

# SIT-GRAPH: STATE INTEGRATED TOOL GRAPH FOR MULTI-TURN AGENTS

Sijia Li<sup>♡\*</sup> Yuchen Huang<sup>♡</sup> Zifan Liu<sup>♡</sup> Zijian Li<sup>♡</sup> Jingjing fu<sup>♣</sup> Lei Song<sup>♣</sup>  
 Jiang Bian<sup>♣</sup> Jun Zhang<sup>♡†</sup> Rui Wang<sup>♣†</sup>

<sup>♡</sup>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology <sup>♣</sup>Microsoft Research Asia  
 {slifg, yhuangg, zliuft, zijian.li}@connect.ust.hk, eejzhang@ust.hk  
 {jifu, lesong, jiabia, ruiwa}@microsoft.com

## ABSTRACT

Despite impressive advances in agent systems, multi-turn tool-use scenarios remain challenging. It is mainly because intent is clarified progressively and the environment evolves with each tool call. While reusing past experience is natural, current LLM agents either treat entire trajectories or pre-defined subtasks as indivisible units, or solely exploit tool-to-tool dependencies, hindering adaptation as states and information evolve across turns. In this paper, we propose a State Integrated Tool Graph (SIT-Graph), which enhances multi-turn tool use by exploiting partially overlapping experience. Inspired by human decision-making that integrates episodic and procedural memory, SIT-Graph captures both compact state representations (episodic-like fragments) and tool-to-tool dependencies (procedural-like routines) from historical trajectories. Specifically, we first build a tool graph from accumulated tool-use sequences, and then augment each edge with a compact state summary of the dialog and tool history that may shape the next action. At inference time, SIT-Graph enables a human-like balance between episodic recall and procedural execution: when the next decision requires recalling prior context, the agent retrieves the state summaries stored on relevant edges and uses them to guide its next action; when the step is routine, it follows high-confidence tool dependencies without explicit recall. Experiments across multiple stateful multi-turn tool-use benchmarks show that SIT-Graph consistently outperforms strong memory- and graph-based baselines, delivering more robust tool selection and more effective experience transfer.

## 1 INSTRUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) demonstrate strong reasoning and decision-making capabilities, making them promising for complex problem solving. However, many real-world tasks cannot be addressed by reasoning alone but require external tools, such as querying databases for up-to-date facts or invoking a code interpreter for computation (Patil & Jadon, 2025; Huang et al., 2025). To bridge this gap, typical agent architectures augment an LLM with planning, memory, and tool-use modules, with the LLM serving as a central controller that coordinates these components. While such systems perform well in single-turn settings with fully specified queries (Yuan et al., 2024), real applications are inherently multi-turn, where user intent is iteratively clarified, and intermediate tool calls change the environment. Decision quality therefore depends not only on the current prompt but also on the dialogue history and the sequence of prior tool invocations (Guan et al., 2025). The multi-turn scenario introduces partial observability and delayed information, making early tool selection error-prone; effective agents must track and update state, reason under uncertainty, and adapt plans as new evidence arrives.

When humans tackle complex tasks, they recognize recurring situations and selectively reuse elements of past successes to guide future decisions. In neurobiology, these forms of reuse are often

\*Work done during internship at Microsoft.

†Corresponding authors.




Figure 1: **Comparison with episodic memory and tool graph based methods in multi-turn tool-use tasks.** (a) In memory-based methods, memories are stored as discrete items, but these approaches typically incorporate only episodic event memories and retrieve trajectory-level experience. Before the task objective becomes sufficiently clear, this retrieval process may return mismatched or inappropriate experiences, which can lead to task failure. (b) Tool graphs typically encode dependency relationships between agents, relying solely on tool dependencies extracted from previous experience. However, they lack consideration of task-specific states. (c) Our method represents both episodic and procedural memory within a unified structure and adaptively leverages these different types of memory at the state level. In this case, the actual issue lies in the mobile phone settings, and the agent can only confirm the underlying problem after invoking the information tool, which updates the state. However, (a) would retrieve a solution based solely on the observed symptoms before the agent has accurately identified the true cause, resulting in an incorrect response. (b), on the other hand, tends to select the tool that has been most frequently used in past trajectories or is highly connected in the tool-dependency graph. Because it ignores the current state and task-specific information, it also often leads to the selection of an incorrect tool.

distinguished as episodic memory and procedural memory (Atallah et al., 2004). *Episodic memory*, supported by hippocampal–midbrain interactions, integrates overlapping episodes into linked mnemonic structures that extend beyond single events and enable flexible generalization (Shohamy & Wagner, 2008). *Procedural memory* is supported by the basal ganglia and allows people to acquire skills through repeated practice and reinforcement of prior actions (Wise, 1996). Recent experience-based LLM agents echo these two forms of memory in different ways. Methods that store and retrieve prior task-solving trajectories (Ouyang et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2024) behave episodically. Given a new query, they recall whole trajectories or predefined subtasks. Other works construct tool graphs to repeat successful tool-use patterns (Liu et al., 2024a), emphasizing procedural regularities. However, both coarse-grained episodes and tool-only dependencies are ill-suited to multi-turn scenarios. Coarse episodes treat each trajectory or predefined subtask as an indivisible unit, preventing reuse and adaptation under partially overlapping experiences, while tool-only links ignore how dialogue history and earlier tool calls shape the next action. As the example illustrated in Fig. 1, in realistic multi-turn settings, decisions instead should be conditioned on an evolving dialogue state, progressively clarified goals, and a continually updated environment state. Inspired by human decision-making arising from the interaction between episodic and procedural memory rather than either in isolation, our framework couples episodic-like fragments with procedural-like routines: it retrieves and recombines partially overlapping trajectory segments while abstracting stable tool-use

---

dependencies from repeated sequences of tool invocations, yielding context-consistent reuse of past experience in continually evolving multi-turn tool-use scenarios.

