% failure injection. Static retrievers, including ToolLLM and Ada-002, frequently select unavailable tools and never recover within the evaluation horizon. DRAGON (pretrained) and BGE-Reranker reduce FSR but remain unable to adapt online. Relative




Figure 4: Hyperparameter sensitivity at 20% failure injection.

to RATED (w/o Feedback), RATED (Full) lowers FSR to 2.5% and 2.9% while it maintains Post-Fail SR above 82%, which is a 7.3× reduction over DRAGON (pretrained) and a 30× reduction over ToolLLM. Batch GRPO updates similar to ToolRL retain higher FSR, and health check blacklisting attains low FSR but recovers slowly. RATED (w/ Global MAB) stays inferior to the full model. These results support decoupling semantic matching from reliability estimation updated online from execution feedback.

4.5 Hyperparameter Sensitivity

Figure 4 reports Post-Fail SR and FSR under 20% failure injection for two grid sweeps over fusion and bandit hyperparameters. Panel (a) varies w_1 and w_3 with bandit settings fixed. Post-Fail SR rises with w_1 and peaks at $w_1 = 0.75$ with $w_3 = 0.10$, whereas FSR grows slowly over the same range and stays in the low single-digit range throughout. We therefore select $w_1 = 0.75$ and $w_3 = 0.10$ on the validation split, which trades about one point of FSR for the highest Post-Fail SR. Panel (b) varies γ and α with fusion weights fixed at the validated setting. Post-Fail SR is highest at $\gamma = 0.95$, where the three α curves nearly coincide, and FSR again grows slowly with γ . We therefore set $\gamma = 0.95$ and $\alpha = 0.1$ on the validation split.

4.6 Efficiency Analysis

We profile end-to-end inference at batch size 1 on the same hardware as Section 4. Table 3 reports average latency, P95 latency, and incremental overhead relative to DRAGON encoding only. The encode-only baseline averages 3.223 ms. RATED (w/o Feedback) applies only the static reliability prior in Eq. 5 and adds 0.025 ms. Contextual bandit re-ranking incurs modest additional cost. RATED (w/ Global MAB) adds 0.108 ms, and RATED (Full) adds 0.172 ms, reaching 3.395 ms average and 4.391 ms P95 latency. These overheads are far below batch GRPO updates similar to ToolRL at 17.839 ms average, which require periodic policy synchronization. Therefore, RATED is fast enough for interactive agent loops and still reduces fault selection.

5 Conclusion

We introduced RATED, a reliability-aware tool retrieval framework that combines DRAGON encoders fine-tuned with contrastive learning and contextual bandit re-ranking from execution feedback. On

Table 3: Inference latency at batch size 1 (ms).

Method	Avg. Latency	P95 Latency	Δ Overhead
DRAGON encode only	3.223	4.269	–
ToolRL-like Batch GRPO	17.839	28.921	+14.616
RATED (w/o Feedback)	3.248	4.274	+0.025
RATED (w/ Global MAB)	3.331	4.351	+0.108
RATED (Full)	3.395	4.391	+0.172

EcoAgent, RATED achieves strong in-domain retrieval and remains competitive on real-world queries. Under injected tool failures, it reduces fault selection to 2.5–2.9% FSR, 7.3× lower than static DRAGON, with only 0.172 ms added latency over encode-only inference. These results highlight the critical importance of incorporating execution feedback into retrieval systems for autonomous agents operating in dynamic environments, and demonstrate that RATED provides an efficient solution for reliable tool discovery in agent systems. Evaluating this cold-start path on newly added tools and validating RATED in live agent runtimes remain future work.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under award number 2623261.

GenAI Usage Disclosure

We use Gemma-3-1b to generate the synthetic queries of EcoAgent-Syn and to verify candidate query–tool pairs during EcoAgent-Real labeling, and we release the prompt templates with the dataset. We used OpenAI’s ChatGPT to improve the clarity and grammar of sentences during the writing process.