In this paper, we propose a State-Integrated Tool Graph (SIT-Graph), which enhances multi-turn tool-use agents by enabling them to adaptively leverage past trajectories in partially overlapping situations. Specifically, we first induce a tool graph from accumulated tool-use trajectories, linking tools that repeatedly appear in a consistent call order. However, tool-only links are insufficient to fully capture the historical experiences in multi-turn scenario, since the dialogue history and the prior tool invocations will also largely affect the decision. We therefore augment tool-to-tool edges with compact state descriptors, which summarize all historically relevant information (i.e., dialogue and tool history) that may affect subsequent decisions as current state. This state augmentation supports retrieval and adaptation from partially overlapping situations. At inference time, SIT-Graph enables a human-like balance between episodic and procedural memory. For each decision step, the agent first assesses whether selecting the next tool requires recalling prior context. When recall is needed, it activates episodic memory by retrieving state summaries associated with relevant edges, using condensed dialogue and tool history to guide the decision. When the step is routine, it relies on procedural memory, selecting tools directly from high-confidence dependency weights in the graph without explicit recall. Essentially, the agent makes decisions by jointly considering (i) transferable tool-to-tool dependency patterns and (ii) situation-specific guidance distilled from similar past states, yielding more robust, flexible, and efficient tool selection in open-ended multi-turn interactions.

Specifically, we summarize the contributions of our work as follows:

1. We propose a **State-Integrated Tool Graph (SIT-Graph)** that jointly encodes (i) compact summaries of historically relevant states and (ii) recurring tool-to-tool dependencies mined from past trajectories. SIT-Graph supports retrieval and adaptation from partially overlapping situations, allowing the agent to select the next tool in a context-aware and experience-driven manner.
2. We further formulate state summarization itself as an invocable tool. This design enables on-demand state consolidation, so the agent can dynamically choose between episodic recall when context matters and procedural execution when patterns are routine. The resulting hybrid control improves effectiveness while reducing unnecessary computation.
3. We conduct extensive evaluations against both memory-based and tool graph based baselines, which show significant and consistent gains on three stateful multi-turn tool-use benchmarks.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 MULTI-TURN TOOL USE

Multi-turn tool use presents distinctive challenges as agents should not only select the appropriate tool to invoke but also manage the intricate interaction in dialogue and tool outputs across successive turns. To enable such capabilities, prior work has explored both supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and reinforcement learning (RL) approaches. For SFT, Magnet (Yin et al., 2025) synthesizes multi-turn tool-use data via graph translation, while APIGen-MT (Prabhakar et al., 2025) generates training data through simulated agent-human interactions. RL methods focus on optimizing tool-use policies through interactive feedback. For example, MUA-RL (Zhao et al., 2025) and RAGEN (Wang et al., 2025b) study multi-turn tool use with user interactions and self-evolution in text-based environments, respectively, while verl-agent (Feng et al., 2025), RL-Factory (Chai et al., 2025), and Tool-Star (Dong et al., 2025) extend the RL post-training paradigm to more complex reasoning and multi-tool settings. Complementary to these algorithmic advances, recent benchmarks such as DialogTool (Wang et al., 2025a) and ToolSandbox (Lu et al., 2024) highlight the difficulties of maintaining state across turns and call for systematic evaluation of tool-use agents. Nevertheless, SFT approaches require large-scale data collection, and RL methods need substantial computational costs. Our method leverages prior experiences to achieve superior performance without additional training costs.

---

## 2.2 TOOL GRAPH

Recent studies have explored tool graphs as a means of structuring and reasoning over large tool spaces. Depending on how the graph is constructed, existing methods can be categorized into four groups. First, approaches based on input–output relationships include ControlLLM (Liu et al., 2024b), Magnet (Yin et al., 2025), and NaviAgent (Jiang et al., 2025b), where nodes represent tools or resources and edges capture data dependencies. Second, methods leveraging historical trajectories, such as GTool (Chen et al., 2025b), ToolFlow (Wang et al., 2024), and NaviAgent, infer connections from past tool-use sequences, with ToolFlow further modeling parameter-level semantic similarities to generate coherent tool combinations. Third, manually constructed graphs exemplified by SciToolAgent (Ding et al., 2025) encode expert knowledge to guide LLMs in executing multi-step toolchains in scientific domains. Finally, approaches supporting dynamic updates, such as ToolNet (Liu et al., 2024a) and SGC (Wu et al., 2024), organize massive tool collections into weighted directed graphs and update them adaptively based on usage, enabling more efficient navigation and planning. By contrast, our method integrates state information with the tool graph during dynamic modeling, enabling the execution of tool graph following in a task-specific and stateful way.

## 2.3 AGENT MEMORY

Agent memory has been explored in two primary ways: internal and external. Internal memory is generated and maintained within the agent’s reasoning or planning modules, often serving as intermediate representations to guide decision-making (Lee et al., 2024; Agashe et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024; Song et al., 2024). In contrast, external memory stores distilled information outside the agent’s core reasoning loop, enabling modular retrieval and reuse across different tasks and time steps (Zhang et al., 2025b; Xu et al., 2025; Rezazadeh et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2025). Recent studies increasingly emphasize this external approach for its flexibility and scalability in long-horizon interactions, as it can retain a larger amount of past experience to support continual learning and adaptive behavior.

Besides, memory systems exhibit diverse forms, including pure experiential records (Xiong et al., 2025), summarized textual content (Ouyang et al., 2025), latent embedding representations (Zhang et al., 2025a), and structured graph-based memory architectures (Chhikara et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2025; Anokhin et al., 2024). Accordingly, the retrieval mechanisms are also adapted to align with the specific forms of memory representation, such as similarity-based retrieval (Hou et al., 2024), episodic search (Anokhin et al., 2024), and implicit retrieval (Zhang et al., 2024). However, previous approaches primarily provided insights at the trajectory level, which limits their suitability and flexibility in multi-turn tool-use tasks. In multi-turn scenarios, similar states should be integrated to enable experience transfer at the state level rather than at the level of individual events. Our method models the task at the state level, retrieving prior experiences based on current state similarity through an external stateful tool graph augmented with summarized state information.

## 2.4 GRAPH-BASED MEMORY

Graph structures can organize memory and knowledge in a coherent, interconnected manner. They encode episodic or semantic information as nodes linked through relational edges, thereby enabling efficient retrieval of contextually relevant information (Liu et al., 2025). Graph-based methods continuously update the memory graph by adding new episodic events or semantic knowledge, dynamically creating nodes and relational links that refine the agent’s understanding as it interacts with the environment (Xu et al., 2025; Anokhin et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2025a). However, these approaches primarily focus on episodic memory. In tool-use tasks, tool dependencies can be determined by the inherent sequencing of tool invocations. In contrast to these graph-based methods, our approach encodes episodic state information on the edges and leverages these meaningful connections to jointly capture episodic relationships and tool dependency structures. The agent can rely on both episodic and procedural memory when making decisions.

---

### 3 TASK FORMULATION

#### 3.1 MULTI-TURN TOOL USE

We formulate the multi-turn tool-use process as a partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP):

$$(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{O}, T, R, \pi_\theta),$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  denotes the dialogue states and the underlying database states,  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the action space consisting of textual responses and tool invocations,  $\mathcal{O}$  the observable dialogue history, and  $T$  the transition dynamics driven by user inputs and tool feedback.

At step  $t$ , the agent observes a dialogue history  $h_t \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ , selects an action  $a_t \sim \pi_\theta(a_t | h_t)$ , receives an observation  $o_t$ , and updates the history  $h_{t+1} = h_t \cup \{a_t, o_t\}$ . Tool actions may modify the underlying world state (e.g., updating retrieved data or executing API calls), while textual response actions contribute to the message history exchanged between the agent and the user.

This formulation captures the interactive and partially observable nature of multi-turn tool use, where the agent must coordinate decision-making and acting under uncertainty while continuously updating its internal dialogue state.

#### 3.2 TOOL GRAPH

We formulate tool-use planning as a decision-making problem on a *summary integrated tool graph*, defined as

$$G = (V, E, D, W, I),$$

where each node  $\tau_v \in V$  corresponds to a tool in the pool. Each node is associated with a textual description  $d_v \in D$ , specifying its functionality. Each edge  $(\tau_u, \tau_v) \in E$  denotes a dependency or sequential relationship, indicating that the output of tool  $\tau_u$  serves as the input to tool  $\tau_v$ , or that the two tools exhibit a temporal ordering in the historical interaction sequence. In addition, each edge is associated with a weight  $w_{uv} \in W$ , representing factors such as accuracy and efficiency. Some of the edges are associated with a stateful summary  $i_{uv} \in I$ , which encodes contextual information from previous interactions. The task planning objective is to suggest the next tool within  $G$  that adaptively optimize over the edge weights or state summaries similarity.

## 4 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we first explain how the historical experience is obtained (Section 4.1). We then use this experience to construct the SIT-Graph, which integrates weighted and summary information on the edges to store both the procedural memory and episodic memory (Section 4.2). Finally, we employ the SIT-Graph to adaptively guide the agent’s tool-selection decisions (Section 4.3).

#### 4.1 HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE

In multi-turn tool-use scenarios, the interaction context is composed of information originating from multiple sources, including user interactions, agent responses, and feedback provided by external tools from the environment. When making decisions, the current state is embedded within the dialogue context, making it difficult for the agent to distinguish state-relevant information from the long multi-turn context. To manage this complexity, we formulate the multi-turn tool-use task as a POMDP and employ a summary-based approach to capture the information of the agent’s current state, capturing essential task-relevant stateful information while abstracting away redundant or low-level details.

Instead of summarizing at each turn, which would incur substantial cost, we introduce a dedicated state-summarization tool that allows the agent to autonomously decide when to summarize its current state and extract historical information relevant to future decisions. Rather than forcing summaries at predefined steps, the agent can invoke this tool on demand. This design offers more structured guidance while preserving flexibility in when and how the tool is used, leading to more adaptive and context-aware decision-making in multi-turn interactions.

We first perform rollouts using the base model to generate trajectories in the training set, during which the summarization tool is automatically invoked. These tool-augmented rollout trajectories serve as the historical experience for State-Integrated Tool Graph construction. In some scenarios, a training set may not be available. In such cases, the trajectories collected during testing can be used instead, enabling the State-Integrated Tool Graph to be updated in real time. In the next section, we describe how we construct the graph with the collected historical experience.

#### 4.2 BUILDING THE GRAPH




Figure 2: **Building the graph.** We build the graph based on previous successful trajectories. Except for the summarization tool, all tools invoked in the historical trajectory are treated as nodes, and edges are constructed to connect them according to their calling sequential relationships. The state information summarized by the summarization tool is treated as edge information. Each edge must contain a weight and may additionally include the corresponding state information, depending on whether the agent chooses to invoke the summarization tool between the two tool nodes.