References

- [1] Naoki Abe, Alan W. Biermann, and Philip M. Long. 2003. Reinforcement Learning with Immediate Rewards and Linear Hypotheses. *Algorithmica* 37, 4 (Dec. 2003), 263–293. doi:10.1007/s00453-003-1038-1
- [2] Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. 2002. Finite-time Analysis of the Multiarmed Bandit Problem. *Machine Learning* 47 (05 2002), 235–256. doi:10.1023/A:1013689704352
- [3] Jianlv Chen, Shitao Xiao, Peitian Zhang, Kun Luo, Defu Lian, and Zheng Liu. 2025. M3-Embedding: Multi-Linguality, Multi-Functionality, Multi-Granularity Text Embeddings Through Self-Knowledge Distillation. arXiv:2402.03216 [cs.CL] https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03216
- [4] CrewAI. 2024. CrewAI. GitHub repository. https://github.com/joaoandmoura/crewAI
- [5] Xiaofei Dong, Xueqiang Zhang, Weixin Bu, Dan Zhang, and Feng Cao. 2024. A Survey of LLM-based Agents: Theories, Technologies, Applications and Suggestions. In *2024 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Internet of Things and Cloud Computing Technology (AIoTC)*. IEEE, Shenyang, China, 407–413. doi:10.1109/AIoTC63215.2024.10748304
- [6] Aurélien Garivier and Eric Moulines. 2011. On upper-confidence bound policies for switching bandit problems. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory (Espoo, Finland) (ALT’11)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 174–188.
- [7] Gemini Team. 2025. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. arXiv:2312.11805 [cs.CL] https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805
- [8] LangChain AI. 2023. LangChain. GitHub repository. https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain
- [9] Claude Lassance, Hervé Déjean, Thibault Formal, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2024. SPLADE-v3: New baselines for SPLADE. arXiv:2403.06789 [cs.IR] https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.06789
- [10] Jiawei Li, Yang Gao, Yizhe Yang, Yu Bai, Xiaofeng Zhou, Yinghao Li, Huashan Sun, Yuhang Liu, Xingpeng Si, Yuhao Ye, Yixiao Wu, Yiguan Lin, Bin Xu, Bowen Ren, Chong Feng, and Heyan Huang. 2025. Fundamental Capabilities and Applications

- of Large Language Models: A Survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 58, 2, Article 38 (Sept. 2025), 42 pages. doi:10.1145/3735632
- [11] Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E. Schapire. 2010. A Contextual-Bandit Approach to Personalized News Article Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW '10)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 661–670. doi:10.1145/1772690.1772758
 - [12] Zehan Li, Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, and Meishan Zhang. 2023. Towards General Text Embeddings with Multi-stage Contrastive Learning. arXiv:2308.03281 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03281>
 - [13] 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. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 6385–6400. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.424>
 - [14] LlamaIndex. 2024. LlamaIndex. GitHub repository. https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
 - [15] Grégoire Mialon, Roberto Dessì, Maria Lomeli, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Ram Pasunuru, Roberta Raileanu, Baptiste Rozière, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Asli Celikyilmaz, Edouard Grave, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Augmented Language Models: a Survey. arXiv:2302.07842 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.07842>
 - [16] n8n. 2024. n8n. Workflow automation platform. <https://n8n.io/>
 - [17] Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, Muhammad Saqib, Saeed Anwar, Muhammad Usman, Naveed Akhtar, Nick Barnes, and Ajmal Mian. 2025. A Comprehensive Overview of Large Language Models. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.* 16, 5, Article 106 (Aug. 2025), 72 pages. doi:10.1145/3744746
 - [18] OpenAI. 2022. New and improved embedding model. <https://openai.com/index/new-and-improved-embedding-model/>. Accessed: 2026-01-23.
 - [19] Shishir G. Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2023. Gorilla: Large Language Model Connected with Massive APIs. arXiv:2305.15334 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15334>
 - [20] Cheng Qian, Emre Can Acikgoz, Qi He, Hongru Wang, Xiusi Chen, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Gokhan Tur, and Heng Ji. 2025. ToolRL: Reward is All Tool Learning Needs. arXiv:2504.13958 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.13958>
 - [21] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Lauren Hong, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023. ToolLLM: Facilitating Large Language Models to Master 16000+ Real-World APIs. arXiv:2307.16789 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.16789>
 - [22] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. arXiv:1908.10084 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.10084>
 - [23] S. E. Robertson and S. Walker. 1994. Some simple effective approximations to the 2-Poisson model for probabilistic weighted retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Dublin, Ireland) (SIGIR '94)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 232–241.
 - [24] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools. arXiv:2302.04761 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04761>
 - [25] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. DeepSeek-Math: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models. arXiv:2402.03300 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03300>
 - [26] Karen Spärck Jones. 1972. A statistical interpretation of term specificity and its application in retrieval. *Journal of documentation* 28, 1 (1972), 11–21.
 - [27] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2019. Representation Learning with Contrastive Predictive Coding. arXiv:1807.03748 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03748>
 - [28] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2024. Text Embeddings by Weakly-Supervised Contrastive Pre-training. arXiv:2212.03533 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.03533>
 - [29] Qiancheng Xu, Yongqi Li, Heming Xia, and Wenjie Li. 2024. Enhancing Tool Retrieval with Iterative Feedback from Large Language Models. arXiv:2406.17465 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17465>
 - [30] Zijiang Zhang, Zhanpeng Chen, He Zhu, Ziyang Chen, Nan Du, and Xiaolong Li. 2025. ToolExpNet: Optimizing Multi-Tool Selection in LLMs with Similarity and Dependency-Aware Experience Networks. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Vienna, Austria, 15706–15722. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.findings-acl.811