To capture both tool selection dependencies and stateful information, we employ a state-summarized, graph-based structure, which the agent subsequently leverages for informed decision-making. As shown in Fig.2, we construct the graph based on historical experiences, which contain the entire conversation and the tool-invocation trajectories of previous completed tasks. The tool graph is constructed based on the invocation order of tools in the historical trajectory, with nodes representing individual tools and edges capturing their sequential relationships. Each edge is assigned a weight that reflects the frequency or strength of the corresponding tool transition. When a summarization tool is invoked between two tools, the resulting summary information is attached to the edge as an additional attribute. Whether an edge includes such summary information is determined by the historical interaction data, and the state produced by the summarization tool is stored on the edge connecting the corresponding tool pair. For example, given a historical trajectory represented as:

$$(m_{\text{user}}, m_{\text{agent}}, m_{\text{user}}, \tau_1, \tau_{\text{summary}}, \tau_2, m_{\text{agent}}, m_{\text{user}}),$$

where  $m_{\text{user}}$  and  $m_{\text{agent}}$  denote messages from the user and the agent respectively. We construct two nodes,  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ , where each  $\tau_i$  represents a normal tool provided by the environment, and  $\tau_{\text{summary}}$  denotes the summarization tool we designed. An edge is then established between these nodes, represented as:

$$(\tau_1, \tau_2, w_{12}, \{\text{content of } \tau_{\text{summary}}\})$$

where  $w_{12}$  represents the weight of the edge, while the content of  $\tau_{\text{summary}}$  serves as the edge information, which may later include stateful summary information.

The weight represents both the success rate of the corresponding tasks and the efficiency of successful trajectories. The efficiency is measured by the number of rollout steps required to complete the

task. Previous work typically relies solely on the probability of successful transformation between tools to define edge weights (Liu et al., 2024a). However, this approach may lead to the tool overuse trap. To mitigate this issue, we incorporate efficiency as an additional weighting factor, enriching the information encoded in the graph. By leveraging the Accuracy–Efficiency tradeoff, the agent can develop resource-bounded strategies that avoid repeatedly invoking tools that are harmless but task-irrelevant, such as simple information retrieval tools.

To be specific, we define the weight as:

$$w'_{ij} = N_{ij} + c \sum \frac{1}{n_{ij}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $w'_{ij}$  denotes the raw weight of the edge  $e_{ij}$  connecting tool  $\tau_i$  and tool  $\tau_j$ ,  $N_{ij}$  represents the number of successful invocations of this tool pair in successful trajectories,  $n_{ij}$  denotes the number of turns in the successful trajectories where the two tool invocations occur and  $c$  is the weight used to control the relative importance of the two terms. The reciprocal of  $n_{ij}$  emphasizes more efficient successful trajectories.

To ensure local comparability for each node, the weights of all outgoing edges are normalized as follows:

$$w_{ij} = \frac{w'_{ij}}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} w'_{ik}} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}(i)$  denotes the set of nodes that can be reached from node  $i$ , which is all the next tool selection candidates of  $\tau_i$ . This normalization ensures that the sum of all outgoing edge weights from each node equals one, allowing the weights to represent the relative importance of different tool dependencies conditioned on the current tool.

#### 4.3 LEVERAGING THE GRAPH




Figure 3: **Adaptively leveraging the graph.** First, we locate the last tool call in the graph and identify the candidate node it is connected to. Then, the agent decides whether it should summarize the current state. If the decision is **yes**, the agent calls the summary tool and abstracts the current state as a summary. It then compares the similarity between this summarized state and the stored states in the connected edges, selecting the two with the highest similarities as the next tool candidates. If the decision is **no**, the agent directly selects the next two tools by comparing the edge weights. Both the similarity comparison and the weight comparison methods return two candidate tools for suggestion.

During inference, we leverage the SIT-Graph to provide tool-selection guidance for the agent, as shown in Fig.3. Specifically, after the agent invokes a tool, we locate the corresponding tool node in the graph and find all connected edges. The tools connected to these edges are regarded as candidate tools for the next invocation. Before making its next decision, the agent autonomously determines whether it is necessary to invoke the summary tool. If the agent determines that it need to summarize the current state, the summary tool is called to obtain a stateful summary of the current situation. This summary is then compared with the summary information stored on the

connected edges. Finally, the two tools associated with the edges exhibiting the highest similarity scores to the current summarized state information are selected and provided as suggestions for the next tool invocation. If the agent decides that summarization is not necessary, we select only the weight information for comparison and identify the two tools connected by the edges with the highest weights as suggestions for the next tool invocation. It is worth noting that we provide top-k candidate tools as suggestions to the agent, rather than directly selecting the tool with the highest score. This design choice offers greater generality and flexibility.

In conclusion, when summary information is required, the agent selects tools based on the summarized state; otherwise, it relies on the edge weights. This mechanism enables the agent to adaptively determine whether to draw on episodic memory or procedural memory when selecting tools. By dynamically switching between these two sources of memory, the agent can leverage high-level contextual cues when needed, while maintaining efficient decision-making through frequently observed transition patterns between tools. This adaptive selection process enhances the agent’s robustness and overall performance in complex or evolving environments.

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

### 5.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETTINGS

**Benchmarks.** To verify the effectiveness of our method, we conduct evaluations on four multi-turn tool-use benchmarks to demonstrate the superiority of our approach. We select Telecom tasks in  $\tau$ -Bench (Yao et al., 2024), Retail tasks in  $\tau^2$ -Bench (Barres et al., 2025), ToolSandbox (Lu et al., 2024) and agent multi-turn task in ACEBench (Chen et al., 2025a), which offer diverse stateful, conversational, and interactive real-world scenarios, in which an LLM-simulated user interacts with the LLM agent. Among these benchmarks, both  $\tau$ -Bench’s Telecom tasks and  $\tau^2$ -Bench’s Retail tasks have separate training and test sets, and the training set can be used to construct the tool graph. In ToolSandbox only a test set of approximately 1,000 tasks is available. We divide this set into a training set and a test set, containing about 800 and 200 tasks respectively. The training set can then be used to construct the tool graph as prior experience.

**Evaluation.** To ensure a fair comparison, we follow the evaluation protocols defined in the original benchmark settings. Specifically,  $\tau^2$ -Bench uses assertion functions to evaluate task success,  $\tau$ -Bench evaluates performance by comparing the final database state of each episode with the ground-truth expected state, and ToolSandbox adopts a milestone-based evaluation strategy that defines key events which must occur within a trajectory. Although these benchmarks adopt different evaluation criteria, we use the test-set accuracy as a unified metric to assess the performance of different methods.

**Baselines.** We compare our method with a basic retrieval approach, where the top three past experiences most similar to the current task are retrieved. In addition, we include comparisons with the memory-based method ReasoningBank (Ouyang et al., 2025), where the agent retrieves summaries of previous similar trajectories, and the tool graph-based method ToolNet (Liu et al., 2024a)<sup>1</sup>, which organizes tools into a directed graph, allowing the agent to navigate it by iteratively selecting the next tool from its successor nodes until the task is fully resolved.

### 5.2 MAIN RESULT

As shown in Table 1, SIT-Graph achieves state-of-the-art performance across benchmarks with different base models when compared with both episodic memory and tool graph based method. Notably, the performance improvement is more pronounced for base models with lower reasoning ability. For instance, GPT-4.1-mini benefits more from our method compared with GPT-4.1 and GPT-4o in most of the cases. This suggests that our approach is particularly effective at compensating for the reasoning limitations of smaller or less capable models with adaptive memory. Furthermore, while  $\tau^2$ -bench and  $\tau$ -bench contain similar tasks within a single domain, Toolsandbox includes tasks spanning multiple domains. Our method consistently outperforms all baselines across these benchmarks, highlighting its generalizability to tasks with varying complexity and diverse

<sup>1</sup>Since the original implementation is not open-sourced, we re-implemented it ourselves.



Table 1: Performance comparison of different models across three benchmarks, showing the average task reward (1 for completed tasks, 0 for incomplete tasks) and relative improvement over the Base Model.

Benchmark	Model	Base Model	Reasoning Bank	ToolNet	Retrieval Top-3	SIT-Graph
$\tau$ -bench	GPT-4.1-mini	0.541	0.567 (+4.8%)	0.572 (+5.7%)	0.575 (+6.3%)	<b>0.661 (+22.2%)</b>
	GPT-4.1	0.658	0.645 (-2.0%)	0.652 (-0.9%)	0.672 (+2.1%)	<b>0.710 (+7.9%)</b>
	GPT-4o	0.609	0.624 (+2.5%)	0.634 (+4.1%)	0.644 (+5.7%)	<b>0.670 (+10.0%)</b>
$\tau^2$ -bench	GPT-4.1-mini	0.396	0.441 (+11.4%)	0.452 (+14.1%)	0.422 (+6.6%)	<b>0.526 (+32.8%)</b>
	GPT-4.1	0.358	0.413 (+15.4%)	0.425 (+18.7%)	0.439 (+22.6%)	<b>0.512 (+43.0%)</b>
	GPT-4o	0.287	0.309 (+7.7%)	0.333 (+16.0%)	0.298 (+3.8%)	<b>0.362 (+26.1%)</b>
Toolsandbox	GPT-4.1-mini	0.584	0.628 (+7.5%)	0.624 (+6.8%)	0.582 (-0.3%)	<b>0.658 (+12.7%)</b>
	GPT-4.1	0.633	0.605 (-4.4%)	0.643 (+1.6%)	0.526 (-16.9%)	<b>0.704 (+11.2%)</b>
	GPT-4o	0.619	0.632 (+2.1%)	0.652 (+5.3%)	0.598 (-3.4%)	<b>0.673 (+8.7%)</b>

tool requirements. Notably, among the baselines, step-level methods such as ToolNet outperform trajectory-level retrieval approaches like Reasoning Bank. This performance gap can be attributed to the nature of multi-turn settings, where the relevant trajectory information becomes progressively clarified over the course of the interaction rather than being fully specified at the outset. As a result, trajectory-level retrieval may introduce incomplete or even inaccurate contextual signals during early reasoning stages, limiting its effectiveness. While both the trajectory-based retrieval methods and tool graph method provide moderate improvements, our approach consistently achieves superior results. This suggests that the proposed mechanism for integrating segment-level episodic knowledge and repeated pattern offers a more reliable and adaptive form of guidance in multi-turn scenarios.

### 5.3 SCENARIOS WITHOUT AN AVAILABLE TRAINING SET

In some scenarios, a dedicated training set for graph construction may not be available. In such cases, the graph must be updated online using test-time data. We employ an LLM-as-a-judge to determine whether each task is successfully completed, and the successful trajectories are then used to construct the graph in real time following the procedure described in Section 4.2. To evaluate our method under this setting, we conduct experiments on the ACEBench multi-turn agent tasks, and report both end-to-end and process accuracy in Table 2. End-to-end accuracy is evaluated by comparing the instance attributes of the corresponding class with the target. If all attributes match exactly, Accuracy = 1; otherwise = 0. Process accuracy is determined by the consistency between the actual function call process and the ideal process. It is expressed as  $n/m$ , where  $m$  is the length of the ideal function call sequence, and  $n$  is the number of correctly matched steps. ACEBench contains multi-turn tasks with partially overlapping scenarios, so our dynamic graph construction approach yields notable performance improvements by enabling the agent to adaptively retrieve state-specific memories or tool dependencies. Notably, in this setting, we replace the original Retrieve-Top-3 related experience baseline with a Retrieve-Top-1 scheme. When the total number of tasks is relatively small, forcing the agent to retrieve three similar experiences often introduces irrelevant or weakly related trajectories, which can mislead decision-making and ultimately degrade performance. Our method also achieves performance gains even when the SIT-Graph is constructed using only a small amount of data during the online update stage. In contrast, ToolNet, which relies solely on tool-dependency information, exhibits a significant performance drop. This observation further supports that relevant prior experiences can effectively guide the agent toward correct decisions, whereas irrelevant memories may introduce noise and hinder reasoning.

### 5.4 MORE ADVANCED MODEL

The performance of GPT-5.1 on the  $\tau^2$ -Bench benchmark is notably strong. We further evaluated the GPT-5.1 across a wider range of benchmarks, and the results are demonstrated in Table 3, where GPT-5.1 corresponds to the reasoning-high mode. Due to the high computational and monetary costs associated with running GPT-5.1, we restrict our primary experiments to GPT-4.1. Notably, our SIT-Graph framework built upon GPT-4.1 already surpasses the performance of GPT-5.1 on half

Table 2: Performance comparison across two evaluation metrics (process accuracy and end-to-end accuracy).

Metric	Model	Base	Reasoning Bank	ToolNet	Retrieval Top-1	SIT-Graph
Process Acc	GPT-4.1-mini	0.633	0.701	0.627	0.641	<b>0.719</b>
	GPT-4.1	0.653	0.703	0.664	0.601	<b>0.765</b>
	GPT-4o	0.664	0.684	0.659	0.628	<b>0.720</b>
End-to-End Acc	GPT-4.1-mini	0.400	0.483	0.436	0.473	<b>0.533</b>
	GPT-4.1	0.503	0.498	0.481	0.432	<b>0.567</b>
	GPT-4o	0.484	0.477	0.473	0.467	<b>0.503</b>

Table 3: Performance comparison of different models across five benchmarks.

Model	$\tau^2$ -Bench	$\tau$ -Bench	ToolSandbox	ACEBench end-to-end	ACEBench process
GPT-5.1 with high reasoning	0.842	0.739	0.647	0.433	0.674
GPT-4.1 with SIT-Graph	0.512	0.710	0.704	0.567	0.765

of the evaluated datasets. A comprehensive evaluation of SIT-Graph instantiated with GPT-5.1 is left for future work.

## 5.5 ABLATION STUDY

### The components of SIT-Graph

We conduct a series of ablation studies to analyze the contribution of each component within the SIT-Graph framework. Specifically, we design three variants: (i) Without the SIT-Graph. In this setting, the base model is equipped only with our Summarization Tool, which the agent can autonomously decide to invoke. (ii) Graph traversal using state information only. Here, the agent maintains the ability to decide when to recall past information. However, tool retrieval from the graph is conditioned solely on the current state representation, without considering edge weights or tool-dependency signals. This design evaluates whether state-conditioned retrieval alone is sufficient for effective guidance and how much performance relies on fine-grained dependency modeling. (iii) Graph traversal using edge weights only. In this configuration, the agent follows the SIT-Graph deterministically at every step. We rank tools based on learned edge weights and retrieve the top-k candidate tools as suggestions. The agent no longer leverages explicit state information during retrieval.

Table 4: Ablation results on SIT-Graph: component ablations (top), weight design ablations (middle) and graph-leveraging methods (bottom).

Method	$\tau^2$ -Bench	$\tau$ -Bench	Toolsandbox
Base model	0.358	0.658	0.633
SIT-Graph	0.512	0.710	0.704
<b>(A) Component ablations</b>			
(i) w/o graph	0.430	0.667	0.647
(ii) w/o weight	0.472	0.684	0.663
(iii) w/o state	0.465	0.678	0.674
<b>(B) Weight design ablations</b>			
(i) only weight	0.465	0.678	0.674
(ii) only weight w/o efficiency	0.456	0.660	0.655
<b>(C) Graph-leveraging methods</b>			
(i) w/o adapt	0.477	0.652	0.678
(ii) with GNN4plan	0.427	0.669	0.602

The results reported in Table 4 show that, even without the graph structure, the agent’s adaptive use of the Summarization Tool consistently yields performance improvements across different models and benchmarks. This variant isolates the contribution of memory summarization from that of graph-based retrieval. Moreover, the results indicate that both state information and edge-weight information within the SIT-Graph contribute significantly to the final performance.

**The design of weight in the graph** To assess the effectiveness of our weight design, we conduct two controlled experiments: (i) Weight-only traversal. In this setting, the agent makes action selections solely based on the learned weights, retrieving tools according to their top-k weight values. (ii) Accuracy-only weighting. In this variant, the agent retrieves tools using only the accuracy-related signal adopted as in prior work Liu et al. (2024a), excluding the efficiency term introduced by our method. This allows us to isolate the contribution of the newly proposed efficiency component.

As shown in Table 4, all ablated variants exhibit performance degradation compared to the full SIT-Graph model. The deterioration is particularly pronounced in tasks that rely on weight information incorporating both tool-dependency structure and efficiency signals. Notably, the results also demonstrate that the efficiency term contributes additional gains even when the agent relies solely on weight-based retrieval.

**Ablation study on different graph-leveraging methods** We conduct experiments to examine the impact of adaptive memory retrieval during traversal of the SIT-Graph. Specifically, we consider two variants: (i) In the w/o adapt variant, the agent is required to recall episodic memory whenever a previously invoked tool connected by an edge contains relevant state information. If none of the connected edges provide state information, the agent defaults to weight-based retrieval. (ii) with GNN4Plan (Wu et al., 2024) traverses the SIT-Graph according to the original GNN4Plan strategy. Each variant is tested under identical conditions to isolate the effect of the ablated component.

As shown in Table 4, both alternative graph-leveraging methods exhibit performance drops relative to the full SIT-Graph. These results underscore the importance of our approach in dynamically invoking different types of memory and incorporating state-level information. The findings indicate that the ability to selectively retrieve episodic and procedural memory according to task-specific states is critical for effective multi-turn reasoning and tool selection. The observed performance degradation in the ablated variants highlights that both memory adaptation and fine-grained state awareness jointly contribute to the robustness and efficiency of the SIT-Graph framework.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose a unified graph structure for multi-turn tool use, SIT-Graph, which stores both state information and tool dependencies. The agent adaptively decides how to traverse the graph, using either state information or tool dependencies, which is analogous to how humans recall episodic or procedural memory. Experimental results demonstrate that our method consistently outperforms strong memory- and graph-based baselines, indicating that adaptively recalling different types of memory in realistic multi-turn tool-use scenarios enables more robust decisions. This adaptive memory control also steers the agent toward more human-like decision-making behavior.

## REFERENCES

- Saaket Agashe, Jiuzhou Han, Shuyu Gan, Jiachen Yang, Ang Li, and Xin Eric Wang. Agent s: An open agentic framework that uses computers like a human. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08164*, 2024.
- Petr Anokhin, Nikita Semenov, Artyom Sorokin, Dmitry Evseev, Andrey Kravchenko, Mikhail Burtsev, and Evgeny Burnaev. Arigraph: Learning knowledge graph world models with episodic memory for llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04363*, 2024.
- Hisham E Atallah, Michael J Frank, and Randall C O’Reilly. Hippocampus, cortex, and basal ganglia: Insights from computational models of complementary learning systems. *Neurobiology of learning and memory*, 82(3):253–267, 2004.
- Victor Barres, Honghua Dong, Soham Ray, Xujie Si, and Karthik Narasimhan.  $\tau$ 2-bench: Evaluating conversational agents in a dual-control environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07982*, 2025.
- Jiajun Chai, Guojun Yin, Zekun Xu, Chuhuai Yue, Yi Jia, Siyu Xia, Xiaohan Wang, Jiwen Jiang, Xiaoguang Li, Chengqi Dong, et al. Rlfactory: A plug-and-play reinforcement learning post-training framework for llm multi-turn tool-use. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.06980*, 2025.

- 
- Chen Chen, Xinlong Hao, Weiwen Liu, Xu Huang, Xingshan Zeng, Shuai Yu, Dexun Li, Shuai Wang, Weinan Gan, Yuefeng Huang, et al. Acebench: Who wins the match point in tool usage? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12851*, 2025a.
- Wenjie Chen, Wenbin Li, Di Yao, Xuying Meng, Chang Gong, and Jingping Bi. Gtool: Graph enhanced tool planning with large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.12725*, 2025b.
- Prateek Chhikara, Dev Khant, Saket Aryan, Taranjeet Singh, and Deshraj Yadav. Mem0: Building production-ready ai agents with scalable long-term memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19413*, 2025.
- Keyan Ding, Jing Yu, Junjie Huang, Yuchen Yang, Qiang Zhang, and Huajun Chen. Scitoolagent: a knowledge-graph-driven scientific agent for multitool integration. *Nature Computational Science*, pp. 1–11, 2025.
- Guanting Dong, Yifei Chen, Xiaoxi Li, Jiajie Jin, Hongjin Qian, Yutao Zhu, Hangyu Mao, Guorui Zhou, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. Tool-star: Empowering llm-brained multi-tool reasoner via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16410*, 2025.
- Lang Feng, Zhenghai Xue, Tingcong Liu, and Bo An. Group-in-group policy optimization for llm agent training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.10978*, 2025.
- Shengyue Guan, Haoyi Xiong, Jindong Wang, Jiang Bian, Bin Zhu, and Jian-guang Lou. Evaluating llm-based agents for multi-turn conversations: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.22458*, 2025.
- Yuki Hou, Haruki Tamoto, and Homei Miyashita. ” my agent understands me better”: Integrating dynamic human-like memory recall and consolidation in llm-based agents. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–7, 2024.
- Yuchen Huang, Sijia Li, Zhiyuan Fan, Minghao LIU, Wei Liu, and Yi R Fung. Scaling environments for llm agents: Fundamentals, approaches, and future directions. In *Workshop on Scaling Environments for Agents*, 2025.
- Jinhao Jiang, Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yang Song, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, and Ji-Rong Wen. Kg-agent: An efficient autonomous agent framework for complex reasoning over knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 9505–9523, 2025a.
- Xun Jiang, Feng Li, Han Zhao, Jiahao Qiu, Jiaying Wang, Jun Shao, Shihao Xu, Shu Zhang, Weiling Chen, Xavier Tang, et al. Long term memory: The foundation of ai self-evolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15665*, 2024.
- Yan Jiang, Hao Zhou, LiZhong GU, Ai Han, and TianLong Li. Naviagent: Bilevel planning on tool dependency graphs for function calling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.19500*, 2025b.
- Kuang-Huei Lee, Xinyun Chen, Hiroki Furuta, John Canny, and Ian Fischer. A human-inspired reading agent with gist memory of very long contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09727*, 2024.
- Xukun Liu, Zhiyuan Peng, Xiaoyuan Yi, Xing Xie, Lirong Xiang, Yuchen Liu, and Dongkuan Xu. Toolnet: Connecting large language models with massive tools via tool graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00839*, 2024a.
- Yixin Liu, Guibin Zhang, Kun Wang, Shiyuan Li, and Shirui Pan. Graph-augmented large language model agents: Current progress and future prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.21407*, 2025.
- Zhaoyang Liu, Zeqiang Lai, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Ziheng Li, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Qifeng Chen, Yu Qiao, Jifeng Dai, et al. Controlllm: Augment language models with tools by searching on graphs. In *ECCV (12)*, 2024b.
- Jiarui Lu, Thomas Holleis, Yizhe Zhang, Bernhard Aumayer, Feng Nan, Felix Bai, Shuang Ma, Shen Ma, Mengyu Li, Guoli Yin, et al. Toolsandbox: A stateful, conversational, interactive evaluation benchmark for llm tool use capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04682*, 2024.

- 
- Siru Ouyang, Jun Yan, I Hsu, Yanfei Chen, Ke Jiang, Zifeng Wang, Rujun Han, Long T Le, Samira Daruki, Xiangru Tang, et al. Reasoningbank: Scaling agent self-evolving with reasoning memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25140*, 2025.
- Avinash Patil and Aryan Jadon. Advancing reasoning in large language models: Promising methods and approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03671*, 2025.
- Akshara Prabhakar, Zuxin Liu, Ming Zhu, Jianguo Zhang, Tulika Awalgaonkar, Shiyu Wang, Zhiwei Liu, Haolin Chen, Thai Hoang, Juan Carlos Niebles, et al. Apigen-mt: Agentic pipeline for multi-turn data generation via simulated agent-human interplay. *CoRR*, 2025.
- Alireza Rezazadeh, Zichao Li, Wei Wei, and Yujia Bao. From isolated conversations to hierarchical schemas: Dynamic tree memory representation for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14052*, 2024.
- Daphna Shohamy and Anthony D Wagner. Integrating memories in the human brain: hippocampal-midbrain encoding of overlapping events. *Neuron*, 60(2):378–389, 2008.
- Yueqi Song, Frank Xu, Shuyan Zhou, and Graham Neubig. Beyond browsing: Api-based web agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16464*, 2024.
- Xiangru Tang, Tianyu Hu, Muyang Ye, Yanzun Shao, Xunjian Yin, Siru Ouyang, Wangchunshu Zhou, Pan Lu, Zhuosheng Zhang, Yilun Zhao, et al. Chemagent: Self-updating library in large language models improves chemical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06590*, 2025.
- Bing Wang, Xinnian Liang, Jian Yang, Hui Huang, Shuangzhi Wu, Peihao Wu, Lu Lu, Zejun Ma, and Zhoujun Li. Enhancing large language model with self-controlled memory framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13343*, 2023.
- Hongru Wang, Wenyu Huang, Yufei Wang, Yuanhao Xi, Jianqiao Lu, Huan Zhang, Nan Hu, Zem-ing Liu, Jeff Z Pan, and Kam-Fai Wong. Rethinking stateful tool use in multi-turn dialogues: Benchmarks and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13328*, 2025a.
- Zezhong Wang, Xingshan Zeng, Weiwen Liu, Liangyou Li, Yasheng Wang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Kam-Fai Wong. Toolflow: Boosting llm tool-calling through natural and coherent dialogue synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18447*, 2024.
- Zihan Wang, Kangrui Wang, Qineng Wang, Pingyue Zhang, Linjie Li, Zhengyuan Yang, Xing Jin, Kefan Yu, Minh Nhat Nguyen, Licheng Liu, et al. Ragen: Understanding self-evolution in llm agents via multi-turn reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.20073*, 2025b.
- Steven P Wise. The role of the basal ganglia in procedural memory. In *Seminars in Neuroscience*, volume 8, pp. 39–46. Elsevier, 1996.
- Xixi Wu, Yifei Shen, Caihua Shan, Kaitao Song, Siwei Wang, Bohang Zhang, Jiarui Feng, Hong Cheng, Wei Chen, Yun Xiong, et al. Can graph learning improve planning in llm-based agents? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:5338–5383, 2024.
- Zidi Xiong, Yuping Lin, Wenya Xie, Pengfei He, Jiliang Tang, Himabindu Lakkaraju, and Zhen Xiang. How memory management impacts llm agents: An empirical study of experience-following behavior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16067*, 2025.
- Wujiang Xu, Kai Mei, Hang Gao, Juntao Tan, Zujie Liang, and Yongfeng Zhang. A-mem: Agentic memory for llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12110*, 2025.
- Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan.  $\tau$ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12045*, 2024.
- Fan Yin, Zifeng Wang, I-Hung Hsu, Jun Yan, Ke Jiang, Yanfei Chen, Jindong Gu, Long T Le, Kai-Wei Chang, Chen-Yu Lee, et al. Magnet: Multi-turn tool-use data synthesis and distillation via graph translation. *CoRR*, 2025.
- Siyu Yuan, Kaitao Song, Jiangjie Chen, Xu Tan, Yongliang Shen, Ren Kan, Dongsheng Li, and Deqing Yang. Easytool: Enhancing llm-based agents with concise tool instruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06201*, 2024.

- 
- Jintian Zhang, Yuqi Zhu, Mengshu Sun, Yujie Luo, Shuofei Qiao, Lun Du, Da Zheng, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. Lightthinker: Thinking step-by-step compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.15589*, 2025a.
- Yizhuo Zhang, Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Zhaoxuan Tan, Xiaochuang Han, Tianxing He, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Can llm graph reasoning generalize beyond pattern memorization? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15992*, 2024.
- Zeyu Zhang, Quanyu Dai, Xu Chen, Rui Li, Zhongyang Li, and Zhenhua Dong. Memengine: A unified and modular library for developing advanced memory of llm-based agents. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, pp. 821–824, 2025b.
- Weikang Zhao, Xili Wang, Chengdi Ma, Lingbin Kong, Zhaohua Yang, Mingxiang Tuo, Xiaowei Shi, Yitao Zhai, and Xunliang Cai. Mua-rl: Multi-turn user-interacting agent reinforcement learning for agentic tool use. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18669*, 2025.